

Our readers will find in this paper a communication from our correspondent, 'Cayenne,' explaining his remarks made a short time since on the position of Mr. Grow, in 1848. It will be seen that Cayenne affirms that it was at the so-called Democratic party, and not at Mr. Grow that his blow was aimed, and as he is abundantly able to defend himself from misrepresentation, we shall let him do so, and leave our readers to judge of the merits of the case for themselves. We are not disposed, at this time, to enter into any controversy upon the subject, neither do we feel ourselves called upon to find fault with Mr. Grow for the course pursued by him in 1848. Since the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, and the attempts to extend Slavery into new Territories, new issues have come before the people, and a great portion of the North have become better acquainted with the term 'Popular Sovereignty,' than they were at that time. We repeat it, it was not our purpose to malign Mr. Grow, in giving place to the communication of our correspondent.

Some of the pro-slavery papers and members of Congress deny that the recent election in this State was a Free-Soil victory, and assume that therefore Pennsylvania may still be counted on as the land of Doughfaces. We believe that this is decidedly an error, and that the interests of freedom require its correction as soon as possible. Massachusetts has just testified anew her devotion to right and humanity, by electing to the United States Senate, Henry Wilson, a well-known and uncompromising opponent of the Slave Power. There is now little doubt that New York will elect Wm. H. Seward, the chief opposition to anti-slavery from the fact that he is strongly anti-slavery. Several of the Western States have also recently elected, or are about to elect, Free-Soil Senators. If the Fall elections left any doubt as to the position of the North, these elections of Free-Soil Senators must remove it. Among the rest, Pennsylvania is called upon again to define her position. Our legislature is understood to be strongly Free-Soil, and it is confidently expected that they will elect for United States Senator a man who will represent the sentiment of the State on the Slavery question.

It is not too much to say that the election of a U. S. Senator is considered, at this particular crisis, a matter of so much importance, that the results in the several States are watched for with anxiety by the whole country. The character of the Senate must be changed. That of the House has already been, and no power or favor of the Executive, no appeals to the spirit of party, or of mammon, will ever carry a measure like the Nebraska bill through the lower House of the Thirty-Fourth Congress. But in the Senate changes are more slowly effected. There, every acquisition to the ranks of freedom is an event at which the great mass of the Northern people rejoice.

Such being the state of things, this State is about to elect a Senator. Whom should she elect? It should not be a man about whose position there is any doubt, so as to admit of his being claimed on both sides, till at some future day his official course may indicate his position, but one whose bold advocacy of Free-Soil principles, in times past, will both afford a guarantee to the friends, and bring dismay upon the foes, of freedom. He should be of one whose election will felt as decisive of Pennsylvania's position. With- out wishing to detract from the merits of others, we must say, that in our own opinion, of all who have been named in connection with the office, there is no other whose election would have so marked and beneficial an influence on the great struggle between freedom and slavery, as that of Judge Wilmot. If Henry Wilson is the prominent Free-Soil man of Massachusetts, so is David Wilmot, of Pennsylvania. And if there ever was a time when the people demanded the selection of such men for office, it is the present. True, some of the other candidates have been consistent opponents of the Slave Power, but as none other has been so prominently associated with the Free-Soil movement, the election of none other would be considered so emphatic a rebuke of Northern doughfaces, and so significant a warning to the Southern Dictators. Even the speaking and hypocritical allies of slavery in our midst, would hardly deny that his election was a Free-Soil triumph. If he is elected, the whole country will understand what Pennsylvania means, and where she may be found, in future.

Aside from the open exertions of rival candidates, we believe the chief opposition to Judge Wilmot will come from President Pierce's Nebraska Administration and its friends. We can hardly believe that Washington influence will be very strong in Harrisburg, this winter, but we doubt not those influences will be exerted to the fullest extent to prostrate his defeat. The Democratic Union, the Nebraska organ at Harrisburg, has already sounded the alarm, and kindly admonishes the Know-Nothings, (whom it has always bitterly opposed,) that if Wilmot is elected, 'the whole cargo of the Know-Nothings will go to the devil!' On condition of producing such a result, we believe the national administration would even consent to Wilmot's election, but on no other that we can think of.

We have been informed that some of the spurious anti-Nebraska men of this region have gone to Harrisburg, to oppose Wilmot. As they are individuals who will stick at nothing to effect their purposes, they may do him some injury, provided they can find any members credulous enough to trust their statements. But we believe there are few in the present Legislature who would be likely to be misled by representations coming from such suspicious sources.

We have taken some pains, and had some opportunity to learn the opinions and wishes of the people of this region, on the subject, and we can give assurance that Wilmot is more popular than ever, at home, and in the great mass of the people are enthusiastically in favor of his election as United States Senator.

It is said that the following questions have been proposed for discussion in the Know-Nothing lodge of Titonium:

- 1. If we are in favor of education and an open Bible for all, can we conscientiously give aid and comfort to a system which, like that of Southern Slavery, makes it a crime to teach children their letters, and keeps the Bible a sealed book to the great body of the people?
2. If the interests of free American laborers are injured by coming in competition with the pauper labor of Europe, are they not also injured by coming in competition with the Slave Labor of America? and ought we not to oppose the formation of new Slave States, on something like the same grounds that we oppose the flooding of our country with pauper emigrants?
3. Is it in accordance with true American principles to extend over free territory, a system which gives men power in the National Government in proportion to the amount of (slave) property they possess?
4. Judging from what has occurred in the past, would the interests of the free labor and free men of the North be properly cared for and protected, if the States in which the free rule the many and in which labor is considered degrading, should acquire a numerical superiority in the Union?
5. When we perceive two great perils threatening our country, is it wise or right to direct all our opposition against one, and leave the other to go on unopposed?
6. Is our system of government based on the Republican theory that all men are by nature created free and equal? and if so, is it not the duty of the General Government to carry out that theory, as far as can be done under the provisions of the Constitution?
7. Is it not our duty, as lovers of our country and her free institutions, and as intelligent freemen who aim at a just protection of our own interests, to oppose slavery-extension?

C. C. BURKIN, the celebrated lecturer, visited this borough last week, and delivered three lectures, on Slavery, Temperance, and Woman's Rights, respectively. He is a speaker of much ability and eloquence. His lectures here were largely attended and very well received. The second one on Slavery, which was appointed for Friday evening, was prevented by his unexpected departure on receiving intelligence of the sudden and severe illness of his brother.

Mr. Burlinghame, we believe, is doing much good throughout the country by his lectures. 'Long may he wave' his yellow locks.

STANHOPE BURLINGHAME. The Senate in our Honors. A Novel. By Helen Dhu. Stringer & Townsend, No. 222 Broadway, New York, will shortly publish a book with the above title.

From the feeling now excited throughout the country on the subject to which the story relates, the reputation of the writer, and the high praise bestowed by those who have read the proof sheets, we infer this publication will produce a great sensation and meet with an extensive sale.

An eminent Protestant Divine says: 'I have read Stanhope Burlinghame's unusual admiration, and delight. It is not often that I can use this language in speaking of Works of Fiction; but this book is a Fiction only in name; its truthfulness will speak for itself on every page, and almost at every period. I regard it as one of the most powerful literary works which Protestantism has produced, not excepting all things considered—the ablest treatises on this subject, which were published by the great Protestant Divines of England, after the period of the Lutheran Reformation. I am quite confident that it will be read with entire delight by all the Protestant clergy of America, and of the world, if they hold, with earnestness and zeal, 'the Faith once delivered to the Saints.'

From another who has contributed much to the wealth of our national Literature, and who read the manuscript as a professional labor, the publishers have a letter from which they make the following extract: 'By no means lose the chance of publishing the work. It is the best American novel ever written—not excepting Cooper's "Leatherstocking Tales," or even "Uncle Tom's Cabin." It is a book which will, if treated right, create a profound impression throughout the country. \* \* \* There is no attempt at fine writing; but there is fine writing in the book, and the book is full of it. I am not acquainted with any work of fiction in the English language, since the time of Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," where the author evidently relies so much upon the simple narration of a story, without calling to his aid any garbure except that of chaste and simple language with which the Anglo-Saxon tongue invests the noblest thoughts and feelings of the human soul.'

A gentleman of great learning, who has passed many years in Europe, where he became familiar with the whole spirit of despotism, Jesuitism, and priestly domination, says, after reading the proof sheets: 'I applaud the book—I cannot help it. Speaking within due bounds of moderation, I am really of opinion that the sensation which it will create in our reading community, may almost be called electrical. The astounding events introduced in the tale, will astonish even experts in our present social and political condition, while it will thrill and amaze other readers, who are less posted in what is secretly going on around us. If I were to eulogise the work according to my opinion of its merits, I should have to use language which I fear you would consider hyperbolic: I always like a good novel, but I have read so many that I did not expect to see another that would make me feel so wild and strange as I felt when I first read "Eugene Aram" and "Monte Cristo." So much for the dramatic power with which Stanhope Burlinghame is written. But its high literary finish is not its chief charm to a Republican Protestant. I am no saint, but I never felt so deeply in all my life, how dangerous is being Jesuitism in a free country, as when I came to the last page of this book. I could not repress—or did I desire to—the ejaculation that Heaven itself would send it to every American home. This book

alone has power enough to defeat all the schemes that Padre Jaudan and the whole company of Jesus put together can ever contrive for the overthrow of the fairest form of enlightened Republicanism the earth has ever seen.

Post Office Removal.—John Hancock has been appointed Postmaster at Fairdale, a friend writing us from Fairdale, gives some interesting information relative to this removal. He tells us that Mr. Hoff, who has long been known as an earnest Free-Soiler, has held the office for the last twelve years, and that he voluntarily tendered it to the present incumbent, provided a majority of those interested desired a change; but to that people interested were known to be generally opposed; yet a petition was got up, signed by about a dozen names, including several official recipients of public bounty in Montrose, and sent on to Washington, and shortly after Mr. Hoff read the announcement of his removal in a 'Democratic' newspaper, being the first notice he received of that interesting fact. Slavery has a searching eye, and a long arm.

Hon. Charles Durkee, the fusion candidate, who is described as an old fashioned Abolitionist, a thorough Land Reformer, and Christian Philanthropist, has been chosen U. S. Senator from Wisconsin for six years from the fourth of March next. So the ranks of freedom are filling up in the Senate. Let us see what will result from the 'sober second thought' of Pennsylvania.

Correspondence. For the Independent Republican. Hon. G. A. Grow. Messrs. Editors.—When the course pursued in Congress by Mr. Grow to be questioned by any paper or by any party in this country, I would wish for no worse cause for my pen than his defence. The strong, constant and determined opposition he has offered to the encroachments of human slavery upon the rights of northern freemen, receives from his constituents the warmest commendation and most generous approval. The eloquence and sound logic of his Congressional speeches, and his untiring labors in this respect, have secured him the respect and admiration of the people. In short our country can be represented in Congress by no better and by no stronger man than Mr. Grow.

In this country men are made to represent principles. It is seldom an opportunity is given, to vote directly for any principle or measure. Last fall we voted for or against the Prohibitory Liquor Law. But this was an isolated case. We usually vote for men who advocate and represent principles which we approve. This is the true design of the representative system. It is to propose to the people, and to elect for the Democratic party, to draw the party lines, and by rigid party discipline, to compel its members to vote for principles revolting to their hearts and consciences. To elucidate this point, and make clear to the mind of the reader that this is the course pursued by the party and its organs, allusion was made to the respective positions of Mr. Wilmot and Mr. Bigler. One is freely denounced because he refused to vote for Gov. Bigler, while the other is applauded because he voted for the same man. Now do not suppose to the regular reader, and yet both of these gentlemen, on the same evening, conducted the administration in the strongest manner, and both denounced Gov. Bigler for the course he pursued in regard to the passage of the Nebraska Bill. Men may vote and speak what they please, but when they come to vote, they must vote the regular nominations or be censured by the party organ. If it had been simply stated that Mr. Grow voted for Mr. Bigler, no exceptions would have been taken, but when a few words are added to the Governor's name, just sufficient to indicate the principles and measures he represents, then the inconsistency of the vote is made too glaring, and the party organ becomes highly incensed. It should be remembered that Gov. Bigler urged the Legislature to pass a law permitting men to hold slaves in Pennsylvania, for a limited period of time, and also that our county jails should be converted into slave pens. He was opposed to the Maine Law, and in favor of the Nebraska bill. This is the position he occupied, and these are the principles he represented in the candidate for the suffrages of the people. I maintain that it is correct to say that Mr. Grow "voted for Gov. Bigler, Nebraska, Slave Pen, and all." The design was not to "mud" Mr. Grow. A blow was aimed at the Democratic party and its organ, for attempting to "crush out" the Free Soil sentiment from its candidates; for in the absence of any good, or even of any plausible reason for the vote cast by Mr. Grow, I was forced to the conclusion that the "pressure" was put upon him as it was upon other candidates, and was directed to put upon Mr. Hollister. What ever may have been the reasons which governed Mr. Grow, we are sorry to say that the vote which he cast in direct opposition to the facts stated and the principles inculcated by him in the Court House, only a few weeks before election, has cost him the confidence of many of his friends, and lost him hundreds of votes.

For the same purpose—that is, to demonstrate the dishonesty and inconsistency of the party and its organs upon the Free Soil question, an allusion was made to a former position occupied by Mr. Grow, in which it was alleged that he was "not sustained by the party." In this case as in the other, there was no design to "mud" or attack Mr. Grow. It is evident that it is exceedingly difficult to prove with sufficient clearness the different positions occupied by the party, without alluding to the prominent men who sustained it and advocated its principles. When reviewing the past history of the party, a writer has the right to allude to public men to elucidate his subject, without being liable to the charge of "mud-slinging."

It is a source of deep regret that the mention of Mr. Grow's name in connection with the campaign of 1848, should be construed into a personal attack upon his present friends. Mr. Wilmot was clearly, and justly, the organ of the party, and it was his duty to sustain and defend the course pursued by the party on the free soil question, but it is not correct to say that he was "not sustained by the party." In an argument the Editor is lost; in a personal quarrel he is at home; it therefore suits his purpose to convert every discussion of public questions into personal diffusions. Disclaiming any disrespect to Mr. Grow, I will try to show how and why an allusion to his connection with the campaign of 1848 was not sustained by the free soil question.

Gen. Cass, an opponent to the President, wrote the following letter, containing principles alluded to and assigned to the principles of the Wilmot Provision, for the purpose of courting the favor of the South: "I advanced the principle which has since been christened Popular Sovereignty. It contemplated the extension of Slavery upon free Territory, but gave to the inhabitants the inalienable privilege of doing as they pleased with it. It was not a question of the three candidates for the Presidential chair, only one of them, Mr. Van Buren, was in favor of restricting Slavery to its present limits. Mr. Wilmot was clearly, and justly, the organ of the party, and it was his duty to sustain and defend the course pursued by the party on the free soil question, but it is not correct to say that he was "not sustained by the party." In an argument the Editor is lost; in a personal quarrel he is at home; it therefore suits his purpose to convert every discussion of public questions into personal diffusions. Disclaiming any disrespect to Mr. Grow, I will try to show how and why an allusion to his connection with the campaign of 1848 was not sustained by the free soil question.

Gen. Cass, an opponent to the President, wrote the following letter, containing principles alluded to and assigned to the principles of the Wilmot Provision, for the purpose of courting the favor of the South: "I advanced the principle which has since been christened Popular Sovereignty. It contemplated the extension of Slavery upon free Territory, but gave to the inhabitants the inalienable privilege of doing as they pleased with it. It was not a question of the three candidates for the Presidential chair, only one of them, Mr. Van Buren, was in favor of restricting Slavery to its present limits. Mr. Wilmot was clearly, and justly, the organ of the party, and it was his duty to sustain and defend the course pursued by the party on the free soil question, but it is not correct to say that he was "not sustained by the party." In an argument the Editor is lost; in a personal quarrel he is at home; it therefore suits his purpose to convert every discussion of public questions into personal diffusions. Disclaiming any disrespect to Mr. Grow, I will try to show how and why an allusion to his connection with the campaign of 1848 was not sustained by the free soil question.

Gen. Cass, an opponent to the President, wrote the following letter, containing principles alluded to and assigned to the principles of the Wilmot Provision, for the purpose of courting the favor of the South: "I advanced the principle which has since been christened Popular Sovereignty. It contemplated the extension of Slavery upon free Territory, but gave to the inhabitants the inalienable privilege of doing as they pleased with it. It was not a question of the three candidates for the Presidential chair, only one of them, Mr. Van Buren, was in favor of restricting Slavery to its present limits. Mr. Wilmot was clearly, and justly, the organ of the party, and it was his duty to sustain and defend the course pursued by the party on the free soil question, but it is not correct to say that he was "not sustained by the party." In an argument the Editor is lost; in a personal quarrel he is at home; it therefore suits his purpose to convert every discussion of public questions into personal diffusions. Disclaiming any disrespect to Mr. Grow, I will try to show how and why an allusion to his connection with the campaign of 1848 was not sustained by the free soil question.

Gen. Cass, an opponent to the President, wrote the following letter, containing principles alluded to and assigned to the principles of the Wilmot Provision, for the purpose of courting the favor of the South: "I advanced the principle which has since been christened Popular Sovereignty. It contemplated the extension of Slavery upon free Territory, but gave to the inhabitants the inalienable privilege of doing as they pleased with it. It was not a question of the three candidates for the Presidential chair, only one of them, Mr. Van Buren, was in favor of restricting Slavery to its present limits. Mr. Wilmot was clearly, and justly, the organ of the party, and it was his duty to sustain and defend the course pursued by the party on the free soil question, but it is not correct to say that he was "not sustained by the party." In an argument the Editor is lost; in a personal quarrel he is at home; it therefore suits his purpose to convert every discussion of public questions into personal diffusions. Disclaiming any disrespect to Mr. Grow, I will try to show how and why an allusion to his connection with the campaign of 1848 was not sustained by the free soil question.

Carried out, benefit posterity. To confer benefit is as well as to harm. If I am in error, convince me by fair and honorable argument, and I will manfully give in. This is the only way to settle a question. I am no way inclined to controversy. I do not think of troubling you any more, however others might do; nor would I at this time, were it not that the idea appears to be entertained that I would treat all law for education under and east the fragments to the winds. Distinctly I say, let us have a school law by all means—a better one than the present, if it possibly can be obtained. I have no personalities to offer against any incumbent. Let each do his duty as well as he can. Individuals do not deserve objections from me; as I know, and from me they shall not have them. To the law only object, and I shall continue to do so, so long as its present arbitrary and insupportable features and principles are retained.

In conclusion I have only to add what I have inadvertently passed over, viz: During the last twenty years, the full age of our School system, I have not been able to see any considerable improvement in our schools, except what some may account such, the increase of teachers' salaries, without an equivalent in more efficient teaching, or in an improvement of the law, is not the cry of a dissatisfied few, as some would fain have us believe, but the full, clear voice of the many. Indeed, I have yet to feel the man say, "I like the school law as it now is." If the expressions of the inhabitants of the towns nearest to us, can be regarded as anything like a specimen, at least three-fourths of the parents of the whole county are dissatisfied, and are desirous of a judicious, consistent, and appropriate alteration of the law. Who should decide? friend Scott, or the people? That is the question.

Republican Meeting at Jackson. Pursuant to notice a meeting was held at Jackson on Thursday evening, Feb. 1st. James Miles Esq. was chosen President, and John Gunnison Vice President. L. P. Hinds Esq. being in attendance was introduced to the audience, and addressed the meeting at length, in an eloquent and impressive speech. After the address, the following resolutions were presented by J. W. Carrell, and after some appropriate remarks, were unanimously adopted. Resolved, That Slavery is a moral, social and political evil, existing in violation of the laws of nature and of God. Resolved, That the extension of Slavery over the territories of our Republic—the controlling influence it is exerting over the national government, is endangering the rights, interests and safety of the Free-laborers of the Northern States. Resolved, That the interests of the free States be the immediate passage of the Homestead Bill. Resolved, That the Homestead Bill is opposed by the Slave Power, because its provisions would be more beneficial to the laboring masses than to the Slaveholding capitalists—establishing freedom in the territories instead of Slavery. Resolved, That the Fugitive Slave Law is an aggression on the rights of the Free States. Resolved, That we are in favor of the improvement of the rivers and harbors by the general government. Resolved, That the Free-Trade and Douglas crew have deserted the original principles of the 'Democratic' party, that they are waging war upon those principles, that they are the leaders of the great Slave party.

Resolved, That the political course of Judge Wilmot, his unyielding opposition to the demands of the Slave power, his active exertions in the cause of freedom, entitled him to the thanks and gratitude of his fellow citizens. Resolved, That being Republicans we will sustain the principles of the 'Republican' party, as taught by Jefferson and the fathers of the Republic. Resolved, That we will support no man for the Presidency in 1856, who is not in favor of Republican principles. On motion of E. Leons, it was resolved, that the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Independent Republican. On motion, adjourned. L. C. BASSON, Secy.

Area of the States and Territories. According to the census report, the area of the United States and Territories is 2,439,166 square miles. The following table, taken from that document, but transposed so as to give each its proper rank, shows the area of each State and Territory:

Table with 3 columns: State/Territory, Sq. Miles, Sq. Miles. Includes entries for Nebraska Territory, Utah Territory, Texas, Pennsylvania, Oregon Territory, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Districts of Columbia.

The Nebraska Territory is large enough to cut up into seven States of the size of New York and leave a surplus of territory large enough for a State the size of Connecticut. Kansas Territory has an area sufficient to make two States of the size of Ohio and one of the size of Indiana. Texas will make four States of the size of Alabama, and one of the size of Indiana; and California has a sufficient area to convert into sixteen States of the size of New Hampshire, and have a surplus to make one about the size of Massachusetts.

The instructions of the Michigan Legislature to her Senators relative to the Missouri Compromise and the Nebraska act, give Gen. Cass a great deal of trouble. They not only speak in terms of disapproval of his past course; upon the question involved in the latter measure, they were direct in bringing out a bill for the restoration of the compromise, and to urge its adoption by his voice and vote. Of course the General will disavow, for the democratic doctrines of obedience to instructions apply only to cases in which democratic Legislatures instruct opposition Senators in which contingency the latter are in duty bound to obey or resign. But when the contrary of this happens, all the Democrat has to do is to assert that the majority who give the instructions are Abolitionists, or higher or lower law men, that they are too tall for short, loose constructions or misconstructions, anything, so that they represent opinions and purposes repugnant to the interests and feelings of the person instructed. Senator Will commenced the game of quibbling and evasion. He would neither obey nor resign, because the Will Legislature which gave the instructions did not believe in the duty of obedience. Cass was instructed in 1850 to vote for the Wilmot Provision. He repudiated because it was not convenient to obey. Today, of course, he was last year instructed to resist the restoration of the Missouri Compromise. He repudiated because the Legislature was thought justly elected on that very question, was composed of factious. And so they go, quibbling, equivocating, and at last breaking through the meshes of the nets which they have set to catch their opponents.

The Prohibitory Liquor bill now before the Pennsylvania Legislature is substantially the same as that which was before the Legislature in 1853, and much less cumbersome in its provisions than that of last year.

Interesting Correspondence. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Harrisburg, Jan. 18, 1855. Hon. David Wilmot.—Dear Sir:—Your friends here will bring your name before the Legislature in connection with the office of U. S. Senator. The main objection urged against you arises out of an impression entertained by many that you are unfriendly to the great interests of our State.

We should be glad to see you here, but if you cannot visit Harrisburg before the election, please give us in a letter the history of your course in Congress, on the Tariff question, as there seems to be a misapprehension about in regard to your views, if I have properly understood them. Truly yours, B. LAPORTE.

MONTROSE, January 22d, 1855. My DEAR Sir:—Your favor came to hand last evening. I do not think I shall be in Harrisburg. The week vacation between my Courts would be mostly occupied in the journey, leaving me but little time to make the acquaintance of gentlemen now assembled at the Capitol. Again, if no difficulties were in the way, I am reluctant to show myself at Harrisburg at this time. Not that I am indifferent to the issue of the Senatorial election; but I do not wish to appear as a selfish and ambitious aspirant for the place. I have not, as you will know, been eager for the signal honors, nor have I in any way whatever been instrumental in making myself a candidate. The connection of my name with the office of Senator is the result of the late signal revolution of politics of this State, and of my well known position on one at least, of the important issues on which that revolution turned, and not through any vanity or scheming of my own. To visit Harrisburg at this time would subject me to suspicion, and the charge of sinister and selfish motives, which I wholly and emphatically disclaim. I do not deny that I should feel a personal pride in an election to one of the highest and most honorable positions in the Government; but I do deny that I desire the place for any selfish ends. I should hope, if elected, to be able to contribute to the country, and to the cause of sound principles. While I claim no eminent qualifications for the office, I do, nevertheless, believe that my election would, in some respects, be fortunate, especially so, in uniting and cementing for future action the men who achieved the late signal victory in this State.

You say that the main objection urged against me arises out of an impression entertained by many that I am unfriendly to the great interests of our State. This is a total misapprehension of my feelings and position, and springs doubtless from the fact, that in 1846 I could not act with my colleagues in a profitless and obstinate support of the tariff of 1842. It was apparent, weeks before the late tariff bill was passed, that the act of 1842 could not stand. I was in favor of its modification and revision, and in doing this, was zealously anxious to preserve for the great interests of our State, permanent and ample security; and to this end, I labored industriously and perseveringly. On the floor of the House, I urged the laying of specific, instead of ad valorem duties on iron, and to that extent, I should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

My DEAR Sir:—Your favor came to hand last evening. I do not think I shall be in Harrisburg. The week vacation between my Courts would be mostly occupied in the journey, leaving me but little time to make the acquaintance of gentlemen now assembled at the Capitol. Again, if no difficulties were in the way, I am reluctant to show myself at Harrisburg at this time. Not that I am indifferent to the issue of the Senatorial election; but I do not wish to appear as a selfish and ambitious aspirant for the place. I have not, as you will know, been eager for the signal honors, nor have I in any way whatever been instrumental in making myself a candidate. The connection of my name with the office of Senator is the result of the late signal revolution of politics of this State, and of my well known position on one at least, of the important issues on which that revolution turned, and not through any vanity or scheming of my own. To visit Harrisburg at this time would subject me to suspicion, and the charge of sinister and selfish motives, which I wholly and emphatically disclaim. I do not deny that I should feel a personal pride in an election to one of the highest and most honorable positions in the Government; but I do deny that I desire the place for any selfish ends. I should hope, if elected, to be able to contribute to the country, and to the cause of sound principles. While I claim no eminent qualifications for the office, I do, nevertheless, believe that my election would, in some respects, be fortunate, especially so, in uniting and cementing for future action the men who achieved the late signal victory in this State.

You say that the main objection urged against me arises out of an impression entertained by many that I am unfriendly to the great interests of our State. This is a total misapprehension of my feelings and position, and springs doubtless from the fact, that in 1846 I could not act with my colleagues in a profitless and obstinate support of the tariff of 1842. It was apparent, weeks before the late tariff bill was passed, that the act of 1842 could not stand. I was in favor of its modification and revision, and in doing this, was zealously anxious to preserve for the great interests of our State, permanent and ample security; and to this end, I labored industriously and perseveringly. On the floor of the House, I urged the laying of specific, instead of ad valorem duties on iron, and to that extent, I should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition. I entered into an argument to prove the propriety and advantage of specific over ad valorem duties, in respect to various articles, and especially in regard to iron; establishing to my own satisfaction that position, as well in respect to the interests of the revenue, as also to that of the consumer and manufacturer, that every article should give security to our interests against ruinous foreign competition.

My DEAR Sir:—Your favor came to hand last evening. I do not think I shall be in Harrisburg. The week vacation between my Courts would be mostly occupied in the journey, leaving me but little time to make the acquaintance of gentlemen now assembled at the Capitol. Again, if no difficulties were in the way, I am reluctant to show myself at Harrisburg at this time. Not that I am indifferent to the issue of the Senatorial election; but I do not wish to appear as a selfish and ambitious aspirant for the place. I have not, as you will know, been eager for the signal honors, nor have I in any way whatever been instrumental in making myself a candidate. The connection of my name with the office of Senator is the result of the late signal revolution of politics of this State, and of my well known position on one at least, of the important issues on which that revolution turned, and not through any vanity or scheming of my own. To visit Harrisburg at this time would subject me to suspicion, and the charge of sinister and selfish motives, which I wholly and emphatically disclaim. I do not deny that I should feel a personal pride in an election to one of the highest and most honorable positions in the Government; but I do deny that I desire the place for any selfish ends. I should hope, if elected, to be able to contribute to the country, and to the cause of sound principles. While I claim no eminent qualifications for the office, I do, nevertheless, believe that my election would, in some respects, be fortunate, especially so, in uniting and cementing for future action the men who achieved the late signal victory in this State.