

# FACTS AND FIGURES

FOR

## FREMONT AND FREEDOM.



—◆—  
“Is he capable—Is he honest?”  
Read and Judge.

900981A

“SEC. 12. If any free persons, by speaking or by writing, assert or maintain *that persons have not a right to hold slaves* in the Territory, or shall introduce into Kansas, print, publish, write, circulate, or caused to be introduced into the Territory, written, printed, published, or circulated in this Territory, any book, paper, magazine pamphlet, or circular, containing any denial of the rights of persons to hold aives in this Territory, such persons shall be deemed guilty of felony, and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term not less than two years.”—*Kansas Law, passed by Bogus Legislature.*

“Congress shall make no new law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”—*Constitution of the United States.*

“A well regulated Militia being necessary to the Security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED.”—*Constitution of the United States.*

—◆—  
“Give me Liberty, or give me Death.”

PATRICK HENRY.

—◆—  
PROVIDENCE, R. I.

PRINTED AT THE DAILY TRIBUNE OFFICE, 3 CANAL STREET.

1856.

1. U.S. - Politics, 1853-1857

2. Fremont, John Charles...

A.H.

ED. (1)

Spec  
Capam

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

900981A

ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

R 1937 L

## FACTS AND FIGURES.

Reader, let us forget our respecting parties a few moments and remember our obligations to our country and to our God, while we consider the question of our next President. As American Citizens responsible to a certain extent for the character and official acts of men whom we aid in elevating to power, it becomes a vastly important question. "WHAT IS OUR DUTY *in the coming election?*"

### CANDIDATES.

Four candidates are before the public, and you doubtless expect to vote for one of them; and as an *honest* man you intend to vote for the *best man for this Nation*. The friends of each candidate ask you to vote for their nominee on the ground that *he* is the *best* man. Have you carefully examined their respective merits in the light of *facts* and figures so as to vote understandingly? Can you if necessary sacrifice *party* for *principle*—give up mere *political triumph* for the triumph of *truth* and righteousness? Come let us review the ground of political action, and enquire after truth and duty.

MILLARD FILLMORE, JAMES BUCHANAN, JOHN C. FREMONT and GERRIT SMITH are the candidates for the Presidency. GERRIT SMITH, the Anti-Slavery candidate and one of the noblest men in our nation, is too well known to the public to require a comparison. We therefore call attention to the three great rival candidates that engross the public mind.

Which is the *best man for our nation*, under existing circumstances, is the great question with every honest man.

Mr. Fillmore is properly the candidate of the Native American party in the South, with such of the American party in the Free States, as sympathise with the South on the question of national policy, with reference to slavery. Perhaps we should include among Mr. Fillmore's supporters, a portion of the old Whig party which has adopted him for their candidate, since his nomination by the Americans.

Mr. Buchanan is the regular Democratic candidate, nominated by the party at their convention in Cincinnati. *Southern Whigs* very generally support him, because they consider him a better man for the South; while many *Northern Whigs* will probably support him from sympathy with the South on the subject of slavery.

Mr. Fremont is the Republican candidate. The Republican party, is made up of Democrats, Whigs, Americans, Free Soilers, Anti Slavery men and members of all parties, who unite in Mr. Fremont as a *man for the times*, who if elected will exert his executive power to check the progress of American slavery, and bring back the government to the original design of our National Constitution.—With the supporters of Mr. Fremont, *the question is, the progress of liberty, or the progress of slavery.* They appeal to the ballot box for a decision of this question.

## ISSUE.

We shall now attempt to prove beyond all controversy, by "*facts and figures*," that the *true issue* in the coming presidential election, is the extension, or non-extension of slavery. There may be "*side issues*," but they are of so little account, compared with the main question, as scarcely to be mentioned when considering the claims of candidates.

That the supporters of Mr. Fremont regard this as the *real issue*, needs no proof. That the friends of Mr. Buchanan at the South consider this the great question, is evident from the fact that Whigs and Democrats endorse him as "safe" on the subject of slavery, while Northern Democracy do not deny it, but claim the Southern vote on that ground. Mr. Fillmore is identified with pro-slavery by official acts and public speeches. Indeed, some Southerners based Mr. Fillmore's claims to the vote of the South, on the fact, that he is more reliable on the subject of slavery, than Mr. Buchanan.—That we do not misrepresent either of the candidates, will appear when we give "*Facts and Figures*."

Now, reader, if the *extension* or non-extension of slavery in this country is the *real issue*, then on which side will you arrange yourself in this great conflict of principles? Will *you*, perhaps, a descendant of our patriotic fathers, who fought the battles of the Revolution—an American citizen—a professed friend of humanity; will you, we ask, be found on the side of oppression? Never, no, *never*, we trust, while sentiments and feelings of true manhood animate you with the love of civil liberty.

## CAUSE AND EFFECT.

Ever since our nation's birth, sentiments of liberty have been cherished by our fathers, as a divine legacy to mankind. The Declaration of American Independence was the embodiment of that sentiment, while it was also the *first emphatic act* in the grand programme of American liberty. Since then the contest between *freedom* and *oppression* has waxed warmer and warmer, slavery continually invading and encroaching on the rights of liberty by extending its domain and contriving to monopolize to a great extent, the public offices of the nation.

For some few years past the conflict has raged with more violence, liberty showing a more determined resistance to oppression, while slavery has exhibited the energy of despair, until our country fairly reels on the borders of political revolution.

The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the Nebraska Bill, and recent Kansas outrages, have aroused the nation to a sense of danger, and to efforts in behalf of liberty. Hence the issue is between freedom and oppression. In proof of this, we now offer some facts.

## FACTS.

"During the Debates on the repeal of the "Missouri Compromise," in the U. S. House of Representatives, the following language was addressed to the opponents of that measure by

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS, OF GA.

"Well, gentlemen, you make a good deal of clamor on the Nebraska measure, but it don't alarm us at all. We have got used to that kind of talk. You have threatened before, but never *performed*. You have always *caved in*, and you will again. You are a *mouthing white-livered set*. Of course you will oppose: we expect that; but we don't care for your opposition. You will rail; but we don't care for your railing. You will hiss; but so do adders. We expect it of adders, and we expect it of you. You are like the devils that were pitched over the battlements



of heaven into hell. They set up a howl of discomfiture; and so will you. But *their fate was sealed, and so is yours.* You must **SUBMIT TO THE YOKE.** But *don't chafe Gentlemen, we have got you in our power.* You tried to drive us to the wall in 1850; but times are changed. *You went a wooling and CAME HOME FLEE- CED.* *Don't be so IMPUDENT as to COMPLAIN.* *You will only be SLAPPED IN THE FACE.* *Don't resist; you will only be LASHED INTO OBEDIENCE."*

Such language shows what the South means, and the character of the issue they are now making with the North.

The fact that Fremont is discarded by the South on account of the suspicion of Anti-Slavery, proves that Slavery is the issue.— See an extract from the

### MOBILE ADVERTISER.

"*There are men here in Alabama, and in this county, who are not ashamed to own a preference for Fremont, or any other abolitionist, to Buchanan. How can the South ever expect to maintain her self-respect or obtain her just rights, if she even endures such persons on her soil, much less permits them to occupy influential positions within her border.*"

That Slavery, and the extension of Slave territory is the *real issue*, is very certain from the reasons offered for oppositions to Fremont, and the election of Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fillmore. Take the argument for Buchanan as an illustration:

"*The Richmond Enquirer*, under the head of "A Record without a Blemish," gives the following list of Mr. Buchanan's votes in Congress on questions relating to Slavery. We believe it correct except in its omission of the fact that in 1819—before he had caught a glimpse of the White House—Mr. Buchanan signed a call for a meeting of the citizens of Lancaster to protest against the admission of Missouri as a Slave State. Since that we do not know that he has ever spoken, acted or voted with reference to Slavery otherwise than to "strengthen and uphold it," as the *Enquirer* fairly asserts in its article in its introductory to the following summary:

1. In 1836, Mr. Buchanan supported a bill to prohibit the circulation of Abolition Papers through the Mail.
2. In the same year he proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas.
3. In 1836-37 he denounced and voted to reject petitions for the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.
4. In 1837 he voted for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolutions, defining the rights of the States and the limits of Federal authority, and affirming it to be the duty of the Government to protect and uphold the institutions of the South.
5. In 1838, 1839 and 1840, he invariably voted with Southern Senators against the consideration of Anti-Slavery Petitions.
6. In 1844-5, he advocated and voted for the annexation of Texas.
7. In 1847, he sustained the Clayton Compromise.
8. In 1850, he proposed and urged the extension of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific Ocean.
9. But he promptly acquiesced in the Compromise of 1850, and employed all his influence in favor of the Fugitive Slave law.
10. In 1854 he remonstrated against an enactment of the Pennsylvania Legislature for the obstruction and arrest of fugitive slaves
11. In 1854 he negotiated for the admission of Cuba.
12. In 1856 he approves the repeal of the Missouri restriction, and supports the principles of the Kansas Nebraska Act.
13. He never gave a vote against the interests of Slavery and uttered a word which could pain the most sensitive Southern heart.

The prominent facts of Mr. Buchanan's record touching Slavery are thus grouped into a single view; so that the person of the least patience in research may ascertain at a glance how the Democratic candidate stands in respect to the great issue of the canvass. In this succinct statement, we give not detached passages and isolated acts, but we bring the whole history of a long life to bear upon the popular mind with the irresistible force of truth. This rapid retrospect discloses a consistency and an efficiency of service to the South which flattery can claim for no other man. Mr. Buchanan is not only vindicated from calumny; he is not simply shown to be exempt from just reproach and worthy of confidence; he is prominent to his proper position in advance of any and every statesman of the North, in the confidence and affection of the people of the South he demands not a mere recognition of his attachment to the Constitution, but unbounded applause for such service in the interest of the South as no other man can boast. Against the captious criticism of a desperate adversary, refining upon distinctions and skulking among quibbles, the Democracy oppose this incontestible attestation of their candidates' reality.

We presume no one will question the Pro-slavery of the Hon. Stephen A. Douglass. He endorses Mr. Buchanan as follows :

**THE IDENTITY OF BUCHANAN WITH DOUGLAS.**—We give an extract from a speech by senator Douglas at a Buchanan ratification meeting in New York:—

“But my friends, I find that these Black ‘republican’ murderers and black ‘republican’ newspapers have all begun to shed crocodile tears over mine own humble fate, because they made a Douglas platform and put Buchanan on it. I wish to call your attention to a point for a moment, and that is whether it is not a Buchanan platform as well as a Douglas. They say it is a Douglas, because it endorsed every position that I have taken, not only on the slavery question, and Kansas and Nebraska, but the foreign policy, that is true, and because it is true, I stand with heart and soul ready to devote all my energies to the success of the platform and candidate. Now, my friends, if you will listen for an instant for a brief historical account, I will show you that Buchanan and myself have for several years back—ever since I came into public life—held the same position on the slavery question from beginning to end.”

Does Mr. Douglas regard Slavery as the issue? Take also the testimony of President Pierce :

**WHERE MR. BUCHANAN STANDS.**—President Pierce, in a late speech, says of the nomination of Mr. Buchanan :

“I congratulate you that your choice has fallen on a man who stands on the **IDENTICAL PLATFORM THAT I OCCUPY**, and that he will take the same with the standard lowered never an inch.”

The following extract from the New York Tribune, needs no comment—it explains itself.

“Mr. Buchanan was the candidate of Virginia at the two last Democratic National Conventions, and her slave-breeding politicians are not often mistaken in their tools. There is not a man in the Union who, since he snuffed the Presidency far off, has been more subservient to the Slave Power than he. His distinguished friend and champion, the Hon. J. Glancy Jones, in a late triumphant reply to his South American Colleague the Hon. Henry M. Fuller, who had vainly attempted to pick some flaws in Mr. Buchanan’s Pro-slavery escutcheon, truly said—

“All such accusations as these against Mr. Buchanan are answered.

“By the fact that, twenty years ago, in the Senate of the United States, he was among the first of Northern men to resist the inroads of Abolitionism.”

“By his opposition to the circulation of insurrectionary documents through the mails of the United States among the slaves of the South.”

“By his determined support of the bill admitting Arkansas into the American Union.”

“By his early support of the Annexation of Texas.

“By his persevering support of the Fugitive Slave law.”

“By his energetic efforts to effect a repeal of the law of the State of Pennsylvania, denying to the Federal authorities the use of her prisons for the detention of fugitive slaves.

“By his early and unyielding opposition to the Wilmot Proviso.

“By the fact that, while a member of Mr. Polk’s Cabinet, against the opposition of fanaticism, he proposed to extend the Missouri line to the Pacific amid the delight and gratitude of national men of all parts of the Union.”

“By every vote he gave in the American Congress on the question of Slavery, and by the fact that of all Northern men he has been among the most prominent in asserting and defending a strict construction of the Federal Constitution.”

“By the construction which he placed upon the compromise measures of 1850, the letter addressed by him in November of the same year to the people of Philadelphia, in which he declared that the compromise measures had superseded the Missouri line, or, to use his own language, that that line had ‘passed away,’ which construction led inevitably to the adoption of the principle of popular sovereignty, embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska bill.”

These extracts not only prove conclusively that Slavery is the issue, but they also prove that James Buchanan is Pro-Slavery to the back-bone, and that the South will sustain him for that very reason.

### FILLMORE.

But what of Millard Fillmore? A few facts will answer the question as to his reliability. Once Mr. Fillmore stood, professionally on the side of liberty. Alas! how fallen. Let his admirers read the following :

## MR. FILLMORE IN 1838.

" BUFFALO, Oct. 17th, 1838..

To *W. Mills, Esq., Chairman, &c., &c.*—

Sir:—Your communication of the 15th inst., as chairman of a Committee supported by ' *The Anti-Slavery Society of the County of Erie,*' has just come to hand.— You solicit my answer to the following interrogatories;

1st. Do you believe that petitions to Congress on the subject of slavery and the slave trade ought to be received, read, and respectfully considered by the representatives of the people ?

2. Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to this Union under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held therein ?

3. Are you in favor of Congress exercising all the constitutional power it possesses, to abolish the slave trade between the States ?

4. Are you in favor of immediate legislation for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia ?

I am much engaged and have no time to enter into an argument, or to explain at length my reasons for my opinion. I shall, therefore, content myself for the present, by answering all your interrogatories IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, and leave for some future occasion a more extended discussion of the subject.

\* \* \* \* \*

I am very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

MILLARD FILLMORE."

## How just the remarks of the New York Courier—

The New York Courier, commenting on the above letter, truly says:—Now, in 1856, this same Millard Fillmore is so in love with *Slavery* that he stands pledged, if elected to the Presidency, to oppose any legislation which shall exclude slavery from Kansas, or the tendency of which shall be to restore the Missouri Compromise of 1820, and the restriction of slavery to south of 36 deg, 30 min.! But this is not all. Such is his infatuation with slavery, and such his subserviency to the slave power, that in the desperate hope of carrying a portion of the South, he publicly proclaims that the election of Fremont *by the people of the United States*, is good cause for the dissolution of the Union. If this be not treason to the Union, it evinces such consummate folly, and such abject subserviency to the Slave Power, that honest and intelligent men will not vote for him."

After signing the Fugitive Slave Bill, we are prepared to hear Mr. Fillmore's Albany speech, in which he goes off in the style of Southern disunion.

(Extract from Mr. Fillmore's speech at Albany.)

" We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency, selected for the first time from the free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by suffrages of one part of the Union only to rule over the whole United States. ( Cries of 'shame! shame!') Can it be possible that these who are now engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow, in case of success? Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate?

## DONELSON ON FILLMORE.

The following query, which answered itself when propounded by Andrew J. Donelson, a little over four years ago, does not require an answer *now*.

" Is it not, to the plain sense of every man, a monstrous foolery to ask a National Democrat to sustain Mr. Fillmore, now repudiated by two thirds of his own party as an eleventh hour apostate from his *known Abolitionism* of 1848, to the old Democratic doctrine of non-intervention as embodied in the Compromise.

But, as scarcely anybody regards Mr. Fillmore as likely to carry a single State in the Union, it is hardly worth while to talk about him. Let those who *will* vote for him remember that their influence goes for Slavery.

## FREMONT.

That Mr. Fremont, if elected, will give the weight of his influence for *Liberty*, there can be little doubt; indeed, that is the grand objection of the South. Before he was a candidate for the Presidency, he was the pride and admiration of his country. Since his nomination, selfish, sordid politicians and a hireling press have said and done all they could to blight his character and prospects of success.



This is just like the age we live in, and well accords with the spirit and manner of conducting political campaigns. But the cause of truth has nothing to fear from investigation, but much to hope.— We therefore invite attention to Mr. Fremont's character and adaptation to public station. What he *was* before receiving the nomination of the Republican party, will appear from the testimony of his political enemies, as well as other documents. *Then*, they had no motive for traducing his character and lying about his civil and religious life; hence we believe they tell us the truth in past history. A few facts will show their estimate.

HON. JOHN C. CALHOUN,—a South Carolinian Democrat, a leader in their ranks, and a severe critic on men, bears the following testimony :

“I have an acquaintance with the Colonel, (Fremont,) and am so favorably impressed as to him, that I *would as readily trust him as any other individual*. HIS INTEGRITY IS ABOVE SUSPICION.” The following expresses a like sentiment :

“I regard Col. Fremont as one of the most heroic and successful officers in our army—an army of which any nation might be proud.”—*Senator Rusk of Texas*.

How does this compare with the slang we hear now?

Another speaks of Fremont as follows :

“Col. Fremont in my opinion, is the most meritorious American of his age now in existence.”—*Senator Allen of Ohio*.

The following high authority is very satisfactory. The nation are about to fulfil the prediction of the Hon. Senator :

“Col. Fremont exhibited a combination of energy, promptitude, sagacity and prudence, which indicates the highest capacity for civil and military command.—That the country will do justice to his valuable and distinguished services, I entertain not the slightest doubt.”—*Senator Dix*.

We commend the following to Rufus Choate. It may aid him in his estimations of the two candidates :

“Col. Fremont is a young officer of great merit—one who deserves well of his country for the bravery and ability with which he discharged his important and delicate duties in California.”—*Daniel Webster*.

The following speaks well for Fremont, as possessing ability to act in public life :

In his speech at Utica, Caleb Lyon said :

“He was a Secretary of the California Constitutional Convention. Col. Fremont was prominently and nearly solely influential in giving the State a Free Constitution. He exhibited wonderful power over men in directing the mountain men and miners in their action. A strange body was it, and his mind gave it direction.”

The following testimony is valuable; *first*, because the witness is under oath: *second*, because that witness is James Buchanan, the present candidate of the Democratic party. In another place we will give a fuller extract. Mr. Buchanan says;—“His (Fremont's) SERVICES WERE VERY VALUABLE; HE BORE A CONSPICUOUS PART IN THE CONQUEST OF CALIFORNIA, AND IN MY OPINION IS BETTER ENTITLED TO BE CALLED THE CONQUERER OF CALIFORNIA, THAN ANY OTHER MAN.”

The following presents the views and feelings of South Carolina, relative to the merits of Fremont. It is worthy of note that to her brave Fremont she gives a *sword*, while to her cowardly Brooks she gives a *cane*, or bludgeon, the weapon of a bully, or a rowdy.

#### SWORD FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

The citizens of Charleston S. C., at a public meeting, in 1846, after passing resolutions, highly eulogistic of Col. Fremont's services in Oregon and California, voted



him a sword, limiting the subscription for the same at one dollar to a person. The sword is costly and elegantly wrought, of gold and silver mounted, in a scabbard of gold, and bears the following inscription:

Presented  
by the citizens of Charleston  
to Lieutenant-Colonel  
JOHN CHARLES FREMONT,  
A memorial of their high appreciation  
of the gallantry and science  
he has displayed in his  
services in Oregon and California.  
Sword belt from the Charleston ladies.

[From the Charleston, S. C. Mercury, Sept. 27th, 1847.]

We regret to learn that Col. Fremont, whose departure for Aiken we noticed a few days since, did not reach that place in time to see his mother alive, she died but a few hours before his arrival. He accompanied her remains the next day to this city, and after witnessing the last sad rites, left here the following evening for Washington. In this affliction, rendered doubly poignant by his deep disappointment in not receiving her parting look of recognition after his long and eventful absence, he has the sympathy of the entire community.

"The marked and brilliant career of Col. Fremont has arrested general attention and admiration, and has been watched with a lively interest by his fellow citizens of South Carolina. Charleston particularly is proud of him, and the reputation which he has at so early an age achieved for himself, she claims as something in which she too has a share. But for the melancholy circumstance attending his visit, our city would have manifested by suitable demonstrations their respect for him, and their continued confidence in his honor and integrity. It will require something more than mere accusation to sully them in the minds of the people of Charleston. Some months since a sword was voted to him by our citizens, the individual subscriptions to which were limited to \$1; it now awaits his acceptance at a suitable opportunity. We are happy to learn that the ladies of Charleston propose, by a similar subscription, to furnish an appropriate belt to accompany the sword, an evidence that they too can appreciate the gallantry and heroism which have so signally marked his career, and have thrown an air of romance over the usually dry detail of scientific pursuits."

The following is from a most reliable source, and the writer enjoyed an excellent opportunity for acquaintance. Let ranting demagogues blush when they traduce such a character, if they are capable of blushing:

A TRIBUTE TO COL. FREMONT.—Mr. Winthrop, in his late speech in Boston spoke of the Pathfinder in such terms as the following:

"For Mr. Fremont I entertain nothing but respect and esteem. Our seats were next to each other during his brief term in the Senate of the United States, and I was a witness to his intelligent and faithful service. Our homes in Washington were within a biscuit's throw of each other, for a much longer period, and I can bear the most cordial testimony to the attractions and accomplishments of more than one of those beneath his roof. His scientific attainments and explorations have reflected the highest credit on his country as well as on himself."

That distinguished philanthropist, Hon. Gerrit Smith, bears the following pleasing testimony relative to Fremont. Mr. Smith is himself the candidate of another party:

GERRIT SMITH AND FREMONT—Gerrit Smith stopped in this city yesterday on his way to the great Kansas meeting at Buffalo. While here the following colloquy occurred between him and another gentleman.

"Are you acquainted with Mr. Fremont, Mr. Smith?"

"Very well—he dined with me several times at Washington, and he is a great favourite in my family."

"What kind of a man is he?"

"He is the most modest man I ever knew—he rarely speaks unless spoken to, a man of talents, generous impulses, and an accomplished scholar."

"Is he firm, has he decision of character, is he reliable, in case he is elected President?"

"Perfectly—if Mr. Fremont is President, he will carry out his convictions promptly, and with unflinching firmness."

"Is he a slaveholder?"

"No, never—until lately he has been very poor, and in no condition to be a slaveholder—besides he is anti-slavery."

"Well, what do you think of Jessie?"

"She is beautiful, highly educated, and accomplished. Her mother is the daughter of Gov. McDowell, of Virginia, (an abolitionist). Mrs. Fremont told me her mother taught her to hate slavery, and she did hate it. She said she would never own a slave nor permit one to do her work. She did her own work rather—it is a shrewd choice, the selection of Fremont."

"It is of great importance that he be elected—the question is not now a constitutional question—but a question of blows, a war question, and if the first battle is to be in Kansas, we should cast aside party and fight the battle.—*Syracuse Journal*.

LIEUT. WALPOLE.

"Lieut. Walpole of the British navy, mentions that Fremont's expeditions were conducted on temperance principles. This enabled him to maintain the perfection of discipline which won the admiration of all who witnessed the conduct of his battalion. Without any military badges, without even a drum to tap, there was the most exact regularity and order. Without severity there was obedience under Fremont's school of personal good conduct and good feeling, and of every manly virtue. The consequence is that those of his men who survived their hardships are, with scarcely a single exception, good citizens, useful members of society, men of commendable habits, and enjoying the prosperity which such characteristics will be like, in the long run to command."

How glorious an example to our entire army in this.

The following extract shows how Fremont is regarded by the distinguished Bayard Taylor.

COL. FREMONT IN CALIFORNIA.—In Bayard Taylor's narrative of his travels in California in 1846, we find the following allusion to Col. Fremont:

"In the morning we went with Lieut. Beale to call upon Col. Fremont, whom we found on the portico of Mr. Cook's house, wearing a sombrero and California jacket, and showing no trace of the terrible hardships he had lately undergone. It may be interesting to the thousands who have followed him, as readers may, on his remarkable journeys and explorations for the past eight years, to know that he is a man of about thirty five years of age; of medium height, and lightly but most compactly knit—in fact, I have seen in no other man the qualities of lightness, activity, strength and physical endurance in so perfect an equilibrium. His face is rather thin and embrowned by exposure; his nose a bold aquiline, and his eye deep set and keen as a hawk's. The rough-camp-life of many years has lessened in no degree his native refinement of character and polish of manners. A stranger would never suppose him to be the Columbus of our central wilderness, though, when so informed, would believe it without surprise."

The following testimonial from a distinguished man and a scholar, ought to excite feelings of admiration and regard towards Col. Fremont:

LETTER FROM BARON HUMBOLDT.

"To COL. FREMONT, SENATOR:—It is very agreeable to me, sir, to address you these lines by my excellent friend our minister to the United States, N. de Gerold. After having given you, in the new edition of my "Aspects of nature," the public testimony of the admiration which is due to your gigantic labors between St. Louis, of Missouri, and the coasts of the South Sea, I feel happy to offer you, in this little token of my existence (*dans ce petit signe de vie*), the homage of my warm acknowledgement. You have displayed a noble courage in distant expeditions, braved all the dangers of cold and famine, enriched all the branches of the natural sciences, illustrated a vast country which was almost entirely unknown to us.

A merit so rare has been acknowledged by a sovereign warmly interested in the progress of physical geography; the king orders me to offer you the grand golden medal destined to those who have labored at scientific progress. I hope that this mark of the Royal good will, will be agreeable to you at a time when, upon the proposition of the illustrious geographer, Chas. Ritter, the Geographical Society at Berlin has named you an honorary member. For myself, I must thank you particularly also for the honor which you have done in attaching my name and that of my fellow-laborer and intimate friend, Mr. Bonpland, to countries neighboring to those which have been the object of our labors. *California, which has so nobly resisted the introduction of Slavery, will be worthily represented by a friend of liberty and of the progress of intelligence.*

Accept, I pray you, sir, the expression of my high and affectionate consideration.

Your most humble and most obedient servant,

A. VON HUMBOLDT.

*Sane Souci, October 7,*

On the envelope thus addressed:

To Colonel Fremont, Senator,

With the Great Golden Medal

For progress in the sciences.

BARON HUMBOLDT.

There is a great deal of force in the remarks of the Boston Chronicle, when it says, "For the honesty and competency of our candidate, we have the certificate of the highest authority among our opponents, and they cannot eat their own words without ruining their cause." The following is a specimen:

"Hon. David R. Carter, a Democratic member of Congress from Ohio, said of Col. Fremont in that debate:

"He is a small man, but he is as gallant as any mass of stuff of the same size that was ever wrapped up in a coat that would fit him. And, sir, he met a combination of enemies, such as very few of the servants of this republic have ever met—both enemies that man presents and enemies that God presents; mountain enemies, ravine enemies, enemies of frost and of heat, and of fasting. \* \* \*

Sir, you might as well undertake to separate Fremont's soul from his body by your action here' he being 3,000 miles distant, as to separate Fremont's fame from the fame of this side of the Republic."

"FREMONT IN OREGON.—We take the following tribute to Col. Fremont from the Oregonian, printed at Portland. It will be read with interest, emanating as it does from the largest and most popular journal in Oregon.

"Col. Fremont is now fairly before the people of the United States, as a candidate for the highest office within their gift. That he has done much during his life to benefit his country, cannot be denied. That his prospects of an election as the chief Magistrate of the Union, are equal if not superior to all others, is admitted by everybody except those wearing the party fetters, is undoubted. That if elected he will make a good President, all concede. Therefore we are safe in saying that a vast improvement on the present dynasty is near at hand, and we look forward with pleasing anticipations to the time when this government will be brought back to its original purity by the reformation consequent upon the approaching Presidential election, and the fruits growing out of it."

### FREMONT'S INTEGRITY.

Certain reckless politicians in the desperation of their cause, have endeavored to impeach Mr. Fremont's integrity, while in the United States' service in California. With how much honor and success will appear from the following extracts :

#### FREMONT! IS HE HONEST? IS HE COMPETENT?

Let his opponents answer. The matter of his honesty when in the public service, in California, which Buchanan's pack mule Bigler was commissioned to agitate in the Senate, was passed upon by Congress in 1853, with all the documents which belong to it. They discussed all the "cattle," "milch cows," "Mariposa purchase," and everything that bore on the question, and this is what Gov. Gorman, a Democrat whom Pierce has made Governor of Minnesota, said:

"The prejudices which had been upon my mind have been dispelled by the investigation of ALL his conduct in California, and I am prepared to bear testimony on this occasion to the correctness of his whole line of conduct as an officer and disbursing agent.

Not one dollar can be traced in his hands, no property can be traced in his hands, for which he cannot give to the Government satisfactory vouchers that it has been appropriately and properly applied."

Speaking of Col. Fremont's achievements in California, Gov. Gorman himself, a gallant officer in the Mexican war, said:

"Upon our whole Pacific border no battallion behaved with more distinguished bravery, than did that battallion under Col. Fremont.—No battles were ever fought against such tremendous odds. THE BATTLE OF BUENA VISTA, EVEN, WAS NOT FOUGHT AGAINST SUCH ODDS AS WERE SOME OF THE BATTLES FOUGHT BY THIS LITTLE BATTALLION UNDER FREMONT. But this brave soldier, who served his country faithfully and honorably, is now incarcerated all oad for debts incurred for the benefit of his government, the payment of which is sought to be denied by mere quibbling."

Mr. Buchanan, the Democratic candidate for President, gives the following testimony under oath. See his evidence before the commissioners. Mr. B. says—

A. To the best of my knowledge, the originals of the bills, copies of which are now produced and shown to me and are hereto annexed, marked Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, were presented at the same Department in the City of Washington, for acceptance and payment, but I do not recollect the individual or individuals by whom presented; I should have accepted and paid these bills, from my general knowledge of the transaction in California, had Congress appropriated any money, and placed it at my disposal, which could be applied to their payment, though it would have been more correct to have drawn these bills on the Secretary of War: I should have accepted and paid these bills, and have them charged in account against Col. Fremont, to be settled for at the general settlement of his accounts as Commander of the California battallion, had any such appropriation been made; I know of no other matter or thing touching or concerning the matters at issue in this case, or the parties thereto material or necessary to be known and adduced in evidence on the trial thereof.

Will presses and politicians that have uttered the falsehood, now take it back? We wait to see. As a further illustration of Fremont's integrity in his connection with California matters, we submit to our readers an extract from the House of Representatives, taken from the New York Tribune :



Years afterwards—in fact, only last year—his long evaded claim to be paid for cattle furnished, not to his own command, but to other U. S. officers in California, after he had caused to wield any authority there, was brought to issue before Congress and unanimously sanctioned. Both Houses, after a careful scrutiny, decided that the money was honestly his due, and should be paid. Here is the essential portion of the unanimous Report of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, consisting of Messrs. Orr of S. C., Eastman of Wis., Grow of Pa., Ball of Ohio, Maxwell of Fla., Wright of Miss., Greenwood of Ark., Pringle of N. Y., and Latham of Cal., (all Democrats but Ball and Pringle, and five of them now Buchanan men.)

“Colonel Fremont,” they say, “purchased a large number of beef cattle in the southern part of the State, and hired drivers at a heavy cost to drive them to the designated place. The cattle were driven upward of three hundred miles in the heat of summer, in the dry season, at great labor and exposure, and some 400 were lost or died on the route. He delivered to agent Barbour, and took his receipt thereof, one million two hundred and twenty-five thousand five hundred pounds of beef on the hoof (1,225,500 lbs.) and accepted in payment drafts drawn by agent Barbour and the Secretary of the Interior, amounting to one hundred and eighty-three thousand eight hundred and twenty five dollars (\$183,825). These drafts were protested on presentation; no appropriation having been made by Congress from which they could be paid. Subsequently, the treaties were rejected by the Senate, for reasons which have not yet been made public, and the Indians of California have been driven from their lands and homes, and have received no compensation from the Government, save the beef furnished them by Col. Fremont, and which he now asks the Government to pay him for. The beef went into the hands of the agents of the Government: whether it was all faithfully distributed among the Indians by the sub-agents is not a question that is to affect the justice and equity of the claim of Col. Fremont. He furnished the agents of the Government with a large quantity of beef. Most if not all of it, was used in feeding the Indians; it was furnished to comply with treaty stipulations: *it stopped the war and restored peace to the country*; and will the Government now shield itself from the payment of this claim, and devolve a ruinous loss upon one of its own citizens, upon the technical pretext that the agent had no specific authority to make the contract? **WE HAVE RECEIVED THE ADVANTAGES AND BENEFITS OF THE CONTRACT, AND YOUR COMMITTEE BELIEVE THAT IT IS JUST THAT WE SHOULD PAY FOR IT.**”

Weller and Gwin Senators from Dalifornia, united in saying that Col. Fremont was justly entitled to the money. The Representatives of California (McDougal and Latham) concurred in this opinion. Mr. Breckenridge, the Buchanier candidate for the Vice-Presidency, concurred in the opinion expressed in the report. The House UNANIMOUSLY passed a bill indemnifying Col. Fremont.

Such is the action of our government and such is the testimony of Democrats including Mr. Buchanan, under oath. If Fremont is a defaulter, or defrauder, these witnesses are convicted of being grossly ignorant, or parties to deception.

### FREMONT'S RELIGION.

“Is FREMONT A CATHOLIC?—If not, why does he not deny it? Why, my poor, deluded friend, he has denied it daily ever since he was nominated, and his friends have denied it for him, on his authority and on their own. Here, for example, is a denial from a California ex-member of Congress:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Aug. 16, 1856.

My dear Sir: *I am authorized by Col. Fremont to deny, in the most positive language, the report now in circulation, to the effect that he is a Roman Catholic.*

From a long and intimate acquaintance with Col. Fremont, I will further add that I know of my own knowledge, that he had never had any connection whatever with the Catholic Church, or the Catholic religion.

G. W. WRIGHT.

Hon. RICHARD MOTT, House of Representatives.—*Bost. Chron.*

A great effort has been made to identify Fremont with Romanism. The evident design of this effort, is to destroy the confidence of Protestants and Native Americans, and thus cut off their votes. That corrupt political parties, who care very little about any religion, should seize upon such an argument only evinces the hypocrisy of such organizations. Here, for example, is a party, which is laboring night and day to swell their ranks with Irish Catholics, and yet with holy horror cry out, “Why, Fremont is a Catholic!” What candor! We have no fellowship for Catholicism, nor have we any for dupli-

ity and barefaced hypocrisy. Still, we are ready to meet the charge and show its utter falsehood. Indeed, this has been done again and again, while the "dog Nobles" continue looking at the same old hole. We deny most emphatically that Fremont *is*, or ever *was* a Roman Catholic. The following is a specimen of political candor. No doubt everybody will believe it!

"The following paragraph," said to have come from a political tract in circulation in the Eastern States, is a good summary of the 'New York Express' for the past month or so:

"I live in New York, next door to Col. Fremont. I know him well. He invariably attends church Sundays—at Bishop Hughes's church in the forenoon, and a Puseyite church in the afternoon. Two Sundays ago he and Bishop Hughes were coming home from church, arm in arm, and they were so drunk that they reeled against my door yard fence and knocked out three lengths."

If Fremont were a Romanist, would not Romanists be likely to give him their support? But what are the facts? Hear!

"The Albany Evening Telegraph says that of seventeen Irish Catholic papers in the United States, not one supports Fremont, and SIXTEEN give a hearty support to Buchanan. The other is neutral or refuses to support Buchanan on account of the Keating affair.

This fact presents the following dilemma for the Hindoos to solve: The presumption is that Fremont is not a Catholic, for if he is, then the charge that Catholics invariably combine and support persons for office of their own religion in preference to those of the Protestant faith, it is found false."

But we offer in evidence church records under the certificate of the Rector—

WASHINGTON CITY, July 12, 1856.

"The following children of J. Charles and Jessie Benton Fremont have been baptized in the Church of the Parish of Epiphany, Washington, D. C., their baptisms being recorded in the register of said parish:

"1848, Aug. 15, Elizabeth McDowell Benton Fremont.

"1848, Aug. 15, Benton Fremont.

"1853, Dec. 28, John Charles Fremont.

"1855, Aug. 1, Francis Preston Bennet.

"As none were baptized in a house, but all were brought to the church, the order of the Protestant Episcopal Church for 'the Ministration of Public Baptism of infants,' was that which was used.

J. W. FRENCH,

"Rector of the Parish of the Epiphany,"

Washington, D. C.

"ANOTHER WITNESS:—Rev. J. Banwell Campbell, rector of St. Phillip's Protestant Episcopal church, in Charlestown, S. C., writes to the Charleston Courier, that he finds the following in the handwriting of Bishop Gadsden:—"On the 37th of June, 1827, of St. Philip's Congregation, was confirmed at St. Paul's church by the Right Rev. Nathaniel Bowen, Charles Fremont, a non communicant."

We give the following as a specimen of many that might be offered to the public:

A New York correspondent of the Boston Journal, says:

"In conversation with Col. Fremont, this morning, I asked him explicitly, that I might authoritatively deny the story concerning his religion—"Colonel, are you a Roman Catholic?" To which he replied—"I am not, nor have I ever been; and but twice during my life, do I remember to have been inside of a Roman Catholic church."

At a public meeting in Spridgfield, Mass., on the evening of July 4th, Hon. C. C. Dhaffee declared "that he knew Fremont personally, and that if any man said, *he was now* or ever *had* been a Roman Catholic, he *lied in his throat*, and held himself responsible for the charge, according to any code of honor, North or South."

The interview given below speaks for itself:

(From the Boston Atlas.)

FREMONT'S RELIGION.—To the editor:—A certain Fillmore man in New York, seriously exercised about the religion of Mr. Fremont, finally made this offer to a Fremont man: That if Mr. Fremont would say to him that he was not a Catholic, and never had been, he would vote for him or forfeit a thousand dollars.



The offer was gladly accepted, and a time appointed to call on Mr. Fremont and propound the momentous question. At the time agreed upon, the party, consisting of five persons, proceeded to the residence of Col. Fremont, and were introduced by a venerable gentleman who had known the Colonel in California. The party being admitted, *without stating the object of their visit*, they were introduced, and the following dialogue ensued.

*Fillmore Man.*—"Mr. Fremont, I called to ask you if you are a Catholic or ever have been one."

*Fremont.*—"I am not a Catholic, and I have never been a Catholic. I was reared in the Protestant Episcopal Church, where my children have also been baptised: my wife is also a member of that Church."

*Fillmore man.*—"It is admitted, I believe, that you were married by a Catholic Priest,"

*Fremont.*—"Not admitted—that is a *fact* which is upon the record, and was never disputed."

*Fillmore man.*—"I am told a Catholic Priest cannot marry parties unless one of them is a member of that Church."

*Fremont.*—"That may be so: I have taken little interest in the tenets of that Church, and know little about them. All I know is, myself and wife were married by a Catholic clergymen of the city of Washington, and we are both Protestants.—I believe, however, that there are many instances where Protestants have been married by a Catholic clergymen. I know some other cases myself."

*Fillmore man.*—"I am informed that there is a person who is ready to make affidavit that you habitually attended the Catholic Church in California."

*Fremont.*—"So far is that from being true, I attended *no church* in California; I was generally a pretty hard worked and hard working man while in California, and found it necessary to rest, instead of going long distances to church; whenever it was convenient, my wife attended the Protestant church."

*Fillmore man.*—"I am entirely satisfied, Colonel,—you shall have my vote, as I have promised my friend there, on this result of our interview. I am sternly opposed to the further extension of slave territory, and only wished those honest doubts dispelled by your personal declarations."

*Fremont.*—"Thank you. I am informed there are other and much worse stories to be put in circulation about me, one of which is that I have been a *slaveholder*, and that on a certain voyage, myself and my wife took turns in whipping a slave we carried with us. Another is that I am an *inbriate*. Now the truth is, although I am not a member of any total abstinence society, I cannot use liquor—it is against my nature."

The conversation was conducted on the part of Mr. Fremont with such entire frankness, with such freedom from those evasive modes of expression which politicians often use, to conceal instead of expressing their thoughts, as to win the admiration of the listeners. The Fillmore man was a prominent Delegate to the Whig Convention at Albany. It is needless to say he did not attend.

AUTHENTIC!

It would seem superfluous to say more in regard to Fremont's religious faith. Still we add the following from the New York Evangelist of Sept. 18. Some of our opponents are like certain old Testament sinners, who needed "line upon line, line upon line." As we have the means, we give the "lines."

## IS FREMONT A CATHOLIC!—THE QUESTION SETTLED

[From the New York Evangelist, Sept. 18.]

NOT FOR PARTY, BUT FOR TRUTH.

"It is not our business to enter into the strife of politics. That is not our vocation, and we have religiously abstained from such contests. Nor shall we depart from the line of strict propriety. But we are sometimes appealed to for information as to matters of fact, by readers who imagine that we may have special means of knowing the truth. In such a case we are willing to tell what we know—not for the sake of party, but of truth. This we may do without sacrificing our neutral and independent character. If we can help to correct an error, or to disabuse the public mind of a false impression, we are doing a service to right minded men of all parties. We do not urge our readers to vote one way or the other, but we do wish them to vote intelligently."

It is well known that one of the candidates for the Presidency has been charged with being a Roman Catholic. To this story we never gave the slightest importance knowing that it was one of those bald falsehoods which were fabricated for a party purpose, and which would drop into oblivion and be despised as soon as it had served its object. But as the originators of the story cling to it with great pertinacity, thinking it a very effective weapon to excite odium and prejudice, some good men have thought it worth while to set the matter at once and forever at rest. Clergymen of this city have been applied to by members of their churches, and by letters from abroad, to make personal inquiry, since the public would have entire confidence in their statement, knowing that they could have no motive to misstate the fact.

This appealed to, a number of clergymen, though very reluctant to do anything which could bring their names before the public in connection with any political question, called on Col. Fremont for the purpose of a frank conversation in regard to his religious profession and belief. This they did—not for their own personal satisfaction—for not one of them had a doubt about the matter—but simply that they might be able to satisfy others by an assurance from his own lips. Among those who went were Rev. Dr. DeWitt, of the Dutch Reformed Church; Professors Henry B. Smith and R.



D. Hitchcock, of the Union Theological Seminary; Rev. David B. Coe, Secretary of the Home Missionary Society, and one of the editors of this paper. They were received with great cordiality, and Col. Fremont responded very frankly and cheerfully to their enquiries.

When it was remarked that some of our good people were disturbed about his religion, he replied, smiling, that he was glad that his opponents were willing to admit, at least, that he had some religious feeling—that he was not wholly indifferent to Christianity. One of the ministers inquired if the account of his early religious education and of his joining the Episcopal church, as given in Bigelow's "Life of Fremont," was correct? He replied that it was, and added, in a few words, that he had been born and educated in the Episcopal church; that he had been confirmed as a member of that church, and had never had a shadow of a thought of leaving it.

When allusion was made to the persistent assertions that he was a Catholic, he replied that he could not imagine how such a story took its rise, for, that, in fact, he had hardly been inside of a Catholic church more than half a dozen times in his life, and then upon occasions of public interest or curiosity.

All this was said very quietly, and with no apparent desire to obtrude his religious education and belief. No one could listen to this frank, yet modest statement, without feeling that it was perfectly ingenious; and that, with no bigotry towards others, he was sincerely and unaffectedly attached to the religion in which he had been educated by a pious mother.

The following from the Providence Daily Journal speaks for itself. Mr. Hatfield is well known among us, and his testimony must be satisfactory:

WARREN, R. I., Sept. 12, 1856.

Dear Bro.—I have *some* interest and *more* curiosity to know the truth in reference to the report, so current, that Col. Fremont is a Catholic; and it has occurred to me that you may have means of knowing, and perhaps would take the trouble to inform an old friend and correspondent on the subject.

It is extremely difficult to arrive at the truth in times of such intense excitement; as the political papers are filled with contradictory statements, each of which claim to be true.

Are you acquainted with Alderman Fullmer, who has testified on the subject? Are you able to give me definite and reliable information with regard to the report that Fremont is a Catholic?

An answer to the above at such time as may suit your convenience will oblige, yours truly,  
S. C. BROWN.

Rev. R. M. HATFIELD, New York.

NEW YORK, (12 Forsyth st.,) }  
Sept. 13, 1856. }

Dear Brother—Your note of the 12th inst. came to hand this morning, and I avail myself of my first leisure moments to reply to its contents. Of Alderman Fullmer I have nothing to say. I do not know the man, and have no wish to repeat rumors that are current with regard to his character. In times of high political excitement like the present, such rumors are utterly unreliable. Touching the report that Colonel Fremont is a Catholic, I am prepared to give you "definite and reliable information." Such reports are utterly false, "all a lie from end to end." Macaulay, in one of his reviews, says that one who has never read the life of Bareve, may be said not to know what a lie is. The eloquent essayist would certainly modify his opinion were he to acquaint himself with the present position of American politics, or look occasionally into the columns of some of our Fillmore papers. Neither Bareve, nor the father of lies himself, ever concocted a baser falsehood than the one by which a set of demagogues are attempting to deceive the public with regard to the religious sentiments of Col. Fremont. He is not a Romanist, never has been, and has done nothing to give color to the fabrications of his slanderers. John Wesley was not more free from all reasonable suspicion of leaning toward the church of Rome, than is John C. Fremont. He was educated in the Protestant faith, confirmed in a Protestant church, has been during all his life-time, and is now, an undisguised and decided Protestant. This statement I make not on the strength of newspaper reports, nor from hearsay or second hand testimony. I am personally acquainted with Col. Fremont, I know that he is not a Papist, just as I know that you are not one. With the hope that my reply will be satisfactory, I remain,  
Fraternally yours,

R. M. HATFIELD.

Rev. S. C. BROWN, Warren, R. I.

## DISUNION.

Who are the disunionists, we ask? Republicans have no thoughts of dissolving the Union, but desire to unite and consolidate it by a more faithful administration of government according to the spirit and design of the Constitution. It is *Southern fanaticism* that talks of dissolving the Union. We submit a few specimens:

The following paragraph appears in the Washington correspondence of the New Orleans Delta:

"It is already arranged in the event of Fremont's election, or a failure to elect by the people, to call the Legislatures of Virginia, South Carolina and Georgia, to concert measures to withdraw from the Union before Fremont can get possession of the army and the navy and the purse-strings of Government. Governor Wise is actively at work already in the matter. *The South can rely on the President in the emergency contemplated.* The question now is, whether the people of the South will sustain their leaders."

REANNEXATION OF THE SLAVE STATES TO ENGLAND.—The Richmond Whig proposes the following:

"The time is not so remote but that it lingers in the memory and traditions of our people, when England was familiar and endearingly spoken of as *home*. If the worst comes to the worst—and we cannot find peace, justice or safety with our Yankee brethren—that time may come again!"

We give below some extracts from Buchanan Democrats:

BY SENATOR YULER, OF FLORIDA.

"For my part, I am ready to proceed to extreme measures, even to the dissolution of the Union."

BY SENATOR BROWN, OF MISSISSIPPI.

"If the Wilmot Proviso is adopted, it will raise a storm that will sweep away this Union, and I pray God devoutly it will do so."

BY MR. MORSE OF LOUISIANA.

"The southern man who will stand up and say that he is for the Union, 'now and forever,' is more dangerous to the cause he represents than those who are in open hostility. If California be trammelled with a preamble declaring the territory now free, I am willing to dissolve the Union."

BY MR. STANTON, OF TENNESSEE

"When the Wilmot proviso is adopted, I and the South are ready to walk out of the Union."

BY SENATOR BUTLER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

"I do not make the salvation of the Union the paramount question."

BY SENATOR MASON, OF VIRGINIA.

"It is the time the yoke was thrown off and the question settled."

BY MR. MCWILLIE, OF MISSISSIPPI.

"The people of the South know their rights, and will maintain them at all hazards, even should disunion result. \* \* \* The South must defend their rights at the expense of blood."

BY MR. MEAD OF VIRGINIA.

"If you exclude us, I am not willing to submit. \* \* \* We intend to give the land peaceably if we can, *forcibly* if we must."

BY MR. COLCOCK, OF GEORGIA.

"If the Wilmot proviso should pass in any form, I will introduce a bill for the dissolution of the Union."

The following resolution was adopted at a Congressional caucus of Southern Democrats held in Washington in January, 1849:

"Resolved, That the dissolution of the Union is preferable to the submission of the South to the Wilmot Proviso."

The following toasts were drunk at a Democratic 4th of July celebration at Atchison City, in Kansas:

"Disunion:—By secession or otherwise—a beacon of hope to an oppressed people and the surest remedy for southern wrongs. (Enthusiastic cheers.)"

"The City of Atchison:—May she, before the close of the year '57, be the capitol of a southern Republic, (Cheers.)"

SPOKEN OUT.—Judge Rust, of Louisiana, one of the Democratic speakers, of Concord, N. H., uttered in very plain English precisely what Rufus Choate took for granted when he wrote his remarkable letter against the Declaration of Independence. He said:

"The institution of slavery is stronger than faction, than fanaticism, than party, *than the Constitution, than the Union.*"

These extracts show who are the disunionists,—Democrats or Republicans. We add a few more to prove that such madcaps will find trouble at home if such treason is attempted. Such "nullifiers" *might* find in Fremont another Jackson to deal with. Don't believe they will try the experiment.

Henry W. Davis, a young and talented member from Maryland, made a speech in Congress in which he attributed the evils that now afflict Kansas and the country to the right cause, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and indignantly denounced those who threaten a dissolution of the Union if Fremont is elected. He said:

"There are men who go about the country declaiming about the inevitable consequences of the election of Fremont; and the question is asked whether that simple fact is not sufficient, not merely to justify but to require a dissolution of the Union. The question has been asked me to day. This is a question which I do not regard as a subject for discussion. *It never will be done while men have their senses.* It never will be done until some party, bent upon an acquiring party power, shall again and again exasperate beyond the reach of reason the Northern and Southern minds, as my Southern friends have now exasperated the Northern mind. It would be an act of suicide, and sane men do not commit suicide. The act itself is insanity. It will be done if ever in a tempest of fury and excitement which cannot stop to reason."

The following is significant, because from a man supposed to possess a good deal of the spirit of Revolution. The extract says:

"Scarcely less indignant was the denunciation of Senator Houston, who said:"

"They tell me, that if Fremont is elected, forty thousand bayonets will bristle about the Capitol—that the South, in fact, will secede. Mr. President, I scorn the suggestion! There will be neither bristling bayonets nor secession. If Col. Fremont shall be elected by a majority of the people, though I am not his supporter,



I shall respect the majesty of the people; and to Col. Fremont, as the Chief Magistrate of their choice, I shall pay my respectful homage." [Here the old hero, putting his hand to his breast, made one of his most elaborate bows.]"

"We are told to vote for Buchanan to defeat Fremont, as the election of the latter would lead to the dissolution of the Union. It is false; to say that Southern men will dissolve the Union in the event of Fremont's election, is a slander and a calumny on them. The Union is stable and strong, and we remain so, let who will be elected. There is not one inch of soil from Minnesota to the Belize that is in the political North or the political South. The Union is welded and bound together by ties of blood and kindred, and will come out unscathed from the fiery trial of the coming election."

The North need have no fears about the South leaving the North, or dissolving the Union. It is only the hot-bloods that talk such nonsense. It would be suicide for the South to do any such thing. If they can scare a few "faint-hearts and dough-faces into compliance, it will be capital game. Let the North be firm, and the Union is safe. Fremont's election will teach the South that all this *scare-baby* cry about the Union is of no avail, and the cry will soon die out.

### DEMOCRACY.

We have a few words to say about MODERN DEMOCRACY. It is a base slander upon the word to call Pierce's administration Democracy; or say that the party bearing the name are in the true sense Democrats. "Modern Democracy" is a *spurious*, bogus concern;—hence many intelligent, honest Democrats are leaving the party.—We commend to "honest Democrats" a pamphlet called "A PLAIN STATEMENT," from which we select the following definition, taken from KENDALL'S EXPOSITOR:

"The Democracy we advocate is justice between man and man; between state and state; between nation and nation. It is morality. It is giving every man his due. It is doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. It advocates the banishment of falsehood, fraud, and violence, from the affairs of men. It is the moral code of Him 'who spake as never man spake.' It is the perfection of reason and the law of God."

Thus Jefferson says, "The love of justice and the love of country plead equally the cause of the people: it is a *moral reproach* to us that they should have plead it so long in vain." See letters to Edward Cole, Aug. 25, 1814.

Such was Jeffersonian Democracy. Let us look at the modern, bogus kind.

NEW YORK DAY BOOK.—So late as June 21, 1856, the Day Book gives us the following:

"Negro 'slavery' is the basis of American DEMOCRACY; or the subordination of an inferior race has secured, and always will secure, the equality of the superior race."

Have the party repudiated this "Day Book" Democracy?

We add the following as further illustrating the Democracy of the New York Day Book:

MODERN DEMOCRACY.—The New York Day Book, the leading Buchanan paper in New York City and State, says:

"We hold negro 'slavery' to be right, right *per se*, right in itself, in the nature and necessity of things. \* \* \* \* \*

It also adds, that when the question is submitted to the Northern Democracy, they will be in favor of the extension of slavery. So much for the democracy.—*New Bedford Standard*.

Perhaps it will be objected that the Day Book is not good authority—is not the standard of Democracy. Suppose we try the character of the party by its declarations, and acts and the doings and sayings of its leaders. The good old book says, "by their fruits ye shall know them."

The following resolution was adopted by the Democratic Convention in Cincinnati, and is one of the planks in the platform—



Resolved. That the Administration of FRANKLIN PIERCE has been true to Democratic principles, and therefore true to the great interests of the country; in the face of violent opposition he has maintained the laws at home, and therefore we proclaim  
 OUR UNQUALIFIED ADMIRATION OF HIS MEASURES AND POLICY.

We entreat all honest men to look at poor Kansas for an illustration of Mr. Pierce's "Democratic principles."

The RICHMOND Inquirer says:

The South once thought its own institutions wrongful and inexpedient. *It thinks so no longer—and will insist that they SHALL BE PROTECTED AND EXTENDED BY THE ARM OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, EQUALLY WITH THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE NORTH.*"

Now the "EXTENSION BY THE ARM OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT," of such "institutions," is the pet design of the South, and the South is using and *intends* to use the Democratic party for such purposes. That such is the *fact* cannot be denied with any show of candor. Look at *Facts and Figures* bearing upon this point. Was not the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise a Democratic measure, supported by the South almost to a man? Is not the South now using Democracy to carry Slavery into Kansas? Does not the South claim Buchanan's election on the ground that "*he is safe for the South,*" on the subject of Slavery; because "*he never gave a vote,*" or "*uttered a word against it,*" "*but has always stood on the side of the South?*" Are not the Pro-Slavery leaders in Kansas to-day, Democrats, and have they not been from the commencement? Have not those Pro-Slavery, Democratic Kansas leaders carried elections by *fraud and violence*? Take a few *facts and figures*, for example:

The report of the Kansas Investigating Committee shows that, of 2871 votes cast at the election for Delegate, 1729 were illegal, leaving but 1142 legal votes. And of the 6320 votes cast at the election for members of the Legislature, 4908 were illegal, leaving but 1412 legal votes.

Was this fraud? Hear what Stringfellow said *before* the election:

"I advise you, one and all, to enter every election district in Kansas, in defiance of Reeder and his vile myrmidons, and vote at the point of the bowie-knife and revolver. Neither give nor take quarter, as our case demands it. It is enough that the Slaveholding interest wills it, from which there is no appeal."

Hear what David R. Atchison said, after the election:

"Well, what next? Why, an election for members of the Legislature to organize the territory must be held, . . . and, cold and inclement as the weather was. I went over with a company of men, . . . and the Abolitionists of the North said and published it abroad, that Atchison was there, with bowie-knife and revolver; and, by God, it was true! I never did go into that Territory—I never intend to go into that Territory—with-out being prepared for all such kind of cattle."

The "*Squatter Sovereign*," a Pro-Slavery paper published at Independence, Missouri, boasts as follows:

Independence, Missouri, March, 31, 1855.

"Several hundred emigrants from Kansas have just entered our city. They were preceded by the Westport and Independence brass bands . . . They gave repeated cheers for Kansas and Missouri. They report that not an anti-slavery man will be in the Legislature of Kansas. *We have made a clean sweep.*"

Read the following note of triumph from Atchinson:

"David R. Atchison writes to a gentleman in South Carolina, and the letter is published in the Carolina Times. We quote a paragraph—:

"My opinion is that the South will be stirred by the transactions of these few weeks and will come up with men and money. The latter is particularly wanted to assist the men. In a few months, in my opinion, there will not be an Abolitionist in Kansas; they will be swept with a clean broom. Then the war will be carried elsewhere, if war we are to have."

Look at the following from South Carolina:

Thus we find that even the admission of Kansas as a slave State will not satisfy. The abettors look beyond it. Not long since a Mr. Townsend at a meeting in Charleston South Carolina, used the following significant language.

"In gaining Kansas we shut out an enemy from our camp; we support Missouri, and immeasurably strengthen our outposts on that important frontier; and with her we not only secure Missouri to our ranks, but the Indian Territory, which is large enough for two or three States, will cease to be doubtful ground—as it now is—and will be certain for the South. Kansas, then, is the Malakoff fortress, the taking of which will decide our victory in this battle with Abolitionism in that quarter—a battle in which three to five slave States are to be the prizes won or lost to the South and her cherished institutions.

Douglas' Democratic Bill was designed to make Kansas a Slave State, and so understood by the Pro-Slavery press—

*Working of Douglas's Bill.*—The Leavenworth Herald, the Stringfellow organ, is strongly in favor of this bill, and gives reasons:

"Our party has now a majority in the Territory; but whether it will retain that majority is to our mind a matter of much doubt. Every one knows that the capacity of the Northern States for colonization is far superior to that of the Southern States. Then we may let this bill pass, and let the question of slavery be brought up when our party has a majority in the Territory. We regard the bill as eminently wise and just, and believe that, if it takes effect, Kansas will be a SLAVE STATE."

### "OSTEND CIRCULAR."

We refer to this famous document to prove that the extension of Slavery is a cherished object with the South—that the seizure of Cuba as well as the possession of Kansas, is essential to the carrying out of the plan, and that the South calculate on Mr. Buchanan and Democracy to carry out the measure. What Mr. Buchanan's views are relative to the seizure of Cuba, may be easily ascertained.

JAMES BUCHANAN says—"After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba, far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question—Does Cuba in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our internal peace, and the existence of our cherished Union? Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then by every law human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain, if we possess the power. And we ought neither to count the cost, nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us."

Some sinner having dared to breathe a suspicion that Mr. Buchanan might be tainted with the sin of *Free-Soilism*, the Charleston Mercury, S. C., comes to the rescue as follows:

"But, in order that the absurdity of the charge of Mr. Buchanan's being a 'free-soiler' may, if possible, become apparent, we need only cite the fact, that, two years ago, he signed the Ostend manifesto, a document whose sole object was to acquire Cuba, out of which two or three slave States could have been formed. Here, then, is his record. The champion of the admission of Arkansas, the champion of the annexation of Texas, the champion of the acquisition of Cuba—where is the taint or suspicion of free-soilism in all this? Whatever are Mr. Buchanan's prejudices against Slavery, his votes and his acts are with us.

What Democracy thinks about Cuba, may be inferred from the following resolution, passed at the Cincinnati nominating Convention:

"Resolved, That the Democratic party will expect of the next Administration that every proper effort be made to insure our ascendancy in the Gulf of Mexico—to maintain a permanent protection of the great outlets through which is emptied into its waters the products raised upon our soil and commodities created by the industry of the people in our western valleys and the Union at large."

Cuba is situated at the entrance of the Gulf of Mexico. Now the plain English of Mr. Buchanan's instructions, the Charleston Mercury, and this Democratic platform, is, "get Cuba at any rate—honorably if we can, but violently if Spain refuses to sell; in other words, buy or steal it—nay still worse, rob Spain!! Can an honest man vote for such men and measures without wearing the blush of eternal



shame, when he meets an honest man. Such moral principles ought to sink any party below the respect of men of decent morals. And to talk about the "*divine law*," justifying such seizure is adding glaring hypocrisy to national robbery. It is morals with a vengeance!

### FREE LABOR.

Reader, do you believe in labor, and are you a laborer? Hear what the South thinks of you and all other free working men who earn their bread by honest industry, and remember James Buchanan is the choice of the South, because "he never gave a vote, 'or' uttered a word against Slavery."

"THE OPINION OF A BUCHANAN ORGAN.—The Muscogee, Alabama, Herald, gives the following opinion of free men and free labor:

Free society! we sicken of the name. What is it but a conglomeration of GREASY MECHANICS, FILTHY OPERATIVES, SMALL FISTED FARMERS, and moon struck theorists? All the northern and especially of the New England states are devoid of society fitted for well bred gentlemen. The prevailing class one meets with is that of mechanics struggling to be genteel, and small farmers who do their own drudgery; and yet who are hardly fit for association with a southern gentleman's body servant. This is your free society which the northern hordes are endeavoring to extend into Kansas."

The very word FREE, or *free labor* is so abhorrent to Southern blood, that the mention of it almost brings on hysterics. Read the following beautiful extract from the RICHMOND ENQUIRER, Dec. 28, 1855:

"We have got to hating everything with the prefix *free*—from free negroes down and up, through the whole catalogue of abominations, demagogueries, lusts, philosophies, and follies, free farms, free labor, free niggers, free society, free will, free thinking, free love, free wives, free children, and free schools, all belonging to the same brood of damnable isms whose mother is Sin and whose daddy is the Devil—are all the progeny of that prolific monster which greeted Satan on his arrival at the gates of hell.

Where such an abhorrence of everything *free* prevails, we are prepared to hear such sentiments as follows:

### JOHN C. CALHOUN.

"We regard slavery as the most safe and stable basis for free institutions in the world. It is impossible with us that the conflict should take place between labor and capital. Every plantation is a little community, with the master at its head, who concentrates in himself the united interests of capital and labor, of which he is the common representative."

### CHANCELOR HARPER, S. C.

"Would you do a benefit to the horse, or the ox, by giving him a cultivated understanding, a fine feeling? So far as the mere laborer has the pride, the knowledge, or the aspiration of a freeman, he is unfitted for his situation. If there are sordid, servile, laborious offices to be performed, is it not better that there should be sordid, servile, laborious beings to perform them? Odium has been cast upon our legislation on account of its forbidding the elements of education being communicated to slaves.—But, in truth, what injury is done them by this? *He who works during the day with his hands does not read in the intervals of leisure, for his amusement, or the improvement of his mind; or the exception is so very rare as scarcely to need the being provided for.*"—*Southern Literary Messenger.*

### B. WATKINS LEIGH, VA.

"In every civilized country under the sun, some there must be who labor for their daily bread,—men who tend the herds, and dig the soil,—who have no real nor personal capital of their own, and who earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow.—I have as sincere feelings of regard for that people as any man who lives among them. But I ask gentleman to say, whether they believe that those who depend on their daily labor for their daily subsistence, can, or do, ever enter into political affairs? They never do, never will, never can"—*Speech in Virginia Convention, 1829.*

### F. W. PICKENS. S. C.

"All society settles down into a classification of capitalists and laborers. The former will own the latter, either collectively through the government, or individually in a state of domestic servitude, as exists in the Southern States of this confederacy. *If laborers ever obtain the political power of a country, it is in fact in a state of revolution.*"—*Speech in Congress, January 21, 1837.*

### GEORGE M'DUFFIE.

"If we look into the elements of which all political communities are composed, it will be found that servitude in some form is one of the essential constituents. . . . In the very nature of things, there must be classes of persons to discharge all the different offices of society, from the highest to the lowest. . . . Where these offices are performed by members of the political community, a dangerous element is obviously introduced by the body politic. . . . Domestic slavery, therefore instead, of being an evil, is the corner stone of our republican edifice."—*Message to S. C. Legislature, 1835.*



What a contrast do we find in the following extract from Fremont's letter of acceptance—

**“FREE LABOR**—The natural capital which constitutes the real wealth of this great country, and creates that intelligent power in the masses alone to be relied on as the bulwark of free institutions.—**JOHN C. FREMONT.**

In an elaborate speech on his Bill to regulate the working of the mines, Mr. Fremont, said:

“The principles of this bill, as I have already stated them, are to exclude all idea of making a national revenue out of these mines, to prevent the possibility of monopolies by monied capitalists, and to give natural capital, that is to say, to **LABOR** and **INDUSTRY**, a fair chance to work, and the secure enjoyment of what they find.”

Slavery ever *has* and ever *will* war with free labor, and tend to degrade the *working* man. Southerners show their appreciation of the honest laborer, when they style all such **“GREASY MECHANICS, FILTHY OPERATIVES, AND SMALL FISTED FARMERS,”** who are unfit to associate with their **“body servants.”** Will the working men sustain such men by giving political power to that party which go with the South?

## BUCHANAN'S FITNESS.

Since Democracy and Pro-Slavery are desirous of comparing fitness, and boast of Mr. Buchanan's long-trying and well-known political character and eminent qualifications for the Presidency, we submit a witness or two upon that point:

### GEN. JACKSON ON BUCHANAN.

The following note was addressed to Col. Polk on the subject of his appointing Mr. Buchanan to a place in his Cabinet. The opinion of 'Old Hickory' did not save Polk's administration from the disgrace—for he had already given Mr. Buchanan the appointment:

HERMITAGE, Feb. 28, 1845.

“Your observations with regard to Mr. Buchanan are correct. **HE SHOWED A WANT OF MORAL COURAGE** in the affair of the intrigue of Adams and Clay—did not do me justice in the *expose* he then made and I am sure about that time did believe there was a perfect understanding between Adams and Clay about the Presidency and the Secretary of State. This I am sure of. But whether he viewed that there was any corruption or not, one thing I do know, that he *wished me to combat them with their own weapons—that was to let my friends say if I was elected I would make Mr. Clay Secretary of State.* This, to me, appeared gross corruption, and I repelled it with that honest indignation as (which) I thought it deserved.”

**“ANDREW JACKSON.”**

Were Andrew Jackson now living, would he vote for such a candidate? Will Andrew Jackson men *now* vote for such a man?

**FOR AND AGAINST.**—A Virginia letter writer says:—

“Mr. Buchanan has been for a bank and *against* it—for the tariff of 1842 and against it—for the Maysville and Cumberland roads, and against internal improvements—for distribution of the proceedings of the public lands and against it—for squatter sovereignty *now* and against it in 1848—for the principal of the Wilmot proviso hitherto, and against it *now*, because it clashes with the squatter sovereignty platform built in Cincinnati—thanking his God that his fortune was cast in a state not cursed by slavery, and now the champion of Southern institutions—but above all, for Gen. Washington's policy of non-intervention with the affairs of foreign countries, and *yet* the author of the Ostend manifesto.”

The following Southern comment on the Democratic platform we give to amuse our friends:

Read the following from the Arkansas Whig:—

“Now this Cincinnati platform seems to be a perfect hodge podge. Tom Kikkman used to tell of a friend of his, dropping in about dinner time, on an old lady who invited him to draw up to the table. There was a huge pie of the pot order for dinner. The old lady helped him bountifully, and he being hungry, was doing justice to it. ‘Stranger,’ said the old lady, ‘you will find almost every sort of meat in this pie.’ ‘Yes, madam,’ said he, ‘and fish too,’ as he drew between his lips what he imagined was the back-bone of a red horse or sucker. ‘Lord have mercy,’ exclaimed the old woman, ‘if there ain't our fine tooth comb that Billy lost two weeks ago.’”

## NON-EXTENSION.

**JOHN C. FREMONT** is the only candidate reliable and safe on this subject. He says:

“I am opposed to slavery in the abstract, and on principle, sustained and made habitual by long settled convictions. While I feel inflexible in the belief that it ought not to be interfered with where it exists under the shield of State sovereignty, I AM IN-FLEXIBLY OPPOSED TO ITS EXTENSION ON THIS CONTINENT BEYOND ITS PRESENT LIMITS.”

**JOHN C. FREMONT, 1856.**

While Fremont is opposed to slavery and its extension, he is not a sectionalist, but a man for the whole nation, North and South. Hear him :

*Comprehending the magnitude of the trust which they have declared themselves willing to place in my hands, and deeply sensible to the honor which their unreserved confidence in this threatening position of the public affairs implies, I feel that I cannot better respond than by a sincere declaration that, in the event of my election to the presidency, I should enter upon the execution of its duties with a single-hearted determination to promote the good of the WHOLE COUNTRY, and to direct solely to this end all the power of the Government, IRRESPECTIVE OF PARTY ISSUES AND REGARDLESS OF SECTIONAL STRIFES.*

JOHN C. FREMONT.

Fremont thinks with Daniel Webster on the subject of slavery—

“Under no circumstances will I consent to the further extension of the area of slavery in the United States, or to the further increase of representation in the House of Representatives.”

DANIEL WEBSTER, 1848.

WHENEVER THERE IS A SUBSTANTIVE GOOD TO BE DONE, WHENEVER THERE IS A FOOT OF LAND TO BE PREVENTED FROM BECOMING SLAVE TERRITORY, I AM READY TO ASSERT THE PRINCIPLE OF THE EXCLUSION OF SLAVERY.”

DANIEL WEBSTER, 1850.

### HENRY CLAY'S VIEWS.

“I repeat that I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote, to spread Slavery over Territory where it does not exist.”

HENRY CLAY, 1850.

George Washington would never have voted for the extension of slavery; but for its abolition—

I hope it will not be conceived, from these observations, that it is my wish to hold the unhappy people who are the subject of this letter, in slavery. I can only say that there is not a man living, who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it. . . . And this, so far as my feelings will go, shall not be wanting.—*Letter of Gen. Washington to Robert Morris.*

### FREMONT AS A SENATOR.

Fremont was only twenty-one working days in the Senate. The following Bills introduced by him show how his thoughts ran, and the following votes indicate his position on leading questions relating to slavery.

#### BILLS.

I.—A Bill to regulate the working of the Mines in California.

II.—A Bill to Grant said State Public Lands for Purposes of Education.

III.—A bill to Grant Six Townships for an University.

IV.—A Bill to Grant lands for Asylums for the Deaf and Dumb, for the Blind and Insane.

V.—A Bill to Provide for Opening a road Across the Continent.

#### VOTES.

On a proposition to substitute for the bill to abolish the Slave Trade, a bill abolishing Slavery in the District of Columbia, he voted *Nay*, the vote stood, Yeas 5, Nays 45.

On a bill to suppress the Slave trade in the District of Columbia, he voted *Yea*.

On a bill to punish any person who should entice or induce a slave to run away, by confinement in the District Penitentiary five years, he voted *Nay*.

On a bill to authorize the corporation in the District to prohibit free negroes under penalty of fine and imprisonment, he voted *Nay*.

### CONCLUSION.

1. We have proved most conclusively, that the overshadowing question and *grand issue* of the November Presidential election, is the *extension* or *non-extension* of slavery.

2. We have now shown conclusively that the South claims the election of Buchanan, on the ground that he is in favor of extension; also that the Democratic platform makes no issue with the claims of the South, but passes resolutions satisfactory to the South, thus endorsing the views and designs of the South on the subject of slavery.

3. We have also shown that Mr. Fillmore's views on the subject of slavery, so far as known, do not essentially differ from Mr. Buchanan's.

4. We have also shown, that of the three candidates, Fremont, Fillmore and Buchanan, Fremont is the only one known to be opposed to the extension of slavery; and the South oppose him for this very reason.



We give, below, two resolutions, passed by the Democratic State Convention at Worcester, Mass., Sept. 22, 1847.

*Resolved*, That the Democratic party and creed are the party and creed of freedom, whose fundamental tenets are the inborn, heaven-granted freedom and equality of all men (to deny which is to destroy republicanism,) the limited powers of all government, and their derivation from the people as the fountain of political authority.

*Resolved*, That the corner-stone of all republican institutions is the inalienable freedom and equality of all men; that the American Revolution, and all the political blessings thereby secured to our country, were the legitimate results of the adoption of that great principle by our fathers; and that we ought never to forget or fail to declare our undying attachment to this chief tenet in the creed of Democracy."

This talks like Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence, and looks like *true* Democracy.

Honest Democrats, are those your sentiments? Can you then as honest men, before God and your country, vote for James Buchanan and a Democracy, that is willing to seize Cuba and Kansas, for the benefit of slavery? Can you by a vote, endorse the Cincinnati Platform, without renouncing *true* Democracy as defined in the above resolutions? Can you go with the present Democratic party—a party which endorses Pierce, Douglas, Atchison, Stringfellow, and at the South even Brooks, without sacrificing every essential principle of true Republican government? Can you go for a Democracy that blinks the outrages of poor bleeding Kansas, and sustains Franklin Pierce, whose executive power and influence has upheld Missouri Border Ruffianism?

Whigs are in the same dilemma with Democrats. Mr. Fillmore is not a whit safer for non-extension than is Mr. Buchanan; as his past acts and recent speeches most clearly show. The same ANDREW JACKSON DONELSON, who boasted in the Convention that nominated him, that "HE OWNED ONE HUNDRED SLAVES," characterised Fillmore a few years since, as an "*eleventh hour apostate abolitionist*."—That the man who endorsed the Fugitive Slave Law, should go against the South on the question of slavery, is too absurd to believe. Honest Whigs choose then your position.

Fremont goes for liberty, against extension, against disunion and for industry. Neither Whig nor Democrat nor Free Soiler need sacrifice his principles in voting for Fremont. Members of all parties support him on the common ground of opposition to slavery. The name, REPUBLICAN, may well apply to the supporters of Fremont, for none are Republicans, who vote for slavery or its extension.

Let, then, every honest man of all parties, who professes to love his country as the land of freedom, and who would resist the progress of slavery, give his vote for JOHN CHARLES FREMONT, as the ONLY candidate, reliable and safe in the present *great emergency*.

5. Therefore, to vote for Fillmore or Buchanan is to *endorse the South*, and vote for the *extension of American slavery*.

6. We have also proved that the cry of "dissolution" is only the *panic-cry* of a few hot-headed Southerners, that it is rebuked by their own citizens, and that to prevent "dissolution" we must elect Fremont, whose administration will stop the enroachments of slavery and bring the nation back to the Constitution, the only stable basis of union.

7. We have also shown that to vote for Buchanan or Fillmore, thus carrying out the designs of the South in regard to slavery, is to degrade honest industry at the North, by endorsing, virtually, the sentiments of the South on the subject of labor.



The first part of the document is a letter from the Secretary of the Board of Education to the Board of Trustees of the University of the State of New York. The letter is dated October 10, 1890, and is addressed to the Board of Trustees of the University of the State of New York, Albany, New York.

The letter discusses the progress of the Board of Education in carrying out its duties during the past year. It mentions that the Board has held several meetings and has considered many important matters. It also mentions that the Board has received many suggestions and recommendations from various sources, and that it has endeavored to give due consideration to all of them.

The letter concludes with a statement of the Board's confidence in the future of the State's educational system, and a hope that the Board of Trustees will continue to support the Board of Education in its efforts to improve the quality of education in the State.

*Handwritten notes in cursive script, written vertically on the right side of the page. The text is difficult to decipher but appears to be a list or series of entries.*

