# Intelligencer & Journal.

**Lancaster, March 9, 1852.**

GEO. SANDERSON, EDITOR.

FOR PRESIDENT:

# JAMES BUCHANAN,

*(Subject to the decision of the National Convention.)*

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER:

## William Searight,

*OF FAYETTE COUNTY.*

☞ An interesting correspondence between a number of the prominent Democrats of Baltimore (who had invited him to a public dinner) and Mr. BUCHANAN, will be found on our first page. The Baltimore *Argus*, Washington *Union*, Richmond *Enquirer*, and several other leading Democratic papers, have all spoken in the highest terms of Mr. B's letter. We recommend the correspondence to the attention of all our readers.

☞ The third and last of the series of letters on Slavery, Abolitionism, &c., will be found in our columns to-day. Its great length should prevent no one from giving it a careful perusal.

Having now disposed of this correspondence, we shall be able, next week, to resume our usual variety.

### William Searight, Esq.

This gentleman, who is now the Democratic nominee for Canal Commissioner, is represented by those who enjoy his personal acquaintance, to be peculiarly well qualified to fill the station with credit to himself and to the advantage of the public. Of easy and agreeable manners, of sound and discriminating judgment, mature years, and of great energy and business tact, he is just such a man as should be placed over the public improvements of the Commonwealth. Added to which, his acknowledged personal popularity and political integrity are a sure guarantee that he will be elected by an overwhelming majority.

His success in October next is already a foregone conclusion. The Convention, we are sure, could not have selected a more popular or available candidate for the responsible station of Canal Commissioner. Mr. SEARIGHT hails from Fayette county.

☞ We have seen the plan and design of the contemplated new German Reformed Church, which is to be erected during the ensuing season on the site of the old building, in East Orange street. If the design is carried out, of which we have no doubt, the Church edifice will be a beautiful specimen of architecture, and will add very much to that portion of our thriving little city. The Church is to have two spires. The drawing can be seen at the Marble Room of Mr. LEWIS HALDY, in North Queen street.

☞ We have received several numbers of a valuable little monthly, edited and published at Washington City by P. G. Washington and C. Alexander, Esqrs., entitled "The United States Postal Guide." To Postmasters it will be a most valuable publication, as in it they can see at a glance their multifarious duties, and be instructed how to perform them. It is also an abbreviated record of the various departments of the Government, and contains a large amount of matter that will be interesting to the general reader. The principal editor, Mr. Washington. was, for many years, Auditor of the Treasury for the Post Office Department, and is intimately acquainted with all the ramifications of of that important branch of the public service.

The price of the "Postal Guide" is $1 per annum.

☞ The Ice Bridge over the Susquehanna, at Havre de Grace, lasted fifty-two days during the months of January and February, during which time 1,378 freight cars passed over the railroad track laid upon it. The cars were taken across by two horses attached to each, and not a single accident occurred during the whole time. The charter for the road having expired by nature's limitation, the Marylanders are now talking seriously about constructing a bridge at that point which may be permanent.

### Small Notes in Maryland.

Speaking of the action of the Legislature of Maryland, which is intended to prevent the circulation of foreign small notes in that State, the Philadelphia *Argus* has the following remarks:

If any one fact more than another, will exhibit the folly and madness of the scheme now pending in our Legislature, to allow the use of notes of less denomination than five dollars issued by Banks of other States to circulate in Pennsylvania, it is the one that we have stated at the head of this article. So convinced have our sister States become of the wisdom of the prohibition Statute of Pennsylvania, that they are obtaining from their own Legislatures similar laws to project them from this imposition. All the merchants and business men in our city and county, as well as in the whole middle, western and southern part of the State, are in favor of the law as it now stands, and are not willing that a few of the counties bordering on the State of New York, and whose representatives seem to have an eye to the advantages of a border currency shall unite with the discontents, and introduce again into our markets the issue of other States. Whatever small inconvenience was experienced at the onset of this prohibition in our State for the want of change, has long since passed away; and now we have a sure and reliable currency, blurred only by our own Relief issues, which we hope soon to see removed from the community by some means that will be the most practical and at the same time most effectual.

J. B. BAKER, Esq.—During our recent visit to Philadelphia, we had the pleasure of an introduction to the above named gentleman, who is the young and talented Superintendant of the Philadelphia and Columbia Rail Road. Our personal acquaintance with Mr. Baker, has been limited, but we learn from persons who know him well, that his character is that of an energetic business man, possessing superior business qualifications, combined with gentlemanly deportment, and steadfast integrity.—With such men to manage our State improvements, the interests of the Commonwealth, will always be safely guarded, and matured. The appointment gives general satisfaction and is alike creditable to the Board, and to the merits of the person appointed.—*Juniata Register.*

### Canal Commissioner.

The following is the vote of the Delegates from this County, on the several ballots for Canal Commissioner:

FIRST BALLOT.

Messrs. Bunn, Hamilton and Lightner, voted for JOHN CUMMINGS.
Mr. Patterson voted for WILLIAM SEARIGHT.
Mr. Reynolds " " JOHN B. BRATTON.
Mr. Stambaugh " " HENRY S. MOTT.

SECOND BALLOT.

Messrs. Bunn, Hamilton and Lightner, voted for JOHN CUMMINGS.
Mr. Patterson voted for WILLIAM SEARIGHT.
Mr. Reynolds " " JOHN B. BRATTON.
Mr. Stambaugh " " HENRY S. MOTT.

THIRD BALLOT.

Messrs. Bunn and Hamilton voted for JOHN CUMMINGS.
Messrs. Lightner and Patterson " WILLIAM SEARIGHT.
Messrs. Reynolds and Stambaugh " " JOHN B. BRATTON.

FOURTH BALLOT.

Mr. Bunn voted for John B. Bratton.
Messrs. Hamilton, Lightner, Patterson, Reynolds and Stambaugh, voted for WILLIAM SEARIGHT.

TERRIBLE OCCURRENCE IN BALTIMORE.—On Friday evening last, James White, a shoemaker, while drunk, cuts the throats of his daughter, aged fifteen years, his little son, aged three years, and then, after setting fire to the house, cut his own throat. The bodies of the three were burned to a crisp. The wife of White had left him a few days previous, in consequence of his intemperance.

### The State Convention--Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. BUCHANAN is now, as he has been for the last ten years, the favorite candidate of Pennsylvania for the Presidency. The State Convention which met at Harrisburg on Thursday last, with remarkable unanimity have presented his name to the Democracy of the Nation, and now ask their brethren of the other States of the Union to do simple justice to the long neglected claims of the Keystone State. Since her Revolutionary statesmen, she has, perhaps, had no man of pre-eminent abilities to offer for the Presidency, but Mr. BUCHANAN, to whom is awarded, by common consent of friend and foe, talents of the very highest order. By force of his own industry and indomitable energy, he has risen from the condition of a poor boy, to be the acknowledged head of the Democratic party of his native State, and in point of experience and profound statesmanship is not surpassed, if equalled, throughout the length and breadth of the Republic. To rise to the highest eminence in a great State like Pennsylvania, where there are so many aspiring men, and where so many interests come into conflict with each other, is evidence of an unbounded popularity with the masses, and shows an affection on the part of the people which is as rare as it is well placed. We have had other men of ability in the State, but Mr. BUCHANAN is the "noblest Roman of them all"—has a faster hold on the popular mind, and in all the elements that constitute a great statesman is a head and shoulders above his contemporaries.

Such is the favorite candidate that Pennsylvania presents for the Presidency, and such is the distinguished statesman that she asks her sister commonwealths to nominate for the Chief Magistracy of the Republic. Will she present his name in vain to the National Convention? Will that body turn a cold shoulder upon her, and say by its action that the Old Keystone will do well enough as a "hewer of wood and drawer of water," but that she is not worthy to furnish a standard bearer for the Democracy of the Nation. We cannot believe it.—On the contrary, we have a strong, and an abiding faith that our brethren of the north, the east, the south and the west will concede the candidate to this ancient Commonwealth, and that Mr. BUCHANAN, if he lives, will be the next President of the United States.

The Resolutions of the State Convention are ably drawn—setting forth the claims of Pennsylvania and the qualifications of our candidate in a strong and forcible light, which cannot fail to have a happy effect throughout the Union. We shall publish the proceedings entire in our next issue; in the mean time we give the following synopsis of them, which will give our readers an idea of what has been done:

HARRISBURG, March 4.—The Democratic State Convention met in the hall of the House of Representatives at 11 o'clock.

Judge Wm. S. Ross, of Luzerne, was elected temporary Chairman, and the Convention proceeded to consider the contested seats of delegates in numerical order. The Erie and Crawford district case being the first in order, on a motion that the contestants be permitted to state their claims, a great variety of amendments were proposed and much discussion prevailed, and the chair evidently became bothered. The motion to hear both sides finally prevailed, limiting the speakers to twenty minutes. Mr. Lowrie advocated his claims, and Mr. McArthur replied. Much discussion followed and numerous motions were made; much excitement prevailed; an angry altercation ensued between Mr. Lowrie, Judge Gillis and others, during which there was much disorder, hissing, stamping and applauding. After the passage of a resolution in reference to the permanent organization of the Convention, a motion for adjournment prevailed, to meet at three o'clock this afternoon.

AFTERNOON SESSION.—The Convention assembled at 3 o'clock. The consideration of contested seats was continued and concluded.

The Chairman of the Committee on Organization reported the Hon. William Hopkins, of Washington county, as President of the Convention, and a large number of Vice Presidents and Secretaries.

The President upon taking the Chair, made an eloquent and somewhat lengthy address.

Mr. Hirst, from Philadelphia, presented a resolution to the effect, that this Convention proceed to vote *viva voce* for a candidate to be presented to the National Convention for President, and that the one receiving a majority of the votes of this Convention shall be the choice of Pennsylvania.

The roll being called, resulted as follows:—Jas. Buchanan received 98 votes; Lewis Cass, 31 votes; Samuel Houston, 2; and Robert J. Walker, 2.

It was then moved by Mr. Searight that the Convention unanimously concur in the nomination of James Buchanan. The yeas being called, were, 103 yeas, 30 nays. This vote created considerable sensation.

A resolution was offered, authorizing the President of the Convention to appoint a committee of one for each congressional district, to report to the Convention, subject to its approbation, the names of Delegates to represent this State in the National Convention; and that no one should be nominated who is not known to be the firm friend of Mr. Buchanan, and having no other preference; which was amended by Mr. Scott, of Huntingdon, to the effect that the Delegates from the several congressional districts be requested to report to this Convention the name of one person from each district, as a Delegate to the Baltimore Convention, to nominate candidates for President and Vice President. A very exciting and animated debate upon this question ensued, pending which the Convention adjourned, to meet at 7½ o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.—The Convention met at 7½ o'clock.

The discussion on the resolution and amendment, in reference to the appointment of Delegates to the Baltimore Convention, was resumed and continued. Many warm speeches were made on both sides, after which, the amendments were all voted down by most decisive votes, and the original resolution adopted by a vote of 91 to 41. The chair declined to vote.

Mr. Scott, of Huntingdon, on behalf of himself and others, presented a paper, signed by twenty-four delegates, protesting, in the most emphatic and decided terms against the action of the majority, and expressing a determination to decline participating any further in the selection of delegates to the National Convention. The paper is quite lengthy, and the language exceedingly strong.

Mr. Hirst moved to refer it to a committee of five members. The motion was violently opposed by the Cass delegates, who denounced it as an attempt to stifle the protest.

Mr. Hirst defended his motion and it finally prevailed, and the President announced Mr. Hirst as Chairman of the Committee.

A Committee, consisting of seven members, Mr. Hugus, Chairman, was appointed to prepare resolutions, to be submitted to the action of the Convention.

The Convention then adjourned, to meet at 11½ o'clock, to-morrow morning.

SECOND DAY'S SESSION.

HARRISBURG, March 5th.

The Convention met at a quarter past eleven o'clock.

Mr. Hirst, from the Committee appointed for that purpose, reported the names of 54 delegates to represent the State in the National Democratic Convention to meet at Baltimore. Also, the names of twenty-seven gentlemen as electors.

DELEGATES TO BALTIMORE.

SENATORIAL.

James Campbell, Philadelphia.
Samuel W. Black, Pittsburg.
David R. Porter, Harrisburg.
J. Porter Brawley, Meadville.

FROM THE STATE AT LARGE.

A. H. Reeder, Northampton.
Luther Kidder, Luzerne.

Con. Dist.

1. Robert Tyler, Robert T. Carter.
2. James C. Van Dyke, Chambers M'Kibben.
3. Samuel D. Patterson, John G. Brenner.
4. Peter Rambo, Henry Leech.
5. John B. Sterigere, Jacob S. Yost.
6. Charles W. Cooper, James W. Wilson.
7. John A. Morrison, P. Frazer Smith.
8. James L. Reynolds, William Mathiot.
9. Charles Kessler, William M. Heister.
10. J. L. Ringwalt, John F. Lord.
11. H. B. Wright, S. S. Winchester.
12. John Blanding, C. L. Ward.
13. A. D. Wilson, William L. Dewart.
14. Jonn Weidman, Isaac G. M'Kinley.
15. Henry Welsh, James Gerry.
16. George W. Brewer, John Stuart.
17. S. E. Hench, A. S. Wilson.
18. R. P. Flenniken, Isaac Hugus.
19. Job Mann, J. M. Burrell.
20. Thomas Cunningham, R. Donaldson.
21. David Lynch, Mathew J. Stewart.
22. Arnold Plumer, James E. M'Farlane.
23. J. L. Gillis, J. Y. James,
24. Alfred Gilmore, J. Forney.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

George W. Woodward, Luzerne.
Wilson M'Candless, Alleghany.
Gen. Robert Patterson, Philadelphia.

Con. Dist.

1. Peter Logan, Philadelphia City.
2. George Martin, City and County.
3. John Hiller, " "
4. F. W. Buckius, " "
5. R. M'Kay, Delaware.
6. A. Apple, Bucks.
7. Nimrod Strickland, Chester.
8. Abraham Peters, Lancaster
9. David Fisher, Berks.
10. R. E. James, Northampton.
11. John M'Reynolds, Columbia.
12. P. Damon, Tioga.
13. Henry C. Eyer, Union.
14. John Clayton, Schuylkill.
15. Isaac Robinson, Adams.
16. Henry Fetter, Perry.
17. James Burnside, Centre.
18. Maxwell M'Caslin, Greene.
19. Joseph M'Donald, Cambria.
20. William S. Calahan, Washington.
21. Andrew Burke, Alleghany.
22. William Dunn, Mercer.
23. John S. M'Calmont, Clarion.
24. George R. Barrett, Clearfield.

The delegates from the 6th, 13th, 14th and 17th Congressional Districts, proposed to the Convention the names of gentlemen from their districts, for delegates and electors.

The report made by Mr. Hirst was adopted by a vote of 97 yeas to 3 nays.

Mr. Hugus reported a long series of resolutions approving of and adopting the platform laid down by the Baltimore Convention of 1844 and 1848; sustaining the compromise measures, and in favor of the fugitive slave law; urging Mr. BUCHANAN as the only choice of the Democracy of Pennsylvania, and as one who would secure an old fashioned Jackson majority in the Keystone State.—The resolutions also instruct the delegates named by this Convention to vote for Mr. Buchanan from first to last, and requiring a pledge from each delegate and elector to sustain the instructions of this Convention; and provides that upon the failure to give such a pledge, within a reasonale time, substitutes shall be appointed.

Various amendments to the resolutions were proposed and discussed. Finally a call was made for the previous question, which was sustained, and the resolutions were then unanimously adopted.

AFTERNOON SESSION.—The Convention met pursuant to adjournment.

The Convention then proceeded to nominate a candidate for Canal Commissioner. A large number of candidates were brought before the Convention. The fourth ballot resulted in the choice of Wm. Searight, of Fayette co., he having received 77 votes, G. F. Mason received 37, J. B. Bratton receiaed 8, and Henry Mott 8. The nomination was then unanimously confirmed.

A number of the customary resolutions were passed, one of which authorizes the Central Committee to fill any vacancy occurring in the Electoral ticket.

After the transaction of other unimportant business, it was moved that the Convention adjourn *sine die.*

The President then made a few appropriate remarks. After which the Convention quietly, and in apparently the best humor, adjourned.

### Our Democratic Governor.

Governor BIGLER is determined to do his duty to the people, by protecting them, so far as he can from the dangers of incorporated monopolies. Accordingly he has vetoed an omnibus bill, entitled "An Act relative to certain school districts—to authorize corporations to subscribe to the stock of the Ohio and Pennsylvania railroad company, *and for other purposes.*"

The Governor takes the true Democratic ground, and will be abundantly sustained by the people.—We make one or two extracts from the Message which is a very able production. Its great length prevents us from publishing its entire. After describing the title of the bill, the Governor says:—

"The ninth section of the bill proposes to authorize the "constituted authorities of any corporation within this Commonwealth, other than municipal corporations, to subscribe to the capital stock of the Ohio and Pennsylvania railroad company, and to pay for the same in money or *otherwise*, as may be agreed upon, by and with the authorities of said corporations and the authorities of said company. It may be somewhat difficult to define the extent of the power proposed to be conferred by the latter part of this section; or to decide how far it might release these corporations from the restrictions imposed by their original charters. I am of the opinion that whatever might have been the intention of the author of this broad and unguarded provision, that it would most certainly vest these corporations with the right to make payment in money, or in bonds and obligations in any form or size which the authorities of such corporations might deem proper; and thus the subscription of one corporation to the stock of another might be paid in certificates of stock of five, ten, twenty or fifty dollars, or in bonds or other evidence of indebtedness of similar denomination, thereby creating a fictitious capital; assimilating a circulating medium, and thus directly contravening the principles laid down in my message in reference to the York and Hanover railroad company—that no certificate or loan should be created of a less denomination than one hundred dollars. These considerations alone are sufficient to constrain me to withhold my sanction."

And again he says—

The inquiry now fairly presented, in view of all the considerations connected with this subject, is, what policy shall we adopt for the future? It is to this point I desire to ask your attention. Assuming the principle that one corporation may subscribe to the stock of another, under proper restrictions, it is nevertheless clear, that if unrestrained in its application and extension, most alarming evils may result from the practice, and there will probably be no more proper occasion than the present for the Legislature to determine upon certain fixed and unyielding limits within which its exercise should be restrained. These can best be ascertained by an examination of the evils that are likely to result from its too liberal use. The most prominent that have occurred to my mind are the following:

First.—The dangerous influence that the union or political consolidation of numerous corporations, various in their objects, powers, and pursuits, located in all parts of the State, actuated mainly by the motive of private gain, may exercise over the independence of the elective franchise and the purity of legislation; as well, also, as their increased ability to infringe individual rights and to usurp the field of personal enterprise.

Second—The creation of fictitious capital, when allowed to pay such subscriptions by loaning their credit, thereby starting an artifical and delusive enterprise, well calculated to mislead the unwary, and to result in the most injurious consequences to the people generally.

Third—Its tendency to a concentration of corporate power; thereby neutralizing many of the public advantages which may result from such grant. One corporation created for a specific purpose of public good, in rivalry with another, established for a like purpose (by which rivalry the public are mainly benefited) may thus become assimilated in *their* interests and act the part of one grand, unchecked monopoly, and greatly lessen the public good secured in their original formation. An extensive exchange of stocks, and bonds, and subscriptions, must beget concert of action and interest between these institutions, which cannot fail to work infinite injury to the mass of the people.

If there is a possibility that evils of such magnitude may flow from the unrestrained application of the principle referred to, it is our solemn duty to seek for a remedy in guards and restraints to be applied where this principle is sought to be allowed. This power, in my opinion, should never be granted, even in a restricted form, except for the promotion of some great object of public good and pressing importance, that cannot be reached by the ordinary mode of individual enterprise.

The corporations authorized to subscribe should be specifically named—the amount of subscription limited to a moderate per centage on the property of the corporation asking to subscribe—and in case of municipal subscription, there should be a clear identity of interest between the corporation subscribing and the object to be promoted by such subscription, and the payments in all cases required to be made in cash and not in bonds or the evidence of indebtedness of such corporations. I have satisfied my mind that the creation of bonds of this kind, to be handed over to a corporation to be converted to their use, without restriction at the rates they may command in market, is a most hazardous experiment and may be made the means of great injury to an honest and confiding people; whilst on the other hand, the subscriptions to be paid in money will be much better calculated to advance the true interests of any great public enterprise, and be greatly relieved from the evil consequence to which I have referred. Indeed, I can see no good reason why the bonds of a municipal corporation should be handed over to a railroad company at all. They cannot be used in the construction of the work, but must be reduced to cash. Nor can I see why the authorities of municipal corporations may not have this effected as advantageously as the agents of another corporation. I am confident that this policy, whilst it will not interfere with any of the advantages of such municipal subscriptions, may greatly lessen the chances of injury to the people.

### LETTERS ON SLAVERY, ABOLITIONISM, &c.,

BY A GENTLEMAN OF MISSISSIPPI, TO HIS FRIEND IN THIS CITY.

LETTER III.

NEAR NATCHES, Nov. 10, 1851.

*My Dear Friend*—I have shown you in my last letter, that up to the year 1838, when the Rev. Mr. Malcom wrote, nothing had been done towards the emancipation of the millions of Hindoo slaves in the British East India Colonies—and up to this day in this same year of grace, A. D., 1851, nothing has been done. Is it not apparent, then, that some other motive than philanthropy should have caused the British people and statesmen, to expend all their sympathies for the slaves upon those of the woolly haired, or negro race? Has the history of these people as a nation shown that they present stronger claims for freedom, and self government, than the other races of men? Let us look into this matter. The researches of the learned Lepsius and others, among the monumental records of Egypt, show conclusively that the negro presented five thousand years ago the same physical and mental characteristics, that so strikingly mark their descendants of the present day;—and who, in our time would attempt to maintain for them an intellectual equality with the white race.—Where are their monuments of art or of science, of Religion, or of Government? Search all Africa, and you find no temples, or palaces, or country seats, or rural farms; not even a stone, or brick building that is not the work of foreign interposition. From the earliest dawn of history up to the present day, the negro mind has remained stationary, and they have never emerged from a state of the most savage and degrading barbarism, until they came under the protection, and became *the property* of the white race. All travellers among the Africans, both in ancient and modern times represent them as Idolators, or else as destitute of even a trace of religion—that they have no idea of property in land—that the endearing ties of husband and wife, and parent and child does not exist among them—that as regards mind or morals, they are but little removed above the brute animals around them; and last, but not least, that they are cannibals, many tribes eating the bodies of their prisoners, or those slain in battle with Hyena like voracity.

These travellers also inform us, that at least two-thirds of them are the slaves of the remaining third—that their Kings put hundreds and thousands of their slaves to death, either to appease the manes of their ancestors, or in the belief that in another world the rank of the deceased will be decided by the train he carries along with him.—When the British Commissioners, in 1817, visited the King of Ashanted, they found he had just sacrificed upon the grave of his mother three thousand victims, and that the sacrifice was continued weekly for three months, each time consisting of 200 slaves.

To such a people has slavery, as it exists in this country, been a curse? Has it not on the contrary elevated them in civilization, and opened up to them the hopes of immortal life? "God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts." Who does not see the hand of the Almighty in permitting the enslavement of the negro race in our country, and in opening a door through the Colonization society, for their gradual return to humanize, and christianize the milllions of their brethren in benighted Africa.

But this cause of Colonization which presents such strong claims to the heart of every philanthropist, has met with the fiercest opposition and denunciation, by both British and American Abolitionists. Do they tell us we ought to emancipate our slaves and colonize them in the free States?—We can show that the experiment has been tested, and is against the best and highest interests of the slave. Need I point to the case of the Randolph negroes who were emancipated and colonized in the state of Ohio—land purchased for them, buildings erected and implements of labor given them—and yet these poor creatures were, in a few years, mobbed and driven out by the whites around them. I present you another case: A citizen of Chester county, one John Rabb, came to this State some thirty or more years ago, and amassed a comfortable fortune. About 15 years ago he sold his lands, and giving his slaves an abundant outfit, he paid their passage to Pittsburg, and then set them free. I met this man some two years after he had emancipated his negroes, and he gave me a most distressing account of the condition in which he had found them at the expiration of that short time.—Many had died. Most of them were sunk into the depths of poverty and vice, and but few had been able to support themselves respectably amid the buffetings of an unfriendly world. "No, (I quote the words of a northern clergyman,) the man into whose hands Divine Providence has thrown any of his fellow men in this form, is bound *not* to set them free until he can do it to their advantage.—He may feel the charge a heavy burden—a charge weighty and difficult to manage—but he is bound by God's authority to sustain the charge, to endure the labor of caring for them, making them work, feeding, clothing and instructing them, and thus fitting them for the use of freedom, and so leading on to that result whenever it can be done consistently with the highest interests of the community. The opposite doctrine is radicalism and leads to the subversion of all order and law. Immediate abolition would be, in almost all cases, a gross violation of the universal law of love."

Again. Do they tell us we ought to raise our slaves to a political and social equality and amalgamate the two races? We point to the abhorrence and disgust with which the connexion has ever been regarded by the white race in all ages and countries. It is furthermore a well ascertained fact, that mulattoes are the shortest lived of any class of our species, and that if this class were compelled to marry among themselves, the mixed breed would not last beyond the third or fourth generation. But more than this, we find the connexion most clearly discountenanced in the Bible. See Gen. xxvi, 35—xxvii, 46—xxviii, 1.

But I see I am digressing from the subject to which I mainly designed to call your attention—the "Fugitive Slave Law." If Slavery then be not sinful, (and this point is so generally conceded, that it would be a waste of time and words to argue the subject with the few who think differently,) wherein consists the sin of returning a fugitive slave? Let us turn to the Bible for light on this question. We find in Genesis, xvi, 6 to 9, that Hager, the slave of Sarah, fled from her mistress, who had "dealt hardly with her," or, in the margin, "afflicted her," and which the commentators I believe agree means, to have inflicted corporeal punishment upon her, and that the angel of the Lord Jehovah appeared, and said unto Hager,—"return to thy mistress, and submit thyself *unto her hands.*" She is not only commanded to return, but also to submit to chastisement; for we find in Exodus, xxi, 20–21, "If a man smite his servant (slave) or his maid with a rod, and she die *under his hand,*" he shall be surely punished, nothwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is *his money.*"

How different the teachings of modern Abolitionism? "But who art thou Of man; that repliest against God!" The return and submission of the Fugitive Slave is then so clearly enjoined in the *Old Testament*, that it would be superfluous to add further proof, and in the *New Testament*, the example St. Paul has set us has been so clearly elucidated by Dr. Wheaton, that I need not repeat it. Why, then, the furor of opposition to the Fugitive Bill, and to its enforcement on the part of so many people in different sections of the North? Do they contend it is unconstitutional? Your Judges of the highest legal attainment, and in different northern States have drawn up elaborate opinions that this is not the case. If this Law is then so clearly constitutional, and so entirely in accordance with the teachings of both the Old and New Testaments, where is there a reflecting man among you, that cannot yield to its enforcement a cheerful acquiescence? I can very well imagine, that there may be in the minds of some honest persons, a sensitiveness in regard to this Law, upon the ground that free blacks in the north might be kidnapped, and carried into slavery. But is this possible under the present Law? A distinguished Senator has told us that the present law was more favorable to the fugitive than the old law of 1793; "inasmuch as it calls for a record under seal from a Court in the State from which the fugitive came, proving and ascertaining that he is a fugitive, and next, that it secures a higher tribunal, and places the power in more responsible hands, to wit: The Judges of the Supreme and District Courts of the United States, and learned persons appointed by them to execute it." And I might add, that you will do the South the justice to admit, that such an occurrence as the kidnapping of a free black would create as deep a feeling of indignation among us, as it would at the north. This objection, then, has been entirely done away with by the new law, and no man can assert that such a Judiciary and Commissioners as you have to adjudge these cases, would be likely to consign a freeman into slavery. Who, then, are the fierce opponents of this law in the northern States? Are they not mostly such men as claim to have in their own breasts the revelation of a "Higher Law?" a law which Mr. Webster has happily said exists somewhere between us and the "third heaven," he dont know exactly where—and that like the Fifth Monarchy men of Cromwell's time, they are men who are "above ordinances, who walk about firm and spruce, self satisfied, thankful to God that they are not as other men, but have attained so far to salvation as to be above all necessity of restraint, civil or religious."

Now it is very plain that no fugitive bill which could be framed, would satisfy these men. They wish to expunge it entirely. In other words, they wish to overthrow the Constitution, and thus to bring upon their country the direst calamities.—They know that this Fugitive Bill, as Judge Story has said, and as one and all of your highest Judges have said, is a fundamental article of the Constitution, and that if they can pull out the corner stone, the whole structure falls to the ground. But you say, you hope even these will in time become quieted, and finally acquiesce in the enforcement of the law. I fear not. They tell us they will give neither sleep to their eyes nor slumber to their eyelids, until they accomplish its repeal. They have got up into the third Heaven, into the clouds of fanaticism, and have been, and will continue to be, inaccessible to reason, common sense or argument. True, some of your most distinguished men entertain the opinion that they are not to be dreaded.—The Rev. Dr. Hodge, in his late admirable and logical Essay upon Civil Government, (see Princeton Review, Jan. 1851.) says: "We are convinced by reading the discussions on this subject, that the immorality attributed to the fugitive slave law, resolves itself into the assumed immorality of slave-holding. No man would object to restoring an apprentice to his master, and no one would quote scripture, or search for arguments to prove it sinful to restore a fugitive slave, if he believed slave holding to be lawful in the sight of God. This being the case, we feel satisfied that the mass of the people at the north, whose *conscience* and action are ultimately determined by the Bible, will soon settle down into the conviction, that the law in question is not in conflict with the law of God."—All this may be true, but will they not blind thousands as to the true teachings of the Bible upon this matter? Have not the great political parties in different northern States opened their arms to them and gladly taken them into their ranks? Are they not most efficiently organized with able presses, and lecturers sent out to travel over the country, and with plenty of British Gold to back them in this unholy warfare against the Constitutional rights of the South. I think it was Mr. Webster who asserted in Congress, that if all the money which had been expended in this abolition agitation had been appropriated in removing the free blacks of the north, it would have colonized the whole of them in Africa. If they are not formidable or dangerous, why the fears expressed by the merchants of New York in their recent letter to Mr. Clay, and which has drawn forth so able and eloquent, and patriotic a reply from that venerable man. Look, too, at entire New England, and see the vast hold their principles has taken upon the public mind there. And there, too, is my native Pennsylvania, whose honor, and glory, and prosperity is so dear to me. Has she escaped them? My friend! I have seen with profound regret, that your *Whig party* has become tainted with their sentiments, and that your Whig candidate for Governor did not hesitate to truckle to them for their votes, and even to show the cloven foot of disunionism. This may sound harsh, but what intelligent man among you does not know that if you annul the Fugitive Bill, you at once overthrow the Constitution. Dr. Wheaton has told you, and more recently Judge Nelson, in his charge at Albany, has told you, that if you take this law from the South, you are the *Disunionists.* It was in vain that your Governor came out at the eleventh hour, and proclaimed that he was in favor of the compromise measures. Did the 3000 Whigs in the city of Philadelphia and other parts of the State who voted for his opponent, believe him? or did the people of *Schuylkill County* believe him? No! his pocketing the Jail Bill passed by yonr last Legislature, and his palpable connivance at the escape of the Gorsuch murderers, told too plainly his hostility to the Fugitive Bill. Why, then, did the Whigs of Lancaster county to a man vote for him? Did they think that local interests ought to override every other question, and that the Tariff interest or any other vital interest would be prostrated by the election of his opponent? Why, I dare say that Col. Bigler is quite as warm a friend to the Tariff as Gov. Johnston. But what, let me ask, would your magnificent Iron works, or your noble farms be worth to you, if this Union should be torn asunder? Let us, however, keep in a good humor, and so here I will tell you a story.

There was once upon a time (as the children say.) two brothers who had inherited a flock of sheep. They made several unsuccessful attempts to divide them. It at length occurred to the elder brother that it might be accomplished in this wise. "Let me" said he to his younger brother, "divide the sheep and you shall have the first choice."—"Agreed," said the younger chap, "its a bargain." Well, out goes the elder brother, and divides the flock into two lots of equal numbers; but he was careful that one of the lots contained all the lame, and the halt, and *blind.* He likewise put into this lot all the *black ones*,—and last, but not least, he put along with them a certain old ram, called "Billy." Now, this ram "Billy" had been reared by the younger brother—had eat with him, and slept with him, and played with him, and he thought his younger brother could never part with his favorite Billy; it would be like tearing body and soul asunder.—When all was arranged and the two lots separated, the younger brother was called to make his choice. He cast his eye over the separate lots, and soon saw the character of Billy's associates; he advanced and with deep emotion thus addressed his old playfellow, "Billy! Old fellow! We've long been friends, but we now must separate, you've got into *such mighty bad company.*" And so, Whig as I am, had I been among you, I should have said to your Governor, Billy! old fellow! I can't vote for you this time, you've got into such mighty bad company. Yes, my friend, there are times when we must cast party aside, and let higher and nobler motives than the success of party influence our votes. I rejoice then in the election of Bigler. I rejoice that my native State, God bless her, when she saw the stability of this Union threatened, rallied her democracy under the banner of the Constitution, and crushed down with her *Iron Heel* the foul demon of fanaticism.

And there, too, is the MAGNUS APOLLO of the Abolitionists among you. He who I am informed directs the wires of political intrigue for most of the nominations of the Whig party in your State. Does he, too, pretend to tell you, he is not a disunionist? What! not a disunionist? Wherefore then his threat at the close of the session in which the Compromise acts were passed, that he would at the next Congress move to annul the Fugitive Bill? Look, too, at his speeches during the passage of the compromise acts, and previously. What are they but a nauseous compound of all the billingsgate calumnies that his British friends, the Thompsons and Garrisons have for years been pouring out upon the slaveholders of the South? Not a Disunionist? Why, then, is he so rampant for war. Does Texas ask an indemnity for lands surrendered by her to the Government? He tells us he would rather go to *war*, than give her a dollar. Does the South ask for a Bill to secure her runaway slaves? He tells us he would rather *fight* than give it. Now, your Mr. Stevens may perhaps be ambitious for military distinction, and may think that a civil war would open up a grand field for the display of military talents. True, I have never heard of any *notable exploits* on his part in the tented field—but I must correct myself. I have an indistinct recollection of his once figuring in a war within the walls of your Capitol, well known among you as the "Buck Shot War," in which there was a pretty general clearing out, and *jumping out* from a hot place; but whether he was one of the drivers, or the driven in that case, my memory fails to serve me. But I may be unjust in my suspicions. It may be that political aspirations alone—the "loaves and fishes" of office, even to the occupancy of the White House of a Great Northern Confederacy, may have loomed up before his dazzled vision, and he may have designed to leave all the fighting to those who lay claim to a *larger experience* in this line of business.

Truly, my friend, when we come to fathom the motives of these ultraists, they do look most unpatriotic. Self interest, and passion, and prejudice have so weighty an influence in determining political conduct, that I have sometimes thought if we were narrowly to investigate the conduct of Caesar's murderers, we might doubt the influence of patriotism in the deed, and tremble even for the virtuous Brutus himself.

But again. It has sometimes struck me in reading those speeches how they must delight the hearts of the British Abolitionists, as well as those large land holders, and Bishops and Mill owners, (men whose incomes amount to half millions, and even millions per annum, while thousands of their fellow men are dying of hunger around them.) How, I say, it must delight the hearts of these men, to hear the Washingtons, and Henrys, and Madisons, and all that glorious band of heroes of our Revolution, held up before the world by a representative from the great State of Pennsylvania, as a set of "Robbers" and "Thieves" as "negro drivers" and "negro breeders." Beautiful compliments are these for the men who emancipated themselves and their descendants from the tyranny of laws, and a Government that would have consigned most us, had British rule triumphed, to the misery and degradation of her present starving millions. And had Pennsylvania no share in those deeds of glory?—Look at her services in the field, and the deeds of her men who were mighty in Council. I have recently looked over, with intense interest, a volume of the records of the early Conventions of our State, before and during the Revolution. I have read with pride their patriotic appeals to the people, and their stern resolves when the day for action had arrived. In the lists from Lancaster county, I see the names of your ancestors and mine, together with the Hubleys, and Reigarts, and Whitehills, and Atlees, and Grubbs and many others.—Yes, my friend, Heroes were these men of our revolution, one and all of them, for their resistance to British Tyranny—and Heaven inspired men were they, to have framed a Constitution conferring such liberty and happiness upon their Country. But, mark!!! These men, were most of them, I might indeed say all of them, *slaveholders.* And yet, your representative, a man who came a stranger among you, has dared within and without the halls of Congress to insult their memories, and hold them up before their descendants as monsters in crime and iniquity.

The bones of my ancestors for four generations past, are deposited in the soil of Lancaster county. All of them but one were slaveholders. And you know, and all your old citizens know, the cause which both of my Grandfathers so zealously espoused in the war of the Revolution. The remembrance, then, of their actions and their virtues, are deeply engraven upon my heart; and when I shall forget all that they have done for their posterity, or shall neglect to vindicate their memories from such aspersions as your representative has cast upon them, then will my "right arm have been palsied," and my "tongue have cleaved to the roof of my mouth!!"

But, you say Mr. Stevens does not call himself an Abolitionist. What then, pray, I ask, is he?—Has he not entered the lists with those who, trampling the Constitution of their country nnder their feet, and rejecting the Bible as a fable, and its teachings as an exploded system of Ethics, claim the inspiration of a "higher law" for the government of their actions? I know full well that the Abolitionists, at least a great many of them, are getting sick of the name. There is too much Infidelity associated with it, and hence, in some parts of the country they have dropped that title and assumed the epithet of "*Liberty Men.*"

Well, this is not the first time that sacred word has been profaned. We all know that in the delirium of unrestrained liberty, men have shown themselves to be more like monsters than human beings, and have shocked heaven and earth with the most atrocious crimes. "Oh! Liberty," exclaimed the heroic Madame Roland, as the glittering axe was about to plunge her into eternity—"Oh Liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name." Just look at France during that awful reign of Terror, when Tygers in human shape, claiming to be the *apostles of Liberty*, usurped her Government, and caused her rivers to carry to the ocean a *very sea of blood.*

Did a mother weep for the unhappy death of her son? her head must come off. Was a citizen popular? He might excite a civil war—his head must come off. Did he shun popularity and keep at home? This retired life excited suspicion—his head must come off. Were you rich? There was imminent danger that the people might be corrupted by your bounty—your head must come off.—Were you poor? There is no one so enterprising as he who has nothing—your head must come off. Were you of a grave and melancholy character? The cause of your sadness was the public prosperity—your head must come off. Was a citizen a philosopher, an orator, or a poet? He coveted the possession of more reputation than those who governed—his head must come off. Again. "Oh Liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name."—Well, we will recall that odious epithet of abolitionist, and call your representative "*a Liberty man,*" and may he live in the remembrance of posterity with Danton, and Robespierre, and the rest.

But let me again remind you, what Dr. Wheaton has told you, that New England men, with New England capital, and New England ships were largely engaged in the Slave Trade, in tearing these same negroes, they now wish emancipated, from their native Africa, and landing them against our protest at our very doors. And let me remind you further, what Dr. Wheaton has omitted; that when our Congress abolished this horrid traffic, a majority of the southern votes were cast in favor of the bill, while a majority I believe, (at all events the votes of Massachusetts and Rhode Island) of New England votes were cast for its continuance. Perhaps, then, Mr. Stevens may be quieting his conscience, and feel that he is atoning for the sins of his countrymen and ancestors, when in joining with their descendants of the present day, they would as "Liberty men" for the slave, commit a double robbery in the persons of these same negroes, in their unlawful attempts to wrest them from honest owners.

When I hear, as I sometimes have, the assertion, that this man is the exponent of the feelings and principles of the Whig party in your county and State, I have hurled back the imputation with scorn. No! I know too many of your staunchest Whigs in my native county, who were disgusted with his course in Congress, and believed he had aided in giving a death blow to your most vital interests. It surely came with an ill grace from one who had heaped upon the south and her institutions the abuse of a fish-woman, to turn round and solicit southern votes for the interests of his constituents. Here, then, rises up the much vexed Tariff question—another bone of contention between us. Bear with me while I say a few words upon this subject. And first, 'tis a great mistake to suppose that we all in the south are against you in regard to the tariff; a respectable body of our people are in favor of such a tariff as will enable you to compete with foreign manufactures. You must admit, however, as a candid man, that the teriff is, and always has been, *a concession* on the part of the south to the north. Look at the state of things when our forefathers framed this confederacy. We of the south were exclusively an agricultural people. We required and obtained a right to the recovery of our fugitives from labor. The north saw that their destiny and true policy was to embark in commerce and manufactures, and the constitution conferring upon Congress the power to lay duties upon foreign tonnage and imports, you got a monopoly of the entire carrying trade between us, now worth annually some eight to ten millions; and you furthermore got a tariff for protection that great manufacturing interests might be built up among you. You have but to look around you to see the magnificent results of these great interests to the north.

Let us now see how the tariff bears upon the disbursements of the planter. Setting aside food, the heaviest item in our expenses, let us take up the articles of clothing for ourselves and negroes. Every negro in the south gets annually a blanket coat, and every second or third year a blanket for bedding; which will give you some idea of the immense amount we expend for this item. Next is woolens and flannels and cottons for winter and summer wear. And there again is plantation implements. Every laboring hand requires two or three hoes annually, and as the south has nearly a million of laborers, you may imagine the vast consumption of this article. I might go on enumerating steam engines, sugar mills and mill gearing, ploughs and trace chains, nails and axes, and a hundred other articles. Now let us see the amount of tax this *low tariff* of 1846 imposes annually upon a planter who makes one thousand bales of cotton:

| cotton: | | Duty. | Tax. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Blankets, | $600 | 20 | 120,00 |
| Woolens, flannels and cottons, | $800 | 30 | 240,00 |
| Hats, boots, brogans, | 400 | 30 | 120,00 |
| Ploughs, hoes, trace-chains, &c., &c., | 250 | 30 | 75,00 |
| Mill gear. iron, steel, spades, &c., &c., | 300 | 30 | 90,00 |
| Disbursements for self and family, excluding food and wines, say | | | 355,00 |
| Sum total duty, | | | $1000,00 |

Here, then, is one thousand dollars paid by one planter for the above items in duties annually: some paying more and many less. And when you look at the entire south and see the immense amount taken from their annual profits by the tariff, you will, I hope, cease to wonder at their grumbling.

Another matter. The amount of revenue raised from duties upon importations since we became a nation, is estimated at over one thousand millions of dollars. "Of the domestic productions (I quote a well known report on this subject) given in exchange for foreign merchandise, fully two-thirds was of southern growth. Our government, then, has been indebted to southern industry for seven hundred millions of money. It we suppose the value of the goods upon which the $700,000,000 of duties were levied to be four times the value of the duties, it amounts to near three billions. How were these goods brought to this country and distributed? The northern merchant has come to the south and bought from the planter produce of equal value, abating from the price all the expenses of transportation. He has insured them in northern offices and shipped them abroad in northern ships, exchanged them at a profit for foreign merchandise, brought it home, paid ¼ of its value to the government, added that amount and all the expenses of importation and 15 to 20 per cent. to the price, and exposed it to sale. The southern merchant has now gone to him, lingered the summer through with him at a heavy expense, bought a portion of these goods, re-shipped them in northern vessels to southern ports, added 25 per cent. more to the price to cover his northern expenses and for profit, and then sells them to the southern planter. All the disbursements made in this process, save such as are made abroad, are made among northern men; all the profits, except the southern merchant's, are made by northern men—and the southern planter who furnishes nearly all the foreign goods of the country gets his portion of them burdened with every expense that the government, merchant, insurer, seaman, wharfinger, drayman, boatman and wagoner can pile upon them."

Look again at the disbursements of the public money: "Up to 1830 there had been expended in the several States two hundred and eighteen millions in fortifications, light houses, public debt, pensions and internal improvements. Of which sum one hundred and ninety-five millions were disbursed in the northern States, and but twenty-three millions in the southern States. In the matter of internal improvements, the disbursements north of the Potomac were $4,700,000; south of the Potomac $267,000; or nearly eighteen to one! The southern States have, then, virtually put into the treasury four hundred and sixty-six millions of the seven hundred, and drawn out about one hundred and forty millions. The northern States have put in two hundred thirty-three millions, and drawn out five hundred and sixty millions.

I make these extracts to show you that the south has confined herself to agriculture alone and given to the north an entire monopoly of the immense profits of commerce, as likewise to show you the value of our slave labor to the government, as well as to the northern capitalists. The true interest of the south is, and always has been, *Free Trade*, and yet they have conceded to you a tariff of protection that has built up immense manufacturing establishments among you. But sorely as the tariff effects the profits of the labor of the south, you have never heard of southern legislatures passing laws to embarrass the government in the collection of the revenue, or of mobs of discontented people rising up and murdering the government collectors, and yet such acts would be but a counterpart of the treason which has been perpetrated at the north in the case of fugitives from labor.

I have spoken of British influence at work among you. Do not suppose that the south has escaped them. Her emissaries have been busy among us. They have been whispering into our ears, "see the millions upon millions you are annually pouring into the lap of the north; see that oppressive tariff upon all your heaviest articles of consumption, and see the return they are making you; organizing societies and sending out agents to decoy and steal off your slaves. Separate from them, and we will make a treaty with you that will enable you to retain many of the millions you are now giving them. And how have we answered them? I point with pride to the results of the late elections in the different southern States. Yes, we have told them that we yet had faith in a majority of our northern brethren to do us justice; and we have further told them that we would not give the glories of Bunker Hill and Saratoga for all their millions. Let us, then, cultivate towards each other feelings of charity and brotherhood. Let us frown down all those demagogues and presses that either in the north or south are poisoning the minds of the people against those who are their brethren. As we are yet one in territory and one in name, let us cleave together as one in heart and one in affection. Let us look to the future and see the millions yet unborn whose happiness or misery is involved in our Union. And lastly, let us carry out the brilliant destiny, that, as a united people, awaits us.

But let me again remind you, that the battle for this UNION has now to be fought upon northern soil. Let me remind you that the most precious inheritance our fore-fathers have bequeathed us—that glorious temple of constitutional liberty, cemented with their blood, is now threatened with overthrow by impious hands among you. "Daws, ravens and the birds of night now build their nests in its niches." The waves of fanaticism are threatening to submerge it, and infidelity and atheism, aided by the gold of tyrants is daring to undermine it.

And will you not save it? The down-trodden nations from afar off, with tears and sighs are calling upon you to save it! Religion, trembeling for the safety of *her* altars, is calling upon you to save it! And the spirits of the mighty dead, from another world, are invoking you to save it. Rouse then, and rouse your Whig party to rally to the rescue, and to do their duty to their God, to their country and to their race.

For the Intelligencer.

### Maine Liquor Law.

As the Maine liquor law, appears to be the order of the day, those opposed to the measure had better be stirring, lest our Legislature may think we are all in favor of its passage, until too late. Now, what is the true feeling? Will the citizens of Pennsylvania rush into the foot steps of our "cute" neighbors, without well weighing the causes for and against. In the first place, let us examine into the most probable reasons for the prohibition of liquor, in the State of Maine. Is it another "Yankee trick," or not? Are they following the impulses of their holy and conscientious scruples? or the "pinching of their pockets?" The latter, appears somewhat plausible, when it is so well known that their *overplus* grain can never glut the markets; and that almost every barrel of spirits used in the State, is exactly that much money abstracted for the coffers of their more favored neighbors; so that the balance of trade being continually against them they are obliged to save their revenues, at the expense of their "bitters." How is it, on the other hand, in our State. What would we do with our vast quantities of overplus grain, if not manufactured into Domestic Spirits? And although we have numerous public improvements, many of our interior counties would still find dificulty in getting their produce to market in any other than a manufactured form; the expense of transportation being so high, they must reduce the bulk and weight to the least possible compass.—Even in our own county, a few years back, almost every large landholder was obliged to distil his grain so as to be able to haul it to the city markets; and to this day our farmers can sell their corn and rye with more advantage to the distillers, than by sending direct to market, as the last few years can testify. Let our manufactories of spirits be closed, and the farming community will soon feel where the "shoe pinches," although many of them now are very freely signing petitions in favor of the act, without looking further than curing drunkeness, vice and immorality. They tell us, however, that certain distillers will be licensed for *mechanical* and *medicinal* purposes. True enough; but, exclude the *general* manufacture and *introduction* from other States, and a few of the favored and leading "wire workers," may have the chance of monopolising this great branch of trade, and make it a very "*respectable*" business—and *perhaps*, there might be *some* profits arising. Mr. Editor, do you think the price of burning fluid would be affected? or, would these disinterested and honest men, (who are so much *the friends of the poorer classes,*) let it remain reasonable, because almost every family in the country use it in such great quantities. This article being composed of about 3 parts alcohol, forms one of the great demands for our "corn juice."

I am as much opposed to the use of liquor as a beverage, and to drunkenness, as any of the narrow-headed fanatics and scheming politicians now leading this measure—but I am still very loath to have my rights and privileges, as a citizen of a *Republican* Government, infringed upon by laws, fully as arbitrary and unjust in their requirements as those of any Monarchial tyranny. Even should the *majority* demand it, "might will not make right," and we have thousands of citizens ready and willing to defend their rights, as freemen generally do. Are we to place ourselves in a situation, that our firesides and social circles may be broken in upon, at the instigation of any malicious person, merely to "remove tempation" from the way of a few "black sheep" in the great flock. Must the innocent be restricted, or punished, to save the guilty? Quite a new doctrine. Let us now examine the first section of this good act. "No person shall be allowed, at any time, to sell by himself, his clerk, servant, or agent, directly or indirectly, or to sell or furnish, under pretence of giving, any spirituous or intoxicating liquors, or any mixed liquors, a part of which is spirituous or intoxicating, except as hereinafter provided."—Give particular attention to "*furnish, under pretence of giving,*" and what will it cover? Can a farmer *furnish* or *give* a dram or two to his hands during extra exertion in the harvest field. Dare he set out the liberal bottle at a barn raising, or any other act of gratuitous labor? May a private citizen enjoy a glass of wine with his friends over a Christmas dinner, at his own table,—*mix* a glass of mulled wine or Old Whiskey punch for a few country friends who may chance to drop in some cold winter's night while taking a jolly sleigh ride? I say can any of these trifling and customary tributaries to hospitality and friendly feeling be indulged in, without being open to a prosecution, fine and, worst of all, losing his right of a juror, upon the information of any malicious person, though, perhaps, after enjoying your hospitality, in return may say you *furnished* and *gave* him *mixed*, or *intoxicating* drinks; and then aid, and direct the officers to force your "castle" to destroy the "vile stuff."

This may be called an extreme case, but still it is a stubborn fact, and no man will be safe.

One argument is, "to have the effect, we must remove the cause," "take away the tempation," &c. A very pretty doctrine, and no doubt might be carried further. To cure thieving, confiscate the means of the wealthy—take away our horses, and we will have no horse-thieves—"remove the cause," and we will have the effect to some purpose. Remove temptation would be a capital cure for the "long fingered gentry" or envious persons.

Could not our groggeries and tippling houses at every corner be abolished by other means—say, put up the price of license *high enough*, and that license *easily lost*, so that hotels will be few and respectable. Or, if restricting laws are absolutely necessary, let them fall upon the guilty few, and not the innocent masses. Besides it one of the fundamental principles of our Government that "each citizen shall enjoy his own rights and privileges, so long as they do not interfere with the rights and privileges of others." When does a man who drinks to moderation interfere with the rights of another? An intoxicated man does, however, and let the penalties of the law fall upon him and him only, or those who aided in putting him in that condition Is *Tobacco* to be forgotten. Is it not worse than liquor in the eyes of the law. Does not its use interfere more with the rights of others than that of liquor, except only, in cases of intoxication. Who has not been annoyed by some of our "Jakeys" puffing a villanous "long nine" through the streets and into the faces of all passers by? Is a lady safe in visiting a place of public amusement, or any promiscuous gathering, without having her dresses spoiled by some lake of filthy tobacco juice upon the floors, without speaking of her hearth or Brussels carpet at home. A spitting box is now one of the necessaries of life, or at least of comfort.

Before concluding I would caution my readers to be careful in signing away their rights and not require laws for every trifle—at least to specify what we shall not drink, or we might forcibly have some of the old Jewish restrictions before we are done.

"XX."