PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

PUBLISHED BY WRITE & CO.

PITTSBURGH.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 9, 1852.

Antimasonic and Whig County Ticket

FOR CONGRESS—1ST DISTRICT.
DAVID RITCHIE, Pittsburgh.
FOR CONGRESS—2ND DISTRICT.
THOMAS M. HOWE, Allegheny.
FOR SENATE.
GEORGE DARSIE, Allegheny.
FOR ASSEMBLY.
GEORGE K. APPLETON, Birmingham.
THOMAS PENNEY, McKeesport.
RICHARD OWEN, Pittsburgh.
C. S. SYPHER, Pitt Township.
JOHN M. PORTER, Turtlepoint.
SHERIFF.
WILLIAM MAGILL, Pittsburgh.
PROTHONOTARY.
EDWARD CAMPBELL, Jr., Pittsburgh.
ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF COURT OF QUARTER SESSIONS, &C.
JOHN GEHLERT, Allegheny.
COMMISSIONER.
WILLIAM ALGEO, Pittsburgh.
CORONER.
JAMES LOWRY, Pittsburgh.
AUDITOR.
FRANCIS I. GARDNER, Elizabeth.

☞ READING MATTER WILL BE FOUND ON EACH PAGE OF THIS PAPER.

WHO DID IT?—Judge SHALER was particularly severe on the Whig party, in his remarks at the Democratic ratification meeting. They had "opposed the honor and glory of the country." "No action had been done by them to advance our national prosperity and honor." He pointed to their past history. Very well. We will ask the Judge, who passed the Tariff of 1842, which raised Pennsylvania to her highest pitch of prosperity; and what party repealed that beneficent measure, and prostrated her manufacturing interests? Will the Judge tell us?

Again the Judge asked—"Who was it opposed the War of 1812, with Great Britain? True enough, who was it? Wasit Gen. Scott, whom he intimates has "no other qualifications than fuss and feathers?" Did he oppose the war at Chippewa and Lundy's Lane? Who does the Judge mean? We used to hear of certain persons opposing that war, who are now rampant for any war however iniquitous.

As Baltimore reaches the left bank of the Ohio at Wheeling, she is met by two great Ohio works terminating on the right bank.—one of them the Marietta enterprise, opening the shortest and directest route to Kentucky and Tennessee, and to the rich trade of those States which Philadelphia has so long possessed and cannot afford to lose. Bridge or no bridge, these roads will be built—will be very soon built; and the Baltimore and Ohio road is almost completed. Are we to allow these works to become solely tributary to Baltimore? or are we to try conclusions with her for the mastery? The contest cannot be waged in Pittsburgh; and Pittsburgh, strictly speaking, has no part, lot, or interest in it. It is true, if one new Ohio improvements will be to a certain extent, rivals to some of the Pittsburgh roads (to all which, so we have said, Philadelphia is friendly;) and they may be even unsuccessful ones. Nevertheless, they will do some busines, whether profitable or unprofitable; make or break, they will carry goods and passengers to Wheeling; the question is whether all these (lost, necessarily to Pittsburgh, whatever Philadelphia may do) are to be allowed to go to Baltimore, or claim for a due share of them shall be made in behalf of our own city.—*North American.*

This is Philadelphia logic in reply to our remonstrance against their injustice to Pittsburgh. It is taken for granted, that when certain roads terminating at Wheeling are finished, a large amount of trade and travel will centre there, and that when there, this trade and travel must necessarily pass over the Baltimore road, unless Philadelphia contends for it at Wheeling by means of the Hempfield road. We do not deny that a certain amount of business will concentrate at Wheeling, but we aver that Philadelphia can more cheaply and successfully compete for that business, through Pittsburgh than by the construction of a rival route. It is an insult to say that "Pittsburgh has no part, lot, or interest in it." We could just as well retort and say, that Philadelphia has no part, lot, or interest in the trade which concentrates at Cleveland, because New York and Boston have secured the most of it. Where is this trade to come from, but the West and Southwest, and has Pittsburgh no interest in that? This trade and travel must be contended for, not at Wheeling, but at Columbus, at Cincinnati, at Louisville, at Indianapolis, at St. Louis, and from any of those points, the route through Pittsburgh offers Philadelphia as many, and we assert more inducements, than the route through Wheeling.

Is Philadelphia so wilfully blind that she cannot see that Pittsburgh has a deep interest in this matter, when Philadelphia herself proposes to attract trade to Wheeling by means of her Hempfield project? Pittsburgh has no fears of the Baltimore Railroad, with its high grades and circuitous route, and feels confident that she can intercept and turn the bulk of the trade this way over a better route, even from the western shore of the Ohio river opposite Wheeling. But Philadelphia steps in and offers another attraction to take the trade to Wheeling, and by that means wages an active competition with the Pittsburgh route, and does all she can to build up a rival city, and then coolly turns round and tells us we have no "part, lot, or interest in it!" If it were possible to build a direct Railroad from Baltimore to New York, without passing through Philadelphia, would the *North American* admit they had no part, lot, or interest in the matter? Or, if a direct Railroad should be made from the Juniatta to New York, crossing the Delaware at Easton, giving New York a short and direct route to Pittsburgh and the West, would she be grasping a trade in which Philadelphia has no "part, lot, or interest?" Pittsburgh in her degree has just as much interest in the trade of the West as Philadelphia, and when that city is engaged in a work the tendency of which is to draw away trade from us to a rival city, she can scarcely reconcile us to it, by telling us it is none of our business.

The *New York Herald*, endorses the nomination of Gen. Pierce, and pronounces him entirely sound on the Fugitive Slave law, and all other radical Locofoco notions. The Herald hates Gen. Scott. He is too great and good a man for that paper. It cannot bear so much disinterestedness, honesty, and true greatness as shines forth in Gen. Scott. It is a good omen for the Whigs to find the Herald against them. We should doubt the purity of the principles, or of the candidate which the Herald supported.

NO PLEDGES.—The united Whig press, almost, of the Free States, are opposed to any pledges being required from Gen. Scott, by the Whig Convention. They know Gen. Scott, and they confide in him. To ask for a pledge is to insult him. On this subject the *Cincinnati Gazette* says:

We hope Gen. Scott will have the firmness to resist all outside pressure, and come before the people—if he comes at all—*as* an old fashioned republican Whig, utterly refusing to make any pledges as to what his conduct will be, should he be elected President. If his long life and his brilliant services, and his unquestioned patriotism, furnish no pledge that he will do every thing that may become him as a man and as an officer, to strengthen and preserve the Union, and to increase the prosperity of the country, for which he has so often perilled his life, no word that he can speak, no pledge that he can make, no letter that he can write, will give any security for his conduct worth the value of a straw.

The President's duty is to see that the laws are "faithfully executed"—not to make them, nor dictate them to Congress. The exertion of the President's influence to secure the passage of a law, is one of the pernicious Locofoco practices which Whigs have invariably denounced. We protest against its introduction into our party, and we can see nothing else in the demand of a "guaranty for the future" but an attempt to extract from the Whig candidate ante-election veto pledges, and promises to exert whatever influence he may have as President to control the legislation of Congress. To demand them is an insult to the candidate, to practice them would be in violation of whig doctrine, as taught from the beginning, and to insist upon them in support of certain opinions which the individual himself is understood to entertain, and when they are pretty certain to do more harm than good, is a degree of unreasonableness almost amounting to folly.

INTERESTING TO BRIDGE BUILDERS.—The time for receiving proposals for a Railroad Bridge across the Muskingum river, at Zanesville, has been postponed until the 14th instant. See advertisement.

For the Pittsburg Gazette.

WAS ONESIMUS A SLAVE?

MR. WHITE:—By your animadversion in last week's Gazette, on the 16th of Philemon, my attention, with that of others, was drawn to the term "a brother in the flesh." You would greatly oblige us by giving a further explanation of this phrase. I believe, under the old Jewish bigparchy, the younger brother served the elder. Would it be possible that Onesimus was an escaped younger brother from Philemon?

Our other query—the term servant in the Bible, has been often construed to mean slave.—The apostles in almost all the epistles, commenced by stating they were the servants of Jesus Christ. When this word is used by them, does it mean slave? or is the original word different in the 16th verse of Philemon, in respect to Onesimus?

The questions are asked in sincerity. Will you, or some one else, answer them in a like manner?

OLD WHIG.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—It is not our peculiar vocation to engage in the discussions indicated by our correspondent, but as we frequently see the case of Onesimus quoted, in the Northern pro-slavery secular press, as an example of Divine authority for returning fugitive slaves in this country, we will endeavor to gratify an "Old Whig" by giving some quotations from an eminent author on the subject.

Before proceeding to the case of Onesimus, we may remark, in regard to the second question propounded by our correspondent, that the term *servant* (in our translation, we believe is in every case, from the Greek word *doulos*, which is a generic term, meaning any one who serves another, whether as a slave or hired servant. There is no certainty that it always means a slave in the technical sense, unless where there is some qualifying phrase annexed, as in 1 Tim., 6:1:—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke," &c. Here the word evidently means slave, as the phrase, "under the yoke," could be applied to no other servitude. In its general use, the term *doulos*, which is always translated servant, in the New Testament, means any kind of servitude, voluntary or involuntary. Where slavery existed, it would be applicable to that condition. In our Southern people use the term servant, in speaking of their slaves. They say—"house old servants"—"field servants," etc. The term *servant*, in the New Testament, cannot mean *slave* in our acceptation of the word. How would it sound to say—Paul, a *slave* of Jesus Christ—a *slave* of God, *etc?* There is much couched in the idea of the relation of a slave to his master, that would render the word an improper one to be used in many places where it occurs in the New Testament. Slavery is involuntary, compulsory servitude. The service of a Christian to God is voluntary. Christ voluntarily took upon himself the form of a servant. The service of the good and faithful servant, who is rewarded with the joy of his Lord, is voluntary.—Slavery is involuntary—it is an oppressive, unjust and degrading compulsion. These and other reasons which could be given, we think are conclusive, that the term *servant* in the New Testament, does not always or often refer to the condition of a *slave*.

—We come now to the case of Onesimus. Our correspondent's supposition in regard to the relation of Onesimus to Philemon, as a younger brother, we think is not well founded. It is not probable that Philemon was a Hebrew, or that he was governed by Hebrew usages. We have better grounds than that to repel the unjust argument drawn from this epistle to justify slavery, and the returning of fugitive slaves. We give below two extracts from BARNES' NOTES on the Epistle to Philemon. The first extract is from the note on the 16th verse, as follows:

On this important verse then, in relation to the use which is so often made of this epistle by the advocates of slavery, to show that Paul sanctioned it, and that it is a duty to send back those who have escaped from their masters that they may again be held in bondage, we may remark, (1.) there is no certain evidence that Onesimus was ever a *slave* at all. *All the proof* that he was, is to be found in the word *doulos* in this verse. But, as we have seen the meaning of this word by no means proves that. All that is necessarily implied by it is that he was in some way the *servant* of Philemon—whether hired or bought cannot be shown. (2.) At all events, even supposing that he had been a slave, Paul did not mean that he should return as such or to be regarded as such. He says, whatever may have been his former relation, and whatever subsequent relation he may have sustained, that he should be regarded *as a beloved christian brother*; that the leading conception in regard to him should be that he was a fellow-heir of salvation, a member of the same redeemed church, a candidate for the same heaven. (3.) Paul did not send him back *in order* that he might be a slave, or with a view that the shackles of servitude should be riveted on him. There is not the slightest evidence that he *forced* him to return, or that he *advised* him to do it, or even that he expressed a *wish* that he would do it. If he had he did send him, it was not *as a slave* but *as a beloved brother in the Lord*. It cannot be shown that the motive for sending him back was in the slightest degree that he should be a slave. No such thing is intimated, nor is any such thing necessary to be supposed in order to a fair interpretation of the passage. (4.) It is clear that, even *if* Onesimus had been a slave before, it would have been contrary to the wishes of Paul that Philemon should now hold him as such Paul wished him to be regarded 'not as a servant, but as a beloved brother.' If Philemon complied with his wishes, Onesimus was never afterwards regarded or treated as a slave. If he *did* so regard or treat him, it was contrary to the expressed intention of the apostle, and it is certain that he could never have shown this letter in justification of it. It cannot fail to strike any one that if Philemon followed the spirit of this epistle, he would not consider Onesimus to be a slave, but if he sustained the relation of a servant at all, it would be as a voluntary member of his household, where, in all respects, he would be regarded and treated, not as a 'chattel,' or a 'thing,' but as a christian brother.—(5.) This passage, therefore, may be regarded as full proof that it is *not* right to send a slave back, against his will, to his former master, *to be a slave*. It is right to help one if he wishes to go back; to give him a letter of commendation, as Paul did to Onesimus; to furnish him money to help him on his journey if he desires to return; and to commend him as a christian brother, if he is such; but beyond that the example of the apostle Paul does not go. It is perfectly clear that he would not have sent him back to be regarded and treated as a slave, but being able to commend him as a Christian, he was willing to do it, and he expected that he *would be* treated, not as a slave, but as a Christian. The case before us does not go at all to prove that he would have ever sent this back to be a chattel or a thing. If, with his own consent, and by his own wish, we can send a slave back to his master to be treated *as a Christian and as a man*, the example of Paul may show that it would be right to do it, but not to go beyond that. (6.) In confirmation of this, and as a guide in duty now, it may be observed, that Paul had been educated as a Hebrew; that he was thoroughly imbued with the doctrines of the Old Testament, and that one of the elementary principles of that system of religion was, that a man's slave was in *no circumstances* to be returned by force to his former master. "*Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee*" Deut. xxiii. 15. It cannot be supposed that, trained as he was in the principles of the Hebrew religion—which this is a positive and unrepealed law, and imbued with the benevolent spirit of the gospel—a system so hostile to oppression, the apostle Paul would have constrained a slave who had escaped from bondage to return to servitude against his will. (7.) It may be added, that if the principles here contained and by Paul were carried out, slavery would speedily cease in the world. Very soon would it come to an end if masters were to regard those whom they hold, 'not as slaves,' but *as beloved Christian brothers*; not as *chattels* and *things*, but as the redeemed children of God.—Then regarding them, they would no longer feel that they might chain them, and task them, and sell them as property. They would feel that as Christians and as men, they were on a level with themselves, and that they who were made in the image of God, and who had been redeemed with the blood of his Son, *ought to be free*.

Our next extract is from the concluding remarks of Dr. Barnes, on the same Epistle.

This epistle has been frequently appealed to by the friends and advocates of slavery as furnishing a support or apology for that institution. Indeed, it would seem to be regarded by the advocates of that system as so clear on the point, that all they need to do is to *name* it, as settling the whole matter in debate. The points which it is supposed by the advocates of that system to prove are two: *first*, that slavery is right—since it is assumed that Onesimus was a slave and that Paul does not intimate to Philemon that the relation was contrary to the spirit of Christianity; and *second*, that it is our duty to send back a runaway slave to his master—since it is assumed that Paul did this in the case of Onesimus.—It cannot be denied that this view of the matter would be sustained by most of the *commentaries* on the epistle, but it is time to inquire whether such an exposition is the true one, and whether this epistle really gives countenance to *slavery* in respect to these points. In order to this, it is important to know exactly what was the state of the case in reference to these points—for in interpreting the New Testament it should not be *assumed* that anything is in favor of slavery, nor should any thing be *admitted* to be in favor of it without applying the most rigid principles of interpretation—any more than in the case of profaneness, adultery, or any other sin. As the result of the examination of the epistle, we are now prepared to enquire what countenance the epistle gives to slavery in these respects, and whether it can be fairly appealed to either in justification of the system, or in showing that it is a duty to return a runaway slave against his consent to his former master. To make out these points from the epistle it would be necessary to demonstrate that Onesimus was certainly a slave; that Paul so treats the subject as to show that he approved of the institution; that he sent back Onesimus against his own will; that he returned him because he supposed he had done wrong by escaping from servitude; and that he meant that he should continue to be regarded as a slave, and held as a slave, after his return to Philemon. Now, in regard to these points, I would make the following remarks in view of the exposition which has been given of the epistle:

(1.) There is no positive evidence that Onesimus was a *slave* at all. See notes on ver. 16.—Even if it should be admitted to be *probable* that he was, it would be necessary, in order that this epistle should be adduced in favor of slavery, that that fact should be made out without any ground of doubt, or the argument is worthless. It is clear that the epistle, under any circumstances, can be adduced in favor of slavery only *so far* as it is certain that Onesimus was a slave. But that is *not* certain. It cannot be made to be certain. It should not be taken for granted. Either of the suppositions that he was bound to service till he was of age by a parent or guardian, or that he had voluntarily bound himself to service for wages, will meet all that is *necessarily* implied in the epistle.

(2.) There is not the least evidence that Paul used any force or even persuasion to induce him to return to his master. It cannot be proved from the epistle that he even *advised* him to return. It is certain that he did not *compel* him to do it—for Paul had no power to do this, and no guard or civil officer accompanied Onesimus to secure him if he had chosen to escape. Every one of the circumstances mentioned in the epistle will be met by the supposition that Onesimus *desired* to return, but that there were circumstances which made him apprehensive that if he did, he would not be kindly received, and that, at his request, Paul wrote the epistle to induce Philemon to receive him kindly.—Nothing more can be *proved*; nothing more is necessary to be believed, in order to a fair interpretation of the epistle. Nothing is more natural than the supposition that when Onesimus was truly converted, he would *desire* to return to Philemon if he had in any way done him wrong. But to make it proper to adduce this epistle to show that it is a *duty* to return a runaway slave to his master, even on the supposition that Onesimus was a slave, it is necessary to *prove* either that Paul *advised* him to return, or that he compelled him to do it against his will. No one doubts that it would be right to help one who had escaped from slavery, if, on any proper account, he should *wish* to go back to his former master if he felt that he had wronged him, or if he had a wife and children in the neighborhood, or if he was satisfied that he could be more happy in his service than he could be elsewhere. To this point, and this only, this epistle goes.

(3.) There is no evidence that Paul meant that Onesimus should return as a slave, or with a view to be retained and treated as a slave. Even supposing he had been a slave formerly, there is not the slightest intimation in the epistle that when he sent him back to his master, he meant that he should throw himself into the chains of bondage again. Nor is there the slightest evidence that if he had supposed that Onesimus would be the result, he would have even *consented* that he should return to his master. No man can take this epistle and prove from it that Paul *would* have sent him at all, if he had supposed that the effect would be that he would be reduced to slavery, and held in bondage. If such had been his expectation, he would never have written such a letter as this. The expression of such a desire would have found a place in the epistle; or, at least, the epistle would not have been so framed as almost of necessity to lead to a different result.

(4.) There is very satisfactory evidence, besides this, that he did *not* mean that Onesimus should be regarded and treated by Philemon as a slave. It would be impossible for Philemon to comply with the wishes breathed forth in this letter, and meet exactly the desires of Paul in the case, and yet retain him as a slave, or regard him as property—as a 'chattel'—as a 'thing.' For (*a*) if he had been formerly a slave; if this is the fair meaning of the word *doulos*—then this is expressly declared. Thus, in verse 16, he is commanded to receive him '*not now as a servant.*' If he had been a slave before, he did not *wish* that he should be received as such now, or regarded as such any longer. How *could* Philemon comply with the wish of the apostle, and yet regard Onesimus as a slave? The very attempt to do it would be a violation of the expressed desire of Paul, and every moment he held him as such he would be disregarding his wishes. (*b*) He desired him to receive and treat him, in all respects, as a christian brother—as one redeemed—as a man:—'Above a servant, *a brother beloved.*' How could he do this, and yet regard and treat him as a slave? *Is* it treating one as a christian brother to hold him as property: to deprive him of freedom; to consider him an article of merchandise; to exact his labor without compensation? Would the man himself who makes another a slave suppose that he treated as a christian brother, if he were reduced to that condition? Would he feel that his son was so regarded if he was made a slave? There are no ways of reconciling these things. It is *impossible* for a master to regard his slave as, in the proper and full sense of the phrase, a christian brother. He may, indeed, esteem him highly as a christian; he may treat him with kindness; he may show him many favors; *but—he regards him also as his slave*; and this fact makes a difference wide 'as from the centre thrice to the utmost pole,' in his feelings towards him and treatment of him. He is *not* on a level with them *as* a christian. The notion of his being *his slave* mingles with all his feelings towards him, and gives a coloring to all his views of him. He cannot but feel, if he himself is under the influence of religion, that any one that he has been treated as a chattel, as a christian, would be as free as himself; would have a right to his time, and skill, and liberty; would be permitted to form his own plans, and to enjoy the avails of his own labor; and would be secure from the possibility of being *sold*. (c) Suppose now that Paul, after a short interval, had actually come to the residence of Philemon, as he expected to (ver. 22), and had found him regarding and treating Onesimus as a slave; would he have felt that Philemon had complied with his wishes? Did he ask this of him? Did he not request just the contrary? (*d*) Suppose Would it not be natural for him to say to him that he had not received him as he wished him to? And how would Philemon reply to this!

(5.) The principles laid down in this epistle would lead to the universal abolition of slavery. If all those who are now slaves were to become christians, and their masters were to treat them 'not as slaves, but as brethren beloved,' the period would not be far distant when slavery would cease. This probably will be admitted by all. But a state of things which would be destroyed by the fullest prevalence of christianity, is not right at any period. Christianity, in its highest influences, interferes with nothing that is good, and would annihilate nothing which is not wrong. That which is true, and best for the welfare of man, will survive when the true religion spreads all over the world; and to say, as is commonly admitted even by the advocates of slavery, that christianity will ultimately destroy the system, is to say that *it is now wrong*—for christianity destroys nothing which is in itself right, and which is desirable for the highest good of man. It will destroy intemperance, and idolatry, and superstition, and war—because they are evil and wrong—and *only* because they are so; and for the same reason, and that only, will it abolish slavery. When a man, therefore, admits that the gospel will ultimately destroy slavery, he at the same time admits that it is now an *evil* and a *sin*. The gospel is adapted and designed to put an end to the system. It *did* annihilate it in the Roman empire, and its tendency everywhere is to secure its final abolition. The system, therefore, is evil. It is opposed to the spirit of religion. It is destructive of the welfare of society. It is a violation of human rights. It is contrary to the will of God. The gospel everywhere teaches us to regard the slave 'no longer as a slave, but as a brother;' and when this is secured, the system must speedily come to an end. For this, and for all its other anticipated influences, we should labor and pray that the gospel may be diffused as speedily as possible all over the world; that it may raise man everywhere from his degradation, and invest every human being with the dignity of a freeman; that it 'may undo the heavy burden, break every yoke, and bid the oppressed go free.' Isa. lviii 6.

FROM WASHINGTON.

[Correspondence of the Daily Pittsburgh Gazette.]

WASHINGTON, June 6, 1852.

Both wings of the Democracy and all the Whigs appear delighted with the nomination of Gen. Pierce of N. H. It is, therefore, a very fortunate and happy event for the present, however it may turn out. There are some incidents connected with it, which I like. In the first place, this competitor for the candidacy of the party has not distinguished himself as a toady of the South or slavery, in pursuit of the prize; and secondly, he has overthrown all those who have made such exhibitions of themselves. When Pierce received the letter of Robt. Scott, of Richmond, which extorted from all others but General Wool and Butler a veto pledge, he treated the missive of the gentleman with contemptuous silence, and I learn, would have vouchsafed no other answer, had he thought fitto make one, than the famous response of Lord Peterborough to an officious correspondent—"Sir, your letter is before me and it will soon be behind me."

Gen. P. is 48 years old and a man of moderate abilities, very good heart, liberal disposition and naturally courteous manners. He has left in Congress what the South calls a fair record. He will run well till Scott, his old commander, gets after him, and then we shall see what we shall see.

I have not yet seen the resolutions, or platform, in print, and therefore do not feel warranted in criticising them with severity. The last of the series, affirming in substance that because the fugitive slave act was passed to carry into effect a provision of the constitution, therefore its repeal or amendment would be unconstitutional, is an illogical absurdity adopted by men anxious to escape from an inconvenient controversy by the nearest covered way.

So far the chief sentiment expressed by the Democrats congregated here, on the nomination, is that of regret and astonishment that it had not rather fallen upon Douglass or Marcy. It is known that the only thing which prevented the nomination of Marcy, after the discomfiture of the fogies proper, was the vanity and conceit of Dickinson, of New York, and his ten Hunker colleagues on the delegation from that State.—they would not coalesce with the Marcy men from that State at the critical time, and the opportunity passed away forever. Buchanan never stood any chance, nor did his claims excite the least favorable feeling out of Pennsylvania. It was rather a gratifying feature of the proceedings, that Lane never got one vote beside the formal and matter of course support which he received from Indiana. He appears to be a man without one single qualification for the Presidency, and would be utterly obscure but for the little accidental reputation he acquired for courage and activity in the Mexican War. That Houston's friends were able to give him no more efficient support excited surprise. Gen. H. is a man of genius and energy, liberal in sentiment and with many fine points of character. He never received over twelve votes, during the three days balloting and four of those were from his own State, which only changed on the last ballot. The same remark is true of Gen Butler, a man of elevated and dignified character, and who personally was perhaps the most exemplary and unexceptionable of all the candidates. The highest vote he received out of Kentucky, was 13—all from Ohio, Maryland, and New England. It is only justice to Hon. J. W. Davis, the chairman, to say that he discharged the duties of presiding officer with a firmness and ability deserving of unqualified praise—There are few other men in the country who could have restrained that vast and excited assemblage from breaking out into absolute tumult. It required no ordinary force and decision of character to put down as he did the determined efforts to force Gen Commander upon the convention, as the representative for all South Carolina. There were points in his conduct, in respect to this and other questions, that may well be remembered at the opening of the Whig Convention next week. JUNIUS.

PREMATURE DISCHARGE OF A CANNON—TWO MEN HORRIBLY MANGLED.—On receipt of the news by telegraph on Saturday evening last, that General Pierce was the nominee of the Democratic party for the Presidency, his politicians and friends brought out the cannon in honor of the result. In preparing it for the fourth round, it discharged prematurely, taking off both of the arms of James Carnahan, above the elbows—and one of the arms of Ephraim Leahley, off above the elbow, and the other below the elbow—breast mutilated—head bruised, and both eyes, probably destroyed. Hopes are entertained of his recovery. The unfortunate men were engaged in loading at the time—the ramrod, doing the execution. Others close by were stunned and knocked down. The horrible accident, is the subject of regret. The young men possess good characters and were of temperate and industrious habits. In the use of fire arms, when will the public learn to be cautious?—*Steubenville Her.*

BIDS ON THE RAILROAD.—Information was received on yesterday, from section 4, on the Steubenville and Indiana Railroad, that the operatives were on a strike, for higher wages, and that they had threatened the lives of Contractors. It was reported that the military was called out—but we heard nothing of it from authentic quarters, consequently, give it as street reports, needing confirmation. Our readers may be assured no one was killed in the riot, unless by over exertions in getting out of 'harm's way.'—*Steubenville Her.*

TREASON! TREASON!!

A telegraphic dispatch reached Deputy Sheriff Whitman, of Detroit, from Toledo, dated June 3d, stating that three colored women were there on the good steamer "John Owen," advising him to arrest them for crimes, very serious ones we doubt not, committed by them.

What these crimes were, the telegraph did not state. The officer aforesaid, however, *guessed*, from the telegraphic dispatch, that they might be "fugitives from justice," and so he arrested them and put them in jail.

Wishing to be sure, however, he brought them out from the cell, about ten o'clock Thursday night, and began to question them. The three women defied him to get the door open; they guessed that they could get out of it; they thought they could be free; and so, knocking that worthy down, (scamps that they were!) they got into the street.

There, and at that hour of the night, were to be seen a throng of "excited darkies." The deputy sheriff and his friends saw them, and essayed to find the fugitives. In vain! The whites could not pass the "black barrier," and the "darkies" sought for, in a brief half hour, were "in Queen Victoria's realm."

The next morning (Friday) their real crime was discovered; and it was a monstrous one; the villains were really seeking their liberty! What a "finality" set! How mean in them to sacrifice the "Compromise;" how outrageous to disturb the "compact!" Only catch them! How President Fillmore would help send them to "Tophet."

Great sorrow is felt in Detroit, we learn, for Whitman, the unfortunate officer knocked down, though his injuries, we rejoice to say, were slight; and greater apprehension is felt that that city may be charged with "levying war" against the Union, and declared in a "state of siege," for violating the "compromise." What "villains" these "three fellows" are, to cause so much difficulty.—*Cleveland True Democrat.*

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION—OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

From the Cleveland True Democrat.

No man could have been, or could be, more strongly partisan, and no partisan, North or South, has been, or is, more subservient to "Slavery." Mr. Pierce made the first onset against Hale, when he dared first to say there was a Constitution and a North under it, and sought to extracate, and did extracate him therefor. He has been, from the days of the "Alabama Gag" consistent in opposing the Right of Petition, every movement to free the District of Columbia from Slavery; and any attempt to sever the General Government from all connection with that curse. He was the unabashed defender of the Compromise and Fugitive Law, when these measures were proposed, and it pledged, not only to uphold them "*by every means in his power*" but to veto any bill which shall change their purpose, or impair their effective operation. This we believe to be a true representation of the Democratic candidate.

From the Baltimore Patriot.

The Convention has consummated its work by nominating Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, as the Democratic Candidate for President.—We may safely imagine that we hear a thousand voices asking "Who is Franklin Pierce?" The question is easily answered but who will be satisfied with the answer?

Mr. Pierce belongs to New Hampshire, and has been in Congress—but what he has said, what he has done, how, in any way, he has distinguished himself, that he should be selected as a proper man to make President of the United States, no one can explain—except it be to admit that *party did it!*

So we go, the great men of the party—those who have a name that is known, all these are set aside, and Mr. Franklin Pierce overshadows them all! How true is all that Shakespear tells us. He had this act of the Convention in mind when he wrote:

Some men are born great, some achieve greatness,
And some have greatness thrust upon them.

Mr. Pierce belongs to the latter school—greatness is thrust upon him. He is as one of his supporters in the convention said, a "blank leaf, upon which any thing can be written."

☞ JOB PRINTING of all kinds executed at this office with neatness, and at reasonable rates.

Special attention will be given to Posters and Programmes for Exhibitions and Concerts.

Cards, Bill Heads, Bills of Lading, Invitations, Labels, Blanks, Share Bills, &c. &c., neatly and promptly printed and

☞ If there be any man, be he single or married, farmer, mechanic, merchant or beautician, who has not yet supplied himself with a bottle of H. G. Farrell's Arabian Liniment, let him go now and do it: for be assured, it will be worth its weight in gold, over and over again, before it shall all have been used. You have our word for that, Reader! See advertisement. ap25

☞ COME ON—THERE IS ENOUGH FOR ALL!—The following letter is published by the proprietors, that the public may perceive the constant demand which exists for Dr. M'Lane's celebrated Worm Specific. They have, however, made such arrangements as will enable them to fill all orders promptly

"SOMERVILLE, TENN., March 17, 1852

MR. M'LANE—Dear Sir—The vermifuge you left with me last fall, has long since been sold, and I could have sold a great deal more, if had had it. Since my return from the east, I have been called upon nearly every day to write to you, requesting an immediate supply. I have already tried your vermifuge in my own family, and found it to be the best I have ever used.

E. F. MORRISON."

Every mother should try this invaluable specific for Worms. McLane's vermifuge supersedes all others in use.

For sale by most Druggists and Merchants, in town and country, and by the sole proprietors,

J. KIDD & CO.
60 Wood street.

☞ S. M KIER—And now as to your Petroleum. I thought as I had delayed writing so long, it would be well to wait until I had "somewhat to write." When I first offered the oil for sale, the people thought it was perhaps like the much talked spiritual predictions of the age, and so felt but little disposed to buy. But I gave it to some on trial, and persuaded some to buy, until I got them to test its medical powers. It soon began to cure the deaf and lame, &c. A man who had been blind for eight years, was persuaded to try its virtues, and when he had used but three bottles, he could see across the room, and clearly distinguish the color of clothes, &c., while his health was otherwise much improved. His blindness appears to have been the result of a very inveterate case of Scrofula. Much more might be said of the healing powers of Petroleum. But let it suffice to say that it has obtained an extended popularity in this country. I have sold all that you gave me, and might have sold a hundred bottles more. M. HIMEBAUGH.

SHUBUTAN FALLS, Wisconsin, March 16, 1852.

F. S. Cleaver's "Prize Medical Honey Soap."

☞ IT is a remarkable fact that "Cleaver's Honey Soap," was the only article of the kind which obtained the Prize Medal at the World's Fair, in London.—This is accounted for by the universal and acknowledged success which it had obtained, not only in England, but in other portions of Europe. The committee who awarded the medal, not only did justice to Mr. Cleaver, as the sole inventor, but afforded a wide and unmistakeable guarantee to the public of its incomparable and beneficial qualities.

For sale by J. KIDD & CO., 60 Wood street. Wholesale Agents for Pittsburgh and its vicinity; also for sale retail at all Drug and Dispensing stores.

Removed,

W McKendlee Wright, M. D., has removed to Sixteen Dollars, Penn st below Third, ap7:2tr

Nelson's First Premium

DAGUERREOTYPES.

Post Office Building, Third Street.

CITIZENS and strangers who wish to obtain an accurate, artistic and life like likeness, at a very moderate price, will find it to their interest to call at this well known establishment, where entire satisfaction is guaranteed, or no sale expected. Having one of the largest and best arranged Sky and Skylight *rooms* constructed for the purpose, with instruments of the most powerful kind, and having adopted the system of Daguerreotyping, as now practiced by the celebrated Artists of Philadelphia and New York, Mr. N. flatters himself to be able to offer to the patrons of the Art, pictures of a style of Daguerreotype, either singly or in groups, which has never yet surpassed.

Rooms open and operating, in all weathers, from 8 o'clock A. M. to 5 P. M. m10:1w

A. H. HOLMES & BRO.

Successor to H. P. Nelson & Co.,

MANUFACTURERS OF

SOLID BOX VICES,

PLATED SHEARS, WATTOCKS, SPADES, HOES, PICKS, &c. &c.

PITTSBURGH, PENNA.

Office No. 124, Water street, third door above Smithfield. ap24 All work warrant equal to any manufactured.

Citizen's Insurance Company of Pittsburgh

C. G. HUSSEY, PRESIDENT.
SAMUEL L. MARSHELL, SEC'T.

OFFICE, 94 WATER, BETWEEN MARKET AND WOOD STREETS.

☞ INSURES HULL AND CARGO RISKS ON THE Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and Tributaries.

☞ *Insures against loss or damage by FIRE. Also, against the perils of the SEA and INLAND NAVIGATION and TRANSPORTATION.*

DIRECTORS:

C. G. Hussey, Wm. Easelby, Hugh D. King, Robert Dunlap, Jr., J. Hasbrach, Edward Appleton, Walter Bryant,
Wm. Larimer, Jr., N. Wilt, Wm. Bingham, D. Debarem, Francis Sellers, Samuel Ker,

Isaac M. Pennock.

1852. 1852.

SPRING ARRANGEMENT.

Cleveland and Pittsburgh Rail Road

CLEVELAND, TOLEDO, SANDUSKY, DETROIT, CHICAGO, MILWAUKIE, BUFFALO DUNKIRK, COLUMBUS AND CINCINNATI.

THE new and fast running steamer FOREST CITY, Jesse the Monongahela wharf, foot of Market st every morning at 4 o'clock, connecting at Wellsville with the Express Train leaving Cleveland and Pittsburgh Rail Road, leaving at Dresden, M., and arriving at Cleveland at 6 o'clock, P. M., and connecting in the evening with the Express for Toledo, Sandusky, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukie, Buffalo and Dunkirk.

Fare to Cleveland $3 50
For tickets, apply to

JOHN A. CAUGHEY, Agent
Cleveland and Pittsburgh Rail Road Co.

Office, corner Water and Smithfield streets (up stairs) opposite Monongahela House.

Note.—By the time of Penna R. R. to Alliance, and Cleveland and Pittsburgh R. R. from Alliance to Cleveland, the fare from Pittsburgh to Cleveland is $4.75. Passengers by both routes arriving in *Cleveland at the same time and in the same train of cars.* m22

FARE REDUCED.

SUMMER ARRANGEMENT.

FARE, $9,00.

1852 1852

Pennsylvania Rail Road and Express Packet Line.

(EXCLUSIVELY FOR PASSENGERS.)

Between Pittsburgh, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore.

310 miles Rail Road, 72 miles Canal.

TIME THROUGH, THIRTY EIGHT HOURS.

FARE TO PHILADELPHIA & BALT. $9,00.

SWIFT, MOST PLEASANT AND COMFORTABLE ROUTE.

ON the opening of Canal Navigation a daily Express Packet Boat will commence leaving at Blairsville with the Pennsylvania Railroad. A Packet Boat will leave Pittsburgh every evening at 5 o'clock, precisely. Passengers take the Railroad cars Pittsburgh at noon, crossing the Portage Road in daylight, arrive at Blairsville in time to take the Packet in morning. Baltimore passengers on arrival at Harris's Ferry, take the Express Train, which will leave Harris's Ferry on the Susquehanna Rail Road to that city, arriving in time to proceed to Washington by cars leaving at 7 o'clock.

For passage or other information, apply to

C. HERVEN, Agent, Pittsburgh.
J. BERKIMIER, Agent, Blairsville.
or to D. LEECH & CO., Canal Basin.

m12:1

☞ THE Circus has removed to SLIGO, to day, for an afternoon and night exhibition, previous to departing for down the river. The Floating Palace is moored at the Monongahela Bridge, a point about as accessible to our citizens, as where it was within our Corporation.

Eureka Mining Company of Michigan.

NOTICE is hereby given that an assessment of Twenty Five Cents per share was this day levied on the stock of this Company, payable at the office of the Company, in the City of Pittsburgh, on the 10th day of July next.

J. D. CAMPBELL, Sec'y.

JAMES M. CHAISTY, Treasurer.

Notice to Bridge Builders.

OFFICE OF CENTRAL OHIO RAIL ROAD CO.
ZANESVILLE, May 14, 1852.

SEALED PROPOSALS will be received at this office until Monday, June 7th, 1852, for the superstructure of a double track Bridge, to be built on a bed prepared for any standard, across the Muskingum river at Zanes