PERSON NOTHING STATE TO A TOTAL TO STATE OF THE PERSON TO A TOTAL OF TH

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O'MEARA GOODRICH,

TOWANDA:

agriday Morning, Angust 21, 1832.

REBUTLER to SENATOR CHASE, is reply to his letter, dated July 18th 1812, areing the propriety of nominating a third radidate for the Presidency.

New York, July 31, 1852. Dear Sir : I have read, with care the public letyaddressed to me by you, in the columns of the York Herald, of the 20th inst. It reached me nee engaged in proparing for an interpretant case, the argument of which was commenced on the s, and only concluded yesterday.

Heam from this communication that you find it mossible, without doing violence to your convicas of right and duty, to support the candidates president and Vice-President of the United hates, homina'ed by the Democratic Convention ately held at Baltimore. You think the slavery solutions, incorporated in the platform of that Conwan preconcilable with the resolutions adopted. me declarations made, in August, 1848, by Baiala Convention, of which you were a amber ; and you think, also, that Gen Pierce and Kim the present democratic candidates, are ely committed to the support of the plate out by the Convention which nominated someoughly identified with the intere Save Power, that they cannot, " withraised meansistency," be supported by those al in the free-soil movement of 1848, and viv such of this class as, like yourself. , a cading part in the Buffulo Convention. You ner fore, resolved to vote against these canand, by 6 independent action," personal meet with others, to do what you can to

not distinctly speak of the call lately mader the signature of Hon. Samuel weng "the Free-soil Democracy" to send a convention to be held at Pittsburg 11 of August, for the purpose of nominadates for President and Vice-President of el States : but the time chosen by you for vin of your letter, as well as from its and a most but infer that it is designed to lathat you propose to attend, or, some way, to be represented in the coming ashurz Convention; and that to this assemblage ralpok for the organization, and for the candidates the independent democracy with which you

Before the publication of your letter, the free-soil emocrats of New York-whose organization was ing since merged in that of the re-united state degrant and who were thus represented in the late harmere Convention-had, by uniting with other immeerats, in rautication meetings, and in various oner mans, generally accepted the nominations of ha Convertion and expressed their determination grethe nominces their cordial support. The n of the democratic press of the state, which 1848 supported the principles and candidates of Fig. Democracy. This course does not, it appars conscide with your views of policy or duty. adjournave stated at large the grounds of your

s wherent in this place to say, that the free-soil "I be see convention, and having, by the or exception delegates, united in on Pierce and King, it was not to any should repudiate these nomand they might dislike, or object to e e comme and that the support of led as a political duty, but ver, faither commended to their minds aments by the impression prevalent among granges which led to the disputes and divisions! Mill decased to exist, and by a desire, equalseneral, to redeem this state and the union from 200 2-a result only to be accomplished, as Francisco in behalf of same ' ckerk state and national.

1911 has state, connected in 1848 with the question. "I'm ency, have in several instances accomthen their acceptance and support of the present " "craic candidates with protests, more or less - 1 against that part of the platform, which rees aslavery. You refer to this fact, and while T'express your own inability to see the proprie-" ' mlence of this course, and the "keen -"es wah which you have witnessed it, you yet The lat yourself and for others sharing with you "se regrets, that you will not " question the mo-The Cribe C'elliy to their own convictions," of "e who have taken it.

brins, you have but obeyed your own sense o Size and exhibited your usual modesty and canfree of democrats, distinguished for their vincence and honor, of other states, as well as of "T Y k while dissenting from, and protesting and the platform of the Baltimore Convention, Ware ved their intention of supporting its nomiees and while you claimed, for yourself, the right der te according to your own convictions, in has careelion, and how far, you should go, in man-" ag your own disapprobation of the slavery " proclaimed at Baltimore you could not, "4, ist man, deny to others differently circumsteed, the right of deciding, for themselves, the tine quest on; nor as a man conscious of his own is y, venture to affirm, that these decisions tele not as honest, and possibly as wise, as your

The matter being one of public concernment, part of the Baltimore platform, but the nominees of by the Whig Convention. he convention, and for the hostile movement in The two Conventions representing constituencies

which you are about to engage. To set forth these reasons; to remoustrate with Free-soil democrats ciple and policy, deserting, each, the first great do-(and especially with those belonging to this state,) ty of political parties—that of watching each other who have decided to support Pierce and King, and to induce, if you can, democrats who acted with you in 1848 to act with you now-these I take to be the main objects of your letter. You have addressed it to me, not because I had publicly taken ground in lavor of the Baltimore nomineesfor this, hitherto, I have not done-but; as stated by yourself, " because we were co-laborers in the preparation of the platform promulgated by the Buffalo Convention, and afterwards connected in our rs. of its political creed, "the only effectual guardian lations to the convention and its nominees; and because, also, we both profess the same democrate faith, and desire the success of the same demoessity under which your letter has laid me, of come ing before the public with a lengthened reply, 1 cheerfully admit, that in the circumstances you

to the public the form of an address to me. So far as your letter is designed to explain and o vindicate your rejection of the slavery resolutions of the Bultimore Convention, it expresses substantially, my own convictions, and receives my entire

The main purpose for which that Convention had been assembled, was to nominate candidates for the re-united national democracy-for a party which, though numbering in its ranks a large maority of the electors of the United States, had, in consequence of dissentions and divisions, originating in the necessity of legislating for the territory of Oregon and for territories expected to be acquired, from Mexico, and turning on the question of slavery in those territories, lost its ascendancy in in the Union, as well as in several of the United so elaborately discussed by you had occurred to

In the meantime, the question of slavery in the territories had been practically settled by a series of legislative acts, some of them, in their nature, irepealuble, and others of them 'obnoxious alikehough for reasons diametrically opposite-to Freesoil democrats in the north and to many democrats in the south. In this state of things, what was the dictate of prudence, as well as of comity and instice? Obviously, that while the convention reaffirmed the leading and distinguishing principles of the national democracy, in which all its members agreed; and while it declared the known views of its constituents, upon questions of political lever, seemed to me, on the most deliberate and policy, in respect to which the democracy, as a par- comprehensive survey it was able to make of the ly differed from their opponents, it should either condition and relations, present and prospective, of carefully abstain from topics connected with the di- the whole country, that I should best promote all all, that it should be in the terms so broad and toles yet remains unaccomplished of the measures enurant as to enable democrats of the South and of merated in the Bullalo platform-by casting my the North, the East and the West, whatever might vote for these candidates; and this-with only the be their particular opinions on the topics referred to reservation necessary to guard against possible; but -however diverse-however extreme-to sustain most improbable, contingencies, which, should true sense and spirit, torbidden to vote for, and them with freedom, with a just self-respect, and they occur, might demand achange of views-lacwith a fraternal regard, to the equal rights of cordingly resolved to do.

Wise and disinterested democrats, in every to this conclusion: cuarter of the Union, thus desired and expected the Convention to act. It was only in this way that will have been, on the 4th of March next, for four the assembled thousands pledged themselves to the wounds of 1848 could be effectually healed; it years, in the hands of the Whig party. During the abide by and maintain it; and you especially rely was only in this way, that the lessons taught by the first part of the term, this party nearly divided the on the concluding resolution of the platform, in the Wallest now stopping to notice them in detail, it to good account. For the first and most important from the influence which a whig Executive will of them was, that democrats, in every section of the always exert on the action of Congress, even though emergis of New York having been represented country, should be permitted, with entire freedom, there may be a nominally democratic majority in to hold, and in all constitutional ways, to express, each House the legislation of the country, especial their particular opinions on any question of the pub- 1y in respect to financial matters, has been gradualhe policy within the power of the federal govern- ly becoming more and more unsound. No one ment, without being placed under the ban of politi- knows this better than your self. The evil tendencal excommunication. So much, at least, was tacitly implied in that re-union of the party which secured its unbroken representation at Baltimore.

Instead of parsuing this course, the Convention -under what circumstances I cannot stop to inquire -passed the three slavery resolutions recited in 1) & removerats of both the late sections, that your letter. I agree with you in thinking them irreconcitable with the Buffalo platform. I was associated with you in the preparation of that docuto see maknown to you, that individuals and your rejection, on this ground, of the resolutions in | are well qualified to bring back the administration

falo platform.

such slavery agitation as existed in 1840, but also both desire to see predominant. the whole subject as it now exists, in such manner as to apply it to questions which have only arisen since the date of the war with Mexico-these the restoration of the democratic ascendency in the three resolutions as they now stand, must be understood to cover and as intended to embrace every dom would at least be as sale, for the next four kind of discussion-whether in or out of Congress years, in the hands of the democratic party-a -however constitutional in its form and object, and however moderate in its terms, upon any topic connected with slavery. And this interdict is not only to apply to any such discussion in respect to slavery in the slave states, where the Federal Government has no power to touch it, but also in respect to slavery in the district of Columbia, or other plaes under the exclusive control of that Government. This attempt to stiffe free public discussion,

seems to me a most daring and dangerous violation of the Constitution, and of the first principles of civ-

By the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, Congress can " make no faw abridging the freedom of speech or of the press y? yet have we, in the case before us, a political convention doing, or attempting to do, this very thing: grave importance, it is not surprising that and this assault on freedom of thought and utter-Jou should desire to place before, the public your ance is rendered doubly dangerous by the fact, that 23501.5 for rejecting, not merely the exceptionable it has been substantially seconded and followed up

wide a part as the poles, on most openions of prinand taking care that the republic receive no detriment-set themselves to the task of subverting a right, secured, indeed, by the Constitution, but not acquired through it, nor from any other human charter-one of those original, and natural rights, for the preservation of which government is instithied, and which is itself declared by Jefferson and Madison, in the very documents referred to by the Democratic Convention, as one of the sources of every other right !

The topic eminently deserves a full and fearless discussion ; but I cannot, in this place, perform this cratic measures." However I may regret the necessive of "tree speech," without exhausting space centired for other matters at the state of

Nor sitall I question either your right to take, or the propriety of your taking, in respect to Messrs. have mentioned, you had good warrant, if you had! Rieme and King, the extreme step on which you thought proper to use it, for giving to your address have decided. You were it is true, with other Ohio democrats, represented in the Baltimore Convention; and your delegates concurred in making the cominations. Such relations, under ordinary cirsition. This is the common law of party associa-

The reasons assigned in your letter for rejecting the nominations and for actively opposing the nomnees, are, I doubt not, conscientiously entertained; and being satisfactory to your own mind, should of course, be obeyed by you. Their influence, beyond yourself, must, however, entirely depend on the force with which they strike the minds of

Before your letter reached me, most of the points me, and in the course of my reflections, had been considered and disposed of.

The slavery resolutions of the Baltimore platform rejected promptly and without reserve; and as was resolved, on the one hand, not to conceal on any occasion when candor should call for them. my opinions on this point, and unwilling on the other, to obtrude them where the frank and full expression of them might be deemed by any a trespass on the proprieties of the occasion, I determined to abstain from attending any of the public meetings called to ratify the nominations, or to promote the election of the Democratic candidates. It, howrisions of 1848 or, if allusion was made to them at its great interests—and among these functude what

The Executive branch of the federal government legislation.

The next Congress will be under less restraint in prosperity now flowing upon the country, it needs without reserve. I, therefore, concur with you, in | political, of the democratic nominees, I think they | and myself. to that limited construction of federal powers-that But I have other and higher reasons for rejecting equal and exact justice to all sections of the country these resolutions, than their repugnance to the Buf- and to all classes—that caution in imposing public burthens-that frugality in public expenditures- and Not to dwell on the bad logic or worse morality that simplicity and moderation in the general of affirming, as does the second of series, that the working of the government—which constitute, in preceding resolution, originally adopted in 1840 respect to these most important topics the essence covers and was intended to embrace" not only of the Jeffersonian democracy, which you and I

It seemed, also, to me, that while all the other interests of the country imperatively demanded federal government, the interests of human freeparty whose original principles are identified with freedom and progress-as in the hands of the modern whig party, of which you truly declare that perty rather than to the rights of man."

The condition and interests of the state of New entered upon a course of financial policy very dangerous to the credit and prosperity of the state, and. as lately adjudged by our highest tribunal, directly in the teeth of the constitution. But though the fidelity of the judiciary, yet within the acknow. ledged limits of constitutional power there is ample room for a large amount of reckless legislation; and

See Virginia Resolutions of December 21, 1798. ison's report of 1800.

matters have been kept by our present whig rulers through their state organization, then in existence, coed at the coming election, to enter anew upon the career they had commenced.

Considering the vast magnitude of the interests involved in the coming election, I was unwilling to contribute in any degree, however slight, to the success of the whig party in this state. Opposition by Free soil democrate of New York to Pierce and King would give aid and comfort in this state to that party, and such "sid and comfort" I could not, istently with my sense of duly, as the matter then appeared to me, by any means extend.

Since the receipt of your letter, I have reconsidered the anbject, in the light of the facts and reasonings contained in it, but without finding any ufficient reason for abandoning these views or changing the resolve to which they led, "

You think there is a marked inconsistency professing to hold to the Buffalo platform, and yet supporting Pierce and King ; and you have stated, at length, the grounds of your opinion.

From its very nature the case is one of judgment -of conscience. It is a question, not of fact, or science, but of pradence and morality, which recomplances, impose on the constituent the daty of ters itself to the private judgment of two indivi- tio. I submit that it necessarily concedes the two support, or at least, of refraining from active oppo- duals, and to which each of them desires to give a trank and honest answer.

Each is bound fairly to consider the argument of the other; but as the decision of each must be upon his own responsibility, each, as an honest man, is bound to abide by his own matured convictions.

I have already stated by what considerations and motives I was led to give a different answer to the question before us. I have also stated that, I have found in your letter, after careful consideration no sufficient cause for reversing my decision. I can not give up my convictions, merely because they differ from yours; you would despise me were I capable of such an act.

With entire propriety might I here close this eply. For though your letter is in some sense, an appeal to the public, on the point of difference beween us, it is an appeal to a tribunal which can only pass its opinion on the comparative strength of our respective positions, and upon our probable sincerity; but which can make no decision forcing the conscience of either of us. It may, however, be more satisfactory, not only to vontself, but to the public, that I should state my views upon the material points of your argument; and this I will now do.

The point of difference between us relates to the nature and extent of the action contemplated, and of the pledges given by the Buffalo planform, We agree in fidelity, protessed and actual, to

these pledges; we agreed in rejecting the slavery resolutions of the late Democratic Convention; but we differ as to the question, whether democrats like ourselves, who cordially united in the Buffalo platform, and who yet faithfully hold to it, are, by its bound by, independent action, to oppose, the Democratic Nominees? In support of your view of the case, you dwell upon the Buffalo platform; the character of the convention by which it was adopted; the earnestness and enthusiasm with which conflicts and reverses of that year could be turned House of Representatives. From this fact, and following words: "Resolved, that we inscribe on "our banner Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labor. "and Free Men, and under it will fight on and "fight ever, until a triumphant victory shall reward Cour exertions."

To give additional point to your argument, you quote the language of distinguished New York democrats, (some of whom did not attend the sary. cy of this state of things has been hitherto kept in Buffalo Convention.) who, in worls of their own. check by various causes-among others, by the expressed the like determination to do battle with mere want of time for the ordinary business of the Slave Power, for the principles and objects named in this resolution. Extracts of this sort, and this respect than the last two; and, with the tide of some of these parties, occupy a considerable potion of your letter; but as you have expressly disno prophet to forelell what will be the character of claimed any intention to impugn the motives of its legislation, if the Executive department shall be others, I am spared the necessity of volunteering ment. As chairman of the committee, I reported in the hands of the whig party. It seemed to me any remark upon these quotations or commentsit to the Convention; and to it, in what I believe to all important to prevent such a catastrophe. From the more especially as they have no legitimate bearbe its true sense and spirit, I yet hold, entirely and the known character and principles, personal and ing upon the question now at issue between your

I have no desire to explain away or qualify any of the pledges of the Buffalo plattorm. They bind us to opposition, perpetual and uncompromising, to the encroachments of the slave power, and to unceasing efforts for, "tree-soil, free-speech, freeabor, and free men." But through what particular organization this perpetual opposition and these unceasing efforts were to be made, is not determined by the platform. It was left by the convention to the discretion of its members, to decide for themselves, and according to their respective c renmstances and relations, when, where, and how they were to render these services to the cause of free

It was from the necessity of the case that this large discretion was left to each individual. For the Convention did not represent, nor attempt to represent, any particular constituency. It had no constituency, it was emphatically a mass convenit is "marked by devotion to the interests of pro- tion. It had no permanent organization; no power mittees, all its arrangements and proceedings, in which the New York democracy was divided, the earnest and warm-hearted men, who composed it, and that also of 1793, to be unconstitutional and feelings appropriate to an emergency which demanded instant and vigorous action, to be performshould be together-in their individual capacities, laws, but their unconditional repeal. constitution has been saved by the firmness and or in other connections, so soon as they should be separated. 1

the radical democracy. These assurances were, as you admit, honorably

redeemed. * * I do not perceive, in your letter, any censule the tree democracy of New York for their willingness to reunite with their former associates. If the reunion could have been effected on terms proper and honorable, you would not have objected to it The approbation with which you speak of the complete union effected in Wisconsin and Vermont and of the partial union effected in Ohio and in Massachusetts, show that to union, in itself, provid ed it were obtained on just terms, you had no obiections. This sentiment was very decisively mani fested in your own action, in November, 1851, when you publicly declared your approbation of the platform adopted by the regular-democratic Convention of the state of Ohio-that by which Governor Wood was renominated for re election -and your adhesion, on the principles of that platform, to the democracy of Ohio. I take no exception whatever to this action on your part; on the contrary, I thought it, at the time, wise and patrio points above stated—the right of every person who

took part in the proceedings at Buffalo to decide for himself how, and in what political connection his efforts in behalf of the principles there proclaimed were to be made; and the expediency, in the case of every democrat concerned therein, of his making such efforts—supposing the opportunity to be tairly presented-in his former party connection, rather than in any new one-in the old lemocratic party, as organized before 1848, rather than in the free-democracy formed in that year,-You must also, in fairness, concede, that if a reunion was ever to occur, it could only be by some

oncession on each side. Neither section of a party so nearly equally di vided could be expected to accept, without som nodification, the former doctrine of the other.

In the same spirit, in the concluding part of you letter, you distinctly avow your own readiness to emain in the National Democratic organizationin which, as a part of the Ohio democracy, you were represented-provided the candidates and platform of the Convention had met your approbaion. "Had a liberal and tolerant spirit," these are your words, prevailed in the Baltimore Convention; had no new tests, incompatible with demiocratic principles, been imposed; had the nominees represented that spirit, and the ideas of reform, progress, liberty and economy embodied in the original platform, no division need have occurred. The Convention is responsible for the division. The Convention, which organized a compromise democracy upon new tests, created the necessity for a radical and independent dem-

coracv." The division to which, in this passage, you reter, s not the division produced by the Convention of 1848, but a new division produced by the Convention of 1852. The necessity for a radical and independent democracy, to which you allude, is, in like manner, a necessity growing out of the action of the Convention of 1852. It is, therefore, not for the reassembling of the free-democracy of 1818. but for a new organization in 1852, of a new freedemocracy, that you call. You inform us that you think it demanded by the action of the late Convention; and no one that knows you will doubt the sincerity of this statement. But from the very nature and necessity of the case, each of your late associates must be permitted to decide for himself whether the organization of a new party be neces-

Even were it certain that the "independent a tion," in which you propose to engage, could be limited to the very objects and measures set foul. in the Buffalo platform, I should, therefore, for the comments on them, and on the recent course of several reasons above stated, feel myself constrained to decline any participation therein.

But it is certain that it will not be so limited. Several new questions connected with the sub ject of slavery-all those, for example, growing out of the enactment of the several compromise arts of 1850-have arisen since 1848. No one of these questions was or could be then toreseen, in he precise form in which it is now before usmost of them are absolutely new.

Some of these questions are, no doubl, embraced within the principles of the Buffalo platform; but before I can be required to unite with you or others, in taking ground upon any new question, not anticipated at Buffalo, I must be permitted to examine into its character and merits, and to decide for my self as to the course I should nursue.

This is due to every member of the convention of August, 1848. It is especially due to the Free Soil Democracy of New York: for, however may have been as to others, the Bullalo Convention, instead of being a starting point, or a restingplace, was, with most of them, the place of ter nination in this particular path of public duty.

Now, on one at least of the new questions refer red to-and, as it happens, the only one likely soon to become the subject of anima'ed controversy the Fugirive Slave law of 1850-my opinions are entirely different from yours; and, if I may judge of self-perpetuation. All its officers and com. from the public prints, from those of all others, who are likely to take part in the proposed convention York had also much to do with my decision. As its organized capacity, were limited to the time and You deny the power of Congress to legislate on one of the consequences of the dissensions by place, when and where it was assembled. The the subject, and therefore hold the law of 1850, state tell into the hands of the whigs, who soon had been drawn together by the sympathies and void. For this reason, and also because of its objectionable features, you are prepared to urge, and if I correctly understand your views, think it your ed in their collective capacity, so long as they duty to arge, not merely the amendment of these

Whatever I might have thought as to the consti tutional power of Congress to legislate in this be-What these other connections should be, the Con. half, had the point arisen for the first, in 1850. I vention, when it separated, could not, in respect to consider the power too firmly established, by the any of its members, certainly know: but it was acquirescence of the whole nation in the act of authorized to expect, from the assurances given by 1793, and by the decisions of the judicial tribunals. drawn by Madison; the Kentucky Resolutions of Authorized to expect, from the assurance given by Madison; the Kentucky Resolutions of New York, who took to be now drawn in question; Wile, therefore, I November 18, 1798, drawn by Jefferson; and Madison; the free-coil democrate of New York, who took to be now drawn in question; Wile, therefore, I part in its proceedings, that they would be enabled regarded, with astonishment and regret; the enact-

ment, by the American Congress, in the middle of in such a state as to enable them, should they suc. to secure to the Dallalo nominees the support of the 13th century of a new Positive Slave less more stringent and rigorous in its provisions, than the act hamed in the preceding century when slavery existed in three-lopribs of the slates onerating retrospectively and without Imitation of time, so as to embrace persons who though origin ally elaves, had been for years, domiciled in the free states, and there bound by domestic and social relations, into which the sopineness of the master, in the assertion of his rights, had perhaps enabled them to enter,—a law totally deficient in appropricolor, of whom, at the date of its maciment, there were over 400,000 in the free relates. - a law, repugnant in it very name, to the welling ho orthern men-even of those most conscions of duty of fulfilling the constitutional provision it was designed to maintain and one herefore, which should have been trained the new law were necessary) with vareful regard to the wenniments and institutions of the free states, and with scrubbylous altention to the rights of a large but defenceless tributes of wise and considerate legislation as a most to justify the belief that it must have been designedly made so for the very purpose of exciting opposition at the north, and thus giving to disnionists in the south new cause of complaint and auflation :- while, therefore, I have regard this faw, ever since its passage, and still regard it, as a loud blot on the legislation of my country, I have never

温过200011001

vet doubted its constitutionality f I should be most happy to see this law so amended, is to make it consistent with the rules of justice and the claims of humanity; and I am ready to unite in any wise and hopeful tellart to obtain such amendment. But I cannot consent to take part in a political organization, founded in hostilly to the continuance of the laws themselves, even though political organization, founded in hostility amended, on the starue-book. The reasons for this opinion cannot be stated here; but they seem to me to be perfectly consistent with all the pledges made at Buffalo.

When, therefore, in addition to the consideraions before mentioned, it is further manifest that he proposed action is likely to embrace, if not designed to embrace, objects and measures not named in the Buffalo platform-objects and measures which my convictions will not permit me to promole—the reasons against my becoming a pary to it are, as I trust you will have the candor to ac-

knowledge, absolutely insuperable.

It is intimated by you, that many democrats who took part in the Free spil movement of 1848 and 164 ready to take part in the like movement now Your n cans of knowledge are much better mine; but I couless I have seen no evidence of such disposition, in any part of the country—there is no such disposition to my knowledge, among the democrats of New York. In this respect, the whole condition of things is totally different from that which existed in 1848; and unless the pledge binds us to disregard the most obvious rules of political prudence--and true interpretation-there would seem to be good reason for, but at least one very good reason against, the movement you propose viz: that it can do no possible good, and may do much harm, lo the interests you desire to promote.

Your personal objections to Gen Pierce and Mr King seem to me wholly insufficient to justify opposition to them as candidates. You admit you have no word to utter in disparagement of the just claims of either to respect and honor for their private virtues and public services." The object ions are, that each of these gentlemen is an extreme supporter of slavery; that each has treated Freesoil democrats with intolerance, and denounced them in terms of harshness and severity; and that, in their let ers of acceptance, they declared their decided approval of the Bultimore platform. While I regard these things as to recommendation of the candidates, I cannot, without incurring myself the guilt of intolerance, magnily them into a ground of disqualification. They have but exercised, in the way which they, doubtless, have thought, right that freedom of thought, of ulterance and of action, which, as it seems to me, those who prepared the Buffalo platform should be the last to deny or so-

Tou inquire, at the close of your letter, what New York democrate, who support the compromise ticket," while in words rejecting the "compromise platform, except to gain for freedom or for freesoil democ. acy, by supporting this ticket! " Is it? you ask, "that free-soil democrats will share in the patronage, or influence the action, of the administration!" For one I answer, No! not at all. And whatever any might have thought, had I given to the ticket a silent support, yet, after the publication of this letter, I shall hope to be acquited of entertaining any such expectation,

You suggest, that General Pierce, in the event of his election, will feel himself specially engaged to gnard the slave interest so tar as relates to " the [EE NEXT PAGE]

. The meetings for appointing detegates to the proposed Pittsburgh- Convention, whose proceed ings have fallen under my eye, generally concur in treating the immediate and total repeal of the act of 1850, as one of the main objects of the Convent tion. At one of these meetings stated, by the newspapers, to have been held in the Third Congressional District of this state, in the early par f this mouth, it would seem that several persons I whom I was named as one, were recommended to represent the state at darge" in the proposed Convention. L. knew nothings of the meeting, except from the newspapers; no notice has ever seen given to me, by any of its officers, of the alleged recommendation, which was made without my consent, knowledge or approbation.

† That part of the 10th section which provides. that a record, made up in one state, to prove that a man, then actually domiciled in another state, and who has had 'no notice of the proceeding, ower service or labor to the party who precures the record to be so made up; shall be conclusive evi-dence thereof, is bull and word, because contrary to the first principles of civilized jurisprudence; but it is not, property speaking, unconstitution however, illustrates the character of the law.