

THE PEOPLE'S JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY, AND THE DISSEMINATION OF MORALITY LITERATURE, AND NEWS.

VOL. VII.

COUDERSPORT, POTTER COUNTY, PA., DECEMBER 7, 1854.

NO. 29.

THE PEOPLE'S JOURNAL.
PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING.
BY ADDISON AVERY.

Terms—Invariably in Advance:
One copy per annum, \$1.00
Village subscribers, 1.25

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.
1 square, of 12 lines or less, 1 insertion, \$1.50
Every subsequent insertion, .25
Rate of 10¢ per line, per day, 3 insertions, 2.50
Every subsequent insertion, .50
1 column, one year, 25.00
1 column, six months, 15.00
Administrators' or Executors' Notices, 2.00
Sheriff's Sales, per tract, 1.50
Professional Cards not exceeding eight lines inserted for \$5.00 per annum.
All letters, on business, to secure attention, should be addressed (post paid) to the Publisher.

PROGRESS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

After the nomination of Henry J. Gardner, he was charged with being a pro-slavery man. He promptly met this charge with the following letter, which needs no interpretation. When will such men as William Bigler learn to write a quality explicit? [Evs. Journ.]

Letter from Henry J. Gardner, Esq., to Hon. Charles Allen.

Boston, Oct. 20, 1854.

HON. CHARLES ALLEN—SIR: On my return home, after some days absence, I have been shown a copy of the Boston Daily Advertiser of Friday last, containing an extract from the Worcester Spy, purporting to be a sketch of a speech recently made by you. I am further informed that you applied the remarks to me by name.

The extract is as follows:—“What has been the result thus far? They have not in Convention in Boston and nominated a man, as the representative of their principles, who was one of the first subscribers to the fund to establish the *Chronicle*, started with the avowed purpose of repealing the Maine law. And then, as his worthiness on the subject of slavery—his life is covered all over with the badges of the slaveholder. I am greatly informed that he was one of the Marshal's body guard, when a man like our-elves was kidnapped in Boston, and carried through the streets to be consigned to endless slavery, until Heaven, in its mercy, shall effect his liberation through the portals of the grave. He has vindicated by speech and vote the Fugitive Slave Law, and gone as far as any man in the Commonwealth in support of the compromise.”

I had supposed, from your high reputation for integrity and probity, you would not willingly have made statements concerning any man based only on electioneering gossip, and I am fully assured you will promptly and cheerfully give as extensive publicity to the denial of the charge, as to their original assertion.

To the first statement I reply, I never subscribed a dollar to the fund to establish the *Boston Chronicle*. I was never asked to subscribe. I never knew of any such subscription, such a fund. I do not know by what name and was never introduced to a single person connected with that party, either as proprietor, editor, or publisher.

The assertion that I was one of the body guard of Sims, or any other fugitive, on his return to slavery, I pronounce false as a whole and false in all its parts—false in its aggregate and false in every detail. It has no shadow of basis of any sort, kind or degree, and its originator, whoever he was, coined the libel out of pure, unadulterated falsehood.

Were the same charge made against yourself, it could not be more groundless than it is against me. The power of language does not permit me to express the utter loathing I have for the conduct attributed to me. Far sooner would I be the poor, shivering wretch on the road again to the agony of bondage, than a volunteer guard to aid in his return. He who invented the charge grossly slandered me—they who repeat or believe it, do not know me.

It is not true that I am, or ever have been in favor of the Fugitive Slave Bill. I never voted for a man who favored it, knowing such to be his views, and I must very much change before I ever do. I never by word, act or vote, favored its passage, and I am an advocate of its essential modification, or in lieu thereof, its unconditional repeal. Returning from Canada last June, I read in the cars that there was a petition for its repeal at the Exchange news room, and on my arrival, before even going to the place of business, I hastened to the Exchange and signed the petition.

To the general assertion, that my life is covered all over with the badges of the slaveholder, I can only interpose a general denial. You have been very much misled in your estimate of my character. Were it not a little egotistical I might say, my heart beats as earnestly for the rights of the

North, and my determinations are as steadfast to oppose the aggressions of the South, as yours or your informants. But I am not content with a general denial. I ask that the particulars be given—point to the place, the time, and the act.—state the words the votes or the deeds whereon this charge is based. And if those on whose authority you make it, cannot furnish them, I ask you, in common fairness, to recall this statement, so untrue, so unjust.

To the charge of being a pro-slavery man and an “old hunker” I state a single fact. I was not elected by the Whig Convention a member of the State Central Committee of that party, but several vacancies having occurred, I was verbally invited by its secretary to attend a meeting held soon after the passage of the Nebraska bill. I was present and offered a resolution, which I sustained in a speech, to the effect that the Whig organization would call a Convention of the opponents of the Nebraska bill, without distinction of party, to nominate fusion candidates for State officers, as was done in Ohio, Vermont, Michigan, and other States. This resolution was, however, lost and its defeat was one of a series of events which placed me in the political position I this day occupy.

I headed the petition for the use of Faneuil Hall for the great Anti-Nebraska meeting in February last. I procured the officers and speakers. I called the meeting to order, and made the opening address, and I think (though I have not the record by me) was one of its Vice Presidents. The petition is in the City Archives—the other facts in the journals of the day—and yet I am now charged with being a Nebraska man!

In conclusion, I would add, it is foreign to my wishes to write this, or any personal letter. But to permit these assertions to pass uncontradicted, would be construed, where I am not known, into a confession of their truth. I am warranted in saying, had I the honor of your acquaintance, as I have of many of your distinguished political friends, you would never have given currency to these unfounded rumors. My life and conversation would have stamped their utter untruth to your satisfaction.

I repeat, however, all the false rumors that may be originated hereafter. Let the utter falsity of these show my fellow citizens how little reliance can be placed on others from similar sources and for similar ends. I am proud to know the people of our glorious Commonwealth are too intelligent and too chivalric to allow any man, however humble, to be injured by leaders as base and unfeeling as the e. Such false assertions, like the dragon's teeth that were sown of old, at the proper time will spring up as armed men to defend the absent and calumniate from the assaults not so much of his foes, as of the enemies of these American Principles which you in your Worcester speech have connected with his name. With great respect, I have the honor to be,
HENRY J. GARDNER.

AN INCIDENT OF CITY LIFE.

A friend informs us of the following facts relative to the death of a young child in this city. She was an unusually interesting and active child, the pride of her father. One day last winter, while sliding upon the ice, fell and injured her hip permanently, so that the bone became diseased, rendering her a cripple. The sufferings of the little one were great, and she required many delicacies which it was not possible for her parents to obtain, they being in rather poor circumstances. A few charitable neighbors, however, supplied her wants for a time, but she continued to linger, and it would almost seem that the mother came to the conclusion that it was better for her little one to die. She was alone on her bed for much of the time and the every day calls of the world caused her to be much neglected. As she lay there she was often heard liping simple prayers for help, such as “O Holy Mother, aid me.” Finally, one day, she desired a drink of water, but it was distant from her, and no one came to her relief. With a last effort she rose from her bed, took her little crutch, and managed to reach the water, drank freely, returned, laid down, and soon after died. The little sufferer was at rest. Her brief troubles were over. Hidden in the tumult and misery of a great city, how many little ones are thus left to suffer and perish.—*Boston Traveller*, Aug. 16.

Give a man brains and riches, and he is a king. Give a man brains without riches, and he is a slave. Give a man riches without brains, and he is a fool.

THE LESSON OF THE DAY.

Our readers will bear us witness that it was not the fault of THE TRINITY that the election just concluded in this State was conducted so weakly, and to so equivocal an end. Long before the preparations for the canvass were begun, we earnestly appealed for a union of the friends of Freedom, without regard to old party names, which had long ceased to indicate real differences of principle. It seemed clear, even then, that if the cause of Liberty were to receive no detriment here, it must be by fighting the battle boldly in her name, and by the fusion of all the forces that would naturally and enthusiastically follow her banner. Such were the counsels that we warmly and persistently urged upon our friends of the Whig organization. They were not listened to for reasons that need not again be recapitulated. The Whig party, or rather, the form of it, was retained, broken, as it was, by treachery and discord within our own ranks in former contests; and the consequences of this vital error are now plain to the world.

No man of sense will deny that the natural turning-point of this election was opposition to the Pro-Slavery course of the Federal Administration and to the latest encroachments of the Slave Power. In this regard, an ardent and powerful feeling burned in the breasts of the great majority of the electors; and, had that feeling been allowed its legitimate manifestation, it would have annihilated all resistance. Certainly there is none of the Northern States where hostility to the invasions of the Slaveocracy is so deep-seated or so universal; there is none where the Nebraska bill has been received with a more earnest or active indignation; none where the duty of public leaders, and especially of those at the head of the Whig party, seemed to be more imperatively and plainly indicated by the circumstances of the crisis. That duty was simply to renounce all hindrances of old nominal party divisions, to leave the title of Whigs behind them, and, fusing themselves in the great sentiment and impulse of the State, to have summoned all who shared that sentiment to a decisive demonstration against Douglas, Pierce, and all the minions of the Slavery Propaganda. Here was the popular feeling demanding such action; here was the opportunity for patriotism as successful as it was sublime. The opportunity has been rejected, and who can say when it will return!

Before the Convention at Saratoga, it had become manifest that the Whig leaders would not join in the genuine movement for uniting all the opponents of Slavery Extension in a new party; and, as the great mass of these were included in the Whig organization, it became a duty for that Convention, while broadly laying down its principles, to avoid any precipitate action that might produce a permanent schism in the Anti-Nebraska ranks, and not only throw the Legislature, but even the members of Congress, into the hands of Slavery's allies. That duty was performed, as we humbly think, with both decision and discretion; and, Fashion having unfortunately failed, no avoidable obstacles were left in the way of a rally of the free-souled electors of the State around the candidates afterward to be nominated, who should most truly represent the principles and policy of Freedom.

But all efforts failed to obviate and repair the original error. The Whig Convention met; its resolutions were unexceptionable; its candidates were not only all good Anti-Nebraska men, but they were accepted as such by the adjourned Convention of Saratoga. But they did not represent the popular feeling. They were not before the public as candidates of the party of Freedom. They got the promise of other support in one way or another; but still they were Whig candidates with various nominations appended, and various opposition feared and placated, and not as men appealing to the predominant sentiment of the State, and borne on its overwhelming tide to a mighty and certain triumph. How tame and spiritless was the canvass! During the whole of it, one would hardly have supposed that Freedom and Slavery were at issue at all. It was the play of Hamlet, with Hamlet not only omitted, but forgotten. And the reason is obvious. The very fact that Messrs. Clark and Raymond were primarily nominated; not as Anti-Nebraska men, but as Whigs, settled the question that the first point at stake was not resistance to the encroachments of Slavery, but the preservation of a certain party name. They were put upon the course, not merely with clogs upon their feet, but with their feet knocked from under them. They were set to fight a battle, but the war-cry that should have rallied

throng to their aid, was virtually forbidden to their lips.

But this was not the worst. The very fact that the voice of public sentiment, and the circumstances of the emergency were thus disregarded for the purpose of keeping up an essentially extinct party, put the whole cause at the mercy of all the traitors within the ranks of that party—and experience had proved that they were numerous and gifted. The so-called conservative Whigs, the compromisers and fugitive slave-catchers, hated the ticket quite as heartily as if it had been a distinctly Republican one; and, having power in the Whig organization, eagerly seized the chance of using it for a Whig overthrow. The popular feeling having been neglected and chilled, these traitors found no difficulty in working their purpose; while, had the case been put upon its natural basis, they would have been left as powerless here as they have proved in Maine, Ohio, and Indiana. Before the broad issue of condemnation or approval of Slavery Extension, and of bringing back the Federal Government to the side of Freedom, what possibility would there have been for Daniel Ullmann's receiving a hundred thousand votes in the State, either with or without the machinery of Know-Nothing judges? And with a Republican organization, such as has just achieved such a triumph in Michigan and Illinois? At how many polls would traitors in our own ranks have been able to hide or steal our ballots, so that the electors could not obtain them? These questions answer themselves.

Experience is in vain, unless it be put to practical use. We have now passed through the most corrupt election ever witnessed in the State. The original error of attempting to preserve the Whig party, has been followed up by treachery without parallel, and expenditures of money and of rum never equalled. That the forces of Freedom are not totally destroyed under such a complication, only proves their own exceeding vitality, and indicates the tremendous power they would have exhibited had a fair chance been allowed them. We have probably lost the Governor, but the Legislature, and a large majority of the members of Congress, are ours. If any one, whether a slave-catcher by profession or sympathy, or not, desires to go into another election as a Whig, we recommend him to apply to Mr. Francis Granger for admission into the tea-party he is about to get up with that title. It will be well to apply soon, before all the seats at the table shall have been bespoken.—*N. Y. Tribune*.

THE FIRST TRYING FOR THE NEW CONGRESS TO DO.

There is now an excellent prospect that a majority of the next House of Representatives will be composed of men chosen upon the Anti-Nebraska issue; that more than half the members will be disposed to abandon their old superstitious attachment to Whigism and Democracy, and to act in such a manner as shall bring before the country the distinct issue, whether Slavery or Freedom shall have the control, hereafter, in the national councils. If Massachusetts and New York do their duty in the elections soon to take place, the slaveholders and the few “natural allies” they can pick up among the northern delegations, will be insufficient in numbers to cope with the men who have been chosen with direct reference to the slavery issue; and if these last do not most egregiously disappoint the expectations of their constituents, we shall have a contest, on the question of SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, determined in favor of Northern Rights, and against slaveholding aggression.

Next to an election of President of the United States, the election of Speaker of the House of Representatives is the most important of any event upon the legislation of the country. It has always been the first step towards placing the control of Congress in the hands of the slave power. What honorable or useful result; to the North, or to the interests of Freedom, can be expected, for instance, from a Congress controlled like the present one? Let us see how its important committees are made up. In the Senate, the Presiding officer of which is David R. Atchinson, a Missouri slaveholder, the four most influential committees are those upon Foreign relations, upon Finance, upon the Judiciary, and upon Territories.

The Committee on Foreign Relations consists of Mr. Mason, of Virginia, slaveholder, Mr. Slidell, of Louisiana, slaveholder and filibuster, Mr. Clayton, of Delaware, slaveholder, Mr. Weller, of California, doughface, and Mr. Everett. Since Mr. E.'s resignation, we are not aware who is the

sixth member. On Finance, Messrs. Hunter, Badger, and Pearce, slaveholders; Bright, Gwin and Norris, doughfaces.

On the Judiciary, Messrs. Butler, Bayard, Toombs, and Geyer, slaveholders; Toucy and Pettit, doughfaces.

On the Territories, Messrs. Douglas, Houston, Johnson and Bell, slaveholders; Jones, of Iowa, doughface, and Mr. Everett.

The remarkable spectacle is here seen of a majority of slaveholders being placed on these important committees. It is useless, however, to expect a speedy reform in the Senate.

In the House, where a reform is confidently expected, there is quite as much need of as in the Senate. In this branch, Lynn Boyd, a Kentucky Slaveholder, presides. The principal committees are thus constituted.

On Ways and means, Messrs. Houston of Ala., Jones of Tenn., Stephens of Ga., Phelps of Mo., and Breckenridge of Ky., slaveholders; Hubbard of N. H., Robbins of Pa., the meanest of doughfaces, Haven of N. Y., a Fillmore pro-slavery whig, and Appleton of Mass., a gentleman who pretends to no anti-slavery sentiments that we are aware of.

On Foreign Affairs, Messrs. Stanton of Tenn., Caskie of Va., Kerr of N. C., and May of Md., slaveholders; Cutting of N. Y., Seymour of Conn., Wright of Pa., doughface; Meacham of Vermont, anti-slavery whig, and Parker of Ind., whig.

On Foreign Affairs, Messrs. Bayly of Va., Harris of Ala., Clingman of N. C., Preston of Ky., and Perkins of La., slaveholders; Ingersoll of Conn., and Shannon of Ohio, distinguished doughfaces; Chandler of Pa., and Dean of N. Y.

On Territories, Messrs. McQueen of S. C., Bailey of Geo., Smith of Va., Phelps of Ala., and Lamb of Mo., slaveholders; Richardson of Ill., Douglas's man Friday, Farley of Me., and Taylor of Ohio, whig doughfaces.—(Taylor being one of the three forever infamous Northern Whigs who voted for the Fugitive Slave Law.) and English of Ind., doughface, who went for the Nebraska Bill.

We respectfully ask the intelligent people of the North if this is not a singular spectacle. Every one of these Committees, Senate and House, has a slaveholding chairman, except the House Committee on Territories, which is engineered by Richardson. [We have classified Douglas among the slaveholders, though he embodies in himself the worst vices of both classes of the supporters of slavery.] Of the sixty members on these committees, not more than two, (Meacham of Vermont, and Parker of Ind.) have any particular regard for the North, or the interest of any except the slaveholding section of the country. The committees we have mentioned have a direct control of the most important questions which concern the country. The Cuba question, the St. Domingo question, all our Brazilian and South American interests are under the management of the Committee on Foreign Relations.—The Committee on Territories, constituted entirely, in both branches, of pro-slavery men, nine out of fifteen of them being themselves holders of slaves, have charge of the questions relating to the territories. The mischief they can do is seen in the Nebraska bill of last session. The Finance Committee have a majority of Slaveholders and not one anti-slavery man. Before them comes such questions as the President's demand, of last August, for ten millions of dollars for the purpose of making war upon Cuba. The Judiciary Committee find opportunities enough to serve power, and faithfully perform the business they are set to do.

[Bos. Eve. Telegraph.]

AN IMPOSITION EXPOSED.

To the Editor of the National Era:

I have but now been reading in a book just brought from Washington: “The Constitution of the United States of America, with an Alphabetical Analysis. By W. Hickey.” I presume you are familiar with this work, yet I must explain it a little.

Several names of renown, viz: Dallas, Davis, Taney, Wayne, Gibson, Breese, Cranch, Wright, Berrien, Clay, Cass, and Webster, pour their eulogistic oil upon the work. “Hundreds, thousands, and tens of thousands of copies of the work” are purchased by Congressmen for public use. Our member of Congress brings home a quantity. A neighbor of mine obtains a copy, and I am permitted to borrow and peruse it. Well, I have gone through the “authenticated” Constitution of the United States, and, bating the capital letters at the beginning of all “substantives or nouns,” I find that it reads very much like the old copy of that instrument which I have for

many years owned and consulted.

But next comes the “Analysis.” The general principle on which this is constructed is to select, in alphabetical order, some important word, place it in marginal line, and to the right give the sentence in the Constitution that contains the leading word, and the place where it may be found. I commenced reading this. Coming to the words “delivered up,” I am taken all aback, and lose my head-way. What is the cause of this? Why, the clause reads, “Persons held to service or labor, (or slaves,) escaping into other States, shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.”

Here the words “or slaves,” in the parenthesis, are a comment thrown in by the author. They are, first, uncalled for; the sentence without them gives the words “delivered up,” which answers the legitimate purpose of the “analysis.” 2d. This comment is false. There is no such word or being known to the Constitution as slaves; and the author well knew that the simple reading of the clause would convey no such idea; hence his officiousness in giving his own version of the subject. The very idea of service or labor being due from one person to another, involves the power of contracting such an obligation by two competent parties. Now, the chattel-property institution of slavery gives to the slave no such power of contracting a debt that would be obligatory, any more than they would give it to a horse. But here the service or labor set forth as the ground of the “claim,” must, in the nature of things, be the result of a compact between legitimate contracting powers; on no other ground can it become a debt, or “due.”

The author, in the dedication, quotes from Mr. Dallas the following words, viz: “The Constitution in its words is plain and intelligible, and is meant for the home-bred, unsophisticated understandings of our fellow citizens.” But our author, notwithstanding that he endorses these sentiments by quoting them, yet he will not trust them when slavery is to be made out, as the above addition of his own clearly shows. The same words, “or slaves,” are incorporated in the subjects indicated by the leading words “duty” and “escaping.” But our author grows more interested in his favorite theme as he progresses. We next find “fugitive slaves,” and, after that, “runaway slaves,” given as leaders to the subjects analyzed, none of which is given in the text, or warranted by it.

At the leading word, “service, or labor,” we are directed to “see slavery.” But where shall we look in order to see slavery? Not into the Constitution, to be sure it is not there; nay, but look further along in the “Analysis.” Aye, here it is; one, two, three, four, five times, in succession, in the word “slaves” set down as a leader to parts of the Constitution in which it is not named! By this time the sound of the word “slaves” must have become enchanting to our author, as appears by the number of times he repeats it, and the subjects with which he connects it.

Mr. Hickey has appealed to Mr. Dallas in the language we have quoted; we now invite him to consider that high authority for constitutional construction. Mr. Madison, wherein he says: “I think it wrong to admit the idea, in the Constitution, that there can be property in man.” In accordance with this view, neither the word nor the idea was admitted into that instrument, all the passages claimed for slavery being provisions of a general character; and if they embrace slaves at all, it can be but incidentally. But the author of this book has thus used his own die to stamp slavery on the Constitution, and this is the way that “Southern rights” are established, in reference to slavery or freedom—they assume what should be proven, and upon that assumption found their claims.

We deny, in the most positive manner, the legitimate application of the word “slave” or “slaves,” wherever it is used in the “Analysis,” as indicating the character of the clause with which it is connected; and this denial we have defended, “upon the face of the bond,” and rely upon our “home-bred fellow-citizens” to be sustained in our defense of liberty. L. S.

Will county, Illinois.

Wouldn't you call this the calf of a leg?” asked Bob, pointing to one of his nether limbs, rather compactly encased in representations of barber poles and running vines.

“No,” replied Jim, “I should say it was the leg of a calf!”

What the will of heaven ordains is good for all; and if for all, then good for thee.