American Volunteer.

BY JOHN B. BRATTON. "OUR COUNTRY—MAY IT ALWAYS BE RIGHT—BUT RIGHT OR WRONG, OUR COUNTRY." AT $2,00 PER ANNUM.

VOL. 44. CARLISLE, PA., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1857. NO. 15.

AMERICAN VOLUNTEER.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING BY

John B. Bratton.

TERMS.

SUBSCRIPTION.—One Dollar and Fifty Cents, paid in advance; Two Dollars if paid within the year; and Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, if not paid within the year. These terms will be rigidly adhered to in every instance. No subscription discontinued until all arrearages are paid unless at the option of the Editor.

ADVERTISEMENTS—Accompanied by the CASH, and not exceeding one square, will be inserted three times for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each additional insertion. Those of a greater length in proportion.

JOB-PRINTING—Such as Hand-bills, Posting-bills, Pamphlets, Blanks, Labels, &c., &c., executed with accuracy and at the shortest notice.

Political.

SPEECH OF SENATOR BIGLER,

At Clarion, on the 8th inst.,

In reply to the Address of the Hon. David Wilmot, delivered at Philadelphia, on the 24th ult.

After giving a brief history of the Democratic party, showing how eminently wise and successful its policy had been in the past, and how it had uniformly, in all exigencies, in war or peace, stood by the true interests of the country, and had advanced its growth and prosperity, and elevated the dignity and prowess of the nation, claiming for that party a higher degree of purity, wisdom and patriotism than were possessed by any similar association of men in modern times: and having also paid a handsome compliment to the character and qualifications of Gen. Packer and his associations on the Democratic ticket, he proceeded as follows:

Judge Wilmot, the Republican candidate, has evinced his entire willingness to make his views known to the people, and seems quite unhappy that the State Committee would not agree that the Democratic candidate should waste his time with him in personal controversy, and still more displeased that the Committee should have suggested that the discussion of the slavery question is not essential in a Gubernatorial contest. Failing to secure the attractions of Gen. Packer to get up large meetings and excitement for him, he has bravely dashed into the field alone. I am in possession of a copy of his first address delivered at Philadelphia on the 24th ultimo, and published in the "*Evening Bulletin*," to the leading features of which I shall ask your attention before I take my seat. I find no fault with Mr. Wilmot for appearing before the public to make known his views. I think a candidate for any office may properly do so. I see no want of dignity or propriety in the practice, if pursued in the proper spirit. In doing this no candidate properly appreciating his position will solicit votes; he will simply declare his views on pending questions, foreshadowing as best he can the policy he will maintain if elected, so that the intelligent elector may vote for or against him, as may seem proper. But I have searched in vain for any such foreshadowing in the late speech of Mr. Wilmot. It is devoted exclusively to the subject of Slavery, except only a brief reference to his letter on Americanism. State affairs seem to have had no attractions for him. It is an almost incredible fact that in a long speech occupying columns of the *Bulletin*, he should not have alluded to any one of the many interests which would come under his charge, were he elected Governor, nor discussed a single question connected with the duties of the office for which he is a candidate, or over which the political authority of the State Government could in any way be exerted.—From beginning to end he has talked outside of the true purpose of his appearing before the public, and has failed, therefore, to give the people the means to decide whether he would make a good Governor or not. He has talked about Slavery, and questions incidental and collateral; but not a word about State affairs.—He should certainly have given us his views on the question of more Banks and paper currency. Many of the people would be glad to know whether he intends to maintain the policy of the present incumbent, his political friend, on these vital questions. What does he think of the policy of giving away the largest share of the Public Works for an inadequate compensation, payable to the next generation; and if elected, will he favor a disposition of the remainder on the same conditions? Why not give the people his views on these State questions, as also on the subject of paying the public debt, maintaining and extending our system of free schools; on granting of special privileges to facilitate the ends of private gain, and especially on the pending amendments to the Constitution, embracing questions of grave concern for the people. All these subjects, vitally important, and within the range of the legitimate duties of the Executive, seem to have been lost sight of in the smoke and dust of a kind of Quixotic onslaught upon Slavery and the Slave power.

But another fact, equally singular, is, that although his address abounds with graphic descriptions of the evils of Slavery, and coarse imputations upon the motives of its advocates, it does not contain a single practical suggestion as to a remedy for the evils it laments. Mr. W. declares it to be "a question of vital practical importance which lies at the foundation of everything valuable to us as freemen," and yet he has not attempted to show the people of Pennsylvania in what way they can apply the remedy. Not only this, but I shall prove to you that, according to his own showing, the people of a free State have no Constutional right to interfere for or against the evils he affects to deplore, whether in a State or Territory. If Mr. Wilmot found it necessary to make his address on national issues entirely foreign to the Executive duties, it is to be regretted that he did not devote a portion of his time to his once favorite topic, the tariff. The old friends of "protection for the sake of protection," whom he expects to rally under his flag, would doubtless be delighted to hear from the man whom they used to designate as the advocate of "British free trade," the "successful betrayer of Pennsylvania's best interests;" and as a "vile traitor of the State of his birth." Possibly he could have convinced the manufacturers of iron in Clarion and elsewhere, that they are specially his debtors, and permitting the dead past to bury its dead, they should come to his rescue in this his hour of need. Perhaps there were amongst his auditors at Philadelphia, those who had assisted to give Mr. Dallas to the flames in effigy, for following the Wilmot lead on the Tariff, in 1846, and he could have induced them to repent that great wrong on Mr. Dallas, as also their oft repeated imputations upon his own motives and conduct. He certainly could have shown those who abused myself and others, last spring, for agreeing to a modification of the tariff when we had no power left to resist it, that they were unreasonable in that complaint, or are now mistaken in their support of the distinguished advocate of "British free trade." But let that pass; we will leave the distinguished advocate of free trade in the embrace of the protectionists, and the protectionists under the leadership of the distinguished free-trader. The new alliance only furnishes another verification of the homely adage, that political necessity makes strange bed-fellows.

But to the speech, and I will give you its best sentiment first, so that his friends may not complain. It reads as follows:

"I hold that under the Constitution of the United States we have no right to meddle directly with the question of Slavery in the States where it already exists; it is a State institution, and can only be controlled by State laws, and we of Pennsylvania have no more right to legislate for Virginia upon the subject of Slavery, than Virginia has the right to legislate for Pennsylvania on the subject of our Public Schools. But in the Territories the question is different. The Territories are the common property of the Union, and we have the common right to control them."

Then again, speaking of slavery, he says:

"The question is no mere abstraction, nor is it simply a question of right and wrong, a question of morals; it is a question of vital practical importance, which lies at the foundation of everything valuable to us as free men."

Touching the Dred Scott decision, he remarks:

"And as I am on this point, I wish to say that I bow to the Dred Scott decision as a matter of law. I raise no arm against the law, and I would never advise any one to do so; but there is no law on earth which can bind my reason or my conscience. I can, and will think, and vote for what I believe right."

Now let us consider the doctrines of these quotations for a few minutes. In the first he says we have "no right to meddle with Slavery in the *States* where it already exists," but that "the *Territories* are the common property of the Union, and we have the common right to control them." In the second he presents the effects of Slavery as "vital practical questions, involving everything valuable to us as free men." And in the third he informs us that he "bows to the Dred Scott decision as matter of law."

Of course I agree that we have no right to interfere with Slavery in the *States*, but "bowing to the Dred Scott *decision*," how does Mr. Wilmot propose to reach the institution in the Territories? What becomes of "the common right" of the States to control its existence?—How can that right be brought to bear? That decision defines the Constitution to mean that Congress has no right to legislate on the subject for the Territories; that a congressional interdiction against its extension is unconstitutional, and Mr. Wilmot agrees that that decision is law; then what of his common right to control it in the Territories, and of the "vital practical questions" he has presented for our consideration.

Now this is the point to which I wish your special attention. Though acknowledging in his own peculiar phrase the binding effects of the decision of the Supreme Court, Mr. Wilmot is very careful to conceal the influence of that decision upon his position and arguments; he has not told the people frankly that by virtue of the decision he so reluctantly recognizes as binding, Slavery in a territory is almost as completely out of the reach of the people or the Government of a free State, at it is in the State of Virginia. He dare not be explicit on this point; for he would thereby illustrate the utter impracticability of his doctrines on the subject. Indeed his whole theory goes to pieces at this point, and he must necessarily conceal as much as possible, the effects of this decision, or the deceptive character of his speeches would become so transparent that he would be obliged to abandon the discussion entirely.

Bowing to the Dred Scott decision as matter of law, it will not do to say only that "Pennsylvania has no more right to legislate for Virginia, on the subject of Slavery, than Virginia has to legislate for Pennsylvania on the subject of Public Schools." Mr. Wilmot cannot stop at this point; he must, and does virtually agree by that "bow" that neither Pennsylvania nor Virginia has any right to legislate for Kansas or Nebraska, on either subject, and they have no power to interfere for or against the institutions of the Territories directly or indirectly. The citizens of each may go to Kansas, and when *bona fide* residents, they can give effect to their will. He or I can do this; but as citizens of this State we cannot influence the question in either Kansas or Virginia. Prior to the Dred Scott decision, the Republican party contended for the power of Congress over the subject in the Territories; but that decision has settled the question against them, and has closed the last channel through which the free States could reach the question. It has swept away the entire stock in trade of the Republican agitators; the Missouri line, the Wilmot proviso, and every other scheme of Congressional interference. They have no occasion longer to seek even the election of anti-Slavery men to Congress, for that body cannot touch the question. Their long cherished business of agitation is therefore gone—gone forever.—Wherein, then, is the fitness of Mr. Wilmot's inflammatory addresses about Slavery, to the exclusion of every other topic. Having no power over the subject, it cannot be of vital practical importance in Pennsylvania, unless, indeed, Mr. W. in his feverish sensitiveness, has allowed himself to conclude that some "dough-faced Democrat" in obedience to "the slave powers" is about to propose to re-establish the institution in this State. Until this be done the question cannot be so practical as he alleges. But is it not singular that Mr. Wilmot should seek to agitate the public mind in behalf of measures which have been declared unconstitutional and to which decision he agrees? What can he accomplish by such effort? Though he could convince a majority of the people that the measures would work practical good to the country, the constitution, until changed, is an insurmountable barrier to their adoption.—Would it not be wiser to accept the philosophy of the trite saying, that "it is useless to cry over spilt milk." When the election is over he will need the benefit of some such reflection, for I think his chances are better to become the successor of *Judge Bullock*, than of Governor Pollock.

I do not mean to say that the candidates for Governor may not properly allude to the subject of slavery; but Mr. Wilmot insists that measures which have been declared unconstitutional shall be recognized issues in the Gubernatorial contest, and continues to discuss these measures as though they could be made available to the country, and insists that the people should take one side or the other. He says slavery is the only question involved, and has so far declined to speak on State questions at all.

He says that Virginia has the same right to interfere with our public schools, that Pennsylvania has with Slavery in Virginia; and that is true; but did it not occur to his mind, at the same time, that it would be a most singular, if not ludicrous spectacle, to witness a candidate for Governor in Virginia, resting his claims to popular favor solely on his views about public schools in Pennsylvania, and confining his discussions to that topic alone? Why the people of the Old Dominion would get a straight jacket for any man who might attempt to play such a trick before high Heaven. And what would Pennsylvanians think of such impudent interference? They would most certainly invite the Virginia aspirant to take care of his slaves and leave the public schools to them. Mr. W. would be sure to do this, and yet he talked for hours about Virginia negroes, and said not one word about Pennsylvania Schools; so determined does he seem to rest his claims on questions belonging to other States, and over which his has no control. Perhaps his friends can explain all this, but I think I can safely assure them of one thing, if he does not get more votes in States where his address would be appropriate, than in his own, he will be badly beaten. He will be almost convinced that he has not only been speaking for other States, but running for Governor somewhere else than at home.

Mr. Wilmot's prompt recognition of the binding effect of the Dred Scott decision has certainly surprised and disappointed some of his fanatical adherents. But they should notice that he dare not raise his voice against the Constitution, when asking to be permitted to take an oath to support it. That he has yielded reluctantly, and with exceeding bad grace, is evident from the low terms in which he impugns the motives of the Court. He says "*it is easy enough for the Executive to find corrupt Judges to carry out corrupt designs.*"—This is coarse, exceedingly coarse, scarcely allowable in a common place politician, and utterly inadmissible in a candidate for Governor. Very many who intend to vote for the author of the base allegation, will despise his foul aspersions. Even they will not agree that it is becoming in David Wilmot to warn the country against the corruptions of *James Buchanan and Roger B. Taney*. But in his anger at courts, he has gone out of his way still further to make an onslaught upon the integrity of the Supreme Court of his own State, and broadly alleges that its decisions are often contradictory, and it is common talk among the bar, that a decision must be revived every five years to have binding effect. The Courts should take warning, for failing to be Governor, as this gentleman certainly will, he may still retain the office of *Judicial Censorian*.

Fearing to repudiate the decision of the Supreme Court in express terms, many of Mr. Wilmot's school of politicians are industriously engaged in efforts to destroy the confidence of the public in its integrity. As a means of doing this, they are in the habit of expatiating on the extraordinary circumstance that the Ordinance of 1787 should have been declared unconstitutional at the end of sixty years after its adoption, and the Missouri Compromise so declared after having stood for nearly forty years. They certainly know that the Ordinance of 1787 did not derive its authority from the present Constitution—that it was the work of the Congress of the old Confederation, and was agreed to by the States, and was merely perpetuated under the present Constitution, as a measure which the States had agreed to. This item of history they prefer to suppress, so that the action of the Court may seem the more strange.—They know, too, that the Missouri Compromise was an arbitrary arrangement between the North and the South, forced by an exigency that endangered the peace of the country, and that its Constitutional authority, though constantly denied by many wise statesmen, had not been directly tested prior to the late decision.

The history of the renowned Proviso is rewritten in this speech, and Mr. W. has manifested special delight in exhibiting what he considers the inconsistencies of the Democratic party on this subject, and more especially those of Gen. Cass, Hon. Richard Brodhead and myself. He alleges in substances, that if the General had voted before he reflected, he would have gone for the Proviso, and that Mr. Brodhead had said he would vote for it if offered to the proper bill, and that I had been very careful to record my name in the affirmative, when a similar sentiment passed the State Legislature. The course of Gen. Cass and Mr. Brodhead needs no explanation or defence at my hands. Their sentiments are too well known to the country to be successfully misrepresented. And, indeed, admitting all that Mr. W. alleges, I do not see that he makes out any man's destruction. The wisest men in the nation have often been wrong in their first impressions as to the expediency of suddenly proposed measures, and to be mistaken on a constitutional question, is no uncommon thing among able lawyers. As to the Pennsylvania resolution, it certainly did not receive that consideration to which it was entitled. I do not believe it was under consideration in the Senate, exceeding one half hour before it passed finally. For myself I knew but little about it until it came from the House of Representatives, the day it passed the Senate, and had only thought of it as an abstract sentiment against the acquisition of territory, with the view to the extension of Slavery and as effecting the question of peace with Mexico. As a proposition involving the rights of the States, and the powers of Congress, I had, at that time given it no thought. Reflection upon these things soon after, and long before I knew that Mr. Wilmot intended to press the principle as admissible when applied to Territory which had been long previously acquired by the common blood and treasure of all the States, without any such original condition, convinced my mind that its practical operation would do injustice to the slave-holding States, and I discarded its doctrines entirely. Four years after the advent of the proviso, when the Democratic nominee for Governor, I certainly was not charged with a want of sympathy for the South. The reverse was the constant allegation of my political enemies. The execution of the fugitive Slave law and the doctrine of non-intervention were topics in that contest, and I advocated the affirmative of both on all occasions. Mr. Wilmot himself publicly dissented from my views on these points, at a meeting in his own town, where we stood face to face. But it is of little moment whether I have been consistent or not. I trust I may always be more ambitious to be right, and never vain enough to pretend to great wisdom or foresight. If I did not mistake the meaning of the proviso, when first proposed, I certainly misunderstood its author, for I thought him a Democrat, and he has turned out to be anything else. But has Mr. W. relieved his position by what he has said on this point? If it even be true that certain democrats inclined to favor the proviso before they had discovered the wrong, he was not thereby warranted in sustaining it when the injustice of its practical workings had become apparent by discussion, and especially since it has been shown to be unconstitutional.

But this candidate and his party are great on consistency. They are in the habit of arraigning Mr. Buchanan, Judge Douglas, and other Democratic Statesmen, on the charge of inconsistency, because at one time they sustained the policy of settling the slave controversy by a geographical division, and have since embraced the policy of referring the question to the people of the territories, to be settled as they may deem best. There is very little sense and less patriotism in such criticisms. The whole history of the subject shows that the controversy, at the different periods when the excitement attained to a dangerous hight, was treated as a subject of compromise, implying at once the concession of principle and peculiar views. Statesmen and patriots felt required to yield much in the way of opinion, to secure the peace of the country. Mr. Buchanan favored the Missouri line so long as the policy of settling the question by territorial division was maintained; and Mr. Douglas, in 1848, proposed to extend the parallel of that line to the Pacific Ocean as a final adjustment of the dangerous feud. But the very men who now, and since 1854, have not ceased to bewail the abandonment of this policy, were united in their opposition to its extension and perpetuity on that occasion. They repudiated it, scouted and reviled it. Another mode of settlement became absolutely necessary to save the country from civil war, and that of non-intervention as now found in the Kansas law, was wisely adopted in 1850; and is maintained by the statesmen I have named. What inconsistency is there in such action? And what is to be said for the sincerity of those who continued to denounce the Missouri line up to the time of its repeal. That party who in Connecticut burnt James Lanman, in effigy for voting for it, and Isaac Toucey near the same spot, for voting to repeal it, and who labored to reject the principle in 1848. They are not in a condition to talk about consistency. Having so conspired against this mode of adjustment, and secured its overthrow, they now have Mr. Wilmot engaged in a clumsy imitation of Mark Anthony, with the dead body of Cæsar by toting the lifeless remains of this unconstitutional measure from place to place over the State, giving utterance to his deep grief in pathetic appeals to the passions and prejudices of the people, to draw down their vengeance on the destroyers of this once favorite scheme.

On Kansas affairs Mr. Wilmot becomes quite belligerant, and hurls vindictive asperations upon the National Administration. He talks as though that he did not know that the odious test laws enacted by the first Legislature had been repealed by the last; that his party friends in Kansas are daily availing themselves of these bogus laws; that Mr. Robinson, the Topeka Governor, had petitioned Mr. Stanton, when acting Governor, to confer the appointment of Commissioner to acknowledge deeds on his friend, by virtue of the territorial laws. He seems determined to give the version of affairs that will best suit his purpose. Having presented a startling picture of the wrongs and outrages which, according to his story, have been wantonly inflicted upon the free State party of that unhappy Territory, he makes the following sweeping declaration:

"I affirm that the Administration knows all about these outrages, and yet they uphold them. They sustain the Missouri usurpation, and they dare not be just, because they are the slaves of the slave power who created them and upholds them."

This is terrific indeed, coming from a candidate for Governor, but Mr. Wilmot's language is tame and feeble compared with the sparkling rhetoric of Col. Keitt, of South Carolina, on the other side of the question. The Colonel, in his letter dated at White Sulphur Springs, imputes to the Administration altogether different action and purpose. He alleges that its first act was to appoint a Governor to "*debauch Kansas from allegiance to the South and deliver her into the hands of Free Soil fanatics,*" and that "*to say that the cause of the South was lost in Kansas prior to the appointment of Walker, is to palliate fraud by falsehood.*" Here is a wide difference between big doctors. But the Southerner seems to have the best of the contest.—Indeed the best attempts of Wilmot and his school of orators, to show the subserviency of the Administration to the slave power, fall far below the most ordinary efforts of Col. Keitt, the Charleston *Mercury*, and the New Orleans *Delta*, to demonstrate its Free Soil tendencies and its treachery to the South. With such fires in front and rear who will say that Col. Keitt may not reasonably imagine the fantastics to be hereafter played by "shivering Cabinets" and "convulsive Administrations."

Then again, Mr. Wilmot and his party seem *to be in great tribulation lest the slave power should deprive some of the citizens of Kansas of the opportunity of raising their voices against* the institution at the ballot box; lest some be deprived of that high and sacred prerogative, the right of suffrage. They descant eloquently on the sacredness of this right, and hurl destructive anathemas upon the heads of all who shall attempt to restrict or usurp this proud function of American freemen. The people and the whole people must be heard. Now this is all very well, and they cannot go further on this point than will the Democracy; but does not this sickly concern for the rights of the people come with exceeding bad grace from Mr. Wilmot and his party; who in the convention that nominated Col. Fremont, laid it down as a principle, that not only a portion, but *all* the citizens of Kansas should be deprived of the right of saying whether they would have slavery or not. They claimed that right for Congress, and virtually held that though nine-tenths of the people might desire slavery, the interdiction of Congress should be conclusive. It was no half-way business with them. It is part of their faith to deprive all the people of the sacred opportunity which they falsely allege the Democracy are attempting to take from some.—They execrate the interference of Missouri in the settlement of the slavery question in Kansas, and yet according to their own doctrine not only Missouri but Massachusetts, and all the North and South are invited to interfere through their representatives in Congress. The practical effect of their doctrine being that the power to decide the question for Kansas is to be found everywhere else in the United States except in that and the other territories—that the people of the States, who do *not* go to Kansas shall have a voice on the subject, but those who *do, shall not*. How absurd, then, their effected distress, lest by design or accident some citizen of Kansas may be deprived of the opportunity of giving effect to his will on the subject.—Why even now Mr. Wilmot and his party will not say that they will be content with the decision of the people, and admit Kansas as a State, unless that decision be against slavery.—They will agree to take her into the Union when she obeys their dictation and not till then. It was in this connection, in the contest of last Fall, that we ridiculed their pretensions to exclusive friendship for freedom in Kansas, whilst holding that the people should *not be free* to select their own institutions. We claimed that the Democracy were more the friends of "Free Kansas," because they wished to have her people perfectly free to select all their domestic institutions. They holding that Kansas should not come into the Union unless she adopted their views, and the Democracy maintaining that she should come in, no matter how she might decide as to Slavery. The question in the Presidential issue was not whether she should be free or slave, but simply whether her own *bona fide* citizens should be permitted to decide for themselves. That question was affirmed by the people at the polls, and Mr. Buchanan and his advisers, in my judgment, are honestly endeavoring to carry out that decision, in good faith, regardless of denunciation from the North or South, and so performing their whole duty to the country.

Mr. Wilmot talks very positively about what is going on in the territory. Of course he knows; but I spent some weeks there this summer and found it difficult to obtain accurate information. That wrongs have been committed on both sides is clear; but the idea of Mr. W. that his peculiar order have been uniformly right on all the issues that have disturbed the quiet of the territory, is absurd. No unbiassed mind will come to such a conclusion. It is not, however, my purpose to go into a history of Kansas affairs, or give my views at length as to the policy of the administration at this time; but I can assure Mr. Wilmot that the only impracticable politicians I met in the territory were of his own school; the leaders of the Topeka rebellion.—They seemed determined to rule or ruin. It was no uncommon thing to hear them say that if the convention, to meet in this month, should adopt the Topeka Constitution, word for word, they who made it, originally, would reject it at the polls. But I hope and believe that, through the agency of that present able and patriotic Executive of the Territory, Mr. Walker, the bitter feuds dividing the people of that territory, will be happily settled, and Kansas be brought into the Union on principles perfectly consistent with the organic act. In this effort Governor Walker will be sustained by the great mass of the people, whom I found to be moderate, practicable and patriotic in their views. For myself, I have believed that the spirit of the Compromises of 1850, as in the organic law of Kansas contemplated the decision of the question of Slavery, in the Territory, by some direct action of the people, prior to application for admission as a State; otherwise the question will come back to Congress in the same shape in which it was when referred to the people; unaccompanied by any expression of popular will. That expression should, and, I have no doubt, will be had without any official interference as to what it should be; and when so had, deciding the question of Slavery as the people wish, I shall for one, assist to throw wide open the portals of the Union, and welcome Kansas as a State, *Slavery or no Slavery*. But I shall not vote to admit her on the Topeka Constitution, because the movement was not of the people, but of a party; was not by authority of law, but in violation of the law, and therefore revolutionary. Nor am I at all inclined to indulge the rebellious spirit of those in the Territory who seem determined to set the laws atdefiance. If they will not act save in their own way, and Kansas becomes a Slave State by the voice of those who do act, the responsibility mustrest upon them.

But I have been wandering from my text, and neglecting the Republican candidate for Governor. I wish to make one more extract from his speech and then I shall have done. It is one of his best gems, and reads as follows:

"With respect to the labor question, it is alleged by the Democracy that we have no sympathy for free white labor; and that our tears are exhausted on the black man. Now I leave the chivalry of the South to the noble office of *kicking negroes*. God has laid a heavy hand on them, and I seek not to press the curse harder upon them. The chivalry may have all the *glory of horse-whipping women and selling their babies*. Democracy may trample their rights under foot, if they please, but I tell you that the interests of all humanity are one. God has so ordered it, that no man can do deliberate and systematic wrong to other men; no man can be a tyrant or a despot without staining his own soul, and without becoming a beast and a demon."

How idle, if not unmanly, it is for a man who uses language of this character, on a question entirely beyond the reach of those to whom it is addressed, to become indignant and denounce the Democratic press as "debased," "venal," "corrupt," and "in the pay of the Slave power," because it has designated him as an "Abolitionist," a "wild, impracticable theorist." What else could he expect? What else could a truth telling press say? Does not the whole tenor of his address justify this conclusion? Is it not "wild theorism" to excite the minds of the people day after day, about great evils without telling them how a remedy can be applied, and whilst confessing that they have no right to interfere for or against such evils in the States, and acknowledging the binding effects of a definition of the Constitution, which shows that they cannot be reached in the Territories? Is it not Abolitionism to describe the institution of negro Slavery *as so odious that it should not be tolerated in any civilized country—as involving that measure of tyranny and oppression, that no man can practice it "without staining his own soul," without "becoming a beast and a demon?"* Is it not vile demagogueism, thus to inflame the passions and prejudices of the people of one section of our country against the institutions of another or to subserve the ends of party? Mr. Wilmot must not conclude that his sickly recognition of the rights of the States, and his ungracious bow to the decision of the Supreme Court, will protect him in the use of such offensive language as the foregoing. The use of such foul aspersion can in no way improve the morals or politics of the country, its institutions or its customs; can do no good to North or South: to white or black race. It is not my habit to deal harshly with the character or actions of public men, but I should do injustice to my feelings were I not to say that much of Mr. Wilmot's address, whether considered as a declaration of principles or as a specimen of logic or literature falls far below what his friends had reason to expect. It can rank but little above common place anti-Slavery rant, as wanting in method, and useful suggestion as in the ordinary graces of even partizan discussion. Is it possible that the Republican party cannot maintain their principles without resorting to such dangerous incendiarisms? Uncharitable crimination of the South seems to be their only source of partizan capital. Assuming the respect for the constitutional rights of the slaveholding States, they are sure to discourse in such way as to lead the fanatical abolitionist to believe that in some way or other, at no distant day, through their agency, the institution is to be uprooted everywhere. It was by such means in the last Presidential election that they gained over to Fremont, Garrison, Parker, Beecher, and all that school of fanatics. Unable to devise a practicable scheme to improve the condition of the black man, they persist in the work of agitation as their most fruitful means of political power. They know that they could do but little to improve the condition of the black man, though the whole subject was under their unrestrained control. Suppose all legal difficulties to be removed, and the subject placed within their reach, by emancipation on the part of the South, conditioned that the negroes be properly cared for; what then? To what country could they remove the slaves so that they might escape the dreaded "kicks," and be where none would "*horsewhip the women and sell their babies?*" How could they be clothed and fed, and how elevated in the scale of moral being? Would they be brought north to compete with our present laboring population? I am sure that the free States would never agree to that. But suppose they should, would that insure an improvement in the physical and mental condition of the slave? With what new political and social dignities would the black man be clothed, so that they might live easier and happier, and attain to a higher degree of civilization and christianity? Who will stand up for equality for them in the north? Let us have these questions answered, and have a practical scheme for the elevation of the negro, or loss of the agitation. The continuance of these criminations between the North and South may readily disturb the peace of thirty millions of white people but no way can it relieve whatever of hardship there may be in the condition of of the three or four millions of slaves now in our country. Nor is it just or patriotic to allege national sin against our country, because of the condition of the African, when the authors of such asperions cannot point the spot on earth or name the period in history, in which the condition of the curly haired negro was better than at present in the United States—when and where he enjoyed greater physical comforts, or attained a higher degree of mental cultivation, or embraced better ideas of christianity. His own country is "one of slaves and masters," and the ancestors of those we have were slaves of the lowest class when taken from their own country. To restore those now in the United States to that original condition, were such a thing possible, would be an outrage upon humanity and civilization. If then, the condition of the black man has been really improved by even his lowest estate among us, wherein consists the national sin that so constantly besets the consciences of these political doctors?

A Thousand Miles in a Thousand Hours.

At 2½ o'clok this morning, James Lambert accomplished his task, walking 1000 miles in 1000 consecutive hours at Boylestown Hall, and thereby completed one of the most remarkable feats in pedestrianism upon record. Such a contempt for the demands of nature as he has evinced during this trial, taxing his energies to the utmost in the endeavor to perform a deed which all reasonable people would justly consider impossible, has excited more than usual interest for his undertaking. He commenced at ten A. M. on Tuesday July 28, and as stated, retired sine die from the ring this morning shortly after 2 o'clock, having walked one mile in every hour for nearly forty-two days. His fatigue two weeks since was so great that even his friends abandoned all hope of his success; but he was "on the muscle," and, as he affirmed, "would walk until he fell upon the track;" within the last few days that weariness and stupor has greatly increased; and in walking his mile, after being aroused from slumber only by great exertion, he would stagger and exhibit other signs of extreme lassitude. He was in this state upon the completion of the last mile.

The number of spectators through the day yesterday was very large, and at even the late (or early) hour to which the completion of the affair was brought this morning there were crowds in attendance. He made his first mile in about ten minutes and his last in over double that time. At the signal which signified the termination of the 1000th mile, the pedestrian was warmly cheered and the company followed his example by retiring to their various places of rest. It is said that Lambert will receive about $2000 as the result of this affair. The parties betting against him are New Yorkers, and they have had present here two representatives who alternated in "seeing fair play."

As Lambert will now have an opportunity of answering the requirements of his exhausted condition, it will be necessary to use the greatest precaution in regard to him, for fear he should sleep forever. His physician prescribes a thorough waking and exercise after every three hours' rest, and by a strict adherence to this treatment it is hoped that he may regain his former strength. Since he commenced walking he has lost fourteen pounds of flesh, and now weighs but 113 lbs.—*Boston Post, Sept.* 8.

Prevalence of Crime.

It is truly astonishing the amount of crime which is daily brought under our notice. None of our journals are free from the record of some horrible event. All of them cry out for some measure of reform, and lament over the condition of the public morals. We boast loudly of the excellence of our laws, but we never ask ourselves, are they fully carried out. If we did we would discover that they were not. We would find that judges were lenient where they should be harsh, and harsh where they should be lenient—thus giving an example which tempts many to violate the laws with impunity. It would be found, too that our jurors, as a class, have a peculiar manner in discriminating between right and wrong—money having its influence in law as well as in many other things. In fine, then, if more attention were paid to carrying out our laws I think we would soon discover a decided change. Alcohol also lends its helping hand to fill our poor houses and jails.—That traffic could be closed with benefit to the nation. If parents would pay more attention to the education of their children we would find that the public morals would be much advanced, for it is self-evident that the human heart is moulded by circumstances. "As you bend a twig so the tree inclines." We are becoming so accustomed to crime that the most atrocious ones are glanced over, excite our mind for a short time, and are forgotten; and it is sad to think our oblivion increases day after day. It is time for us to reform. Let us shrink from our impending ruin, and become a wiser and happier nation.

"Virtue stands like the sun, and all which rolls around drinks life and light and glory from her aspect."

TEEMING WITH LIFE.—The *Utica* (N. Y.) *Herald* of the 10th, in speaking of the flood there, says:

The water in the Mohawk early yesterday morning, presented a most novel appearance.—Nearly the entire surface of the current was covered with small black grasshoppers, which had been swept away from the hay fields above. Particles of wood, grass, and other floating substances, were literally covered with the insects, and occasionally a rat might be seen floating down upon a slab, enjoying a comfortable breakfast upon the grasshopper community, which had sought the driftwood for protection.

There were thousands, if not millions of various creeping things, floating down the current. Catterpillars, gray beards, crickets, grasshoppers, infant frogs and toads, and an infinite variety of field and barn inhabitants, which had been suddenly swept away from their resorts by the flood, speeding on to some waterfall of destruction, or awaiting the maw of some ravenous finny monster.

HOW OYSTERS GROW.—The process by which Oysters make their Shells is one of the most singular phenomena in natural science. A London Oysterman can tell the age of his flock to a nicety. The age of this bivalve is not to be found out by looking into its mouth. It bears its years upon its back. Everybody who has handled an oyster shell must have observed that it seemed as if composed of successive layers of plates, overlapping each other. These are technically called "shoots," and each of them makes a years growth, so that, by counting them, the year when the creature came into the world, can at once be determined. Up to the time of its maturity, the shoots are regular and successive, but after that time they become irregular, and are piled one over the other, so that the shell becomes more thickened and bulky. Judging from the great thickness to which oyster shells have attained, this mollusc is capable, if left to its natural changes unmolested, of attaining a patriarchal longevity.

☞ A Bank of England Note has some peculiar and interesting characteristics of manufacture, the paper being distinguished by its color, which is peculiar white, such as neither sold in shops, nor used for any other purpose; by its thinness and transparency, qualities which prevent any of the printed part of the note being washed out by terpentine, or removed by the knife, unless a hole is made in the place thus practiced on; by its characteristic feel, a peculiar crispness and toughness, which those accustomed to handle it distinguish the true notes instantly; the wire or water mark, which is produced on the paper when in the state of pulp, and which is easily distinguished from a mark stamped on after the paper is completed: the three "deckle" edges—the mould contains two notes placed lengthwise, which are separated by knife at a future stage of the process, this deckle or wooden frame of the paper mould producing the peculiar effect seen on edges of uncut paper, and this edging being caused when the paper is in a state of pulp, precludes any successful imitation after the paper is made; also by the strength of the paper, which is made from new linen and cotton. In its water leaf or unsized condition, a bank note will support thirty-six pounds; and when one grain of size has been diffused through it, it will lift half a hundred weight.

Politics in New York.

The Republicans of this State are in a worse position, if possible, than those of our own.—They have not yet, however, been compelled to the ignominous resort of selling out to the "scattered remnants of a powerless party," as with us, but they rest for success on an equally "broken reed," defunct, "bleeding Kansas." They have been so completely driven to the wall on the tyrannous usurpation of their last year's Legislature, that they have almost ceased to make a decent show of defence upon that question and do not dare to make an open and determined battle in their support. They have virtually yielded the field on that subject, and have turned with despairing hearts to a revival of slavery agitation as the only hope in their dire distress. All this state of things is the result of but one year's lease of power to that party! That organization, which swept the State almost like an avalanche, upon the wave of a popular and unthinking excitement, now lies dishonored and crushed under the weight of the infamy practiced by those who have been selected, and doubtless with propriety, as its representatives.—"Clothed with a little brief authority," of which they proved themselves utterly unworthy, they sought, by tyranny and wrong, to work out the purposes of their party, by an effort at the subjugation of the Democracy of New York City. Most fearfully has this design recoiled upon them! Not merely those whom they sought so cruelly to wrong, but the whole indignant people of the State demand the overthrow of an organization, which could thus, at the outset of its career, prostitute the power confided to it.—That people will sweep this party from its place of power, and once more entrust their rights in the hands of those, who alone have proved themselves trustworthy.—*Pittsburg Union.*

A Million more of Ohio Money Lost.

The Cleveland Plaindealer of Thursday, 3d, furnishes the following item in regard to the State finances:

Intelligence, direct and reliable, from Columbus, assures that over a million of the money obtained on a loan of last winter, authorized by the Legislature, to take up State bonds, due January last, and deposited with the Ohio Life and Trust, New York, for that purpose has gone the way of all moneys and securities left with that soulless and sunken concern. There were $2,500,000 of the State bonds due Jan. 1, 1857. To redeem these bonds a law was passed authorizing the Commissioners to borrow the amount, which they did by selling a new issue of State stocks. The question then arose, who shall take care of the money and attend to the business redeeming said stocks. The fusion officials soon decided this question by selecting the N. York Agency of the Ohio Life and Trust Company, without taking one dollar of security for the $2,500,000 thus deposited, although the Democrats of the Legislature urged them to do so. As near as can be ascertained, about $1,200,000 only had been presented for redemption up to the time of the failure of said Trust Co. The balance is *non est inventus*.

THE DECLINE IN SUGAR.—Consumers generally will not regret to learn that the price of sugar is still on the decline. The Boston traveller says:

"The decline from the highest point is now over 8 cents a pound, and there is a strong probability that bottom is not yet half reached. When the decline had reached only one half the present amount, a few weeks since, the New York Independent estimated that on the stock of 85,000 tons of sugar and four million gallons of molasses, held in that port alone, the loss was then fully three and a half million dollars. Of course it must be double that now, and if this loss is made on that stored in New York alone, what must it be on the vast quantity afloat, in store in Europe and in the United States, and the stocks on hand in the sugar-exporting countries. It cannot be less than fifty millions of dollars already, and as the tendency is steadily downward, it will probably reach a hundred millions before the dealers will be able to touch the next crop."

THE RIGHT OF EXPATRIATION.—The Attorney General, in a recent official opinion, thus lays down the law as to the right of a citizen of the United States to expatriate himself by renouncing his allegiance to our government. The Attorney General says:

"There is no statute or other law of the United States which prevents any naturalized citizen from severing his political connection with this government if he sees proper to do so, in time of peace and for a purpose not directly injurious to the interests of the country. There is no mode of renunciation prescribed. In my opinion, if he emigrates, carries his family and effects with him, manifests a plain intention not to return, takes up his abode abroad, and assumes the obligation of a subject to a foreign government, this would imply a dissolution of all his previous relations with the United States; and I do not think we could or would afterward claim from him any of the duties of a citizen.—At all events, the fact of renunciation is to be established like other facts for which there is no prescribed form of proof by any evidence which will convince the judgment."

THOUGHTS LYING ON THE SAND.—Adversity brings to light many a hidden beauty. It is like a handsome leg revealed for the first time on a showery day.

The charms that fashion lends to woman would be considered positive defects if nature had given them.

We are never astonished at any happiness that drops into our lap, for we always fancy we are deserving of it; but if any piece of ill-luck falls down upon us, we cannot imagine what we have done to deserve it.

We fancy we are becoming wiser, as we grow older, when it is simply our incapacity to commit the same follies as when we were young.

Envy lashes principally the fortunate. It is like the ragamuffins in the street, who cry out "Whip behind!" directly they see one of their comrades who has got a lift.

To appreciate a free country, you must travel in a despotic State. It is like coming into the open air after visiting a prison.

☞ A Boston correspondent states that a man thereabout has invented a scare-crow, so utterly terrific and hideous, that the crows are all busily engaged in bringing back the corn which they stole two years ago.

☞ One of the newspapers inquires with much seeming innocence, if it is any harm for young ladies to sit in the laps of ages. Somebody answers that it probably depends on the kind of ages selected—those from eighteen to twenty-five being rather hazardous.

☞ An old bachelor, on seeing the words "Families supplied" over the door of an oyster saloon, stepped in, and said he would like to have a wife and two children.

☞ It is stated "by authority," that a new fashion is about to be introduced by the ladies of Buffalo—no less, in fact, than an immense calash, which is to be attached to the waists of the dear creatures, to be raised and lowered at pleasure, like the top of a buggy. Buffalo papers frantically ask, "What next?"

☞ The "retired Physician whose sands of life are nearly run," holds out well. In obedience to his melancholy notice, we expected him to "peg out" some time ago—but it appears that he is bound to take a favorable benefit before he goes.

☞ In the museum in Hifalutin, is a fleaskin, containing seven misers' souls, seven rich men's consciences, the principles of seven leading politicians, seventeen old bachelors hearts, and all the remaining sweetness of seventy old maids.

☞ A girl of twelve years, residing in Detroit, put the figure 14 in her boots the other day, and then going to the justice's office to get married, swore she was *over* that age.

A real puss in boots, and slyboots.—*Bost. Post.*

☞ Kitchen girls are now termed "Young Ladies of the lower parlor." People who go about grinding knives, scissors, and razors, are termed gentlemen of the revolution. Folks who dig clams are termed profound investigators.