

THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

SPEECH OF MR. CALHOUN OF S. CAROLINA.

WASHINGTON, March 4, 1850.

Mr. Calhoun having the floor, briefly stated his inability to address the Senate in person, and returned thanks for the courtesy which the Senate had extended him, in permitting him to have his views upon the great question of present agitation delivered by proxy. He then asked Mr. Mason to read his speech for him.

Mr. Mason then proceeded to read the speech. Mr. Calhoun commences by asking—"What can be done to save the Union?" It was necessary, first, to find the cause of the danger, before a remedy could be applied. The danger arose—first, from the discontent in all the Southern States, which commenced with the agitation of the slavery question and has continued ever since. The next question was—"What has caused the disunion?" It resulted from the belief on the part of the Southern States that they could not live in the Union, under the existing state of things, with safety to their honor and interests.

He proceeded next to show by statistics, that the equilibrium of the different sections of the Union has been lost, in consequence of the increase of population in the North; this state of affairs placed the control of the Government exclusively in the hands of the North—giving them a majority of the States, and a large majority in the population, which would be largely increased by the next census. In addition to this, the newly acquired territory would also add, speedily, at least five new States, which would be admitted to the North—while no additional territories were progressing in the South.

He next proceeded to show that the action of the Government has been such as to give control to sectional majority, by which the South has been deprived of its share in the territories. The first act having such effect, was the ordinance of 1787; the next, the Missouri compromise; and the last the act by which the South were excluded from Oregon. The result of all of which has been to exclude the South from three-fourths of the territory acquired by the federal government, giving her one-fourth only. The North had also unsettled the necessary equilibrium between the two sections, by adopting a system of revenue and disbursements which had imposed unequal burdens upon the South, to the advantage of the North. The action of Congress in the next place had resulted in a concentration of power in the federal government, to the manifest disturbing and violation of State rights. The result of all these series of measures, and this course of policy, was to give the North an ascendancy in every department of the Government.

He then proceeded to consider the views and feelings of the people of the North relative to the institution of slavery, which the South felt to be necessary to her social organization, and which he said was looked upon with greater or less hostility by the whole North—all the people of which felt bound, at least, to discontinue it—while they felt themselves impelled to defend it. He reviewed the course of the slavery agitation by the North—commencing with the first battle upon the right of petition, and coming down to the present day—for the purpose of showing that encroachments upon this point had been continued, gradual and always successful, until imminent danger to the Union had now arisen. He contended that from the first organized movement, the Abolitionists had continually increased in numbers, importunities and demands, until their work had reached a point which demanded immediate and earnest efforts for its arrest.

What, then, could be done to arrest its progress, and what could save the Union? Disunion would not be effected at a single blow. It was the work of time—for the cords which bind the Union were too numerous to be snapped all at once. One of the many chords which had bound the Union together was the religious cord—the sympathy between the associations of various religious denominations of both sections. The first of the cords which snapped was the Methodist Episcopal Church. The next, the division of the Baptists with two opposing sectional parties. The Presbyterian chord had not altogether given way, although some of its strands were broken. The Episcopal only of the four great denominations remained firm and unbroken—as a result of this agitation—(Mr. Calhoun makes no reference whatever to the Catholics.) The next great cord which had snapped was that of political party organization, which had held together until recently severed by the increased agitation. Again—"how could the Union be saved?" It could only be saved by adopting such measures as will satisfy the Southern States that they can remain in the Union with safety and honor to themselves.

It could not be saved by enjoining the Union, nor by appeals to the memory of Washington. Neither was there anything in the life or example of that distinguished man which would deter the South from seceding; on the contrary, there was much to encourage them to secession as a remedy for oppression and deprivation of their rights. Mr. Cass' plan, or the plan proposed by the Administration, could not save the Union. The latter was nothing but a modification of the Wilmot Proviso, and still more objectionable than that measure. Its very object was to deprive the South of its rightful participation in the territories.

Looking at the Constitutional question, he contended that the power of legislation for the territories is vested exclusively in Congress. In this view, the action of the people of California in forming a government for themselves, had usurped the power of Congress. Their conduct in this respect was revolutionary and rebellious in its character. He expressed his full conviction, that the people of California had been

influenced in their action by persons acting under the suggestion and authority of the Executive.

He also proceeded, with an effort, to show that the action of California, and the Executive proposition for her admission into the Union, was in direct violation of all the past action of Congress. What now would the Senate do? Much depended upon their action. If they admitted California into the Union, they would sanction all that she had done. Were Senators prepared, in admitting her, to surrender the Constitution, in view of their oaths to support the Constitution? He denied that there was any such State as California. It had no legal existence, and could not have without the sanction of Congress. They could not form a Constitution when Congress had not given them leave so to do. How could gentlemen on the Whig side of the chamber, after defeating the candidate of the Democratic party (Cass) at the late election—who took the ground that Congress had no power of legislation—now turn around and admit a State upon the ground that she had exercised this very power which had been denied in the Presidential contest? How could those gentlemen who voted on the Oregon question against the position that Congress had the sole and absolute power of legislating for the Territories now propose to sanction a course directly the reverse? What did all this mean? Were they to conclude that the exclusion of the South from the territory acquired from Mexico, as an object of such paramount importance, that right, justice, consistency, and the Constitution, must all yield thereto? There was but one way by which the Union could be saved, and that was by the full and final settlement—upon the principles of justice—of all the questions at issue between the two sections.

The South asked for simple justice—less than that she ought not to take. She had no compromise to offer but the Constitution, and could make no surrender or concession. By satisfying the South, she could remain honorably and safely in the Union, and thereby restoring tranquility. Could this be done? Yes, easily—not by the weaker party—for it could not protect itself—but the stronger. The North had only to do justice by conceding to the South a participation in the territories—her duty by causing the arrest and delivery of fugitive slaves—by ceasing the agitation of the slavery question, and to provide an amendment of the Constitution, such as would restore to the South the power to protect herself, which she possessed before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of the government. Would the North agree to this? Yes, if her love for the Union was half as great as her professions. At all events, the responsibility of saving the Union rested on the North and not upon the South. The South could not save it by any sacrifice of hers, and the North might save it without sacrifice. If the question was not now settled, there was no telling when it would be. If you, said Mr. Calhoun, cannot agree to settle these questions on the principle of justice and duty, say so, and let the States we represent agree to separate—part in peace. If you are unwilling we should part in peace, tell us so, and we shall know what to do when you reduce the question to submission or resistance. If you remain silent, you will compel us to infer what you intend. In that case California will become the test question. If you admit her under all the difficulties that oppose her admission, you compel us to infer that you intend to exclude us from the whole of the acquired territories, with the intention of destroying irrevocably the equilibrium between the two sections. We would be blind not to perceive that in that case that your real objects are power and aggrandizement, and infatuated not to act accordingly. In conclusion he repeated that he had all along endeavored to repel these aggressions of the North by arresting the agitation, with the intention of saving the Union, if possible—and if not, to save the section where his lot had been cast. Having done his duty, let what would come, he would be free from all responsibility.

SPEECH OF MR. WEBSTER.

WASHINGTON, March 7, 1850.

Mr. Webster rose, and after expressing his obligations to Mr. Walker and to Mr. Seward, for having yielded the floor to him, proceeded to address the Senate. He rose, he said, not as a Southern man or a Northern man, but as an American. He hoped to discharge his duty with fidelity, with the hope that the storm which was now raging in the land would be lulled. He spoke for the preservation of the Union—with an anxious heart for the restoration of that quiet and happiness so necessary to the prosperity and happiness of the country. These were his objects, and if he could do ever so little for them, his end would be accomplished.

He proceeded to consider the events which had led to the present difficulties, commencing with a relation of the war with Mexico—its battles, triumphs and results—one of which closed the war. Prior to these negotiations, the people of California, assisted, perhaps, by officers and people of the United States, revolted against the Government of Mexico, and ran up an independent flag. The result was that a tide of emigration set towards San Francisco from every country of the world. The rich and apparently inexhaustible gold mines of California were subsequently discovered, and this new wonder had increased to a wonderful degree the emigration to those distant shores.

He referred, next, to the failure of Congress to provide a territorial government for the people of this new territory, and said that, in this state of things, those people had taken measures to establish a local government—elected senators and representatives, and sent them here, with

their Constitution, to ask an immediate admission into the Union. This Constitution, thus adopted, and now presented here, containing a clause prohibiting slavery in the new State, which provision it was that had given rise to the opposition now made to her admission. Whatever was believed to be the object or manner of the commencement of the war with Mexico, it would generally be conceded that it was carried on with a view to the acquisition of territory. Territory was acquired; but the natural expectation that it would be slave territory was disappointed, by the action of the people of the territory itself.

Mr. Webster then went into a historical consideration of the institution of slavery, from the earliest ages to the present time. The ancients did not justify slavery, upon the ground that the more intelligent, and therefore the stronger, were superior to the weaker. The Roman philosophers and Jesuits defended the institution of slavery upon the international law—arguing rightly that the conventional law of nations admitted that the captives of war, whose lives according to the notion of that day, were at the mercy of the captors, might, in return for their lives, be made slaves for life—the obligation also resting upon their posterity. He also contended, by the civil law, that there might be slavery.

First, as a result of the voluntary act of an individual who sells himself into slavery. Second, as a consequence of debt. Third, for crime.

Bringing the matter down to the Christian era, he alluded, at some length, to the feeling in a large portion of the community—of the conscientious belief that slavery is a sin, and incompatible with the Christian sentiments of brotherly kindness. He expressed his own belief that there was an honest belief of this character. There were men in the community who, in the too hot pursuit of one duty, forgot that there are many other duties which they overlook. Therefore, men who suppose that they could distinguish between right and wrong, with the certainty of an algebraic equation—men who thought nothing good that is not perfect—those, who, if they see a spot upon the sun, consider that a good reason for striking the sun from heaven. There were men too impatient to wait for the slow and gradual working of great moral causes. They forget that the miracles of Christ, in eighteen hundred years, have covered but a small portion of the world. It was this state of feeling which had done much towards creating the present difficulty. What was the feeling on the part of the most eminent public men in relation to the institution of slavery? It was formerly denounced throughout the country—not as cruel and inhuman—but as a political evil—injuringly substituting slave for free labor, and consequently the most eminent public men commented with great acerbity upon the conduct of the mother country, who, to favor the navigator, inflicted the evil upon the colonies. The question in the early days of the government was not whether slavery was an evil. This was admitted. The question was how the evil should be dealt with. It was thought its day would be shortened by prohibiting the importation of slaves, and a proposition was introduced to prohibit such importation twenty years hence. This time was objected to by Mr. Madison, among other prominent Southern men, as being too long. He feared, as he said, that too much of this evil would be introduced. If so, much opportunity was allowed. It would be observed, that the word "slavery" was not made use of in the Constitution—perhaps, in consequence of the feelings expressed by Mr. Madison, when he did not want to see the institution of slavery recognised in the Constitution.

Mr. Webster thought that there were two historical truths which must be clear to all.

First—There was an expectation, formerly, that upon the suppression of the importation of slaves, slavery would begin to run out.

Second—That so far as there was any power in Congress to prevent the spread of slavery in the United States, it would use it in the most absolute and decided manner. He alluded to the ordinance prohibiting slavery in the Northwest Territory. Mr. Calhoun had said that "this was the first of the series of measures calculated to weaken the South." He desired to say, in reply, that the ordinance was passed with the unanimous consent of the South—there being but one vote against it—and that one, a representative from the North. Since that time there had been a great change in opinion, both North and South. Slavery was not now regarded by the South as it then was. There had been a continual and growing opinion in the North against slavery, and a growing opinion in the South in its favor. Now it was considered an institution of great interest and value to her prosperity.

This state of things resulted from causes which would always produce like effects. The interests of men—the change of opinion in the South—had resulted, in a great measure, from the growth and increase of cotton raising in the South. It was well known that in 1794, the value of cotton exported from the United States did not exceed fifty thousand dollars; while now, under favorable circumstances, its value was, perhaps, one hundred millions of dollars per annum. In those days there were more of wax, indigo, and almost any thing else exported from the South than cotton.

Indeed, he was told, that when Jefferson negotiated the treaty of 1794 with England, he did not know that cotton was raised in this country at all, and when the first shipment of cotton reached a port in England, and was sought to be admitted

there, under the provisions of the treaty, it was objected to upon the ground that it could not be an American product, as no cotton was raised there. England would hardly say that now.

Mr. Webster replied to Mr. Calhoun's objection that the operations of the government had been against the South and was calculated to weaken her. He contended that the contrary was the fact, so far as the legitimate effect of Legislation was concerned. Indeed, much direct legislation had been adopted expressly for the benefit of the South. In support of this proposition he recurred to the voting of the admission of Louisiana and Alabama, and commented at great length upon the admission of Texas. He referred especially to the action of the democracy of the North, in relation to Texas, and incidentally to the course pursued by the same party in the Senate. When at the commencement of the war with Mexico, Mr. Berrien introduced a proposition in the Senate to the effect that it should not be prosecuted with a view to the acquisition of territory, this northern democracy failed entirely to support it—thus indicating clearly their opposition to such sentiments.

It suited those gentlemen to bring into the country a world in the valleys and mountains of California and New Mexico, and to put upon it the saving grace of the Wilmot Proviso.

Returning to the question of the admission of Texas, he related his own position thereon, quoting from his speeches and acts, to show that he had always been opposed to it—because he knew that whoever possessed Texas, it would be a slave territory, and he was unwilling to extend that institution. He had time and again expressed himself strongly opposed to the introduction of any new slave States, or the acquisition of slave territories. Upon that point he knew no change in his sentiments at the present time. He had, on one occasion, he believed, expressed himself against the acquisition of any more territory—North, South, East or West. He had expressed his belief in the Spartan maxim—"improve, adorn what you have—seek no farther." But what was our present condition? Texas had been admitted with all her territory, with the institution of Slavery, and an irreparable law, by which, if new States are erected out of any portion of her territory, they should be slave States; and he wished it to be distinctly understood that he considered this government solemnly bound by law to create new slave territory out of Texas, when she shall contain a population sufficient. Slavery was excluded from California and New Mexico by a law of nature, which had erected impassable barriers to its introduction there. This he considered a fixed fact. That that country was to be free, was settled by the arrangement of Providence, and could not be changed. Regarding this as a fixed fact, he would say that he would not vote for the insertion into any bill giving territorial governments to the new territories, of any provision prohibiting slavery there—any re-eractment of the will of God. He would put into it no Wilmot Proviso—nothing that was so useless and nugatory. He meant to stand or fall upon the proposition that every foot of the territory in this country has a character, fixed and irreparable, and which cannot be changed in any view. In this connection, he said, that the proviso, in the case of Oregon, was nugatory and senseless, and observed that if there was any of the Northern democracy who now desired to put a Wilmot Proviso into an act giving government to California, he supposed that the same man would feel it necessary to assert the same principle for the purpose of saving the snow-clad hills of Canada from the foot of the slave, in case she shall be annexed. The provision would be quite as necessary and proper in one case as the other. In the next place Mr. Webster proceeded to consider the complaint made by each section of the Union against the other—beginning with the complaints of the South, and passing over that in relation to the manner of collecting and disbursing the revenue. He alluded to the difficulty arising from the failure of the North to give proper aid in the capture and delivery up of fugitive slaves. In this, he thought the North in the wrong and the South right. It was a cause of complaint upon the part of the South, and one which the North ought to remove. The duty was imposed by the Constitution, and it was not consistent with morality, for Northern men and Legislatures to attempt to evade this provision. Congress ought to pass some law removing the evil. For one, he designed supporting the bill (Mason's) now pending in the Senate, having that object in view. In connection with this point, he made some remarks upon the propriety of Legislative instructions, objecting to them, and saying in effect, that if instructions should be sent to him in relation to any matter affecting the interests of the country, he should pay no more regard to them than he would if appointed an arbitrator to decide some matter in dispute between individuals, to the instructions of him who appointed him. Considering, in the next place, the agitation in the North, complained of by the South, he said he had no doubt but that during the last twenty years, money enough had been subscribed in the North for abolition presses, societies and lecturers, to purchase the freedom of every slave in the land—but unfortunately, he believed the sympathies of these societies had never been extended in that direction. He valued highly the freedom of the press, yet it was, unfortunately, true, that the press was frequently prostituted, and evil articles were frequently found in the papers, having a mischievous and irritating tendency; as there were such expressions in many speeches made in the Houses of Congress. Indeed, he must say that the vernacular of the country had been greatly vitiated and

depraved by the character of the speeches in Congress. After administering a rebuke to persons for having compared the absolute ignorance of slavery with the independent, educated free labor of the North, he eloquently considered the question of the dissolution of the Union, scouting the idea of peaceful secession. Could any man be so foolish as to expect such a miracle? Could any one dream of the breaking up of this great country, without convulsing the upheaving of the waters of the mighty deep—without disturbing the surface? But what was to be the result of disunion? Where and how was the line to be drawn? What was to become of the States? What was to become of him? Where was the flag to remain? Where the eagle to soar—or was it to shrink and fall to the ground. The spirit of our ancestors—our very children and grandchildren would cry "shame!" if we allow these ensigns of our nation to trail in the dust. For one, he would rather hear of national blast and mildew, or war, pestilence and famine, than to hear men talk of secession. He alluded also to the southern convention. He was bound to believe gentlemen designed assembling there for the purpose of considering matters for the safety, perpetuity and prosperity of the Republic. If they had any design of considering any projects of secession, he would only say that they had been inappropriate in their choice of a place of meeting, when they selected Nashville. It was said once, that if King William could have heard of the conclusion of the peace of Amiens, he would have turned in his coffin. The same expression might well be applied to the case of the proposition of secession talked of over the grave of Andrew Jackson. In conclusion, Mr. Webster delivered a most impassioned and eloquent tribute to the value of the Union, and the spirit of patriotism and philanthropy which would maintain it.

THE GAZETTE.

LEWISTOWN, PA.

FRIDAY EVENING, March 15, 1850.

TERMS: ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE. For six months, 75 cents. All NEW subscriptions must be paid in advance. If the paper is continued, and not paid within the first month, \$1.25 will be charged; if not paid in three months, \$1.50; if not paid in six months, \$1.75; and if not paid in nine months, \$2.00.

A number of new advertisements appear to-day, to which attention is requested. Dr. J. B. MITCHELL has opened a new Drug Establishment, and also offers his services as a Physician. Some Philadelphia advertisements are unavoidably postponed until next week.

Appointment by the Governor.

GEORGE W. HARRIS, Esq., of Harrisburg, Reporter to the Supreme Court. Mr. HARRIS is a highly respectable member of the Dauphin County Bar, a gentleman of irreproachable character and fine business abilities, and withal a firm and consistent whig. Such appointments will meet the approbation of the people, and reflect honor upon the judgment of Governor Johnston.

We have not room this week for the testimony of Thos. J. Power, late Superintendent on the Portage Railroad, before the Investigating Committee, but he completely exonerates Mr. Bail, the State Treasurer, from all censure, and digs into the ribs of his brother locofoco by stating that since he has been on the road, he was never positively refused money at the Treasury except on one occasion, and that was in July, 1848, when Mr. ARNOLD FLEMMER was Treasurer.

Mr. MARVIN, a gentleman who possesses peculiar qualifications for imparting a knowledge of music to the young of both sexes, has been giving a series of lessons to a class of a hundred or more, and wound up the twelfth lesson on Tuesday last by a Concert at the Presbyterian Church. By request another was given on Thursday evening. The singing was remarkably good, and the large audience in attendance were astonished, as well as delighted, at the proficiency made.

Destructive fires continue to occur in various parts of the country. At St. Louis on the 10th two fires destroyed property valued at \$183,000. At Buffalo, New York, on the same day, the most beautiful part of that city was laid in ruins—loss \$300,000. At Carlisle, on Tuesday last week, the warehouse of Mr. Saxton was consumed, with some smaller buildings near it. On the 4th, the steam grist mill of Painter & Davis, at Uniontown, in this State, was entirely destroyed by fire.

Pennsylvania Legislature.

In the Senate, a bill has been passed giving the Seventh Day Baptists the right to enjoy their Sunday, and on evidence of church membership are relieved from all liability for labor performed on the first day of the week, provided they do not disturb others. The bill authorizing the erection of a Poor House in Millin county has also passed final reading. The following nominations of Associate Judges were confirmed:

- Benj. F. Purnoy, Schuylkill county.
- Wm. Waugh, Mercer county.
- Chas. T. Whippo, Lawrence county.
- Levi J. Nichols, Tioga county.
- James Harrison, Union county.
- Augustus O. Heister, Dauphin county.
- John McCandless and Samuel Marshall, Butler county.
- George H. Willetts, Columbia county.
- John F. Dentler, Northumberland county.
- William Vankirk, Washington county.
- Jacob Kirk, Jr., York county.
- Paul S. Preston, Wayne county.

In the House, the Apportionment Bill, after being shaped to locofoco taste, passed final reading on Wednesday. Its character can be inferred from its authors.

From California—The Junata Company.

The following letter from a well known member of the Junata Company to David McClure, Esq., of this place, will be read with general interest:

SAN FRANCISCO, January 4, 1850. DEAR SIR—Your very welcome letters of May and June last were received by me at the Mines some time during the month of September, and although the contents were some three or four months old, yet they did not afford me the less pleasure on that account. To me they came as messengers bearing glad tidings, for they told me the news of home. The mines where I was at work are some two hundred miles from this city; and in a new country you are aware that this is no short journey to the post office, especially as the Express to and from the mines is, for at least eighty miles, an ox team. This, in a great measure, accounts for the delay in getting letters from the States. I readily admit that I have to long delayed answering your letters, and would attempt to apologize for my apparent neglect, were it not that by doing so I should consume a greater portion of my time with excuses uninteresting to you. The truth of the matter, however, is that I had intended to be in San Francisco two or three months ago, and had purposely deferred writing until my arrival here.

In the month of July myself and companions left this city for the mines near the Stanislaus river, one of the tributaries of the San Joaquin. We first went to Woods' Diggings, situated some ten miles south of that river, and were there about one month, but had poor luck, as we did not realize more than \$3 or \$4 per day for each person. Owing to dissatisfaction on the part of some members of the company, they seceded from it; and, like every other one that has come to California, the Junata Company died a natural death, and each member went to work for himself. Being dissatisfied with Woods' Diggings, every member of the Company went to what is called "Murphy's New Diggings," situated about thirteen miles from the Stanislaus, and on the north side of that river. At these diggings Messrs. Salisbury, Scott, Campbell, Vandling and Morrow (the first four of those who seceded from the Company) worked together, and had collected at the time I left the mines (Nov. 29, 1849) about \$1500 a piece—at least they gave me to understand that they had got about that amount. They are still at those diggings, and have a stock of goods to sell to the miners in the neighborhood. Duncan and Hays worked together until the middle of December, and made, I presume, \$500 or \$1000 each. Duncan is now here, and Hays was here also, until a week ago, when he went up to Sacramento city. Beck got perfectly sick of hard digging, and abandoned it in disgust in the month of August. He came down here and got a situation in the police department (he's a locofoco now) that pays him \$300 or \$400 per annum and picking up Levis sickened at "de shoo and de hoe," and sloped for San Francisco about the same time that Beck went. He is now engaged in sawing lumber with the whip saw, about eight miles from this city, and has been so engaged for some months. I saw him since I came here, and he told me that he likes it better than any business he has ever been engaged in. He says that while the boards keep their present value (\$300 per thousand feet) he and his partner can each make \$200 per week. E. J. Smith was not very well during part of the time he was in the mines, and was not at all successful. He is now in the city, and has a situation in the police department, which yields him \$210 per month. This is certainly low wages in California; but I presume Smith will retain it until something better offers. Dr. Hammond kept a small store in Murphy's Diggings for about two months, and made \$700 or \$800. He is now a clerk in the office of the State Treasurer, at a salary of \$300 per month. James G. Smith, the quondam barber, of Lewistown, or "Jim the jewel," as we used to call him, was but a short time in the mines, and has again taken to the laudable occupation of scraping countenances and cropping hair, at five cents a shave and one dollar for cutting hair. He is up at San Jose, (pronounced *San Hoozy*, the letter *j* in Spanish being always sounded like the English letter *j*.) the capital of the State. I hope Jim will do well, although I always thought he acted imprudently in leaving a comfortable home in Lewistown.

Now let me come to the last, but by no means the least, personage in the famous company—the "big Junata." I mean no other person than myself. After the final dissolution of the company, my brother and myself worked together three months, when I left for this city. During that time I realized, by hard, honest labor, between \$1600 and \$1700 over and above all expenses of living, and my brother about the same. Upon the whole, I think we have been the most lucky of the company, and I am glad to say, although I cannot say that any of us have done as well as we expected before we left the States. My brother thought it best to stay at the diggings during the winter. He is living in a comfortable log house with Salisbury, Scott, et al. As for myself, I have come to the conclusion to try my old profession (the law) once more; and have accordingly rented an office about 10 by 12 feet, in the back part of a building in the public square of the city. The office is by no means as good and comfortable as my old one in Lewistown—and what do you think I pay for this office? Why, only \$200 per month, or \$2400 a year; and then it is to be paid quarterly in advance. I rented only for three months from the 1st of January, and paid \$600 for the time. Front offices in the same building rent for \$300 per month. By-the-by, when men here talk about rents, and say that such and such a building rents for \$300 or \$500 or \$1000, they mean that it rents for that sum per month, and not per annum, as you say in the States. There are many houses in this city that rent for more than \$100,000 per annum, although the same houses and lots might perhaps be bought for \$200,000, or at most for \$300,000—houses that are by no means as good as some in Lewistown. Thus you will perceive that landlords calculate upon their rents paying for the price of house and lot in one or two years. These exorbitant rents must, however, come down, as a great many new houses have been built in the city and are now offered for rent. These things may appear incredible to you sober minded men in the States; but they are true, nevertheless.

You would, of course, conclude that money here is very abundant; and so it is—and that, too, in nothing but silver and gold; and yet the usual rates of interest for borrowed money is ten per cent per month, or one hundred and twenty per cent per annum. This state of things cannot last, however, as I believe that there must be a great revulsion in this wild system of speculation and gambling. Some things at one time can be bought at lower prices than in the States, and then again they will go up out of all reason. For instance flour: one month ago it was worth \$40 per barrel, now it is not worth more than \$6 or \$8. Just so everything goes. The demand regulates everything, and men will give almost anything for an article they want. Thick soled boots, before the rainy season, sold for \$4 and \$10—now they sell for \$30 and \$40, and even some a piece were \$50. Two months hence they likely will not be worth \$5. So we go on. Indeed it is almost impossible to write a satisfactory account about markets, business, &c., for before the ink on a letter is dry, prices, a change takes place, and the letter cannot convey the true state of affairs. You men who do business by calculation and rule would be bewildered here; and I assure you it is amusing to hear the green-horns talk and wonder when they first land on our shores, "fresh from the ranks of the people." Here every one is, in some sense, a gambler. The miner hopes for luck as in a lottery; so the speculator, merchant, business, &c., are all are mad with excitement, and bent upon getting rich. Of course all these things must have a demoralizing tendency, and what they will ultimately lead to God only knows. It will be some time before we can have anything like stability and regularity in business transactions. Every