

The Daily Freeman.

6 August 1848, 2

Gen. Cushing, in a speech at Newburyport, Mass., on the 25th ult., contended that the question of slavery or free soil should be left to the inhabitants of the Territories.

Daily National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON

29 August 1849, 3

Col. WASHINGTON CUSHING died at his place of residence, in South Hingham, (Mass.) on the 22d instant. He was born on the 8th of January, 1776, and was consequently in his seventy-fourth year. During the war of 1812 Col. CUSHING was in command of the regiment stationed at the Castle in Boston harbor, and was ever distinguished for his promptness, fidelity, and zeal in the discharge of his military as well as of all the other duties of life.

THE REPUBLIC.

WASHINGTON

12 April 1850, 3

ARRIVALS AT THE HOTELS.

Willard's Hotel,
Corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th street.

W Newman, Florida	S Hirston, N Y
C Doolittle, do	A Blavell, N H
J Humbard, Md	Mrs Bissell, do
Maj T G Harris, do	A W Woodward, Va
J M Wright, N Y	J Savage, Boston
C Treadwell, do	Miss Savage, do
H D Evans, do	A J. Brackett, N Y
J Lathrop, do	Mrs Brackett, do
D W Kellogg, do	A E Laurie, do
Mrs Kellogg and two children, do	A G A Bell, San Francisco
Capt S Hamilton, do	S S Guthrie, Ohio
Mrs Hamilton, do	E B Guthrie, do
J Goodin, Cincinnati	Mrs Beecher, do
J R Church, N Y	Mr Beecher, do
P Schermerhorn, do	W Hughes, do
J Banker, do	D A Osgood, Pa
I E Cooper, Cincinnati	Mrs Osgood, child, and maid, do
S L Wilson, do	

Brown's Hotel,
Pennsylvania Avenue, between 6th and 7th streets.

S H Watkins, Va	A D Hudson, Balt
E E Parker, N Orleans	G Sellers, Cincinnati
W B Dunn, Ala	J L Mustin, Ga
J D Chichester, do	J G Winter, do
B Merrill, Tusculumbia	W Hudson, Va
A A Burlison, Ala	S H Waskane, do
A Moss, Va	S S Reynolds, Boston
J Norfleet, N C	E F Cutting, do
D E Beman, Ga	R Todd, Mass
W Northall, Md	R L Toy, Boston
T F Harris, do	S S Whitney, N H
G W Richardson, do	Mr Carter, Va
T Crampton, Md	T S Davis, Md
H L Harrington, do	C A Staller, Pa
J A Hough, Tenn	G L Eaton, N Y
R H Hunton, Va	J W Duncan, Tenn
A G Gordon, Ky	T W Allen, N J
D A Brown, Richmond	T C Fassitt, Md
J R Jefferson, Miss	W W Gilmer, Va
B A Resher, do	Mrs Deville, Balt
R Henly, Mass	Miss Severance, do
D E Reynolds, Pa	T Phillips and lady, Va
J Emmerson, Ia	

National Hotel,
Corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th street.

Dr L D Wilcozen and lady, Ga	Mrs Cardona, Phila
A Powell, Ala	M Campbell, do
R H Duvall, Md	W S Pickett, do
D L Harris, Mass	J G Wartell, La
C Wendell, Washington	W H Murdock, do
W E Whelan	R Healey, Mass
H C Whelan and son, Phila	J T Allen and son, N J
B E Grey, Ky	D E Reynolds, Pa
J C Darby, do	Mr Smith, Va
P Dodge, Mass	J Frink, Chicago
B F Stockton,	A A Line, Pa
E P Johnson, Ky	W Kirkwood, S C
M Stanley, do	C A Stabler, Pa
A M Weedon, do	J B Matthews, N Y
T Irvin, do	H H Morray, do
L P Sanger, St Louis	T R Fletcher, Vt
J C Wynn and lady, N York	R McKee, Va
Capt Gauntt, Phila	G Trinnell, Ala
Mrs Gauntt, do	3 Misses Thorndike and maid, Boston
	C Farley, Maine
	J C Darby

United States Hotel,
Pennsylvania Avenue, between 3d and 4th streets.

A Florence, Va	C W Wernig, Balt
G Vandevants, do	T Hayes, do
Mr Moffat, do	J Nosher, N Y
R Camp, Vt	W T Odell, do
S D Castleman, Va	W Costello, Boston
G Turner, do	O Worstell, do
P L Lett, do	R Foster, do
Dr T H Clagett, do	S Long, Balt
G W S Smith, do	H W Ruggles, N Y
A G Smith, do	Master James
Dr T J Cooke, do	J R Robinson, lady, and four children
Mr Stockton, do	A Rockwell and lady
H Primrose, Balt	G N Eldred
J Boucher, do	A Robinson
J S Jacobus, do	Hall and King
A Schoen, Cincinnati	L Lee and boy
C Rong, N Y	Dr Boyden
A Hess, do	
A Linhard, Balt	

Gadsby's Hotel,
Corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 3d street.

G W Worrall, N C	Mr White, Va
L J Bowden, Va	A B Smith, Ala
J H Hill, Wilmington	H Jennings, Va
Dr Fisher & nephew, Va	L King and son, N Y
E R Saunders, Illinois	W A Nicholls, Mass
J A Craig, Warrenton	C Cushing, do
J Walden, Va	Mrs J N Cushing, do
M Miller, do	

Irving Hotel,
Corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 12th street.

E S Brigham, Phila	G B Gordon, do
S C Williams, N Y	Hook & Ladder Co No. 3, N Y
A V Renssaler, do	Friendship Fire Co, Balt
W H Barton, Boston	Anacostia Fire Co, Wash- ington
C F Newman, New Bedford	Franklin Fire Co, Wash- ington
W Magens, Phila	Mr B Bates, N Y
G E Fairchild and lady, N Y	J Y Fellows, do
F B Wallace, do	O R Cromuck, Boston
Capt M M Van Dyke, N Y	
W Mackay, Savannah	

22 May 1850, 2

From Havana--Cuba.

Havana dates of May 12 come via Philadelphia. Conde Mirasol, the new Captain General of Cuba, had arrived at Havana, from Spain, accompanied by 800 troops. It was reported that the new Government had made concessions to the people with the view of pacification. Nothing had been heard of the Lopez invasion, but the Cubans had taken every precaution to prevent its landing on the island.

The Cholera was making fearful ravages; nearly all the troops had been removed to the interior, as well as the slaves. The deaths had been over forty daily, and the mortality was on the increase in spite of precautions. The rumor of invasion, added to the alarm created by the epidemic, had caused a general stagnation of business.

Dates from St Jago, one of the three capitols of Cuba, to May 2, report several thousand troops mustered there to prevent the invading force from making headway. Three thousand more troops were expected soon, and a war brig with a load of soldiers arrived direct from Spain on the above date. There were besides three Spanish vessels of war in port.

The U. S. Naval force already in the West Indies, with the additions just ordered thither with all dispatch, and directed to look after the Cuba expeditionists and prevent their interference with affairs on the island, embrace the following vessels:

Saranac, steamer, Capt Tatnall, 6 guns; Vixen do, Lt Commanding Ward, 2 guns; Water Witch do, Lt Commanding Totten, 1 gun; Raritan, frigate, Capt Page, 60 guns; Congress, do, Capt, —, 60 guns; Albany, sloop-of-war, Commander Randolph, 24 guns; Germantown, do, Commander Lowndes, 24 guns; Flirt, schooner, Lt Commanding Farraul, 2 guns; Total, 179 guns.

The Washington Republic says it is confidently expected that all this force "will reach the Island of Cuba before any considerable number of those engaged in the enterprise can possibly have effected a landing, and thus prevent the violation of our treaty obligations of amity and peace with Spain."

—Gen Narcisco Lopez, who heads the American marauding party against Cuba, is a native of Venezuela, and about forty-two years of age. He served in the royal army in Spain, where he is said to have distinguished himself in many of the ruthless engagements with the Carlists. He subsequently removed to Cuba, where he was noted for his intrigues, and whence he was forced to retire precipitately about a year since.

Our Gen Cushing is stated to have been offered the head of the expedition, but he declined any connection with it. Gen John Henderson, formerly of Mississippi, but now of New Orleans, is reported to be intimately identified with the affair.

THE UNION: WASHINGTON

9 April 1851, 2

Various resolutions have been submitted in the legislature of Massachusetts to obstruct the rights of the southern people. Mr. Buckingham's is still pending in the senate. So far no measure has been adopted of a hostile character. The election of a free-soil senator for the next six years has been defeated. The Boston Post speaks of a singular move that was made by Mr. Earle, of Worcester, "for considering the subject of prohibiting the conveyance of arrested fugitive slaves on railroads; but Gen. Cushing, by a few remarks, knocked the order in the head."

THE UNION: WASHINGTON

29 April 1851, 3

Hon. Caleb Cushing—formerly in Congress—voted against Sumner (free-soil) in the Massachusetts legislature for United States senator. Mr. C. is a democrat. The abolition Commonwealth, therefore, most atrociously assails him, making a vampire allusion to his having buried his only sister the day previous, and charging that he hurried from the grave for the purpose of being on hand to vote. The vindictive slander is repelled by both whigs and democrats.—*Baltimore Sun*.

The Daily Delta

8 May 1851, 1

Mr. Hon. Caleb Cushing, formerly in Congress, voted against Sumner, free-soiler, in the Massachusetts Legislature, for United States Senator. Mr. Cushing is a democrat. The abolition Commonwealth, therefore, most atrociously sneaked him, making a vampire allusion to his having buried his only sister the day previous, and charging that he hurried from the grave for the purpose of being on hand to vote. The vindictive slander is repelled by both whigs and democrats.

Florida Republican.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

19 June 1851, 2

THE ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY.
—The famous military corps, of Boston, which has just elected Gen. Caleb Cushing as its commander, was the first regularly organized company in America, and may be considered as the germ of all the military organization in New-England. The original charter of the company is dated in 1638, and the original members numbered twenty-four.

22 June 1851, 2

From the Boston Post.

Democratic State Convention

At a meeting of the Democratic State Central Committee, held at the Democratic Reading Room, in Boston, Wednesday, June 18, the following report, submitted by the Hon. Caleb Cushing, on behalf of the executive committee, was unanimously adopted, the question thereon being taken by yeas and nays:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

In Democratic State Central Committee, 18th June, 1851.

The executive committee, instructed by the State central committee to consider and prepare a plan of organization of the democratic party throughout the Commonwealth, and to carry the same into effect, report:

The executive committee have reflected carefully, and have arrived at settled convictions on the subject referred to them; but inasmuch as, since the time when the reference was made, some indications of possible division of sentiment on questions of paramount consequence have appeared in the Commonwealth, the executive committee, before proceeding to action, have deemed it to be due to candor and sincerity on their part, and an act of proper deference and respect for the State committee, to present for its consideration the views they personally entertain, and to ask of it further and more decisive instructions in the premises.

During now a period of ten or fifteen years the people of the United States have been distracted by the discussion of a public question which, independently of other relations of it, is of vital moment to the inhabitants of one-half of the States of the Union, because it affects directly their lives and fortunes.

The discussion of this question has elicited more than the usual warmth of feeling on both sides, not only because of its intrinsic importance to the South, but still more because it involves a claim on the part of the North to change, by volunteer-intervention, the social and political institutions of the South, and because the North manifests on the subject a passionate ardor, kindled by force of conviction, on certain points of moral and political theory.

Thus it has come to pass that, in the course and as the effect of the agitation of this question, we have witnessed the following stages in the progress of the disintegration and organic dissolution of the Union, namely:

1. A severance of most of the churches of the United States into two distinct and hostile religious nationalities, in place of that, their previous unity of religious organization, which had constituted one of the strongest moral bonds of the political nationality of the Union.
2. The gradual separation of the educational institutions of the country, and especially the total or partial cessation of the previous practice, on the part of the young men of the South, of pursuing the higher branches of education at the North.
3. Violent conflict of political interest—the North struggling continually to acquire facilities of attack, and the South to obtain vantage-ground of defence.
4. The growth of a spirit of crimination and recrimination—the North heated by exaggeration of theory and opinion, the South by a sense of peril arising from their numerical inferiority in Congress; and in both sections of the Union personal ambition making the emotion of the day an instrument of power, and inflaming and imbiting the popular passions to promote its own interested object, disregardful of the general good.
5. Following upon this, more or less personal resentment, and reciprocal hard feeling, indicated at the North by the vituperative language of debate, newspapers, public meetings, and even official bodies, towards the citizens of the South, and manifested at the South in the introduction of manufactures and shipping of their own in place of ours, in the encouragement of colleges for education at home, and in abstinence from accustomed acts of social intercourse at the North.
6. The disorganization of those great parties which have served hitherto to impart to political action a generality of concert and a nationality of scope. Neither between the North and the South, nor at the North or the South, does that concert now cordially exist. Acts of Congress are passed by a combination of democrats and whigs against a combination of whigs and democrats. In some of the States of the South the distinction of whig and democrat has ceased to appear in public affairs. In the North, each of the old parties is itself subdivided, and both are held in check by a third party—the free-soilers—which is in organization hostile to both. In some States, the whigs reproach the democrats for co-operating with free-soilers; while the whigs themselves, in the same or in other States, have coalesced with free soilers or others, and thus endeavored to hold the domination of the State. This partial disintegration of parties is the more important, inasmuch as the constitution provides no means of concert in electoral action, which has been secured under it only by national conventions, or something of that nature; and the tendency of this party anarchy, therefore, is to produce political anarchy. In fact, such is already the disorganization of parties, that, without combinations of some sort, in many of the States it would be impossible to accomplish the annual continuation and renewal of government, which the State constitutions require.
7. Not to swell too much this enumeration of the processes of dissolution of the Union already apparently in train of action, it will suffice to add one more, the consummation of the others; and that is the general discus-

sion now going on as to whether the Union can or ought to be preserved, and the deliberate proposition and advocacy at both ends of the Union, as well in Massachusetts as in South Carolina, of nullification and dissolution, by secess, individuals, public meetings, associated bodies, and even authorities of States.

He who denies that there is danger to the Union in all this must be imperfectly acquainted with the facts, or so prejudiced by feeling or position as to suppose that one-half of the States of the Union will submit passively to unlimited aggression and incessant attack from the other States.

The exigency calls upon us deliberately to inspect and measure the danger, and calmly to decide what is the duty of a good citizen in this emergency.

The discussion of the slavery topic has obviously assumed a new phase since the close of the late Congress. That body disposed of the question, so far as it relates to the territories acquired from Mexico—that is, so far as it was a question whether the domain of slavery in the United States should be augmented or not, leaving this to be decided by the people inhabiting the new States or Territories. Congress also surveyed the whole subject, and sought to dispose of it entirely by the adoption of a system of measures for the legal adjustment of the slave relations of the North and the South; since which, the controversy at the North has become one for the extinguishment of negro slavery itself—not, as previously, for its restriction merely within assigned limits.

This new form of the question appears in the debates relating to one of the parts of that system of adjustment, and the only part beneficial to the South—namely, the amendment of the law concerning the extradition of fugitive slaves.

It is contended by many persons at the North that this law is unconstitutional: it has been formally resolved by public bodies that, whether constitutional or not, the law shall not be executed; and the nullification of it has, in some places, been attempted, and even effected, either by force, by the non-action of the officers charged with its execution, or by the abusive application of legal devices and contrivances.

Is, then, the extradition act of 1850 unconstitutional?

The answer to the question is two-fold. First, the constitutionality of this particular law has been considered already, and affirmed by the proper judicial authority in several of the States. Secondly, the objections to its constitutionality, alleged in argument, such as the *habeas corpus* question and the trial-by-jury question, have been many times considered and overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the highest judicial tribunals of many of the States—Massachusetts among the rest—on occasion of process arising under the extradition act of 1793, and involving the same identical points of law.

To this many persons, chiefly men altogether unskilled in the science of law, reply that in their judgment the act is unconstitutional, and therefore they will not obey it.

If this ground were taken only by the persons on whom the law in question acts, it would be not strange, because all men, even the wisest, and still more the ignorant, are subject to be blinded to truth by passion or interest. But the same ground is taken by others, whose only professed interest in the subject is one of opinion.

We come to this inquiry, then: whether a claim of property, made under the laws, is to be decided by the constituted judicial authorities, or by the opinions and passions of private individuals, popular assemblies and mobs.

In the judgments, opinions, or alleged consciences of unauthorized individuals, who have no legal interest in the subject-matter of a process, can be admitted to decide on its legality, apart from, and even in opposition to, the constituted legal authorities, it is self-evident that the bonds of society are ruptured, and there will remain no effective sanction of any rights save the strong hand. A claim of rent, of the ownership of a house, of the possession of a farm, or of the observance of the marriage contract, is open to the jurisdiction of unauthorized private judgment equally with a claim to the services of a fugitive from labor. The result, beyond all peradventure, is crime, vice, riot, anarchy, bloodshed, treason, civil war.

Conscious of this, all men of discreet minds, though they may condemn the law, yet hesitate to engage in acts of resistance to it, and involuntarily in principle the utter annihilation of all security for private rights, of whatever name or nature, and so fatal to the order, safety, and peace of the community.

Many persons of this class content themselves with the utterance of opinions derogatory to the law, in the form either of extravagant but vague and indefinite obloquy, or of unsound but plausible-seeming constitutional arguments, and thus fortify and encourage those who are pledged to resist it by force, and co-operate indirectly, perhaps undesignedly, in the overthrow of the peace and order of society, and in the promotion of acts of social dissolution, bloodshed, and treason.

Others embrace a more definite and more practical course of proceeding—namely, agitation for the repeal of the law. Their objection to this law does not rest in the technical cavils upon it, which misapplied legal ingenuity offers to their approbation; they object to what the law was intended to do, and what it actually secures—namely, the extradition of fugitive slaves. Now, this extradition is preemptorily commanded by the constitution of the United States, and all the law undertakes to do is to provide judicial process to that effect, as other laws do in regard to other injunctions of the constitution. Of

course those persons propose and advocate the nullification, not of the particular law, as others do, but of the constitution itself. They strike beyond the peace and good order of the State to which they belong, and at that of the whole Union.

Whether amendments of the act may or not be made is another question. Doubtless the law, like all others, is not without its defects. What we now speak of is the proposition of its unconditional repeal, with a view to the non-fulfilment of the commands of the constitution in this respect.

We learn, historically, by means of published debates on occasion of the adoption of the constitution, that the insertion of this clause was a *sine qua non* of the formation of the Union.

We learn from the same authorities that the constitution of the United States was adopted in Massachusetts upon explicit consideration and express acceptance of this unpalatable but indispensable stipulation.

We also learn from the journals of Congress that, in just observance of the pledged faith of their respective States in this respect, the act of 1793 was passed by such men as John Langdon and Nicholas Gilman, of New Hampshire; Oliver Ellsworth, Roger Sherman, James Hillhouse, and Jeremiah Wadsworth, of Connecticut; Rufus King and Egbert Benson, of New York; Elias Boudinot and Jonathan Dayton, of New Jersey; Robert Morris, Frederick A. Muhlenberg, and William Findlay, of Pennsylvania; and George Cabot, Fisher Ames, Elbridge Gerry, and Theodore Sedgwick, of Massachusetts; that it stands signed by John Adams, and approved by George Washington.

Such is the constitution; by such men was it applied to the subject-matter. If in these times of sciolism, corruption, and crime, we find ourselves to be so much wiser, purer, and better than the canonized sages of the heroic age of our country, that we must needs, for conscience sake, deny that they understood the import of a constitution which they themselves wrote, and repudiate or nullify the engagements they contracted for us, and which we ourselves have many of us accepted and expressly ratified a hundred times by solemn oaths of fealty to the constitution—if we choose to trample on those engagements, will the other parties in right and interest consent to and acquiesce in the violation?

We know they will not. We feel that in a corresponding case we ourselves would not. We see—every man who does not wilfully shut his eyes to the light sees—that the question whether the constitution shall be observed or not in this respect, is the precise question whether the Union shall continue to exist or not.

We in Massachusetts, while ourselves engaged in performing acts and uttering ideas of nullification, profess to reprobate nullification in South Carolina, Georgia, or Mississippi. Whilst ourselves resolving and talking as if about to stab the Union to the heart, we applaud and honor those who are struggling for its preservation at the South. Nay, in so doing, we virtually labor to destroy those whom we pretend to praise, and to build up and render triumphant those whom ostensibly we denounce. For what is the present attitude of the question at the South?

The disunionists of the South say: Mark the men of Massachusetts; they mean to disregard this law; they mean to nullify the constitution; they say they cannot in conscience observe the compact of union; let us, then, amicably dissolve the Union.

The unionists reply: No; the men of Massachusetts are just, honorable, faithful, and true; they value and love the Union as we do; they have sworn to support the constitution, and they will do it; on their good faith we stake our peace and our honor; and we say to you, that if it prove that we are disappointed and deceived in our estimation of them, we will then be foremost in the cause of disunion, and, if need be, stand ready in that contingency to cut asunder the bonds of the Union ourselves with the edge of the sword.

Such is now the issue at the South. No man there inquires whether the act for the extradition of slaves is to be repealed or not. Every man, of whatever party, is discussing the higher question, whether the Union of the States shall be repealed or not; and those who are not for the immediate repeal of the Union stake themselves on the good faith and honor of the North, and on nothing else. If that falls from under them, if the North persists in its purpose of encroaching upon and usurping the rights of the South, then the dissolution of the Union is certain to follow upon these acts of encroachment and usurpation, as undeniably as the battle of Bunker Hill did the encroachments and usurpations of Great Britain.

We do not stop to dwell on the lesser incidental relations of this inquiry to the domestic peace and well-being of Massachusetts—such as whether Massachusetts can or not, physically speaking, succeed in a scheme of nullification; whether Providence may not have other Andrew Jacksons in store for the salvation of the country; whether force bills are not as applicable to Massachusetts as to South Carolina; whether the labor of Massachusetts wishes to be overcome by a flood of fugitive blacks from the South; whether the farmers, ship-owners, manufacturers, and merchants of Massachusetts are prepared to welcome the reign of mob outrage, and see applied to themselves the doctrines of anarchical socialism, which they wish to apply to the South. These are minor questions compared with the transcendent one whether the American Union—the glory and the hope of our age—shall be destroyed or not by the bad faith of the State of Massachusetts.

But there is a point of the controversy beyond this of

yet higher moment.

Why do any of the people of Massachusetts condemn the extradition act? Why the extradition clause in the constitution? We have the answer to this inquiry in the avowed ulterior objects of the abolitionists;—they are distinguished from the free-soilers; which abolitionists are the men who head the agitation, and under whose apparent leadership so large a mass of men have unreflectingly suffered themselves to come to be ranked. They are logical. They object to the extradition law because their avowed aim is to abolish negro slavery in the United States by extra-constitutional and revolutionary means. They object to the extradition clause of the constitution for the same reason. They object to the constitution itself because it stands in the way of abolitionism. They propose and advocate nullification and the dissolution of the Union in perfect good faith, as being the only means of separating themselves from slavery, and ridding themselves of all participation in the responsibility of its continuance in the South.

We repeat, this movement, as we think, belongs to the school of professed abolitionists; they are, by advanced position, practically the leaders of the agitation; they supply most of the ideas; and they alone are completely logical in the application of theory to action.

If we in Massachusetts hold slavery in Virginia or Louisiana to be such deadly sin as to make nullification a conscientious duty—nay, to render agitation for the abolition of negro slavery a paramount conscientious duty—then it is equally our duty either to undertake the abolition of negro slavery, or, at least, to cease from political association with it under the constitution of the United States. It behooves us, therefore, as upright men, to look these relations of duty frankly in the face.

Is it our duty to sacrifice everything to this one object? Let us examine the pro and the contra, and, after fairly stating the account, see what the rights of conscience demand of us to do.

We cannot abolish slavery in the United States constitutionally without an amendment of the constitution. Such an amendment of the constitution, to be itself constitutional, requires the ratification of three-fourths of the States, and is confessedly unattainable.

We cannot do it, therefore, without unconstitutional intervention, forcible or fraudulent, in the domestic concerns of fifteen States of the Union.

Of course, we begin by violating the constitution. Will the South passively accept this violation? We know they will not. Of course this unconstitutional intervention is to be an armed one. Of course we are to have dissolution of the Union and foreign war between the North and the South, or we are to have civil war between the North and the South, for the combined objects of effecting abolition, and at the same time upholding the Union.

Coming thus by the indissoluble chain of events, and by palpable, manifest steps, directly to war as the only practicable agent of slave abolition in the South by us, we see what we have to pay out in advance as the price of our philanthropic object—namely, the constitution, the Union, and peace, with all its moral and political blessings, and its incalculable advantages to the prosperity and happiness of the United States.

Do we by such war effect the emancipation of the slaves in the South? That depends on the chances of combat in a war to be conducted by us against the lives and fortunes of our fellow-countrymen at the South on their own soil. How many battles will it take, how much carnage will suffice, to subjugate completely one-half of the States of this Union by the arms of the other half? That is the problem to be solved, and without solving which we make no substantial progress in our calculations of philanthropy. We know we have all history to witness to us that we should not reach the end without wading through seas of blood; and the consummation would be not emancipation, but the extermination

of one or the other of the two races which now inhabit the southern States.

Meanwhile, supposing such a scheme of armed intervention to be undertaken, who will venture to forestall the issue? Who may say that invasion, and the disasters in its train, will be confined to the South?

By what means will the Union, or any of its fragments, carry on such a war? We know of but one—namely, the substitution of military monarchy in the place of republican government—that is, the loss of the liberty of the whole people of the United States.

But these men say they must plunge into all these horrors and crimes, forfeit each man's pledged faith, resist the execution of the laws of the land, engage in riot, outrage, and in murder, break the constitution, dissolve the Union, and embark in civil and servile war, in obedience to a law higher than the constitution.

Where is the record of that "higher law?" In each man's own conscience, we are told. Then, every member of the community, however perverted his judgment, however defective his reasoning powers, however limited his knowledge and experience, however passionate, visionary, eccentric, flighty, unbalanced, and vindictive his general character may be, is to set up the absurd conclusions of his own weak mind—nay, the corrupt impulses of his own bad passions—against the law of the land, the order of society, and the public peace. If so, all engagements and obligations between man and man, or man and woman, all that is dear in rights or valuable in possession, becomes the sport of chance, in the universal lawlessness of society, until the sword of some undaunted and positive soldier shall have interposed to redeem the country from anarchy and confusion.

But these men say, further, that they are commanded by God.

To do what? To harass, to obstruct, to wound, to murder a civil officer while in the mere discharge of his bounden duty—to provoke assassination—to encourage the massacre of one race of men by another—to fill society with mutual rage, resentment, hatred, and all fearful and violent emotions—to convert friends into enemies—to vituperate, calumniate, misrepresent—to palter with their sworn obligations as citizens, as jurors, as magistrates—to substitute wrath for love—to place arms in men's hands, after having inflamed their passions and filled their hearts with deadly hate—to plunge the country into war—to turn peaceful and happy States into scenes of carnage and ravage—to heap scorn and obloquy on the name of Washington, and the other honored men of the revolution—to depreciate, pervert, and vilify the constitution—to labor to unloose the bonds of mutual interest and common duty which hold together the States of the Union—to deprive us of our common heritage of historical tradition, of respect for our fathers, of glorious recollections of the past, of pride in the name of American—to make of these now great and happy United States a Golgotha, a thing to shudder at and despise, like that awful beacon in the pathway of nations, the wretched negro-empire of the island of St. Domingo. These the commands of God? Away with the insane self-conceit and the presumptuous impiety which cloaks its ignorance folly, and passion, under blasphemous pretence of being the miraculous recipient of the immediate commands of the Most High!

We hold, therefore, that the views of these abolitionists are wild and false. We deny that any and all means are to be accepted as leading to a supposed good end. We deny that the assumed end can be attained by such means. We deny that the value of the end in question is such as to justify the dissolution of the Union, and the deluging of our fair country in blood for its attainment. And therefore we reject and repel the doctrine that it is the duty of the citizens of Massachusetts to give themselves up to the agitation of the question of slavery-abolition in the South.

On the contrary, we insist that it is the duty of every good citizen and every good man to leave the subject of abolition of slavery where Washington and Madison, Morris, Hamilton, and Jay, the framers of the constitution, placed it—namely, with the domestic legislation of each of the several States respectively concerned.

We think this the only wise and expedient course, as well as the only just and true one. We believe that the agitation of the subject in the North has retarded social change at the South instead of promoting it, and has served greatly to increase and aggravate the disabilities of the black race. And we see abundant proofs that, as a sectional question, its influence has been prejudicial in all respects to the moral welfare, not less than to the material interests, of the North itself.

The questions of statesmanship seem to us to be very simple and obvious—namely, whether, in the professed interest of the colored race, we will pursue a course morally certain to be injurious to it; and whether, for the sake of a possible benefit to the blacks, we will sacrifice the peace and happiness of the whole population of the United States.

Ceasing to make abolition agitation the paramount object of party action, and restoring the subject to its place in the field of moral influence and opinion, we may do much for the welfare of the colored race; we do no good, but much harm, by unconstitutional intervention in their behalf.

We believe the time is near at hand in these United States when this controversy, if persisted in, will present but one issue, and every man will have to march up to the point-blank interrogatory, and to answer without equivocation, "Do you admit and fulfil the obligations of the constitution, while you demand and take its benefits,

or do you not? Are you for the Union, such as it is, with prosperity and peace, or against it, with revolution and war?"

We assume, judging from its antecedents, that the democratic party stands ready to sustain the Union at all hazards, and against all enemies, whether abroad or at home.

It has, on many occasions, avowed and maintained those doctrines of constitutional good faith, of international obligation, of fraternal consideration, and of reciprocal forbearance on the subject of slavery, which are the necessary basis of a national party; which constitute the guarantees of nationality demanded by the existing conjuncture of public affairs; by means of which a citizen of Massachusetts may honorably co-operate with a citizen of Alabama on terms of equal justice and common self-respect; without which a party is national in name only, not in fact; and disregarding which no national party can be held together in the United States.

If, in Massachusetts, any members of the democratic party, through inattention to the spirit of the constitution, or by the force of circumstances, shall have been led into a different course of opinion or action, we do not presume to reproach or condemn; we can but express the hope that they will, on reflection, perceive that the country has reached the point of transition, where sectionalism, if persevered in, becomes disunion; and free-soilism will have to pause, or else pass irrevocably into mere abolitionism, the doctrines of which are admitted on all hands to be incompatible with any possible administration of the federal government, and its ends fatal to the American Union; that they will therefore now cultivate, with renewed zeal, the sentiments of nationality which they have upheld heretofore in all vicissitudes, whether of defeat or victory, and will promptly and manfully gather with us around the standard of the constitution.

Not to do so is, it seems to us, to cease to exist as an integral part of a great national party—it is to cease to exist as a party at all, even within the narrower limits of the Commonwealth.

These are the opinions which we as individuals entertain. We for ourselves think these opinions are but the application, to subsequent questions and to new facts, of the party creed promulgated by successive national conventions. But we do not pretend to possess any power to impose our opinions on other persons, or to determine their conduct. We do not deem it proper for us to attempt to prescribe any new test of party orthodoxy. That, as we conceive, is a duty which, when occasion requires its performance, appertains only to the functions of the national or State conventions.

For which reasons we recommend to the State central committee the adoption of the accompanying resolutions.

All which is respectfully submitted. By order of the executive committee:

C. CUSHING, Chairman.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

In State Central Committee, June 18th, 1851.

The following are the resolutions for calling a democratic State convention:

Resolved, That a State convention of the democratic party be held at Worcester on Wednesday, the 20th day of August next, at 10 o'clock, a. m., for the purpose of nominating candidates for governor and lieutenant governor of this Commonwealth, to be voted for at the election in November next; also to choose two delegates at large to represent the democrats of the Commonwealth in the next national convention; also to transact any other business which may come before the convention.

Resolved, That the basis of representation in the said State convention shall be one delegate for each town, and one delegate in addition thereto for every twenty-five democratic votes given at the gubernatorial election of the last year.

Edward Thorndike,	George B. Loring,	Edward Casneau,
John K. Goring,	Caleb S. Huntis,	A. H. Sollen,
Thos. J. Whittemore,	Frederick Robinson,	Wm. L. Smith,
Deniel Needham,	Caleb Cushing,	Os A. Seaman,
I. W. Beard,	Leonard H. Usher,	Geo. A. Dracser,
Thomas F. Norris,	George Thompson,	Ivora Phillips,
John V. Heard,	Leamuel Dana,	John Spear,
George Roberts,	James D. Thompson,	Edward Avery,
Henry Crocker,	P. W. Leland,	A. M. Ide,
Aaron Hobart,	Sylvanus B. Felaney,	Patb F. Nye,
Charles Mayo,	Moses Bates, Jr.,	Samuel Bradford, Jr.

Filed, unanimously, That the foregoing report and resolutions be published in the democratic newspapers throughout the Commonwealth, with the names of the committee affixed thereto.

EDWARD THORNDIKE, Chairman.

THOMAS GILL, Secretary.

24 June 1851, 3

Mr. Cushing's Report.

In Sunday's edition of the *Union* this document was published without any comment, because the pressure of other business had not afforded us an opportunity to read it. Our readers, we trust, however, will have perused it, and, if they have, are doubtless prepared to sanction the high praise which we desire to bestow upon it for its strength and great ability. Its object is to vindicate the Compromise, as containing nothing which violates the constitution, or which should prevent the democratic party from rallying to its support. Its research and lucidness in the examination of the constitutional and legal principles applicable to the fugitive law entitle the author to the thanks of the country, because they must aid materially in removing the prejudices which have so long surrounded the question of slavery, and which have enabled designing demagogues to take advantage of the good feeling which is so naturally excited by a fact that appears to be not in harmony with our instincts for freedom and equality. We consider it fortunate that such a document has made its appearance at this time, when union and harmony on the basis of that Compromise present a practical issue on which democracy can once more assert the wisdom of those general views which were insisted on throughout the administration of General Jackson, and in all the platforms afterwards recognised as national by the regular conventions of the party.

If the democracy of Massachusetts will rally on the principles of that report, there will then be no exception to the great movement which is making on the same basis in every other quarter of the Union to bring into action the fraternal feelings which existed at the close of our revolutionary war. Our southern brethren, of all parties, will thus find motives to return to those habits of confidence which were familiar in the days of Washington and Jefferson; and the false doctrine which would array one portion of the Union against another, on account of slavery, will be banished to those misnamed religious societies which have grown up in England, and which would have sunk into universal contempt long ago but for the political jealousy, secretly controlling them, of our free institutions and unparalleled prosperity as a nation. In this whole controversy abolition has been the aggressor; and when it is rendered powerless by the sound and potential voice of the great masses of the people of the North, the counteraction and defence not to be denied to the South will cheerfully be converted into patriotic fellowship, and an agreeable interchange of mutual interests and productions.

Such, we devoutly hope, will be the result of the agi-

tation which so recently convulsed our country; and if in the subsidence of the waters of its bitterness the correcting action of the democratic party is ahead of that of the whig in draining them through those healthy channels which are natural to our political system, it is because this party has been less misled by the local prejudices which engendered them. Amongst the statesmen of America, Jefferson was the one who first clearly perceived that the perpetuity of our federal system would mainly depend on confining and limiting the powers given to it by the States; and the numerous proofs afforded by our history of the wisdom of his anticipations in this respect have given his name and views a hold upon the popular mind which nothing has weakened. Hence the power of the party which took its name of democracy from that great man—hence the facility with which that party rallies in behalf of a principle so thoroughly taught by him—hence the movement of this party against political anti-slavery, which contains within itself a perfect type of the dangers which would overwhelm us if the doctrine could once be established that the reserved rights and interests of the people could be disturbed by a consolidated government.

In the effort of the country now to right itself, the ideas of Mr. Jefferson rise up to our view, and command our admiration, just in proportion as the danger which has menaced us is great. Although he shared as largely as any one else in the philanthropy which would improve the condition of the negro, and which deplored his servitude as an evil, yet, when this sentiment went out of its sphere, as in the Missouri Compromise, he denounced it as promptly as he could have done the approach of a foreign foe. He saw more clearly revealed than ever the danger of acknowledging the agency of the federal government in matters not within its sphere, and his voice saved his country then, as it did in the days of alien and sedition laws. It was his unwavering support of the great principle which lies at the foundation of our system that distinguishes him, above all the statesmen of his country; and this slavery question which has misled so many other eminent men establishes more firmly than ever his profound judgment and intimate acquaintance with the causes which undermine and corrupt popular liberty.

Mr. Jefferson wished the largest liberty for the people of all the earth; but he took care not to confound with these general ideas the principles which assign limits to the attainment of this wish, and according to which the distinctions between castes and races, and the separate rights of communities, can no more be disregarded than the laws which obstruct the free movement of animals.

THE REPUBLIC.

WASHINGTON

26 February 1853, 3

ARRIVALS AT THE HOTELS.

WILLARD'S HOTEL.

J Schlyter
 D S Wilson, Md
 B Barstow, Cal
 G W Ogston, Md
 J Snider, jr, Pa
 J A Hozier, do
 J L Newbold, do
 Hon W A Walker, N Y
 Col F T Lally, Me
 J Glackin, Mass
 R McDorkey, N Y
 Mrs McDorkey, do
 Miss Read, do
 Mr T T Read, do
 T H Hardenburgh, N C
 C W Copeland, N Y
 E Morrill, N H
 H Seymour, N Y
 J Robie, do
 Hon C Cushing
 J W Mitchell & I, Pa
 S W Whitaker, N C
 G H V Wilson, Ohio
 H J Jewett, do
 D L Morse, Cal
 J C Buffum, Pa
 F N Fisk, N H
 D Gardiner, N Y
 W J Barkadale, Va
 W C Johnson, Md
 W Buchanan, Va
 Judge Glenn, Md
 Mr Gatchell, do
 A C M Pennington, N J
 S A Chandler, do
 Col O B Debble, Mich
 A Tendryck, Cal

BROWN'S HOTEL.

P C Lauder & I, Cal
 W Jopson, Boston
 J Drenner, Ark
 H S Biscoe, do
 W R Guy, do
 J Clark, Iowa
 J M Preston, do
 J J Henkel, Pa
 W D Beloate, Tenn
 T H Rich, Geo College
 J Harnes, Balt
 R Wallace, Ky
 Col Leathers, do
 W B Tuell, Ia
 D Dodge, N Y
 B V Conner, Wis
 G Folsom, Iowa
 Mr Hackett, N Y
 W Patterson, do
 W McLaughlin, Ohio
 B B Cary, Wis
 W Brownell, Iowa
 Mr Roberts, Ohio

Dr Potter, U S N
 L F Williams & I, N Y
 W H Webb, do
 C S Ward, Pa
 E M Kerp, do
 C Marlon, Del
 W A Vins, Md
 A Stewart, N Y
 G B Laws, N Y
 H M Bedford, do
 J W Pondford, do
 J H Wyman & I, U S N
 J M Caldwell, Ia
 Capt E D Keyes & I
 C Carroll, jr, Md
 J Bigelow, N Y
 D S Benedict, Ky
 C O O'Donald, Md
 Mrs O'Donald, do
 Miss Harper, do
 Miss Lee, do
 W C Waddell & I, N Y
 2 Misses Rich, do
 Capt G Knap
 Mrs Hart, Montreal
 Miss Hart, do
 J B Davis & I, U S N
 W F Johnson, Va
 R M Nimms, do
 J N Shin, do
 T Sweeny, do
 W F Chittenden, Mich
 D Stewart, do
 Col W W Loring, U S A
 H G Roberts, Mich
 G R Griswold, do
 H W Wallen, do

NATIONAL HOTEL.

A A Nunez, Fla
 E S Wilson, Md
 V G Anderson, N Y
 S Upson, Ga
 J S Curtis, Conn
 Mr Elliott, do
 J Tyler, Va
 J A Washington, do
 C S Mattoon, Ohio
 G W James, Md
 C P Hull, Wash'n
 Maj C H Larnard, U S A
 J Brust & I, N J
 A B Reed, Ala
 W G Wade & I, Wash'n
 W A Jackson, Pa
 J M Reed, do
 T Williams, do
 T B Read, do
 Mr Budd, do
 Mr Rawle, do
 E B Litchfield & I, N Y
 E A Lambert & I, do
 J R Shepard, do
 E B Musso, Italy
 D D Briggs, N Y
 D M Von Homburgh, do
 J S Pike, N Y
 H H Taylor, do
 W G Ray, do
 W M Everts, do
 Mrs A K Eno, do
 Miss Eno, do

F J Pitts & I, N Y
 W Wetmore, do
 T K Whitney, do
 J Potter, Ohio
 N Eddy, Indiana
 D P Tyler, Conn
 C W Bradley, do
 A De Iturbide, Mexico
 C E Phelps, Md
 J H Whitman, N J
 T Palmer, Pa
 W F Chittenden, Mich
 J Nilcs, do
 J D Paine, do
 Mr & Mrs B Fallerts, do
 A P Hill, U S A
 J N Brimmer, Boston
 J M Codman, do
 G B Sobler, do
 C F Flynn, Mich
 J J Eckart, Md
 J Porter, Ohio
 J R Daniel, Cal
 W B Reed, Pa
 C G Hall, Balt
 E L Fant, Va
 W M Peyton, do
 Miss G Peyton, do
 D Price, N J
 E S Sanborn, Me
 J Mayall, do
 Mr Holbrook, Ohio

UNITED STATES HOTEL.

C L Wilson, Md
 J Addams, Fla
 H W Coleman, S C
 L J Campbell, Ga
 E H Cohen, do
 J M Clark & son, do
 J G Wilson, Va
 J W Beller, do
 Dr W A McCormick, do
 J McDowell, do
 F De Masso, Italy
 T D Burgess, Boston
 H Clay & I, do
 H H Harris, Ky
 A Boyd, do
 W D Holt, do
 R H Perry, do

E M T Barnes, N H
 W Harris & son, Fla
 Gen Harring, Ga
 E G Lucas, Mass
 Col R Wallace, Ky
 Capt J W Leathers, do
 H Thompson, Ohio
 R B Dixon, do
 F H Wright, Ky
 Dr B Lloyd, do
 W J Garvin, Pa
 J Stewart, Balt
 Hon M H Russell III
 Hon T S Hayne, do
 Mr McCook, do
 H S Disen, do

IRVING HOTEL.

C W Rand, Mass
 F O Norbin, Stockholm
 P B Morisey, N C
 H J Hobbs, do
 R T Long, do
 L M Day, Va
 H Hughes, Mount Alto
 W G Overton, Va
 Mrs F T Overton, do
 A Curtis, do
 Mrs M Curtis, do
 O Carroll, Md
 J V Barris, do

H Fowkes, Md
 C H Scruid, Pa
 E L Bushnell, N Y
 T M Niven, do
 J Beckel, do
 J D Burgess, Mass
 Col J M Petriken, Pa
 D S Morgan, N Y
 Maj C H Larnard, U S A
 S G Davis & I, Mass
 C Fuller & I, N Y
 L W Wells, do
 E Flagg, do

Florida Republican.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

21 April 1853, 1

GEN. CUSHING.—A Washington letter says: It appears that General Cushing is the only man in the cabinet who can talk anything besides English. At the diplomatic dinner given by M. de Bodisco the attorney General charmed and surprised the distinguished party by his captivating and versatile accomplishments. Like a venerable polyglot, he conversed in French with M. Le Comte de Sartiges, in Spanish with Baron Calderon de la Barca, and in Dutch with Baron Testa, spoke German with Baron Von Gerolt, Portuguese with De Figaniere, and the most unexceptionable Tuscan with the representative of the Two Sicilies.

DAILY ADVERTISER.

MOBILE

28 August 1853, 2

The Philadelphia Ledger, in commenting on the rumors of new insurrectionary movements, says:

We have some weeks ago alluded to a pamphlet, printed in Paris, but actually intended for distribution in this country, in which the Philadelphia *Jacobins* endeavor to create the impression, that the government of Louis Napoleon is favoring their designs. It is a miserable shift, intended to entrap young and inexperienced men to their certain ruin. What we should like to know about the first Lopez expedition, is the name of the American General *from the North*, now holding a distinguished position under the Government, who, we are led to believe, was first selected as commander of the American filibuster. The publication of his name might serve to explain a great many recent occurrences, which have baffled all attempts to account for them in a rational way.

CALEB CUSHING

As to the intimation in the latter part of the above extract, we insert it, only to say that we do not at present believe that Gen. Cushing ever lent any countenance to such a scheme. As widely as we differ from that gentleman in politics, and much as we differ from some of his recent theories and sentiments, we have no idea that the tone of his morality and self respect had ever fallen so low, as this implied accusation would indicate. We do not approve of grave charges, lightly made against political adversaries, and we have said thus much by way of justice towards an adversary, whose principles we deem the worst and most dangerous.

14 June 1854, 3

Caleb Cushing has just been home to Newburyport, and the city council have rejected proposed anti-Nebraska resolves. Newburyport sneezes whenever Caleb takes snuff.

[*N. H. Statesman.*]

To the above impudent paragraph, the Coos (N. H.) Democrat replies with sense and spirit as follows: If it had been the other way, the same paper would have had half a column of glorification upon the ground that Caleb Cushing's course had been repudiated and condemned by his old neighbors and his own town. Now it sneers because he has the most influence where he is best known—because his neighbors and all those who have known him best have such confidence in his wisdom and integrity that they are ever willing to come to his support. If ever Caleb Cushing suffers from newspaper attack, it will be from one very different from this.

6 May 1861, 1

Caleb Cushing.—“CALEB QUOTEM CUSHING” has often been considered a prophet. Here is what he wrote in a letter to a “Great Union Meeting” in January, 1860:

“If after that the two New England States, which are soon to hold their annual elections—New Hampshire and Connecticut—shall not redeem themselves,—shall not back square out of the *cul-de-sac* into which they have entered,—if in fear of recent occurrences they shall prove to be persistent in the policy of unconstitutional anti-slavery agitation and legislation in which they in common with other Northern States are engaged, it will become all persons in the Eastern States to look after the condition of their property, to wind up all great local enterprises, to sell out their bank, railway and factory stocks, and betake themselves to hoarding gold against the day of disaster, as men were accustomed to do in the troubled countries of India and China. And then? Why, all history is there to tell us what then: social convulsions, hostile combats in the town streets, predatory guerrilla bands roving up and down the country, shootings and hangings, in a word, that which we have not yet had, but which all other nations have, *cruel war, war at home*; and, in the perspective distance, a man on horseback with a drawn sword in his hand, some Atlantic Cæsar, or Cromwell, or Napoleon, to secure to the weary world a respite from the dissonant din of the raving ideologies of the hour, and the patricidal rage they engender; the reason of force to replace the impotent force of reason; and a line of epauletted Emperors to close up the truncated series of the honored Presidents of the United States.”

The Charleston Mercury.

28 February 1863, 1

Cushing.

Now is the time for the people of the South to form a proper and unalterable estimate of the value of Yankee faith and the constancy of Yankee friendship. Let it not be forgotten that the New England demagogues, who, in the days of political commotion which immediately preceded the war, affected to be the staunchest friends of the South, are now amongst the most truculent and unrelenting of our foes. The people of Charleston remember CUSHING. At the Democratic Convention held here in April, 1860, there were two men from Massachusetts, who took every occasion to attract public notice by the extreme character of the pro-Southern views which they then found it convenient to assume. Those two men were BENJAMIN F. BUTLER and CALEB CUSHING. Where now stand these ultra-sympathizers of the wronged South? Of the brute, BUTLER, we need say nothing. He has taken his place in history. But what of the amiable, polished and soft-spoken CUSHING? He has not belied the perfidy of his race. Conspicuous amongst the supporters of the war, with all his energy he is hounding on the Northern rabble to the desolation of our homes and the slaughter of our people. We give an extract from a speech which he recently delivered in Boston:

"The question had frequently been asked him, 'how will you govern the rebel States if you conquer them?' He thought if they were whipped, the rebel States would give up, as many others had done before them. The proper way to secure this result was by earnestly supporting the Government of the country, and lending it every aid to put down the rebellion. We had failed thus far by the failure to recognize the black element in the South and the white loyal element as those to be first consulted in establishing the policy of the country. We should have consulted the wishes of these people, instead of listening to the soft blandishments of such men as Wickliffe, of Kentucky, or Governor Stanly, of North Carolina, who, in his opinion, were just as ready as Jefferson Davis to cut our throats. [Applause.] If it be necessary to bury three hundred thousand slaveholders to save twenty-five millions of men, let the slaveholders be buried by all means. [Applause.] A rebel has no right to his life, to his property, or to his liberty. That is the plain law. Let us therefore carry it out. If not, what is to become of the loyal men of the South? It was nothing to him who was put in the place of the slaveholder—a black man or a white. [Applause.] There was nothing to prevent the operatives of Lancashire or the Germans from participating in this movement. [Applause.] Those who in Europe are complaining that their operatives are unemployed should send their laborers here, and we will give them land in abundance and enough to do. [Applause.]"

And this is our Yankee champion, the fearless, upright and consistent CUSHING!

25 March 1863, 4

Position of Caleb Cushing.—The Northern papers publish the following letter from CALKB CUSHING to DANIEL MARCY, dated March 5, 1863 :

I hear that some political use is made in New Hampshire of a report attributing to me a speech delivered not long since in New York, at a meeting held to promote the project of Mr. Eli Thayer for the forcible colonization of Florida, and I write to say that the report is, of course, an erroneous one, and that the speech in question was delivered by Mr. Cassius M. Clay.

How this crude utterance came to be ascribed to me it is impossible for me to conjecture. Nor is that important to know. Suffice it to say that the speech is not mine in fact, and that its opinions are not my opinions. I reprobate alike its arguments and its objects. The same mischievous plans brought upon us the curse of Kansas.

This new Emigrant Aid Company belongs to that base brood of pestilent schemes of policy toward the insurgent States—subjugation, confiscation, colonization, emancipation, devastation, extermination—which sound like the delirious ravings of bedlam let loose, which, if carried into actual operation would, in their ultimate effect, most of all injure the loyal States, and which tend to cause a great national uprising, entered upon by us for the maintenance of the Constitution and the Union, to sink down into a mere desperate struggle of suicidal blind rage of self-destruction—the abolition of the Constitution and the overthrow of the Union by our fatal hand, not that of our enemies. This gospel of death, this radical destructiveness, is the only practical disunionism existing among us in the loyal States. Though it makes believe support, it fiercely opposes the Administration; it is in deadly hostility to the freedom, prosperity and happiness of the people; it is treasonable conspiracy against the Government.

May God in his mercy confound all such disloyal counsels, that thus—for thus only can it be—the Union shall be strengthened and shielded to pass unscathed through this its second baptism of blood and fire, and our suffering country be enabled to repose once more in peace under the broad shadow of the Constitution.

The Charleston Courier.

9 July 1868, 2

Caleb Cushing, who is following his profession in Washington, is sixty-eight years old, and is said to be the freshest and most youthful man of his age in America.