THE DAILY PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

ESTABLISHED IN 1786. PITTSBURGH, FRIDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 30, 1859. VOLUME LXXIII---NUMBER 21.

Manufacturers.

STEWART & FAULKNER,
MANUFACTURERS OF
Pressed Fire Brick,
MILTENBERGER'S STATION,
oct22-tf1* FAYETTE COUNTY, PA.

HOLTZMAN & WIEDERHOLD,
[SUCCESSORS TO J. SEIBERT,]
No. 100 Third Street, Pittsburgh,
Manufacturers and Dealers in
Curtains, Cornices, Bands, Shades, Blinds,
Mattresses, Comforts, Cushions, &c.
☞Particular attention paid to STEAMBOAT WORK.
CARPETS FITTED AND LAID TO ORDER.
ja18-tf

Iron City Stove Warehouse.

W. W. BRADSHAW, (Successor to T. J. CRAIG & Co.,) Manufacturer of TIN, IRON and COPPER WARE, and Dealer in STOVES, &c., No. 132 WOOD STREET, between Fifth and Virgin alley, Pittsburgh, Pa. 2-21yd

DUQUESNE FOUNDRY.
E. McCOY & CO.,
LIBERTY STREET, opposite Penna. R. R. Depot,
PITTSBURGH, PA.
MANUFACTURE to order, on short notice, CASTINGS, SHAFTING & PULLEYS, of all sizes and descriptions, of the best materials and latest styles; also WAGON BOXES, SAD IRONS, GRATES, &c., always on hand or cast to order.
☞Orders left at the FOUNDRY, or at Cartwright & Young's, 88 Wood st., will receive prompt attention. jan1-tf

WELLS, RIDDLE & CO.,
80 Fourth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.,
MANUFACTURERS OF
WHIPS, THONGS AND SWITCHES.
Orders solicited from the trade, and promptly shipped as per Instruction.
Terms—3 months, or 5 per cent. discount for cash.
oct25:jy4wtf

CARTWRIGHT & YOUNG,
(Successors to John Cartwright,)
MANUFACTURERS and Importers of Pocket and Table Cutlery, Surgical and Dental Instruments, Guns, Pistols, Fishing Tackle, &c., No. 88 Wood street. They give special attention to the manufacturing of Trusses, Supporters, &c. Jobbing and Repairing with punctuality and despatch. apl2-ly

WILLIAM BARNHILL. JARED M. BRUCE
WILLIAM BARNHILL & CO.,
61 Penn st., below Marbury, Pittsburgh, Pa.
STEAM BOILER MAKERS AND SHEET Iron Workers, Manufacturers of Barnhill's Patent Boiler, Locomotive, Fluted and Cylinder Boilers, Chimneys, Breidens, Iron Bed, Steam Pipes, Condensers, Salt Pans, Sugar Pans, Iron Yawls, Life Boats, etc. Also, Blacksmiths' Work, Bridge and Viaduct Irons, done at the shortest notice. All orders from the distance promptly attended to. jy22

Penn Cotton Mills, Pittsburgh.
KENNEDY, CHILDS & CO., MANUFACTURERS of—
Penn A No. 1 Heavy 4-4 Sheetings;
Carpet Chain of all colors and shades;
Cotton Twine;
" Bed Cords;
" Plough Lines and Sash Cord;
" Rope of all sizes and descriptions;
Batting.
Orders left at the Hardware Store of Lorain, Wilson & Co., 121 Wood street, will have attention. jy26-ly

JAMES IRWIN,
MANUFACTURER OF
SULPHURIC ETHER; Sulphuric Acid;
Sweet Spirits of Nitre; Nitric Acid;
Hoffman's Anodyne; Muriatic Acid;
Aqua Ammonia, FFF; Nitre-ter do.
Fowler's Solution; &c.
May be found at Jacobs Irwin & Sons, 57 Water street. jan1

WILLIAM TATE & SON,
PLUMBER AND GAS FITTER, No. 10 Fourth street, Pittsburgh, and Federal street, underneath Excelsior Hall, Allegheny.
☞Every description of Fixtures for Water, Gas and Steam. mch11y

Commission, &c.

DUPUY & MITCHELL,
PRODUCE COMMISSION MERCHANTS.
Office No. 1 Steet's Block, South-Water St., cor La Salle St., Chicago.
Warehouse No. 13 South-Water St.
Solicit for the purchase of Flour and Grain in Chicago Market.

REFERENCES IN PITTSBURGH:	
Hitchcock, McCreery & Co.,	Daniel Wallace, Esq.,
George W. Case, Esq.,	Messrs. Watt & Wilson.
J. J. Houston, Esq.,	oct25-3m

WM. CULP. OTIS SHEPARD.
CULP & SHEPARD,
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
AND DEALERS IN
FLOUR, GRAIN & PRODUCE,
No. 343 Liberty Street,
PITTSBURGH, PA.
Choice brands of FLOUR, Rye, Buckwheat and Cornmeal always constantly on hand. Particular attention paid to filling orders for Merchandise generally. oct24-tf

JAMES A. KETLER, Forwarding and COMMISSION MERCHANT, for the sale of FLOUR, GRAIN, BACON, LARD, BUTTER, SEEDS, DRIED FRUIT, and Produce generally, *No 16 Market Street, corner Ferry, Pittsburgh, Pa.*
Refer to R. P. Bailey, Esq., Pittsburgh. William Dalzell, Sr., do. S. Cuthbert & Son, do. Alcock, Lee & Co., do. John Dunlap, Esq., do. D. Harper & Co., Cincinnatis. S. Brady, Cashier M. & M. Bank, Wheeling. Samuel Gill, Esq., Orangio & Co., do. Porter & Poston, do. Cockman & Bro., Philadelphia. dec3-ly

L. C. GRAFF. FRANK VAN GORDER.
GRAFF & VAN GORDER,
MERCHANDISE BROKERS,
AND
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
114 Second Street, Pittsburgh.
REFER TO
R. W. Thew & Co., New York. Shriver & Ihlsworth, Pittsburgh.
Fenner & Co., " Spr. Harbaugh & Co., "
Thompson, Clark & Young, Philadelphia. W. Chandless, Means & Co., "
Harrison & Hopper, Chicago.
T. A. Newhall & Sons, Phila. T. S. Dugan & Co., "
J. Whitridge, Co., Baltimore. H. D. Newcomb & Co., Louisville, Ky. dec17 1yd

HERBST & BARKER,
PRODUCE AND PROVISION
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
267 Liberty Street, corner of Hand,
PITTSBURGH, PENN'A.
☞Particular attention given to the purchase and sale of Flour, Grain, Dried Fruits, Potatoes, Pork, Lard, Butter, Cheese, Clover and Timothy Seeds, &c.
Orders promptly filled at the lowest market prices. Advances made on consignments.
☞Office of the Pittsburgh Dog Manufactory. mch11yd

SAMUEL E. FLOYD & CO.,
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
And dealers in Flour, Grain and Produce Generally,
231 LIBERTY STREET, near Pa. R. R. Depot,
PITTSBURGH, PA. oct21yd

E. W. CHADWICK. CHAS. CHADWICK.
CHADWICK & SON,
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
DEALERS IN PAPER AND RAGS,
And Agents for the Sale of
Mahoning Fire Brick and Pot Clay,
Nos. 149 and 151 Wood Street, near Sixth, Pittsburgh.
☞Wrapping Paper at Manufacturers' prices. Cash paid for Rags. jan2-1yd

LLOYD & FORSYTH,
WHOLESALE GROCERS,
AND
DEALERS IN PRODUCE,
COMMISSION MERCHANTS
for the sale of
PIG METAL AND BLOOMS,
No. 257 Liberty Street,
Feb'y 1, 1859:ly20 PITTSBURGH, PA.

J. B. CANFIELD. D. M. DARRAGH.
J. B. CANFIELD & CO.,
Commission & Forwarding Merchants,
And Wholesale Dealers in
WESTERN RESERVE CHEESE,
BUTTER, LARD, PORK, BACON, FLOUR, FISH, Pot & Pearl Ashes, Salerating, Linseed & Coal Oil Dried Fruit and Produce generally.
Nos. 141 and 143 Front Street,
oct2 PITTSBURGH, PA.

HITCHCOCK, McCREERY & CO.,
[Successors to Hoffman, McCreery & Co.]
Forwarding and Commission Merchants,
And Wholesale Dealers in
Produce, Flour and Wool,
No. 153 Front and 122 Second st., Pittsburgh, Pa
aug24-1yd—ly79
SPRINGER HARBAUGH. BENJAMIN F. POTTER. WM. H. SHIPMAN.
SPRINGER HARBAUGH & CO.,
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
DEALERS IN
Wool, Hides, Provisions & Produce Generally,
No. 209 Liberty Street, Pittsburgh.
ja12

McBRIDE & ANJER,
DEALERS IN
Flour, Grain and Produce,
Commission and Forwarding Merchants,
No. 124 Second St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
my31-1yd

S. CUTHBERT. S. I. CUTHBERT.
S. CUTHBERT & SON, General Commission Agents for the Sale and Purchase of Real Estate, No. 84 Market street, Pittsburgh. jan21yd

ROBERT DICKEY, Wholesale Grocer, and Produce and Commission Merchant, No. 248 Liberty street, near Railroad Passenger Depot, Pittsburgh, Pa. ap6

Hotels.

AMERICAN HOUSE, BOSTON.
THIS THE LARGEST AND BEST AR-ranged Hotel in the New England States, is centrally located, and easy of access from all the routes of travel. It contains all the modern improvements, and every convenience for the comfort and accommodation of the traveling public. The sleeping rooms are large and well ventilated; the suites of rooms are well arranged, and completely furnished for families and large traveling parties and the house will continue to be kept as a first class Hote in every respect. jal5daily LEWIS RICE, Proprietor.

W. P. MARSHALL & CO.
announce the arrival of
NEW WALL PAPERS, BORDERS, &c.,
AT
No. 87 Wood Street.

CHILDREN'S FURNITURE.—
Children's Tables,
Children's Bedsteads;
Children's Chairs;
Children's Bureaus;
Children's Swings,
&c., &c., finished and for sale.
dec1 T. D. YOUNG & CO., 58 & 60 Smithfield st.

Pittsburgh Gazette.
OFFICIAL PAPER OF THE CITY.
PUBLISHED DAILY, TRI-WEEKLY AND WEEKLY BY R. ERRETT & CO.,
FIFTH STREET, ABOVE SMITHFIELD.

FRIDAY MORNING, DEC. 30, 1859.

(For the Daily Pittsburgh Gazette.)

Inquiry into the Formation of Washington's Farewell Address.—By HORACE BINNEY.

[CONCLUDED.]

By turning back to my extract from Hamilton's letter of July 30th, it will be seen that Hamilton then sent to Washington a certain draught which he had made "as perfect as time and his engagements would permit." To the same letter he speaks about digesting supplementary remarks to the first address, and adds: "The more I have considered it, *the less eligible* it appears." There seems to be a *certain awkwardness* in the thing, and seems to imply a doubt whether the assurances (of his intention to decline a re-election in 1792) would be believed without the evidence (Madison's draught.)

On the 10th of August, as may be seen by turning back to the extract from the letter of that date, Hamilton sent Washington the other draught, "on the plan of incorporation" of Madison's. On that same day Washington wrote to Hamilton acknowledging the receipt of his letter of July 30, with its inclosure, states that he had given it a "cursory reading," and pronounces "the sentiments contained in it *exceedingly just* and such as ought to be inculcated;" and adds: "The doubt that occurs at *first view* is its length for a newspaper publication."

On the 25th of August, Washington expresses his preference for the paper then sent back to Hamilton, and says: "I have given it several serious and attentive readings and prefer it greatly to the other draughts. It is more copious, more dignified on the whole and with less of egotism, and better calculated to meet the eye of the discerning reader." He then goes on to say: "When the *first* draught was made, I thought the occasion was fair to say what is there contained of myself." He then adds the following: "The draught now sent comprehends *the most, if not all, these matters*, in better expressed and, I am persuaded, goes as far as it ought with respect to any personal mention of myself." He then *says* of it: "I should have been myself no occasion for its undergoing a revision, but as your letter which accompanied it intimates a wish to do this, I send it in conformity thereto," etc. He then makes the request that he (Hamilton) would return it further to be had carefully re-examined it; "for it is my intention to hand it to the public before I leave this city;" and concludes: "if any change or alteration takes place, let them be so clearly interlined, erased or referred to in the margin, that no mistake may happen in copying for the press."

Now I think the following inferences from this summary are indisputable: 1st, the draft sent to Washington on the 30th of July was Hamilton's own production. He says he had made it "as perfect as time and his engagements would permit." Washington, in his letter of August 10th, acknowledges the receipt of that draught, says he had given it a cursory perusal, declares "it shall have the most attentive consideration I am able to give it;" adds his doubt at "first view" that it was too long for the newspapers. Surely Hamilton's language implies that it was his own production, and the Washington must infer from the expressions in Washington's letter of August 10th that it was a new matter to him; he had only given it "a *cursory* reading," and at first view thought it too long. It was, it is true, twice as long, or nearly so, as his own draught, including Madison's.

These inferences are corroborated by the fact that Hamilton had requested that that draught should be sent back to him for revision and by Washington's remark that he thought there was no necessity for revision. If the draught had been Washington's own production, he would have been presumptuous for Hamilton to say to him, "I have corrected your draught *once*, but after you have had it, it will need revision," and it certainly would not be modest for Washington to say, "it needed no further revision." But if it was the production of Hamilton, then the conduct of both was as modest and proper as we would expect of two such men.

Washington, in his letter of August 25th, approved that production, thought it needed no revision, urges Hamilton to make his corrections publicly, and if sent it back to that it may be copied for the press. It was sent back on the 6th of September, copied by Washington, signed on the 17th, sent to Mr. Claypoole and published on the 19th.

Can there, then, be any room for a doubt that the draught mentioned in Hamilton's letter of the 30th of July, which Washington was pleased with on a "cursory reading," but "at first view" thought too long for the newspaper, and yet upon more careful examination approved and so anxiously urged its early and careful revision, so that no mistake should occur in copying it for the press, was the Farewell Address? Can there be a doubt that Washington himself copied it for the press, or that it is that copy, which is now in the hands of Mr. Lenox?

It is true there is no evidence that Hamilton's draft ever came to Washington's hands in certain, undoubted, distinct trace of it after it was mailed on the 6th of September. Some doubter may say, perhaps, it was miscarried.

Now while we bear in mind Washington's manifest anxiety to get the revised draft, have it correctly copied and placed in the hands of the printer, let us suppose some accident or haggle to have befallen the letter, and the draught, so that they did not reach their destination, can we believe it possible that nothing more would be said about it by Washington? The thing is incredible: a letter mailed in New York for the President of the United States in Philadelphia, the fact of the mailing again announced two days after, and not only is no house made, no word spoken about the failure, but on the 17th, just eleven days after the mailing of the draught, that Farewell Address is signed by Washington and sent to the printer. Is it conceivable that Washington, after calling upon Hamilton to prepare an Address, after weeks had been spent in writing, examining, correcting and revising the corrected copy—and after heartily approving that copy, would, upon learning that it had been lost in the mail between the two adjacent cities, coolly and silently set himself to work, and either alone or with Madison prepare another address within eight days after receiving Hamilton's last letter, and then publish it, without one word of explanation or apology to the friend who had labored for him with so much industry and so much to his satisfaction? It is impossible, utterly inconceivable. Is it not obvious and clear that the draught revised by Hamilton, mailed to Washington on the 30th, must have been received, copied and signed by him on the 17th, and published two days after?

Although this revised copy of Hamilton's original draft has disappeared, that draft is still in existence, and upon rigid examination and comparison with the Farewell Address furnishes the most conclusive evidence that it was the original of the Address. Mr. Binney uses this evidence with great power and I only condense his remarks.

First, then, the length and extent of those two papers are about the same, and each of them about nineteen printed pages; being about twice as great as Washington's printed copy, including Madison's draught; so that, as our readers will recollect, I drew from Washington the remark, "the doubt that occurs at *first view* is the length of it for the newspapers." Second, in the Farewell Address there are fifty-one paragraphs in Hamilton's draft there are fifty. There are some subdivisions and consolidations of paragraphs and one paragraph on education was added in the revision, and thus appears in the Address and not in the original draught of Hamilton. This is a very marked circumstance, and, as Mr. Binney remarks, amounts almost to a receipt by Washington for the revised draft. Third, the order and collocation of paragraphs and the subjects of them from the beginning to the end of the two papers is one and the same, making allowance for the division and consolidation of paragraphs as before named, and the expansion in two instances. There is no transposition of a letter, except in a partial degree, in a single instance. Fourth, in more than twenty instances, the paragraphs in the Farewell Address begin with the same words as the corresponding paragraphs of Hamilton's draught, and treat of the same subjects in almost the same language to the close. In at least nine other instances, words at the beginning of paragraphs in the draught are changed for synonymous words in the Address, as "*essentially*" for "*substantially*," "*a settled good faith*," for "*observe good faith*," "*why should we forego*," for "*why forego*," etc. In all these instances the corresponding paragraphs proceed with the same subject, and generally in the same language, to the close.

Surely, then, it is not possible to doubt that Hamilton's existing draft is the original of the Revised Draft sent to Washington on the 6th September, 1796, and secondarily the Farewell Address.

I now conclude with the following extract from the last page but one of Mr. Binney's book.

Hamilton was, in the prevalent literary sense, the composer and writer of the paper. The occasional adoption of Washington's language does not substantially take from the justice of this attribution. The new plan, the different form proceeded from Hamilton. He was the author of it. He put together the thoughts of Washington in a new order, and with a new bearing; and while, as often as he could, he used the words of Washington, his own language was the general vehicle, both of his own thoughts and for the expansion and combination of Washington's thoughts. Hamilton developed the thoughts of Washington and corroborated them—included several cognate subjects and added many effective thoughts from his own mind, and united all into one chain by the links of his masculine logic. C.

[COMMUNICATED.]

The Mayoralty.

Messrs. Editors—Not being of the number of working politicians I know nothing of the candidates, except what appears in the papers. And from what has been there published, I am led to believe that Mr. Wilson is willing to recommit the nomination to the people, while Mr. Sawyer says nothing on the subject.

Now silence on the subject of the nomination may be a prudent course on the part of Mr. Sawyer; on that I make no comments. But in relation to his eligibility I am curious to hear from him or his friends. As between the two men, Sawyer and Wilson, I am not personally acquainted with either of them, and as far as their personal merits are concerned, could vote as freely for the one as the other. But from the time that it was stated that Mr. Sawyer was ineligible for the want of three years' residence, I have looked for some statement or proof from himself or his friends on that important point. To this hour not a word, so far as I have seen, has been uttered. This silence has been so close and persistent that I began to doubt whether the charge of ineligibility could have any foundation in the City Charter. And to be assured on the point, I referred to the Charter itself—and therein I find it written that, "the shall be a citizen of the United States, and have resided four years *next preceding* his election within this Commonwealth, *the last three years* of which he shall have resided in said city.

Now, the propriety of the provision here made as to the qualifications of a man for the Mayoralty, need not and will not be questioned. And I care not what lawyers may say for or against a particular interpretation of its meaning, the intention of the people is plain. And even if there were some technical defect in the wording of the provision, it does seem not to be the part of a candidate for the people's suffrages, to attempt to defeat and disappoint their expressed will in their fundamental law, by either proposing to take advantage of a technical defect or by seeking legislative interference—such legislation being nothing less than a change of paper, provision to accommodate a particular aspirant to office for a single term.

Now, as I said before, I do not know either Sawyer or Wilson personally, but they are both, by common report, good men, still I and many others do want light on Mr. S's views of the plan of incorporation" of Madison's. On that same day Washington wrote to Hamilton acknowledging the receipt of his letter of July 30, with its inclosure, states that he had given it a "cursory reading," and pronounces "the sentiments contained in it *exceedingly just* and such as ought to be inculcated;" and adds: "The doubt that occurs at *first view* is its length for a newspaper publication."

On the 25th of August, Washington expresses his preference for the paper then sent back to Hamilton, and says: "I have given it several serious and attentive readings and prefer it greatly to the other draughts. It is more copious, more dignified on the whole and with less of egotism, and better calculated to meet the eye of the discerning reader." He then goes on to say: "When the *first* draught was made, I thought the occasion was fair to say what is there contained of myself." He then adds the following: "The draught now sent comprehends *the most, if not all, these matters*, in better expressed and, I am persuaded, goes as far as it ought with respect to any personal mention of myself." He then *says* of it: "I should have been myself no occasion for its undergoing a revision, but as your letter which accompanied it intimates a wish to do this, I send it in conformity thereto," etc. He then makes the request that he (Hamilton) would return it further to be had carefully re-examined it; "for it is my intention to hand it to the public before I leave this city;" and concludes: "if any change or alteration takes place, let them be so clearly interlined, erased or referred to in the margin, that no mistake may happen in copying for the press."

Now I think the following inferences from this summary are indisputable: 1st, the draft sent to Washington on the 30th of July was Hamilton's own production. He says he had made it "as perfect as time and his engagements would permit." Washington, in his letter of August 10th, acknowledges the receipt of that draught, says he had given it a cursory perusal, declares "it shall have the most attentive consideration I am able to give it;" adds his doubt at "first view" that it was too long for the newspapers. Surely Hamilton's language implies that it was his own production, and the Washington must infer from the expressions in Washington's letter of August 10th that it was a new matter to him; he had only given it "a *cursory* reading," and at first view thought it too long. It was, it is true, twice as long, or nearly so, as his own draught, including Madison's.

These inferences are corroborated by the fact that Hamilton had requested that that draught should be sent back to him for revision and by Washington's remark that he thought there was no necessity for revision. If the draught had been Washington's own production, he would have been presumptuous for Hamilton to say to him, "I have corrected your draught *once*, but after you have had it, it will need revision," and it certainly would not be modest for Washington to say, "it needed no further revision." But if it was the production of Hamilton, then the conduct of both was as modest and proper as we would expect of two such men.

Washington, in his letter of August 25th, approved that production, thought it needed no revision, urges Hamilton to make his corrections publicly, and if sent it back to that it may be copied for the press. It was sent back on the 6th of September, copied by Washington, signed on the 17th, sent to Mr. Claypoole and published on the 19th.

Can there, then, be any room for a doubt that the draught mentioned in Hamilton's letter of the 30th of July, which Washington was pleased with on a "cursory reading," but "at first view" thought too long for the newspaper, and yet upon more careful examination approved and so anxiously urged its early and careful revision, so that no mistake should occur in copying it for the press, was the Farewell Address? Can there be a doubt that Washington himself copied it for the press, or that it is that copy, which is now in the hands of Mr. Lenox?

It is true there is no evidence that Hamilton's draft ever came to Washington's hands in certain, undoubted, distinct trace of it after it was mailed on the 6th of September. Some doubter may say, perhaps, it was miscarried.

Now while we bear in mind Washington's manifest anxiety to get the revised draft, have it correctly copied and placed in the hands of the printer, let us suppose some accident or haggle to have befallen the letter, and the draught, so that they did not reach their destination, can we believe it possible that nothing more would be said about it by Washington? The thing is incredible: a letter mailed in New York for the President of the United States in Philadelphia, the fact of the mailing again announced two days after, and not only is no house made, no word spoken about the failure, but on the 17th, just eleven days after the mailing of the draught, that Farewell Address is signed by Washington and sent to the printer. Is it conceivable that Washington, after calling upon Hamilton to prepare an Address, after weeks had been spent in writing, examining, correcting and revising the corrected copy—and after heartily approving that copy, would, upon learning that it had been lost in the mail between the two adjacent cities, coolly and silently set himself to work, and either alone or with Madison prepare another address within eight days after receiving Hamilton's last letter, and then publish it, without one word of explanation or apology to the friend who had labored for him with so much industry and so much to his satisfaction? It is impossible, utterly inconceivable. Is it not obvious and clear that the draught revised by Hamilton, mailed to Washington on the 30th, must have been received, copied and signed by him on the 17th, and published two days after?

Although this revised copy of Hamilton's original draft has disappeared, that draft is still in existence, and upon rigid examination and comparison with the Farewell Address furnishes the most conclusive evidence that it was the original of the Address. Mr. Binney uses this evidence with great power and I only condense his remarks.

First, then, the length and extent of those two papers are about the same, and each of them about nineteen printed pages; being about twice as great as Washington's printed copy, including Madison's draught; so that, as our readers will recollect, I drew from Washington the remark, "the doubt that occurs at *first view* is the length of it for the newspapers." Second, in the Farewell Address there are fifty-one paragraphs in Hamilton's draft there are fifty. There are some subdivisions and consolidations of paragraphs and one paragraph on education was added in the revision, and thus appears in the Address and not in the original draught of Hamilton. This is a very marked circumstance, and, as Mr. Binney remarks, amounts almost to a receipt by Washington for the revised draft. Third, the order and collocation of paragraphs and the subjects of them from the beginning to the end of the two papers is one and the same, making allowance for the division and consolidation of paragraphs as before named, and the expansion in two instances. There is no transposition of a letter, except in a partial degree, in a single instance. Fourth, in more than twenty instances, the paragraphs in the Farewell Address begin with the same words as the corresponding paragraphs of Hamilton's draught, and treat of the same subjects in almost the same language to the close. In at least nine other instances, words at the beginning of paragraphs in the draught are changed for synonymous words in the Address, as "*essentially*" for "*substantially*," "*a settled good faith*," for "*observe good faith*," "*why should we forego*," for "*why forego*," etc. In all these instances the corresponding paragraphs proceed with the same subject, and generally in the same language, to the close.

Surely, then, it is not possible to doubt that Hamilton's existing draft is the original of the Revised Draft sent to Washington on the 6th September, 1796, and secondarily the Farewell Address.

I now conclude with the following extract from the last page but one of Mr. Binney's book.

Hamilton was, in the prevalent literary sense, the composer and writer of the paper. The occasional adoption of Washington's language does not substantially take from the justice of this attribution. The new plan, the different form proceeded from Hamilton. He was the author of it. He put together the thoughts of Washington in a new order, and with a new bearing; and while, as often as he could, he used the words of Washington, his own language was the general vehicle, both of his own thoughts and for the expansion and combination of Washington's thoughts. Hamilton developed the thoughts of Washington and corroborated them—included several cognate subjects and added many effective thoughts from his own mind, and united all into one chain by the links of his masculine logic. C.

[COMMUNICATED.]

The Mayoralty.

Messrs. Editors—Not being of the number of working politicians I know nothing of the candidates, except what appears in the papers. And from what has been there published, I am led to believe that Mr. Wilson is willing to recommit the nomination to the people, while Mr. Sawyer says nothing on the subject.

Now silence on the subject of the nomination may be a prudent course on the part of Mr. Sawyer; on that I make no comments. But in relation to his eligibility I am curious to hear from him or his friends. As between the two men, Sawyer and Wilson, I am not personally acquainted with either of them, and as far as their personal merits are concerned, could vote as freely for the one as the other. But from the time that it was stated that Mr. Sawyer was ineligible for the want of three years' residence, I have looked for some statement or proof from himself or his friends on that important point. To this hour not a word, so far as I have seen, has been uttered. This silence has been so close and persistent that I began to doubt whether the charge of ineligibility could have any founda-

To the Republican Voters of the City of Pittsburgh:—The City Republican Executive Committee, appointed by the Convention of 1858, have held several meetings since the present division on the subject of the Mayoralty, and deem it their duty to present a narrative of their proceedings.

The committee do not arrogate to themselves any authority whatever—deeming that their functions were determined upon the organization of the late Convention. Still, they viewed with deep concern the unfortunate position of the party and desired to interpose, in the hope of harmonizing the claims of the two gentlemen now in nomination for the office of Mayor. They did not venture upon this meritorious effort until they had been repeatedly solicited by large numbers of prominent Republicans—embracing warm personal and political friends both of Mr. SAWYER and Mr. WILSON—to assemble for the laudable purpose of exercising those powers which, in their judgment, neither of the committees appointed by the last Convention could exercise without conflict, disorder and probable dismemberment of the party. Without expressing preference for either of the gentlemen named, they sought only by every means in their power, to effect a compromise, so as to enable us to present an unbroken front, and to encourage and strengthen the good cause all over the country, with intelligence of a signal victory at the commencement of a year destined to witness the most momentous Presidential contest which has ever occurred.

To accomplish this desirable result the Committee, at their first meeting, appointed sub committees, composed equally of the friends of the two candidates, with instructions to wait upon them and to submit the following interrogatories:

1st. Are you willing to have the Convention re called and submit to its action?

2d. Are you willing to refer the contest back to the Republicans of the Third ward?

These questions were prepared with great care and the committee thought that a satisfactory solution of the misunderstanding between the two candidates would be found in their prompt and deliberated responses in the affirmative.

The committee appointed to wait upon Mr. SAWYER, reported at an adjourned meeting that that gentleman had promised a definite answer on the day after they saw him. No answer, whatever, came from him, although two subsequent meetings were held for the purpose of receiving any reply that he might wish to make. Mr. Sawyer did not, and would not, commit himself by any written answer to the propositions put, in his name favorable, evinced a determination to rule or ruin the party.

Mr. Wilson, on the other hand, immediately made this manly and dignified response:

PITTSBURGH, Dec. 22, 1859.

R. C. Negley and James S. Stanley, Esqs.

GENTLEMEN: Your favor of yesterday, submitting, on behalf of the City Republican Executive Committee of 1859, the following questions, viz: 1st, Are you willing to have the Convention reassembled and submit to its action? 2d, Are you willing to refer the contest back to the Republicans of the Third Ward? has been received, and I answer promptly and cheerfully, all these questions affirmatively.

While I claim to be the regular and only nominee of the Republican party for the Mayoralty, I regret as much as any man can the unfortunate division which has taken place, and am ever ready to submit that the breach should be healed in any reasonable conciliatory way.

Mr. Wilson's friends refused to apply material to the question of regularity or fairness of any friends, and so reduced the propositions above submitted from a pledge nothing less than a change of paper, mament provision to accommodate a particular aspirant to office for a single term

Now, as I said before, I do not know either Sawyer or Wilson personally, but they are both, by common report, good men, still I and many others do want light on Mr. S's views of the plan of incorporation" of Madison's. On that same day Washington wrote to Hamilton acknowledging the receipt of his letter of July 30, with its inclosure, states that he had given it a "cursory reading," and pronounces "the sentiments contained in it *exceedingly just* and such as ought to be inculcated;" and adds: "The doubt that occurs at *first view* is its length for a newspaper publication."

On the 25th of August, Washington expresses his preference for the paper then sent back to Hamilton, and says: "I have given it several serious and attentive readings and prefer it greatly to the other draughts. It is more copious, more dignified on the whole and with less of egotism, and better calculated to meet the eye of the discerning reader." He then goes on to say: "When the *first* draught was made, I thought the occasion was fair to say what is there contained of myself." He then adds the following: "The draught now sent comprehends *the most, if not all, these matters*, in better expressed and, I am persuaded, goes as far as it ought with respect to any personal mention of myself." He then *says* of it: "I should have been myself no occasion for its undergoing a revision, but as your letter which accompanied it intimates a wish to do this, I send it in conformity thereto," etc. He then makes the request that he (Hamilton) would return it further to be had carefully re-examined it; "for it is my intention to hand it to the public before I leave this city;" and concludes: "if any change or alteration takes place, let them be so clearly interlined, erased or referred to in the margin, that no mistake may happen in copying for the press."

Now I think the following inferences from this summary are indisputable: 1st, the draft sent to Washington on the 30th of July was Hamilton's own production. He says he had made it "as perfect as time and his engagements would permit." Washington, in his letter of August 10th, acknowledges the receipt of that draught, says he had given it a cursory perusal, declares "it shall have the most attentive consideration I am able to give it;" adds his doubt at "first view" that it was too long for the newspapers. Surely Hamilton's language implies that it was his own production, and the Washington must infer from the expressions in Washington's letter of August 10th that it was a new matter to him; he had only given it "a *cursory* reading," and at first view thought it too long. It was, it is true, twice as long, or nearly so, as his own draught, including Madison's.

These inferences are corroborated by the fact that Hamilton had requested that that draught should be sent back to him for revision and by Washington's remark that he thought there was no necessity for revision. If the draught had been Washington's own production, he would have been presumptuous for Hamilton to say to him, "I have corrected your draught *once*, but after you have had it, it will need revision," and it certainly would not be modest for Washington to say, "it needed no further revision." But if it was the production of Hamilton, then the conduct of both was as modest and proper as we would expect of two such men.

Washington, in his letter of August 25th, approved that production, thought it needed no revision, urges Hamilton to make his corrections publicly, and if sent it back to that it may be copied for the press. It was sent back on the 6th of September, copied by Washington, signed on the 17th, sent to Mr. Claypoole and published on the 19th.

Can there, then, be any room for a doubt that the draught mentioned in Hamilton's letter of the 30th of July, which Washington was pleased with on a "cursory reading," but "at first view" thought too long for the newspaper, and yet upon more careful examination approved and so anxiously urged its early and careful revision, so that no mistake should occur in copying it for the press, was the Farewell Address? Can there be a doubt that Washington himself copied it for the press, or that it is that copy, which is now in the hands of Mr. Lenox?

It is true there is no evidence that Hamilton's draft ever came to Washington's hands in certain, undoubted, distinct trace of it after it was mailed on the 6th of September. Some doubter may say, perhaps, it was miscarried.

Now while we bear in mind Washington's manifest anxiety to get the revised draft, have it correctly copied and placed in the hands of the printer, let us suppose some accident or haggle to have befallen the letter, and the draught, so that they did not reach their destination, can we believe it possible that nothing more would be said about it by Washington? The thing is incredible: a letter mailed in New York for the President of the United States in Philadelphia, the fact of the mailing again announced two days after, and not only is no house made, no word spoken about the failure, but on the 17th, just eleven days after the mailing of the draught, that Farewell Address is signed by Washington and sent to the printer. Is it conceivable that Washington, after calling upon Hamilton to prepare an Address, after weeks had been spent in writing, examining, correcting and revising the corrected copy—and after heartily approving that copy, would, upon learning that it had been lost in the mail between the two adjacent cities, coolly and silently set himself to work, and either alone or with Madison prepare another address within eight days after receiving Hamilton's last letter, and then publish it, without one word of explanation or apology to the friend who had labored for him with so much industry and so much to his satisfaction? It is impossible, utterly inconceivable. Is it not obvious and clear that the draught revised by Hamilton, mailed to Washington on the 30th, must have been received, copied and signed by him on the 17th, and published two days after?

Although this revised copy of Hamilton's original draft has disappeared, that draft is still in existence, and upon rigid examination and comparison with the Farewell Address furnishes the most conclusive evidence that it was the original of the Address. Mr. Binney uses this evidence with great power and I only condense his remarks.

First, then, the length and extent of those two papers are about the same, and each of them about nineteen printed pages; being about twice as great as Washington's printed copy, including Madison's draught; so that, as our readers will recollect, I drew from Washington the remark, "the doubt that occurs at *first view* is the length of it for the newspapers." Second, in the Farewell Address there are fifty-one paragraphs in Hamilton's draft there are fifty. There are some subdivisions and consolidations of paragraphs and one paragraph on education was added in the revision, and thus appears in the Address and not in the original draught of Hamilton. This is a very marked circumstance, and, as Mr. Binney remarks, amounts almost to a receipt by Washington for the revised draft. Third, the order and collocation of paragraphs and the subjects of them from the beginning to the end of the two papers is one and the same, making allowance for the division and consolidation of paragraphs as before named, and the expansion in two instances. There is no transposition of a letter, except in a partial degree, in a single instance. Fourth, in more than twenty instances, the paragraphs in the Farewell Address begin with the same words as the corresponding paragraphs of Hamilton's draught, and treat of the same subjects in almost the same language to the close. In at least nine other instances, words at the beginning of paragraphs in the draught are changed for synonymous words in the Address, as "*essentially*" for "*substantially*," "*a settled good faith*," for "*observe good faith*," "*why should we forego*," for "*why forego*," etc. In all these instances the corresponding paragraphs proceed with the same subject, and generally in the same language, to the close.

Surely, then, it is not possible to doubt that Hamilton's existing draft is the original of the Revised Draft sent to Washington on the 6th September, 1796, and secondarily the Farewell Address.

I now conclude with the following extract from the last page but one of Mr. Binney's book.

Hamilton was, in the prevalent literary sense, the composer and writer of the paper. The occasional adoption of Washington's language does not substantially take from the justice of this attribution. The new plan, the different form proceeded from Hamilton. He was the author of it. He put together the thoughts of Washington in a new order, and with a new bearing; and while, as often as he could, he used the words of Washington, his own language was the general vehicle, both of his own thoughts and for the expansion and combination of Washington's thoughts. Hamilton developed the thoughts of Washington and corroborated them—included several cognate subjects and added many effective thoughts from his own mind, and united all into one chain by the links of his masculine logic. C.

[COMMUNICATED.]

The Mayoralty.

Messrs. Editors—Not being of the number of working politicians I know nothing of the candidates, except what appears in the papers. And from what has been there published, I am led to believe that Mr. Wilson is willing to recommit the nomination to the people, while Mr. Sawyer says nothing on the subject.

Now silence on the subject of the nomination may be a prudent course on the part of Mr. Sawyer; on that I make no comments. But in relation to his eligibility I am curious to hear from him or his friends. As between the two men, Sawyer and Wilson, I am not personally acquainted with either of them, and as far as their personal merits are concerned, could vote as freely for the one as the other. But from the time that it was stated that Mr. Sawyer was ineligible for the want of three years' residence, I have looked for some statement or proof from himself or his friends on that important point. To this hour not a word, so far as I have seen, has been uttered. This silence has been so close and persistent that I began to doubt whether the charge of ineligibility could have any founda-

CITY AFFAIRS.

METEOROLOGICAL Observations for the *Gazette*, by G. E. Shaw, Optician, 58 Fifth St.—corrected daily:

	IN SUN.	IN SHADE.
9 o'clock A. M.	60	36
12 " M.	70	50
6 " P. M.	56	38
Barometer	29 1 10	

ORPHANS' FAIR,
OPEN EVERY