in substance in the constitutional provision on that subject. It is simply carrying into effect the Constitution of the country, and I cannot help thinking that the opposition comes from those who are not at all loyal to their own government.

I am pleased to see that the President of the U. States who belongs to the same party to which the gentleman from Chester is attached, understands this matter perfectly. I hold in my hand an extract from his last message which I will read for the edification of the gentleman, although he has not himself spoken very graciously of Mr. Fillmore.

The President most truthfully says:

"Some objections have been urged against the details of the act for the return of fugives from labor; but it is worthy of remark that the main opposition is aimed against the Constitution itself, and proceeds from persons and classes of persons, many of whom declare their wish to see that Constitution overturned. They avow their hostility to any law which shall give full and practical effect to this requirement of the Constitution. Fortunately, the number of these persons is comparatively small, and and is believed to be daily diminishing, but the issue which they present is one which involves the supremacy and even the existence of the Constitution."

"Cases have heretofore arisen in which individuals have denied the binding authority of acts of Congress, and even States have proposed to nullify such acts, upon the ground that the Constitution was the supreme law of the land, and that those acts of Congress were repugnant to that instrument; but nullification is now aimed, not so much against particular laws as being inconsistent with the Constitution as against the Constitution itself; and it is not to be disguised that a spirit exists and has been actively at work to rend asunder this Union, which is our cherished inheritance from our revolutionary fathers."

I am sorry to say that the gentleman from Chester has evinced a strong affinity for the class of persons here designated—those who believe that the constitution of this happy country is "a league with the devil and a covenant of hell."

As the gentleman from Chester has denounced the law in question for the additional reason that it does not give the fugitive a trial by jury. Now, sir, I undertake to say that such a thing is not only not required by the Constitution, but that it would be a gross absurdity. The parallel provision of that instrument in relation to the restoration of fugitives from justice is not so construed. No man would dream of trying a person in Pennsylvania, who had been arrested on a requisition of the Governor of Maryland, for example, for a crime committed in the latter State. All that is done, is for the Governor of this State to allow the requisition and the fugitive is removed to the State where he committed the offence. So in a case of a fugitive from labor.—How would we try a case of that kind here? How swear a jury to determine an issue, not known to our own laws and only within the cognizance of the laws of the State from which the fugitive escaped? Would not the jury have to determine what was the law of another State, instead of an issue of fact, which is peculiarly within their province?—and instead of our local tribunals having nothing to do with the rendition of fugitives from labor which is so loudly contended for by those who sustain the act of 1847, and rely upon the case of Prigg to sustain them, those tribunals would have everything to do in cases of this kind. If the fugitive claims his freedom he can have a trial in the State from which he [illegible]

But even if it were not legally impossible, would it not be a virtual denial of the rights of the Southern people, under the constitution, to have trials by jury in cases of fugitives from labor. How could a slave owner come from Georgia and reclaim his slave under a law of that kind? The case would be subject to being continued, and a thousand contingencies, which Abolition lawyers (of whom we have one or two in almost every county town in the State) could readily invent, and carry into successful practice, to postpone or thwart a trial. Then the slave owner must have his witnesses here, must fee counsel, and place himself upon a perfect level with his former servant, in a rough and tumble fight in our courts of law. Such a remedy would be worse, and would cost more in the end, to say nothing of the humiliating spectacle it would present, than the loss of the slave. It would be a complete denial of the constitutional right.

And yet my friend from Chester is loudly in its favor, and urges the want of it as one of the great is again following high example, and agreeing with a large portion of his whig brethren in the Northern States. It is not a modern doctrine with them either. I happened to meet with a resolution yesterday, in a newspaper, adopted by a Whig State Convention held in New Hampshire November 5th, 1846, which accords exactly with the views of the gentleman from Chester.

It is in these words:

"*Resolved*, That the law of Congress of February 12, 1793, under which any person claimed as a slave may be seized and carried, under warrant from any magistrate, however ignorant or corrupt, out of the State, into slavery, without the charge of his being a slave having been tried by a jury of the country, or the person so seized being heard in his defence, is unjust, and dangerous to the liberty of the citizen, and ought to be repealed."

The gentleman from Chester, makes the same complaint against the act of 1850, that his whig brethren of New Hampshire did against the old law of 1793, adopted in Washington's time. There have been many expressions of sentiment throughout the whole north for years, similar to that contained in this New Hampshire resolution, but it is not often they are so boldly avowed in our legislative halls, as they have been by the gentleman from Chester.—But he has again the example of the late Executive of the Commonwealth, [Gov. Johnston] in sustaining the extreme opinion he has expressed in relation to giving the fugitive a trial by jury.

The late Executive in his annual message read in the House of Representatives, January 8, '51, clearly intimates that he is in favor of giving the slave a trial by jury. He advocated in that message ably and at length, most distinctly and unequivocally, a "modification and amendment" of the fugitive slave law, then but recently passed. He denounced in strong terms the tribunal of Commissioners; set up by that act, to determine upon men's rights, and among other things made use of these remarkable words: "If it be deemed expedient to deny a trial by jury;" plainly expressing a doubt whether it was so, and that therefore it might be expedient not to deny "a trial by jury" or in other words, it might be inexpedient to deny such trial, and expedient to grant that privilege.

Now sir, on this subject I have met with a curious reminiscence—one which, goes far to show the devious and winding ways of men who are mere politicians, and who have no aspirations to be considered statesmen—of men who watch the popular breeze, the gathering of public sentiment, and float along upon the current, without caring further than that it may carry them into position and power. Governor Johnston did not always entertain the doubt he expressed in his annual message of 1851, to the legislature, on the subject we are now considering. In the year 1837 he was a Democratic member of this House elected from Armstrong county, from which you sir, hail, for the session of 1836—7. On the 27th of January, 1837, a petition was presented to the House praying the legislature to pass a law giving a trial by Jury to fugitives from labor, and the question being on its reference to an appropriate committee, the Democratic representative from Armstrong, used the following emphatic language:

"Suppose, sir, we could legitimately act upon this prayer of the petitioners, [giving the right of trial by jury to slaves,] would it be politic in this House to do so? By the original compact between the States, Pennsylvania has recognised the right of the southern man in the property of his slave—and she has no right at this late period to dispute that right, to pass laws which would embarrass the recovery of his property. Can the owner of the slave be expected to undergo the delays of a jury trial, the procrastination of the law, and the expense incident thereto? *It would almost amount to a positive prevention to the recovery of his legal right*, and particularly when we take into consideration the fact that in many of the counties of the Commonwealth, a large and respectable portion of the citizens have *conscitious scruples* upon the subject of slavery, which would most effectually prevent the recovery of the slave. It appeared to him that if such an act was passed it would *virtually amount to the emancipation of every negro who might be fortunate enough to escape the pursuit of his master, and put his foot in Pennsylvania.* Such action would be the first act in that drama of blood which some men appear to be so anxious to bring upon the country. Let these infatuated and misled philanthropists pursue their own course, but he confidently hoped this House would refuse to endorse their errors."

There were no doubts about the expediency of *denying* "a trial by jury" then in cases of this kind—but then the late Executive, was a democratic representative, and in 1851 he was the Governor of the Commonwealth, made so by the Whig party, and the nominee by general consent for the same office of the same party, at the then coming fall election. His position had changed and a change of sentiment followed to suit that position.

But the gentleman from Chester is perhaps not influenced entirely by the course of the late Whig candidate for Governor, in his decided opposition to the fugitive slave law. He has the example of his own party when sitting in solemn convention, and laying down the rule of action and enunciating the principles which are to guide them. This court of last resort in the whig party, expressed its opinions at its last sitting which was held at Lancaster. At that Convention Mr. John M. Scott, an intelligent delegate from the city of Philadelphia, who had some conscientious scruples respecting the faith in the whig church on the slavery question, made bold to offer the following resolution as an amendment to the series of resolutions which were submitted to the convention, ready "cut and dried" of a non committal character.

"*Resolved*, That the provisions of the Constitution in reference to the rendition of fugitives held to service or labor demand and shall receive from our party a faithful, manly and unequivocal support."

Now mark the phraseology of this resolution. It is not to sustain the fugitive slave law, or even the compromise measures passed by Congress, but the *Constitution* of the United States!—and mark also its fate.

It was ruled out of order by the President of the convention, Mr. Ewing, of Washington, because the previous question was called *after* the resolution was submitted—and he decided that the previous question cut off all amendments, already offered, instead of those only to be offered—which sage decision was sustained by the convention by a vote of seventy three to forty nine, and thus the Constitution was left to get on without the aid of the whig party.

I mention these historical facts, to show that opposition to the passage of this bill is not to be confined to [illegible] the question is merely as to its passage coming from [illegible] passage can be prevented, it would be the most effective thing that could now be done to render the fugitive slave law inefficient in Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Chester has evinced the most decided hostility to that law in this debate, and hence his decided opposition to the passage of this bill.—The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. Broomall] is for folding his arms, and considers it a compliance with the constitutional provisions on this subject, if we do not actually interfere against the slave owner, and that we may still with perfect propriety keep our jails closed. But he is much more moderate than the gentleman from Chester [Mr. James.]

The latter has given us a long homily on the merits of the compromise measures in connexion with the fugitive slave law. He contends that the South has gained every thing, and the North lost every thing. Now sir, I affirm that the North is the gainer so far as there may be any inequality in that compromise. California has been admitted as a free State, New Mexico and Utah have had territorial governments established, without the extension of the Missouri compromise line, which fact makes them also free States. The northern boundary of Texas has been shorn off, which was slave territory, and added to New Mexico, which will in all probability become free. The slave trade has been abolished in the District of Columbia. Here are five measures favorable to the north, while the only solitary measure, which merely gives the southern people nothing more than their constitutional rights, is constantly carped at, and its "modification" and "amendment" demanded. I look upon this spectacle as a bad omen for the perpetuity of our institutions. The compromise measures ought to be sacredly lived up to by the north. They were adopted as a great peace measure. They were all contained and discussed in one bill, and considered as a unit, and were all passed within a few days of each other. We ought to regard that compromise with as much veneration as the constitutional compact itself. Thrice has the country been endangered by this question of slavery. First in the formation of the government. Secondly, in the Missouri controversy in 1820, which Thomas Jefferson said "awoke him like a fire bell in the night and filled him with alarm and terror." Thirdly, by the crisis which has but recently been safely passed through, by skilful pilotage and steady hands at the helm. And this last compromise, which should be considered as a unit, a great constitutional pacification, is to be subverted by fanatics and disunionists! Why, the gentleman from Chester asserts that we have lost every thing, and the South gained every thing by that compromise. I can hardly believe any man sincere in making an assertion of that kind. If he really believe so, that is some excuse. The gentleman from Chester, has made a most remarkable speech. He has referred us to Moses, the book of Deuteronomy, the works of Homer, Blackstone, the great Somerset case, and various scraps and patches of sacred and profane history—but what the gentleman's speech was most distinguished for, was its abolition fanaticism, spurious philanthropy and want of all correct information.

Mr. James rose to explain. I wish to say that I am not an abolitionist and never belonged to that party.

Mr. Benham. Well if the gentleman is not an abolitionist, his contending that a slave owner cannot arrest his slave in this State, because we have abolished imprisonment for debt, and his advocating a modification of the fugitive slave law, so as to give the slave a trial by jury, have a strong leaning in that direction.

The gentleman can hardly be aware of the tendency of the sentiments which he inculcates with no unsparing hand. He has referred us to the tragedy of Christiana which was just on the borders of his own county, and says he will still call it a tragedy, although it does not deserve that name—but that a name amounts to little. Now sir, I can tell the gentleman, that the expression of sentiments such as he entertains will make occurrences of that kind more frequent than they have been. I am glad we have found a representative on the floor of the House, who is willing to avow in plain language, what the action of his party, on this question and in relation to this bill, distinctly indicate, without the frankness to avow openly. Their opposition to the passage of this measure can hereafter be understood by the people of this State and other States.

Now sir, I charge a want of good faith on this slavery question, to the people of the southern states, on the part of the whig party of this Commonwealth. They seem disposed to take the advantage of treating the fugitive slave law as an open question, at the same time that they are aware that those measures of the compromise favorable to northern interests are beyond the reach of amendment, or further legislation. They seem disposed to enjoy all the benefits conferred by that arrangement of sectional difficulties, *and to snatch away from the South the only portion of that compromise which could be beneficial to her interests.* This I contend is unfair and ungenerous. But as we have this opportunity, we are to take this "dirty advantage," notwithstanding the settlement should be considered as a unit.

That such has been the design of our friends, the Whigs, not only in the legislature but out of it, since the passage of the compromise, I have only to refer to the opposition of the whigs of this House and the Senate last session, to the repeal of this 6th section of the act of 1847 when the act of '89 was not before the House, as an appendage of the bill—to the action of their convention at Lancaster—and to the sentiments promulgated by Governor Johnston, not only in his message vetoing the bill repealing the "obstruction law," but to his speeches made during the last canvass on the subject of the compromise itself. That I may do no justice to his Excellency, or the party with which he is connected, I quote from a speech delivered by him in many places in the last Gubernatorial campaign, but first delivered in Lancaster, immediately after he was renominated for the office of Governor, showing that he well understood the bearing of this opposition to the fugitive slave law, and that following his advice was taking an unfair advantage of our southern brethren.

He says, "the adjustment measures of the last Congress grew out of certain difficulties connected with the acquisition of territory from Mexico. *Most of the laws were irrepealable.* The Texas boundary has been settled, and the stipulated money has been paid by the National Government. California has been admitted. Territorial governments have been established in New Mexico and Utah. The slave trade has been abolished in the District of Columbia. *These questions are settled.* The fugitive slave law *alone* is within the reach of amendment."

Now here is a violent example of "punic faith" such as seldom disgraced the days of treacherous Carthage. His apology is that the Constitution guarantees the liberty of speech, and that we have a right to discuss any measure we please—that we have a right I presume to take one part of the Constitution, and as with a clever how down another portion of the Constitution. My understanding of that instrument is, that all the parts are to be construed so as to harmonize, not to destroy each other, not to destroy one part by pushing a right guaranteed by another part to a dangerous extreme.

Sir, the time has come for Pennsylvania to assume a proper position on this vital sectional issue. It is time that this Abolition and *quasi* Abolition warfare should cease. Without concession on this subject at the commencement of the government, our glorious Constitution, which has given us position, power and a name among the nations of the earth, could never have been formed; and if this agitation cease not, this Union which has conferred so many blessings upon all of us, will soon be dissolved, and its brief life will occupy but a page in the world's history. Let us of Pennsylvania, therefore, be true to ourselves, and adopt such measures of legislation as will best comport with the true dignity and honor of a great Commonwealth—and if we cannot stop the mouths of the Abolitionists, let us show that we disregard them—and above all, let us keep the legislation of the State unfainted by this abominable heresy—and if there has been such legislation let it be wiped from the statute book. Let others do as they please, but as for this patriotic old Commonwealth, she will comply with all her compacts, and remain true to her constitutional engagements. And in the language of Jefferson in his inaugural address on assuming the executive duties of the National Government—"if there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it."

Arrival of the Prometheus--$300,000 in Gold Dust.

New York, April 3d.—The steamship Prometheus, from San Juan de Nicaragua, from which port she sailed on the 25th ult., arrived here this morning, with 238 passengers, and $300,000 in gold, partly on freight, and the remainder in the hands of passengers.

The U. S. sloop-of-war Decatur, steamship Alabama, bark Republic, of New York, brig J. Williams, of New Orleans, and British brig-of-war Sappho were at San Juan when the Prometheus left.

On the homeward passage, on the night of the 27th of March, one of the passengers of the Prometheus, named R. Ripley Hudson, of Maine, fell overboard and was drowned.

Private letters received by the Prometheus, represent that, in consequence of the numerous robberies being perpetrated, the Vigilance Committee of San Francisco have quietly reorganized, and are determined to execute the first delinquent that may be detected.

Arrival of the Empire City.

New York, April 4.—The steamship Empire City, from New Orleans, via Havana, arrived here about noon, to-day, bringing 58 passengers and a small amount of specie.

She left at Havana, on the 30th, the U. States steamer Vixen, steamer Ohio from Chagres, and the steamer Cherokee from New Orleans. The U. S. steamer Fulton sailed on the 29th ult., for Pensacola.

The Empire City brings no Havana papers.

Wreck of the Steamship Independence—Seven Lives Lost.

New Orleans, April 2.—Information has been received here of the wreck and total loss of the steamship Independence, from this port, in Matagorda Bay, on the 26th ult. She had a large cargo, valued at $70,000, and 150 passengers, all of whom, except seven persons, were saved. The lost were Mrs. Mowett and her three children; Mrs. Lieut. Jones; the chief mate, and a Mrs. Hovey.

Terrible Steamboat Accident—Great Loss of Life.

Madison, Indiana, April 3.—This afternoon, about half-past 2 o'clock, as the steamboat "Redstone," Capt. Tate, hence for Cincinnati, with about 70 persons on board, including crew, was backing out from Scott's Landing, about three miles above Carrollton, her boilers burst with tremendous force, instantly killing a large portion of those on board, and dreadfully scalding and mangling most of the rest. The boat being completely shattered, immediately sank, in deep water, and many of the passengers, who might otherwise have been saved, were drowned.—Of the crew, only the captain and clerk was saved, though he cannot recover. The boat having sunk, it was with difficulty that the bodies of those on board could be recovered. Up to 7 o'clock this evening fifteen dead bodies were recovered, most of them so horribly mutilated as to baffle all attempts at identification. The names of the unfortunate have not been ascertained.

Another Terrific Steamboat Explosion.

More Loss of Life—Off Boat Burned to the Water's edge—Three Others Damaged by the Explosion.

St. Louis, April 3.—The steamboat Glencoe, from New Orleans, while coming to at our levee, this evening, burst all her boilers with an awful crash, shattering the boat in every direction, and scattering death and dismay among the hundred and fifty passengers upon her decks. A large number were killed and wounded, but amid the present confusion it is impossible to ascertain the names of the killed or the survivors.

The steamboats Cataract, Georgia and Western, lying alongside, were all more or less shattered, and several persons standing upon their decks were killed by the explosion.

The Glencoe took fire from the embers blown out of the furnaces, and burned to the water's edge.

Georgia Convention.

Macon, Ga., April 1.

The Southern Rights Democratic Convention, which assembled at Milledgeville yesterday, adopted the report of a special comittee, re-affirming the Baltimore platform of 1844 and 1848. The Convention also appointed forty delegates to the Baltimore National Convention. No preference was expressed for any particular candidate, though a large majority of the members of the Convention appeared to be in favor of the nomination of Mr. Buchanan. The delegates go to the Convention entirely uninstructed.

Murderers Sentenced.—On Friday last, in the Philadelphia court of Oyer and Terminer, Judge Allison passed sentence on the two Polish brothers, named Skupinskis, found guilty of the murder of the jewelry boy, Lehman. The sentence was, that at such time as may be appointed, they both be "hanged by the neck until dead." One of the brothers, Mathias Skupinskis, made a confession of his guilt, after the verdict of the jury. The other prisoner, asserted his innocence. The report for the *Ledger*, speaking of the manner and appearance of the prisoners, on the morning of their sentence, says:

The manner of the prisoners was firm and collected. They betrayed throughout the solemn proceedings but little emotion. When they were concluded and the prisoners took their seats in the dock, both bowed their heads upon the railing in front, and remained in that position until summoned by the officers to return to prison.

Before the court was opened, they were observed to be engaged in a discussion together, probably as to the confession which Matthias was about to make; which he subsequently made in private to the interpeter. A large number of persons were present in the court. Everything was conducted in a solemn and impressive manner.

In addition to the confessions made in open Court and to the Polish Interpreter, Matthias stated to some bystanders who spoke to him in a language he understood, that the third man committed the murder, while he stood at the door and kept guard—that he did not participate in the actual killing, although he knew what was going on in the room—that when he entered the house he found the boy dead. The deceased was removed from the room where he had been murdered, to the cellar. Matthias assisted in the dissection of the body, having cut off one of the legs. He said further that the colored witness, Benjamin Johnson, made a mistake in swearing to his brother Blaise, as he mistook him for the escaped murderer. Matthias vehemently urged that a search be made for the other man, who is reported to be a Hungarian. He said he ought to share the same fate. He was very indignant towards him, but expressed no contrition for the murder. Blase said nothing upon the subject of the murder, after sentence had been pronounced upon him. He appeared to be absorbed with the reflections arising from his awful situation.

Rev. Burgess Nelson, of Frederick county, Md., one of the oldest ministers in the Methodist Church, committed suicide one day last week, by strangulation, with a small cord fastened to a stick. He was 90 years old.

THE VOLUNTEER.

John D. Gratton, Editor and Proprietor.

CARLISLE, APRIL 6, 1852.

Presidential Electors.

SENATORIAL.

GEORGE W. WOODWARD, of Luzerne.
WILSON M'CANDLESS, of Allegheny.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT.

ROBERT PATTERSON, of Philadelphia.

DISTRICTS.

1. PETER LOGAN, Philadelphia.
2. GEORGE H. MARTIN, Philadelphia.
3. JOHN MILLER, Philadelphia.
4. F. W. BOCKIUS, Philadelphia.
5. L. McKAY, Jr. Delaware.
6. A. APPLE, Bucks.
7. M. STRICKLAND, Chester.
8. A. PETERS Lancaster.
9. DANIEL FISHER, Berks.
10. R. E. JAMES, Northampton.
11. JOHN McREYNOLDS, Columbia.
12. E. DAMON, Tioga.
13. J. C. EYER, Union.
14. JNO. CLAYTON, Schuylkill.
15. ISAAC ROBINSON, Adams.
16. HENRY FETTER, Perry.
17. JAS. BURNSIDE, Centre.
18. MAXWELL McCASLIN, Greene.
19. JOSEPH McDONALD, Cambria.
20. W. S. COLAHAN, Washington.
21. ANDREW BURK, Allegheny.
22. WM. DUNN, Mercer.
23. JOHN S. McCALMONT, Clarion.
24. GEO. R. BARRET, Clearfield.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,

WILLIAM SEARIGHT, of Fayette.

☞Our Country Friends who come to town during the April Court, are reminded that we shall be happy to have them call and "pay the Printer."

☞Messrs. Baily, Bonham, Rhey, Henderson, Stewart and Deruff, of our State Legislature, will please except our thanks for their attention.

Lectures on Anatomy, Human Health, &c.—We have been informed that it is the purpose of Dr Hinkley to give a course of public lectures, illustrated by suitable plates, drawings, &c., on Anatomy, Physiology and Hygeine, or the means of preserving health. These are subjects which should demand the attention of every one, and are calculated to give much instruction and benefit. They will be rendered plain to the hearers, and be devoid of hard names and technalities, a desideratum to those who listen. We are much pleased that the doctor has taken this matter in hand, as it is a much neglected subject in our educational halls.

Cumberland Valley Railroad.—We are indebted to the politeness of the Treasurer of this company for the following statement of the earnings of this road for the month of March ultimo:

Receipts for the month of March, 1852,	$12,788 48
Receipts for the month of March, 1851,	$10,186 31
Increase, equal to nearly 26 per cent.	$2,592 17

More Winter.—For the last few days we have had a fair sample of winter weather. The snow in this vicinity, on Tuesday, covered the earth to the depth of three or four inches, and the merry sleigh bells were again heard in our streets. There appears to be a severe contest going on between old Winter and young Spring. No sooner have we concluded that to Spring belongs the victory, than angry Winter again appears, and by his rude and chilling blasts, drives us from the streets to our firesides at home. Spring, however, ere long, will gain the victory—and by her balmy breath and sweet smiles will conquer her enemy, and cause creation to sing her praises, [illegible] with blossoms and flowers.

Murderers in Adams County.—The Gettysburg *Compiler* of Monday says—We are informed that on Wednesday last, Mr. George Krebs, residing near Littlestown, in this county, was killed by his own son. It appears, from the information received, that the father was making an attack upon his son with a butcher knife, when the latter, seizing a club, gave him a severe blow upon the head, which caused his death in a few hours after. The act is regarded as having been done in self defence.

On Thursday morning a negro named Green, shot another named Mears, near Bendersville, during a contention from which the latter has since died—the ball having entered his abdomen. The jury of inquest rendered a verdict of wilful an malicious murder. Mears is said to have been a man of good character and well doing, while Green is represented as vicious and desperate. Green was arrested in the mountains beyond Bendersville, on Friday evening, and lodged in the jail in this place.

MR. BONHAM'S SPEECH.

To the exclusion of our usual variety, we this week publish at length, Mr. Bonham's able and masterly speech, delivered in the House of Representatives, on the bill to repeal the 6th section of the obstruction law of 1847. It is a conclusive argument in favor of the repeal of that obnoxious section, and will go far to reconcile all feeling that has heretofore existed between the North and the South. It will be additional evidence to the South that the Democracy of the old Keystone, at least, intend to adhere truthfully to the terms of the Compromise measures of Congress, and carry them out in good faith. The great glory of those peace measures consists chiefly in the fact that they are an honest and faithful construction of the constitution and former statues. The South never asked the North any more than the constitution originally gave her, and, in the adjustment of the Compromise measures, it must be evident to every one that the North was more favored than the South. If the people of the different States, the President, his cabinet, his executive officers, and Congress itself, stand by, and faithfully and honestly execute the Compromise or peace measures, the republic will hold together—it will be like a wall of brass, invulnerable to every attack. Disunion and secession at the South will be confined to a small and contemptible faction, and that faction will be powerless, as fanaticism and abolitionism are confined at the North to an equally small faction, whose demagogueism is already paralyzed by the uprising spirit of the great body of the people.

Slavery is an evil entailed upon the South—an evil which they acknowledge, and which they would fain be rid of. But, this is impossible, unless, in the course of time it should, by the interposition of a kind Providence, gradually die away and become extinct. But, slavery exists, and the constitution recognizes slaves as property. This being the case, our duty to our brethren of the southern States is a plain one, and we are bound, as good citizens, to adhere to the terms of the compact which binds us together. The Compromise measures of Congress are but another pledge of fidelity on the part of the people, North and South, of their attachment to our glorious Union. Let these peace measures be eternal in our history, for when they are blotted out, the republic will go with them.

But, our object in commencing this article, was merely to call attention to the great speech of our able representative, Mr. Bonham. It is a speech creditable alike to himself and his constituents, and is eminently worthy a careful perusal.

MR. BONHAM AND THE BANK OF PENNSYLVANIA.

In another column we publish a well written communication over the signature of "*Justice*," in reply to an article in the Carlisle *Herald* of the 31st ult., and explanatory of Mr. Bonham's course in the Legislature in relation to the application of the Bank of Pennsylvania to be relieved from the operation of the tax laws of the Commonwealth. We give place to this communication with pleasure, not only in justice to Mr. Bonham, but because the writer of it is a sound Democrat, and well "booked up" in regard to State affairs. We regret to say, however, we cannot agree with "*Justice*," nor can we, for a moment, sanction Mr. Bonham's course. We shall, in as brief a manner as possible, endeavor to explain the nature of the application now making to the Legislature by the Bank of Pennsylvania.

The Bank of Pennsylvania asks the Legislature to exempt it from taxation, upon the ground that its charter was granted prior to the passage of the State law of the 11th April, 1848, by which bank dividends are made taxable. Under this plea the bank holds that she is not bound for the tax which the account officers of the Commonwealth have charged her with, and which they consider her liable for, amounting to $51,068 75 due on the 15th of April, 1851, and $20,250 per annum, for six additional years, ending January, 1858—in all amounting to $172,568 75. The Bank was re-chartered in 1833, for twenty-five years. At that time the State owned and held $1,500,000 of the stock of the Bank, and continued to hold it until 1843, when the same was sold, at a loss to the Commonwealth of over $800,000. *The bank bought this stock*, and it was considered, and no doubt was, a fine speculation. Certain it is, the stock (by the *peculiar* management of the directors of the bank,) was depreciated at the time the Commonwealth made the sale, and very soon *after* the sale was quoted at par.

"*Justice*," in his communication, says "the Bank was chartered as a financial measure," and that, in *consideration* of her re-charter, "agreed to loan the State $4,000,000, at a premium," &c. We deny this assertion. There were many bidders for the loan, for the State credit was then good, and the Commonwealth had no difficulty in the way of borrowing as much money as she wanted, at a premium. The Bank of Pennsylvania was anxious to obtain the loan, and no one ever heard before that she made this loan to the Commonwealth "in consideration of her re-charter."

Again "*Justice*" says—"the Commonwealth never thought of collecting a tax on the dividends of this bank until 1848, and the Act of 1848 cannot include it." Whether or not the Bank is bound for the tax, according to the provisions of the Act of 1848, is a matter of law, which we will not pretend to argue. *That* question must be settled by the judicial tribunal where the cause is now pending. We think, however, the court will have no difficulty in settling this question. The case of the Commonwealth vs. the Easton Bank, where Judge Bell delivered the opinion of the court, settles the question as to the power of the Legislature to impose a tax on all corporations, and at any time, unless there is a positive declaration relinquishing this right of taxation.—The Easton Bank, without asking the Legislature to release her from the tax, paid the amount into the treasury of the Commonwealth. As to the argument in favor of the bank, that the Commonwealth did not attempt to collect a tax on the dividends of the bank previous to 1848, we can very readily enlighten our correspondent, by quoting a few sentences from the argument of the late Auditor General, Hon. John N. Purviance, "before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, on the 6th of February, 1852, in the case of the Commonwealth *vs.* the Bank of Pennsylvania." From the argument of Mr. P. on that occasion, we quote as follows:

"It is not difficult to understand why the acts of 1813, 1824 and 1835 were not made applicable to the bank of Pennsylvania. When these several acts were passed, the State owned three-fifths of the entire capital stock of the bank; and it was not, therefore, the interest of the State to tax an institution in which she had so large an interest; nor would it have been regarded good policy, if expedient and just, to have imposed a partial tax upon the capital stock, discriminating against those who had invested their means with the State. The State, too, was represented by a minority in the board of directors. But when the Commonwealth sold the stock which she held in the bank, in September and October, 1843, what reason then existed to exempt the bank of Pennsylvania from burthens which were cast upon all other banks of the State?"

This we consider a triumphant answer to the argument "*Justice*" makes use of in his attempt to justify the Bank in refusing to pay the Commonwealth its just proportion of dividend tax. Look at the question as you may the bank, is bound for the tax, and we hope will be compelled to disgorge.

But, in regard to Mr. Bonham's amendment to the bill taxing Bank dividends. The amendment, "*Justice*" tells us, is "to the effect that the journals and proceedings of the Legislature, at the time the bank was chartered, shall be received as evidence by the court trying the case," &c. Should this amendment be adopted, we can't say, with any degree of certainty, what effect it will have. But those who have examined the testimony this amendment would furnish, are of opinion that it would, beyond question, release the Bank from the tax. Whether this be so or not, we would like to know what right the Bank of Pennsylvania has to ask for a kind of evidence that would be denied to an individual. Suppose one of Mr. Bonham's constituents had a suit pending in court, and should apply to the Legislature for this same kind of testimony. He would be laughed at, and his request scouted from the Hall.—But yet this extraordinary privilege and advantage must be granted to a mammoth institution. Who ever heard of an individual or even of a bank, before now, attempting to evade the plain letter of the law, by refering to the journals, instead of the law itself? The case is now before court—let that tribunal settle the question between the Bank and the Common wealth, but away with all attempts to favor the bank, by admitting testimony that would jeopard the just claims of poor old bleeding Pennsylvania.

"*Justice*" reminds us that the *Pennsylvanian*, *Democratic Union*, and other Democratic papers "are in favor of releasing the bank entirely." Indeed! Well, *we are not* in favor of releasing it, nor do we think the tax-payers of the State are. The *Pennsylvanian* and *Democratic Union* may pursue their own course, and we will pursue ours. We have not been in the habit of looking to either of these journals for political orthodoxy. We believe the Bank is, in honesty, bound for the amount said to be due to the Commonwealth by the accountant officers; and we but express the will of his constituents, when we tell Mr. Bonham that we desire to see no unheard-of favors granted to the Bank of Pennsylvania or any other Bank. Let the law take its course, and "let justice be done though the heavens should fall."

Europe.—The news from Europe by the Canada presents little of marked importance. The New Ministry had announced the intended dissolution of the British Parliament. The country is wide awake for the new Election, to be controlled by a few privileged voters. France is as tranquil as tyranny can make it. Spain is sending out a new Governor-General and more troops for Cuba. Lord Derby's accession to power in England, gives great satisfaction to the Court of Vienna, and the Government had, in consequence, resolved to abstain from reprisal upon English travellers, previously threatened, by way of set off to the countenance given in England to the Austrian refugees.

FROM HARRISBURG.

Liquor Law.—The bill to prevent the sale of spirituous, vinous or maltous liquors in less quantity than thirty-one gallons, passed the Senate of Pennsylvania on Thursday last, and was sent to the House of Representatives for concurrence on the same day. The following was the vote on the final passage of the bill:

Yeas—Messrs. Barnes, Carothers, Carson, Evans, Fernon, Guernsey, Hamilton, Hamlin, Haslet, Hoge, M'Farland, M'Murtrie, Malone, Packer, Robertson, Sanderson and Slifer—17.

Nays—Messrs. Baily, Bucknlew, Crabb, Darlington, Frally, Fulton, Jones, Kinzer, Kunkel, M'Caslin, Matthias, Muhlenberg, Myers, Shimer and Walker, *Speaker*.—15.

North Branch Canal.—In the House, on Thursday last, the bill which had passed the Senate to authorize a lone of $850,000, to complete the North Branch Canal, was taken up on final passage.

Mr. Bonham moved to amend by striking out certain words, and making the loan of $850,000, a lone for the "North Branch and inclined plains." This amendment Mr. B. advocated at some length showing the advantages to be derived by the State and by the travelling community generally, by an early avoidance of the planes on the Alleghany Portage road, and by the immediate completion of the North Branch canal. His proposition, he said, was to appropriate $200,000 to the avoidance of the planes; and he was of opinion that the remaining sum of $650,000 would be, perhaps, sufficient to complete the North Branch extension. Whilst extending the branches, the main trunk should not be neglected.

The SPEAKER, by leave of the House, made a few remarks in opposition to the amendment, and in favor of leaving the two propositions stand as they should do, upon their own merits. He pressed the avoidance of the planes, but was not in favor of the route as at present designated.

The debate was continued by Messrs. Schell, Wise, Hart, Broomall and others, and after a number of amendments had been voted down, the vote was taken on the final passage of the bill, which resulted as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Anderson, Appleton, Benedict, Beyer, Black, Blair, Dungan, Pollmer, Gibbs, Gifford, Gillis, Glosser, Hart, Hook, Hobbel, Huplet, Jackson, James, (Warren.) Kilbourn, Kingsley, Laughlin, Lilly, M'Cune, M'Granahan, M'Kean, Merriman, Meyers, Meylert, Miller, (Phila. county.) Miller, (Northampton,) Moll O'Neil, Painter, Reel, Reiley, Rhoads, Ringer, Ross, Rubicam, Schell, Shugart, Souder, Steward, Torbett, Wagner, Wise, and Rhey, *Speaker*—47.

Nays—Messrs. Acker, Bigelow, Blaine, Bonham, Broomall, Craig, Dengler, Ely, Evans, Fiffe, Freeland, Fretz, Gabe, Guffey, Harris, Herbert, Hunsecker, James, (Chester,) Kelso, Landis, Laury, M'Cluskey, M'Connel, Maclay, Madeira, Martin, Meloy, Mellinger, Miller, (Allegheny,) Mowry, Penny, Reifsnyder, Selizer, Sharon, Shaeffer, Spull, Smith, Thomas, and Yost—39.

So the bill passed. (The bill has since been signed by the Governor, and is now a law.)

Mauch Chunk Bank.—In the House, on the same day, the bill to incorporate the Mauch Chunk bank, was taken up for final passage.

Mr. BONHAM moved that the House go into committee of the whole for the purpose of amending the bill so as to restrict the issue to no notes less than the denomination of ten dollars, which motion was defeated.—yeas 25, nays, 46, Mr. Bonham voted in the affirmative, Mr. Henderson was not present.

Allentown Bank.—In the Senate, on the 2nd inst., the bill to incorporate the Allentown Bank passed finally—yeas 18, nays 11. Mr. Baily voted in the negative.

Easton Bank.—In the Senate, on the same day, the bill to re-charter the Easton Bank, passed finally, by the following vote—yeas 19, nays 8. Mr. Baily voted in the affirmative.

Anthracite Bank.—On the Same day, in the Senate, on motion of Mr. Frally, the bill to incorporate the Anthracite Bank of Tamaqua, was taken up on second reading and passed finally—yeas 17, nays 12. Mr. Baily voted in the negative.

Erie City Bank.—On the same day, in the Senate, the bill to incorporate the Erie City Bank, passed finally, as follows—yeas 18, nays 11. Mr. Baily voted in the negative.

Mr. EVANS, from the Apportionment Committee, reported a bill to district the State for representatives in Congress.

In the House on the 2nd inst., Mr. Bonham submitted, on leave, an amendment he intended to offer to the appropriation bill, authorizing a loan of five millions of dollars, in accordance with the recommendation of the Governor, with which to meet the loans falling due in 1852, '53 and '54—the certificates or bonds to be issued in the sums of two thousand dollars, to have coupons attached, the interest to be paid in gold or silver, at any place in England or America, and the rate of interests not to exceed five per cent.

On motion of Mr. BROOMALL, resolutions authorizing the Governor to appoint commissioners to revise the code of Pennsylvania, were taken up, (Mr. FRETZ in the chair,) read twice and passed finally.

On motion of Mr. SCHELL, the act to authorize the county commissioners of this Commonwealth to subscribe for and preserve two or more newspapers, published in their respective counties, was taken up, (Mr. RHOADS in the chair,) read twice and passed finally.

In the House, on the 3d inst., the Senate bill construing the law taxing Bank dividends so as to exclude the Bank of Pennsylvania from its operation, and to allow in suits now pending the use of the journals and proceedings of the Legislature as legal evidence, was taken up and passed second reading.

The bill allowing the Banks of the Commonwealth to pay their tax on dividends out of their contingent or surplus fund, passed finally.

On motion of Mr. BONHAM, the bill for the better regulation and management of the public improvements of the Commonwealth, was taken