

THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOLUME XV.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

NUMBER 216.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O'MEARA GOODRICH.

TOWANDA:

Saturday Morning, August 26, 1854.

Selected Poetry.

THE TIDE OF DEATH.

BY E. H. CHAMBERS.

The tide rolls on, the tide rolls on—
The never ceasing tide,
That sweeps the pleasures from our hearts,
The loved ones from our side—
That brings afflictions to our lot,
And anguish and despair,
And bears from youth's untroubled brow
The charms that lingered there.

The tide rolls on: wave after wave,
Its swelling waters flow—
Before it all is bright and fair,
Behind it all is woe.
The infant from its mother's breast,
The gay and blooming bride,
Are swept away and borne along
By that relentless tide.

The tide rolls on: the soldier's eye
Grows dim beneath its swell,
The scholar shuns the mystic lore
That he hath loved so well,
The monarch puts the crown aside,
And labor's weary slave
Rejoices that his limbs will know
The quiet of the grave.

The tide rolls on: like summer brook,
It glides to the sea;
But like dark winter's angry tide,
It rushes to the sea.
From battle field and hearth,
It sweeps into oblivion's sea
The dwellers on the earth.

Roll on, thou dark and turbid wave!
Thou canst not bear away
The record of the good and brave,
That knoweth not decay;
Though fierce may rush the billow's strife,
Though deep the current be,
Still faith shall lift thy beacon high,
And guide us through the sea.

Political.

ADDRESS

STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, No. 3.

To the People of Pennsylvania:

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—The manner of organizing the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas, you will agree with us, is not necessarily an issue in this contest—it is not a subject connected with the duties of a State Executive. It is scarcely possible that the election of a Governor, who may succeed, is to have any practical bearing upon the future policy of those territories—and surely no man will be so unreasonable as to hold the Governor of Pennsylvania accountable in an official sense for what Congress has already done on this subject. It is a subject with which that officer has had, and can have, officially, nothing whatever to do. As a member of the Democratic party it must be presumed that he takes an interest in public affairs, and has not been an inattentive observer that there has existed a diversity of opinion in relation to certain features of this measure.

Since the origin of our government, with occasional intervals, the question of slavery in some of its phases, has been a subject of violent and at times dangerous controversy in Congress, menacing the peace of the people and the existence of the national confederacy. Its adjustment within the territories has led to the most threatening struggles. These were invariably renewed by every new acquisition of territory. In 1820, the act of Congress fixing the Missouri line was adopted, interdicting the extension of slavery north of 36 deg. 30', as a means of settling the controversy growing out of the acquisition of Louisiana from France in 1803. In 1845 this line was extended over Texas, which had just been annexed to the United States and seemed to answer the purpose of an adjustment. In 1848, however, when it was proposed to extend this parallel of 36 deg. 30' min. from the Rio del Norte to the Pacific, it was defeated in the House of Representatives, after having passed the Senate, by a majority of ten votes. The agitation in the country soon became general, and by 1850 it had assumed an alarming aspect. The good and great men of all parties, forgetting former differences and constrained by a noble spirit of patriotism, united in a common effort to allay the mighty surging of an excited public sentiment. Foremost in this great work was the eloquent and patriotic Clay, sustained by Cass, Webster, King and others. A series of acts were passed, familiarly known as the Compromise Measures, which were acceptable to the people and were ardently maintained.

One of these acts organized the territories of New Mexico and Utah, on the principles of non-intervention—on the plan of allowing the people to decide for themselves whether they would have the institution of slavery or not. The whole country seemed satisfied with the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress, in the regulation of the domestic institutions of the territories, including that of slavery. Without stopping to inquire into the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on the subject or to what extent that power might be exercised, the people regard it as wise and politic to remove this topic of angry and dangerous controversy out of Congress, and confide it to those who may occupy the territories. We may however remark that the question of authority in the passage of the Ordinance of 1787 under the old Confederation, is a very different one from the passage of the Missouri Compromise or any slave restriction whatever, under our present Constitution. Under the Confederation the institution of slavery was not recognized—under the Constitution it is, in three several particulars:

1st. In fixing the basis of representation and direct taxation.

2d. In tolerating the foreign slave trade until 1808.

3d. In providing for the rendition of fugitives from labor.

If it even be clear that Congress is possessed of ample power to legislate on the subject (and this is mostly denied by Gen. Cass and other eminent men of the country) it was proper to forego its exercise. The resort to this mode of adjustment in 1850, seemed most auspicious for the honor, the dignity and peace of the states—for the happiness and prosperity of the people, and above all, for the stability of our National Union.

And is not this policy right and just in itself according to all our theories of government? Indeed we should never allow ourselves to fear the consequences of treating any question of politics or morals with the people, whether they be residents of a State or territory. This mode of adjustment rests on great principles, which in their application will be co-extensive with all the territory we have now or ever can have, and which are as enduring as the race of man. It is a principle in beautiful harmony with our republican institutions—the principle of self-government—the basis of our entire system.

It was for this doctrine that our forefathers perilled their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in the Declaration of Independence—that they struggled and bled, and left their bones to bleach on the battle field of the Revolution. It was for this principle of self-government, that they invoked the interposition of heaven and accepted the proffered aid of the generous stranger. For seven long years did they labor to impress upon Lord North and George III, the virtue and power of this great fundamental truth in the science of government. The attempt of that monarch "to bind the Colonies in all things whatsoever," and to impose taxes without representation, gave this principle growth and vigor, and cost him armies and an empire. Since that day to the present time it has been gaining strength in all civil countries. American experience has fully solved and settled the problem of man's ability for self-government. Where can be found the instance in which governmental affairs have been submitted to, or intrusted with the people, that the results have not been salutary? Who will then at this day doubt the fitness of the American people to dispose of any question of governmental policy found within the limits of the Constitution? Who will contend for the absurd idea, that a man loses his capacity for self-government by emigrating from a State to a territory?—Who will say that a man residing in Massachusetts should, through his representatives in Congress, be permitted to adopt and regulate institutions of local government for his fellow man in Utah, New Mexico, Minnesota, Nebraska or Kansas? Will our Whig or Abolition friends agree that when they shall have abolished to any of these territories, their Democratic fellow citizens whom they leave behind, shall decide for them what kind of local institutions they shall have—that their judgment and not that of the emigrants themselves shall control as to the institution of slavery? Or who will contend that the people will be careless of their own true interest?—that their government will be feeble or injudicious? Whoever says this, doubts all the principles of our institutions, and disregards the lessons of experience and the teachings of the ages of the revolution.

We have already intimated, that we will not discuss the abstract and somewhat difficult questions of Congressional power, which have grown out of the slavery controversy in the Halls of the National Legislature. We care not to decide, where so many eminent men have differed, whether Congress has the power to establish or abolish the institution in the territories. Be that as it may, we assert that it was wise in 1850, as in 1854, to refer the whole question to the sovereign will of the people, to be settled through the action of the local governments, as all other questions of domestic policy are settled. The rights of property, the relations between husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, are so confided, and we can conceive none more sacred and important in the social state; and we see of no good reason why the question of domestic slavery, the relation of master and servant, should alone be withheld from the action of the people.

It must not be forgotten, that we have not the creation of circumstances for ourselves, but that we must deal with existing facts. The same difficulty occurred in the early history of the country. We had the institution of slavery entailed upon us, and the only matter of enquiry has long been, how it was to be managed to the greatest advantage of both the white and black races. The latter number several millions, and we are forced to the dilemma of retaining a large portion of them in bondage, or make them our companions and equals, and permit them to share the honors of the State and intermarry with our daughters and friends. In the forcible language of Mr. Jefferson, "we have the wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him nor safely let him go."

And yet much has been done in a legal constitutional way for the amelioration of this unfortunate race of people. The men of the revolution had to deal with the institution of slavery as they found it, and they so acted in the formation of the government, when these States were colonies of Great Britain every one was a slave holding province. At the time the Constitution was framed, twenty out of the thirteen were slave holding States. Six of the original thirteen have now become free, not by abolition agitation in Congress, but by the action of the people of the several States in their sovereign capacity at home.

This leaving the question to the people was first adopted by Congress in 1850, and was intended to be general in its application to all territories thereafter to be organized—that it was to be a finality as to the principle to be invoked, but not a finality as to its application—for that would imply that no more territories were to be organized. This position is sustained by the fact, that in forming the boundaries of Utah and New Mexico, no respect

seems to have been paid to the act of 1820, fixing what is termed the Missouri line, nor the act of 1845 extending that line to the Rio del Norte. The larger portion of the territory included in these acts of organization was taken from the Mexican acquisition, but they include also a portion of the Texas territory north of 36 deg. 30' min., and a part of the Louisiana purchase, which was covered by that line. This territory was taken from under the act of 1820, interdicting slavery north of 36 deg. 30' min., and subjected to the action of the principles of the Compromise of 1850, that the territory thus embraced should be admitted into the Union as States with or without slavery as the people thereof shall determine. These facts are claimed as a precedent for the act organizing Nebraska and Kansas. It is for these reasons, and in this sense also, claimed that the principles of non-intervention as adopted in 1850 should be regarded as a finality.

As Pennsylvanians we are not the advocates of the extension of slavery, and we deny that the principles of the Nebraska and Kansas bill produce that effect. It merely leaves it to the people to determine this question for themselves. But the soil, climate and productions of that region are not adapted to slave labor. It is our firm belief that slavery will not enter those territories. Those who are sensitive on this point should not close their eyes to the evidence that surrounds them. The indications are all opposed to its extension to that country. Such is the belief of the ablest men in the nation, those who advocated and voted for the Nebraska and Kansas bill, as well as those who voted against it.

Mr. Douglas said: "I do not believe there is a man in Congress who thinks it would be permanently a slave-holding country; I have no idea that it would."

Mr. Badger said: "I have no more idea of seeing a slave population in either of them (Nebraska or Kansas) than I have of seeing it in Massachusetts."

Mr. Edward Everett said: "I am quite sure that everybody admits that this is not to be a slave-holding region."

Mr. Hunter said: "Does any man believe that you will have a slave holding State in Kansas or Nebraska? I confess that for a moment, I permitted such an illusion to rest upon my mind."

Mr. Bell said, that as respects the South, "it was a contest for a mere abstraction."

Mr. Benton said in his first speech against the bill: "The question of slavery in these territories, if thrown upon a territorial action, will be a question of numbers—a question of the majority for or against slavery; and what chance would the slave holders have in such a contest? No chance at all. The slave emigrants will be out numbered and compelled to play at a most unequal game, not only in point of numbers, but also in point of States."

In his second speech Mr. Benton again said: "I believe in the utility of this bill—its absolute utility in the slave holding States, and that not a single slave will ever be held in Kansas or Nebraska under it, even admitting it to be passed."

Gen. Houston said: "There was no more probability of slavery being introduced into those territories than into Illinois."

Even Mr. Seward, who is so astute on this subject, thus expressed himself: "I feel quite sure that slavery at most can get nothing more than Kansas; while Nebraska, the wider region, will escape, for the reason that its soil and climate are uncongenial with the staples of slave culture—rice, sugar, cotton and tobacco. Moreover, since the public attention has been so well and so effectually directed towards the subject, I cherish a hope that slavery will not be able to gain a foothold even in Kansas."

But to render assurance double sure, we have even a stronger opinion from Judge Pollock himself, the Whig candidate for Governor, who says in legal dated June 19th, 1854: "Slavery can have no legal existence in those territories, either by act of Congress, or under the false pretence of popular sovereignty."

It may in fact be safely said that of all the acquisitions of territory from Mexico, there will not be a slave state in the Union, and that the territory embraced in the Louisiana purchase not already admitted, will come in as free States.

It should also be borne in mind, that any territory that the United States may hereafter acquire must be South of 36 deg. 30' min., and that this principle of popular sovereignty may drive the institution farther south than any positive act of Congress could do. Now should it be forgotten that the interdiction of slavery north of 36 deg. 30' min. is a virtual declaration of the territory south of that line for slave purposes. This has been the moral influence of such legislation, and it would no doubt continue to have that effect. It would in all probability have been a happy event for this country, had this doctrine of popular sovereignty in the territories been adopted in 1820. We should most likely have had a larger portion of free states than we now have.

The Missouri line was never a favorite measure with the old Democratic statesmen. It suited a temporary purpose, and quieted agitation for a time, but it was manifestly wrong in principle, and legislation of a dangerous character, calculated to divide the country into geographical sections, and create dissensions and divisions among the States and the people.

Thomas Jefferson once said: "This Missouri question, by a geographical line of division, is the most portentous one that I have ever contemplated."

In 1820 he wrote to John Holmes: "A geographical line coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated."

James Madison said

"I must own that I have always leaned to the belief that the restriction was not within the true scope of the Constitution."

James Monroe said: "The proposed restriction as to the territories which are to be admitted into the Union, if not in direct violation of the Constitution, is repugnant to its principles."

We might swell the list of authorities on this same point, from eminent American statesmen, living and dead.

It is difficult to force from the mind the belief that this whole subject of slavery in the territories is greatly magnified. The right of a sovereign State to control this subject is not disputed even by abolitionists. The right to establish or abolish the institution is admitted. The only effect that the legislation of Congress can possibly have must be confined to the territorial prohibition of a State, during which time it can exercise but a limited influence upon the social or political affairs of the country. When once admitted into the Union with slavery, a State can abolish it—or admitted without it, she can establish it. Should the people north of 36 deg. 30' min. in Nebraska become numerous enough to be admitted as a free State, they could afterwards establish the institution, even if the Missouri line or the act of 1820 had not been disturbed. Suppose, for example, that any of the States covered by the ordinance of 1820, were at this time to establish slavery, where would be the remedy? There would be none. If the people of a territory should desire to have the institution, but perceiving that Congress might object to their admission into the Union, they could forbear to establish it until after their admission, and then do as they might deem best. Hence the wisdom of allowing that power to control in the beginning, that will most certainly control in the end, or at a subsequent period.

It is not to be denied that there is a most violent and unwarrantable spirit evoked by this slavery conflict, that should be discontinued by the good men of all parties. It is one of the enigmas of human nature, that it can become so unreasonable in some of its manifestations. Our Anti-Nebraska friends should take care lest the mania of a wild and ungovernable fanaticism should possess them as it has already possessed many others. The inflammatory and treasonable proceedings of an abolition convention in the City of New York, not long since, calls for the earnest condemnation of every lover of our national Union.

Wendell Phillips said:—"The Union sentiment is the great vortex which swallows up the great minds, and they have power enough for the time being to influence the people. The only remedy for the slave is the destruction of the government. I challenge any man to tell me what the Union has done for us."

Wm. Lloyd Garrison proposed the following resolution: "Resolved, That the one grand vital issue to be made with the slave power, is the dissolution of the existing American Union."

Henry C. Wright spoke to the resolution and said: "I like that resolution very much. This country denies God, or if it believes in God, I do not. The Christian God is the most accused of demons. No man's rights can be ascertained by reference to a Bible, a law, or a Constitution. I don't care that (snapping his fingers) for any such book or Constitution, when the question of liberty or slavery is to be considered. The only thing of importance is that the mass of people venerate the Constitution. We should endeavor to do away with this. I thank God that I am a traitor to that Constitution. I thank God also that I am an infidel in the popular religion of this country and of all Christendom."

The Hon. Edmund Quincy said that: "The very devil, and that the Union ought to be dissolved!"

This was during the pendency of the Nebraska and Kansas bill before Congress. At the same time the leading Abolition journals were loud in their denunciations of the bill itself, and treasonable in their opinion to the action of the government. Horace Greeley, through the New York Tribune, said in reference to the contemplated passage of the bill:

"Better than confusion should ensue—better that discord should reign in the National Councils—better that Congress should break up in wild disorder, nay, better that the capitol itself should blaze by the torch of the incendiary, or fall and bury all its inmates beneath its crumbling ruins, than that this perfidiously and wrong be finally accomplished."

There were many reasonable exhibitions also, by the same class of men, during the recent Annuals of American Independence. At some places the bells were tolled, as if mourning for some great National calamity. At Farmington, Massachusetts, treasonable speeches were delivered, after which Garrison, above named, burned the Constitution of the United States and the Fugitive Slave Law, amid the applause of men of as true patriotism as Benedict Arnold or himself.

Such are the incendiary and inflammatory sentiments with which despotic fanatics are endeavoring to indoctrinate the minds of the Northern people. Such sentiments are the fit precursors of the recent riots and murder in Boston, trampling the Constitution and Laws under foot of violence.

Let us therefore, fellow citizens, discard the doctrines of the Abolitionists and anti-slavery agitators, and look upon the opinions which they have promulgated and are now promulgating, as the false lights thrown out by the ancient Federalists, during the Missouri controversy, to mislead the people and regain lost power.

We have great confidence in the doctrine of popular sovereignty, and in the justice and wisdom of the people. They have saved the country in many important crises in our affairs. It was the people that settled the government upon the republican platform after the Federalists of 1793 were driven from power. It was the people who sustained Jackson against the monarch bank. It was

the mass of the people who have always upheld the country in time of war. It is to the people that we must look for protection against the miserable treason and despotic wiles of the enemies of the republic. The people of Pennsylvania will be true to their constitutional obligations, and their triumph in 1851 and 1852, are evidences, that they are not only willing to be so, but also that they have the power to be so. The joy of wild fanaticism and stolid bigotry on the question of slavery has passed by in this State, and her Democracy and her people generally have planted themselves upon the principles of the Compromise of 1850, and there they will continue to stand, whether victory or defeat awaits them. They are willing to see the citizens of the territories determine in their primary assemblies, the question of domestic slavery for themselves, without the control or dictation of the Central Government, which may by a usurpation of power pretend to define the lines of freedom and slavery by degrees of latitude and longitude, or by geographical boundaries. The Democracy of Pennsylvania guarding the destinies of the great Central Commonwealth of this Union, will adhere faithfully to the principles of the Constitution, the sovereignty of the States and of the people, and the stability and repose of the nation. The people of Pennsylvania are unselfish and unambitious, but they are just—they are modest and unpretending and slow at arriving at a conclusion, but they are powerful for good. The people of Pennsylvania are patriotic by instinct, and will rush to arms all the feeble barriers to a healthy flow of public sentiment—Pennsylvania has always been a patriotic, union-loving State. She has always stood by the flag of our common country. She is the Keystone of the Federal Arch, and standing midway between the North and the South, she constitutes the great break-water, against which the waves of northern fanaticism and southern folly have long surged and will continue to surge in vain.

J. ELLIS BONHAM, Chairman.
GEORGE C. WALKER, Secretary.

Letter from Hon. David Wilmot.

[The following letter from Hon. D. Wilmot to WILLARD RICHMONDS of Susquehanna county, appears in the Montrose Democrat.]

TOWANDA, June 29, 1854.

DEAR SIR:—Your favor of the 27th has just come to hand. I would be much gratified to be with you on the 5th proximo, and to raise my feeble voice in an earnest appeal to your citizens, to united action in defence of our free institutions of government. I am under an engagement to address the citizens of Tioga county, on the subject of the Nebraska outrage, on the 4th, and shall go from there to Potter county.

I rejoice that you are to have with you so able and zealous a champion of Freedom as Mr. GARTLEY. In making the disposal of party subordinate to the interests of freedom and humanity, he has nobly fitted himself to render the most eminent service to his country in this crisis. The people must come up to the high and patriotic elevation of purpose, or there is no hope for our country's liberties. The policy of Slavery cannot be mistaken—indeed it is boldly proclaimed. The recent high handed outrage, is but the precursor of a series of measures, designed to give the Slave Oligarchy complete domination—to crush out forever the policy and principles of Freedom in this government, and to establish on the American continent the most powerful and mighty Slave Empire known in the history of the world. Submission—acquiescence in the policy of Slavery is fatal, and he who preaches it, preaches treason to Liberty. Acquiescence in the legislation of 1850, emboldened Slavery to invade in 1854, the guaranteed rights of Freedom in Kansas and Nebraska; and to-day, Slavery looks forward with exulting confidence to the acquisition of Cuba—the absorption of more Mexican States—the re-establishment of slavery in San Domingo—the revival of the Foreign Slave trade—and to an alliance offensive and defensive with Brazil, for the protection and aggrandizement of Slavery, and to enable it to defy the public opinion and power of the world. In proof of all this, I have but to point to the proceedings in Congress, and to the leading public journals of the South. In this vast programme of Slavery, where do the submissionists of to-day propose to make a stand? It must be made now—to-day. The Free men of the Republic, thank God, have still left in their hands, a peaceful and Constitutional remedy—the ballot box. The power and designs of Slavery must be checked, and the original policy of the Government on this subject restored. To this end we must lay aside all partisan feelings for a time, the states of party over minor points of controverted policy, and unite in this great work of preserving our Free Institutions from impending destruction.

The first blow must be aimed for the overthrow of the present National Administration—the merciful and puppet of the Slave power. Through the corrupting influence of its patronage upon the people's Representatives, Freedom has been betrayed. It must be overwhelmed at every point with ignominious defeat. We cannot shorten its constitutional term of office, but we must strike down its allies, in every State, District and County. It must have no props in the State upon which to lean for the support of its iniquitous policy. No man should be elected to a responsible office—Governor, member of Congress, Representative, whose relations of friendship and alliance with the National Administration are open to suspicion. We must accept of nothing, in the candidates presented for our suffrages, short of undoubted honesty to the ultra pro-slavery power at Washington. Anything short of this is folly, silliness, shilly shally nonsense, and designed for the end, to lead the people step by step into acquiescence in the policy and plans of Slavery. Let no candidate present to condemn the recent legislation of Congress, and set himself up in party alliance with the present

administration. He cannot be trusted, and so sure as he is trusted, so sure will the people, and their rights, again be betrayed. The man who will not face in open and manly resistance, the aggressions of the slave power to-day, cannot be relied upon to do so, on the occasion of a future provocation. He is hopelessly rotten—unsound to the core, and will sacrifice his Country's highest interests and glory, for some paltry partisan considerations.

Slavery is deaf to the voice of our remonstrance. In vain we point to the history of the country—in vain we invoke the names of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and their co-patriots, in defence of the early policy and settled maxims of the Government—in vain we appeal to the eternal principles of justice and right—all are unheeded, unavailing. In the absence of a future provocation, Slavery pushes onward in its barbaous and destructive policy; subverting every principle that gave life, vigor and success to our Revolutionary struggle, and defeating all the great ends for which the Government was established. It has broken down the highest precedents of Constitutional law, in opening to its ingress, the territories of the nation. To-day, Slavery is prostrating the holiest functions of Government—endangering the public peace, and provoking on the country the horrors of war, for its extension and aggrandizement. Now, at this present writing, it is insidiously undermining one of the most valuable and sacred Constitutional rights of the people, in its efforts to put the National Treasury, through the treaty-making power, at the virtual disposal of the Executive and Senate. The Constitution designed that the immediate Representatives of the people, should be the special guardians of the treasury of the nation—now (as a mere matter of form) they are called upon to vote in the dark, enormous sums of money, in fulfillment of treaties for the acquisition of foreign provinces and States, without even having laid before them, the instructions and correspondence under which the treaty was negotiated.

When, I again enquire, are the encroachments and aggressions of Slavery to be resisted, if not now? The Constitution is invaded—subject to constant change, in the violent interpretations put upon it from time to time, to meet the growing demands and exigencies of Slavery, and enforced upon the country, under threats of dissolution, and the corrupting influences of Presidential patronage. The independence of the House of Representatives is unflinchingly assailed, by promises of Executive favor to each member as would betray their constituents on a question vital to the institution of Freedom—Legislative enactments the most solemn and binding, after being enforced upon the country by the power and votes of Slavery, are repealed under pretences false in fact, and insulting to our intelligence. Party platforms are erected at the bidding of Slavery, and when upon the faith of their honest observance its candidates are elected, they are treacherously violated, and new and more degrading tests of party fealty imposed.

I am a democrat—deeply imbued with the ideas and doctrines of that political school. My principles are safe—I have no fears of losing them. I know what they are, and whether they point; and when assailed shall defend them with the earnestness of a thorough conviction in their soundness and truth. I regret with scorn the insistent mandates of the Administration, requiring adhesion to its measures as a test of democratic orthodoxy. Democracy had a life and history some time before this Administration abused its name and principles, and will survive as the chief Jay of mischievous power. Not the least of the crimes of Slavery, is the attempt to make to prostitute the name and principles of democracy, in its assaults upon the Constitution and liberties of the country.

This Congressional District gave near 2500 majority for Gen. Pierce; and to this result I contributed my vote. I trust the future will show how grossly he has outraged the principles of its intelligent voters. Slavery demanded entire submission to its policy, as a condition of its support—let candidates henceforth learn, that here at least in Pennsylvania, if no where else within the State, we require of no man guarantees of fidelity to the principles and rights of Freedom.

Very respectfully,
Your sincere friend,
D. WILMOT

Willard R. Richards, Esq., Bradford, Pa.

A BARK.—The Poughkeepsie Daily Press says:—As a drowsy-looking colored child about ten years of age, and from the country, was passing under the scaffolding of the building now being erected at the corner of Main and Catherine streets, the other day, a bark came down, struck upon his head and broke in two. He was struck for a moment, but soon recovered sufficiently to get off the following, and leave those who had gathered around him in a roar of laughter: "I say, you white man up dar, ef you don't want your backs broke, just keep 'em off my head!"

To CATON RATS.—Take your bed and place it on the floor where the rats are most troublesome, then place a bit of cheese, sardines, &c., on the pillow and clothe get in bed and blow out the light and lay still, the rats will soon make their appearance and when they get busy a work on the cheese, make a snap!

QUITE USELESS.—A good deacon making an official visit to a dying neighbor, who was very popular, put the usual question—
"Are you willing to go my friend?"
"Oh yes," said the sick man.
"I am glad of that," said the deacon, "for all the neighbors are willing."

AT NO LOSS FOR AN ANSWER.—An Irishman having accidentally broken a pane of glass, was making the best of his way out of sight; but the proprietor stole a march on him and having seized him by the collar, exclaimed—
"You broke my window, fellow, did you not?"
"To be sure I did," said Pat, "and did you not see me stepping home for money to pay for it?"