Among the exceptions, we are pleased to name the N. Y. Times, the organ of Gov. Seward, from which will be found below, an article worthy the serious consideration of every man, he Black Republican or what not, that truly loves his country, and desires to see her institutions preserved. We also give an article on the same subject, from that sterling American paper, the New York Sun—one of the few papers by the by, in that great city, which advocated the election of Mr. Fillmore. This paper has ever been true to the Constitution, and to the laws made under it, and as a consequence, has ever been true to the South. There is a great deal of good food for thought, in both these articles. They speak the language of soberness and truth, and put the issue plainly before the people, pointing out in unmistakable language, that the war of secession would follow, should Grocey & Co. succeed in carrying out their wishes and designs.

The Times has the following sensible remarks: "The utter futility of opposition to the decision rendered by the Supreme Court, in the Scott case:"

The Decision of the Supreme Court.
We must decide, and we will, in the face of the arguments that reach us, in regard to the recent decision of the Supreme Court, in regard to Slavery—not because we are inclined to depreciate its importance, or to misquote it in its argument—but mainly, because no practical good can follow the discussion. When the various opinions of the several Judges are published, we shall endeavor to ascertain from them what points of law have been actually decided, and what have not, and we shall probably take occasion to speak to those who are disposed to deny the validity of the decision of this action of the Court upon the future relations of Slavery to the Government and the country.

There are some discussions in which a journalist may profitably engage, and some in which he cannot. Before the late election, it was agreed that Judge Brough, of Mr. Buchanan, that event, has not been able to perceive the utility of such a line of argument. It is the business of a newspaper to deal with pending issues and to aim at practical results. But when a point is once established—beyond all chance of being changed—strength is wasted in old, and I reserve the power to arouse popular hostility against the supposed change, it is the duty of the Constitution, in this instance, as in all others, is the law of the land. What it has decided must stand, all the arguments in the world will not change it. If we thought we could persuade the Judge to reverse their own decision, we would gladly consent to a change; but we see no special ground to hope for such a change.

Some of our correspondents appeal from the Court to the people—deem its character, a public tribunal, and would serve to arouse popular hostility against the supposed change. We cannot second those efforts, for we deem them useless and even dangerous. If the Court, in its present state, is to sustain the decision of the Court, or to alter the old institution of the tribunal which decides against us, it is a step rational on that account to seek the overthrow of its authority. The Supreme Court is..."