

Have been here a third time, contrary to the political usage of my country. Sir, the remark has been made to me, since I occupied the floor before, that I must have spoken then without due reflection, that I must have permitted my feelings to be excited. No, sir, I said what I thought, and although I spoke with feeling and some excitement, yet I was then as cool as ever I was in my life. I did not stand up and make charges that could not be proved; but I stood here as a representative of the people, and spoke what I knew to be true; and I should have been derelict in my duty, if I had not pointed to corruption and turned its bloated sides to the public gaze. I know, sir, it is an unpleasant thing to attack men in office, and my heart beat loudly, when I voted to turn out the Judges of the court of General Sessions, because I knew it would be considered a disgrace upon them by the world. And, sir, I only voted for the bill because the people of the city and county of Philadelphia were almost unanimous on the subject. My heart bled, almost, to remove Judge Anthony, a highly honorable and respectable gentleman. Although I was opposed to his removal, as throwing a stigma upon him, yet I was compelled to vote for the repeal of the Nicholson court. Now, sir, I would ask, what does your Constitution say? If the constitutional provision required that you should wait till charges were preferred, why would never get men out of office. Sir, the Constitution of the State, the palladium of our civil and religious liberty has said that two-thirds of this House, and of the Senate, may remove Judges from the bench, though they had never soiled the purity of the ermine. The may be removed either with charges or without. Two-thirds can remove the most distinguished judge in Pennsylvania, without charge or specification; and yet, when we come to talk of submitting this question of the Canal Commissioners to the people, or of taking the power into our own hands to elect them, listen to the human cry that is raised against us—that we are actuated by feelings of disappointment and vindictiveness. Ask, sir, whether these Canal Commissioners are better or her men? whether they are more sacred than other officers? Sir, I shall say nothing with regard to their private character, their public character is public property, and the laws of the land protect me in my place in the freedom of speech—of their acts I can speak—and this I shall do without stint or limitation. No person can restrain me. It is my Constitutional right. Sir, since so much has been said, I will say why I alluded to Mr. Overfield the other day in debate. When the gentleman from Northampton was making some remarks as the representative of his constituency—when he supposed that he was only discharging his duty as a freeman in the free hall of a free people, I will not say the man was making mouths at him, but he was attempting to turn the subject into derision. Why are we to be intimidated? The representatives of two millions of people to be intimidated in the hall of Legislation? If this be so, we had better burn up the charter by which we hold office, and return to our constituents. That, sir, is the reason why I referred to him, coupled with the remarks that were made now in this Hall to intimidate the representatives of the people—to throw ridicule upon the gentleman of Northampton. Sir, I trust I know enough of the ordinary rules of politeness, not to refer to a gentleman who comes into this hall, unless he gives me cause and provocation. I hope my feelings of sensibility are not so much blunted as to single out, as the gentleman from Lycoming (Mr. Boat) the other day said, Cicero did Cataline who obtused his obnoxious presence into the Roman Senate: this moving image of accumulated crime. Sir, I trust I know my duty better as a man legislator. That is the reason I referred to him. Was I not right in doing it? I will venture to say that there are gentlemen in this hall who would vote to keep these men in office if a plan and palpable fraud were proved against them. Suppose you were going to remove a judge from office, a man without political patronage, who here would rise and be the advocate? Who here would sever the bonds of a long and intimate acquaintance in the contest about the question of removal? Who would predict that the member of this House would repent in sack cloth and ashes for daring to vote as the impulse of reason and honesty pointed out? Who would interpose any obstacle to delay justice? Strip those men of their official patronage, and none would be so poor as do them reverence.

Suppose that the question of electing the Canal Commissioners were submitted to a vote of the people, do you believe that these men could be elected to that office? No, sir, these men could not be elected. The gentleman from Tioga, (Mr. Sherwood) seems to think they would. If so, I must be deceived in my opinion in regard to his constituents. Sir, I know his constituents to be intelligent men. Why, sir, it has been intimated here again, that if you interfere with these Canal Commissioners you break up the party. Break up the party? How? As to numbers or principle? I have no fear of its breaking up as the numbers; but as to principles, I pass it over, the less said the better. Gentleman may think I had a hand in prostrating the great democratic party in the state, in my vote on the relief bill of famous notoriety, I plead guilty, and for that act I do repent in sack cloth and ashes, but for my act this day, that this step is cancelled.

Then, sir, I was a novice in politics and took counsel of others—not exactly way wise—easily persuaded and absolutely thought that when I was serving myself. Experience has taught me better, and I now have found that the true axiom is for every man to take care of himself, (laughter) and let others take care of themselves. But sir, to talk of the principles of the party at this day you might search in vain to find even the tattered shred that hang about the skeleton. Of late, sir, I had do difficulty in getting along here. It is all summed up in two words, *honesty and integrity*. Nay sir, one more step, go as the people direct, and fling all others advice to the winds!

The principles of the party have nothing to suffer; but they are in peril now—unless this bill becomes the law of the land. Mark that sir I!

I fell now sir, a deep sense of obligation to my constituency for retaining me after my vote on the relief bill, and that too by an increased majority over the previous year. They thought I was honest in that vote, as the result of the canvass showed. I know I got only 150 majority the last fall's canvass, and the reason was that certain extraneous influences out of my district, were brought heavily to bear against me. I knew that at the Danville encampment, there was a good deal of figuring; and I know, too, that it was said in high places, that if my opponent had come here, his democracy would be endorsed. I have nothing to say against Mr. Chester Butler, he is an honorable high minded man—he was my opponent. He is favorably known to the country—and it is unnecessary for me to state a fact that is familiar with the people of the State. But why am I to be told sir that my majority was reduced to 150 votes? Since I have been I here heard it bruited at the street corners that my nomination and election was the result of fraud—and I have no doubt the vile slanders have reached the polite ears of the gentleman from Clefield, and probably he has unwittingly believed them—and so the matter must needs get celebrity by a promulgation in the Hall of the House. I know sir, there has been an uncommon desire manifested by some kind, generous, and grateful soul, to attempt to prejudice the public ear; but thank fortune the greedy effort was an abortion—the thing fell still born.

Sir, I stand here, this day, not to carry out feelings of private malice, or personal revenge; but as a freeman to proclaim my principles just as I think and I say that I will vote to remove these Canal Commissioners, because I believe they have lost the public confidence. There is no turning me about; there is no influence that can be brought to bear upon me that can effect a change in my sentiments on this subject; and I wish it to be understood that I do not vote against them because they refused to make the appointments I wished. This indeed would be a small matter. No, sir, it is not so.

It is true that I recommended an honest man; so did my worthy colleague and the gentleman from Columbia, (Mr. Snyder) to the Canal Commissioners; but they did not think proper to appoint them. And, perhaps, they were actuated by honest and proper motives. I do not impugn their motives, I do not impugn their conduct, any more than this: I considered it an indignity to the people of Luzerne and Columbia. But does any gentleman understand me, because I failed in procuring the appointment of good men on the canal, that I am apposed to the Canal Commissioners? Sir it is said that the representative of the people do not vote elsewhere for Canal Commissioners? Why in the State of New York, the Canal Commissioners are elected by joint ballot of the legislature.—Mr. Bouch; the distinguished Governor of that State, who was elected by a vote of 20,000 to the Executive Chair, held the office of canal commissioners for 21 successive years, and received his appointment by the joint ballot of the two Houses. It proves the facts that a Canal Commissioners may hold the office by a vote of the legislature, and at the same time have the public confidence. This cannot be said of our system. Let others tell me the reason. The same plan of election is the law of Ohio, it works well there and would here if the experiment were tried. I have examined their newspapers and I do not find them teeming with complaints like ours. (Sir) I know as regard my own feelings in this matter, that if I were called upon to cast my vote for Canal Commissioners, in joint convention of the two Houses, I would not permit them to be operated upon in reference to my views in relation to the Presidency. If I could be so misled as to do it, then I confess that I do not know my own feelings—that I do not know my own mind. But sir, when I see men in power controlling that power for political purposes and to gratify their friends, I should be derelict in my duty if I did not expose and oppose such conduct and proceedings. I do not make specifications and personal charges, but I should like to know where all the Cass handbills were done up, I would like to know too, who did them up, and I would like to know, also, how much he got for doing it! Does the journal in the commissioners office show all this? Sir, I do not say this out of any personal disregard for General Cass. It is said that the country has been flooded with them. When I speak for General Cass, I only do so to express my opinion that he is being deceived; and that his professed friends will turn right about face as soon as ever opportunity occurs. Sir, I have

said enough on that subject, and I caution the admirers of Tecumseh to be careful. They will not be in the vanguard, but I caution them. I repeat, not to be in the rear. If they are to join the Tyler ranks as recruits, let them have a prominent post. Sir, I know an Editor in the North, who, it is reported, is coming here to establish a paper, and I know that he was a Cass man, and I know that the same influence will make him a Tyler man. I could refer to three papers in the North that have changed their politics within twenty days, on the presidential question. And I am sorry to see our late representative at the French court deceived and misled, he who has settled the opinions of continental Europe on the right of search, and given a character to that subject which perhaps, no other man could have done.—But sir, he has come home to be deceived—to be duped, by a pretence to falsify a party around him which is, in fact, to wheel about and march into the ranks of President Tyler. I ask his pardon, Captain Tyler.

Now sir, let us go on a little further, he said I charged the Canal Commissioners with bringing politics into the canal board. I will not refer to the conduct of one of the Canal Commissioners though I should be perfectly justifiable in doing so, for his conduct in Ohio during the late war.

Mr. LOWRY: I hope that the gentleman does not allude to the coffin handbills.

Mr. WRIGHT: No sir; no sir. A gentleman gave me a slip of paper since I have been on the floor, a brief memoir of his conduct during the late war. No doubt the honorable incumbent has a most wonderful dislike to the enemies of that war! No doubt of it.

Mr. LOWRY: I shall be glad to compare notes with the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT resumed. I shall not read the paper, it might make the gentleman sit uncomfortable in his seat as I see him in the Hall. Now sir, I will proceed to examine and make some remarks in reference to the letting of the passenger cars, on the Philadelphia and Columbia railroad. I was told the other day, whilst addressing the House, that George M. Lauman withdrew his bid. What could I say? George Lauman stands here now, and he authorizes me to say that it is false! Ask him! (Here Mr. W. stated the facts.)

Gentlemen will not say now that the bid was withdrawn. No, No! He bid 25 cents per passenger. It was allotted at 35 and afterwards increased to 41 cents. Mr. Lauman will now take the contract at his bid and give ample security. Suppose an hundred thousand passengers pass over the road in a year. This is the probable estimate. By giving the contract to Mr. Lauman, the State would have saved \$10,000! A nice little item in retrenchment. But then the people—the dear people—can make up this small sum by taxation, to enable the Nabobs of the land to dress in "purple and fine linen." And if a representative of the people dare point his finger at the fraud, he must be denounced and vilified. Sir, at this moment there are men in this broad commonwealth, famishing with hunger! Children at this moment crying for bread! While thousands are lavished on favorites—drawn from a treasury exhausted—and all for what? To help on a Presidential campaign—and reward the favorites who cringe and fawn at the feet of the honorable the Board of Canal Commissioners. But gentlemen must not mention these things abroad for fear of distracting the party. Sir, there are times when it is a crime to be silent. This is one!

Mr. SHERWOOD: I said the other day that I was informed the bid was withdrawn I give the authority at the time, but whether the statement was true or false, I knew not.

Mr. WRIGHT proceeded. Well, here he stands who says he did not withdraw his bid. And then, if you speak out of an official delinquent, it is said how can you be so cruel as to turn a man out of office. Why sir, let us deal out even handed justice without fear, favor or affection; and if there is not a great deal for cause of complaint, then I do not understand it. The travelling from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, is made a monopoly. Four hundred miles of canal and railroad a monopoly! I understand that the contractors are engaged in getting boats ready. I am told that if they carry passengers to Columbia, all the State gets is 82 cents; while, if they shift their boats and go from this to Lancaster, they pay the State \$1 62.

The men who hold a contract have an exclusive right to carry all the passengers. The farmer in Lancaster or Chester cannot put a barrel of flour on a burthen ear and get on and go to market. No, he must ride in the passenger train and pay his fare! They are building their packets to commence this grand monopoly operation as soon as the navigation opens in the spring. What will be the consequence. The packets will run to Columbia—the passengers will take the cars there, instead of travelling on the Harrisburg and Lancaster road—and thus the State must loose 40 cents on each passenger. For whose benefit is all this? It goes into the pockets of the contractors. The traveller pays as much one way as the other; but the working the article gives them 40 cents in addition to the excess of 16 cents, over the bid of George Lauman.—Put the 16 and 40 cents together—56 cents loss to the State—on a hundred thousand passengers \$56,000. And yet gentlemen sit down and swallow it all; and are honest men not to stand up and protest against it? Sir, I cannot defend conduct of this sort.

This matter has already been discussed at great length, and I cannot now take up the time of the House by going into the minutia [Mr. LOWRY explained.]

Mr. WRIGHT: I vouch for the allegations I make, and I can prove them by reference to the contract. And when I say, that there is a monopoly of 400 miles, along which they have the control of the whole travel. I say that which the gentleman must know; and further, that boats, as I have already stated, are building, and the intention is to throw the whole travel open to Columbia as I have stated. I will not stop to say where the contract was made—for I know where it was made and written. I do not want to be personal, and therefore I do not wish to name the place not the hand of the man that drew it. Persons getting in at Columbia will have more miles to travel than if they entered at Dillerville. They travel more over the rail road and pay less. Why sir, ought not the contract to say, that every man that travels so far shall pay so much. What right have the company to say to a man who enters at one point that he shall pay one price, and to another man entering at another, a different price. Should not the rates be uniform? Now sir, I want the people to understand my motives, and the facts of the case, as they really are; and if they condemn me, because there are whigs here who think and take the same view of the matter that I do, why I cannot help it; but I shall have the consolation of knowing and feeling that I have acted from the purest motives and with a sincere desire to protect the rights and interests of the people. Sir, must I vote against the whigs, because they happen to take the same view of the matter that I do? I hope the Reporter will take down all that I say, for I wish to be understood by the people. And when the Tyler paper is published, it may denounce me from Dan to Beeshebe—I will disregard it! The excursion on the North Branch of the Canal Commissioners, when they had lemons, loaf sugar and some of the "O-be joyful," is a small matter, it is true; but gentlemen should recollect the couplet delivered in Congress by Mr. Duncan of Ohio. He said "there were rogues that stole millions and rogues that stole spoons." If there are rogues who steal millions, they will steal millions. I refer to the excursion on the North Branch, because it is an item in the general charges. And what, sir, is that? The Canal Commissioners on a tour of examination, employed boats and horses for that purpose, and I, sir, was one of the invited guests, and a very pleasant time we had. On board, we had first rate Cogniac, lemon and lump sugar as white as the snow on Mount Blanc. (Laughter.) I partook of it, too, but I thought it was to be paid for by the gentleman who furnished the boat. In fact, I knew nothing about the matter, as to who paid the charges, till I came here. The gentleman from Northampton (Mr. Heckman) the other day read in his place the affidavit of John McReynolds, the Supervisor—who swears that when the party arrived at Northumberland the Commissioners directed him to enter the expenses of the pleasure voyage on the check roll as day labor! (Much Laughing.)

Now sir, this is a fact. He swears to it, and he who would impeach John McReynolds does not know whom he impeaches. Mr. friend from Columbia (Mr. Snyder) knows him like a book. I appeal to him if he be not an honest man and of integrity. (My S. nodded assent.) He swears that he went along as one of the Supervisors, and the canal commissioners told him to enter the amount of [\$24] on the check roll and the gentleman from Northampton went into the department and made an examination, and he found \$16 horse hire, \$4 to each of the two hands, which makes \$24. If it be not so let gentlemen look up the check roll and bring it in here!

(Concluded in our Next.)

**DEMOCRAT.**  
 "TRUTH WITHOUT FEAR"  
**BLOOMSBURG:**  
 SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1843.  
 FOR PRESIDENT,  
**JAMES BUCHANAN.**  
 (Subject to the decision of a National Convention.)  
 HARRISBURG, Feb. 21, 1843.

The house was engaged during the forenoon session in discussing the senate's amendment to the bill repealing the Nicholson Court. The house adjourned however, before the final vote was taken. The veto of the Governor, upon the apportionment bill, was sent into both houses, this morning. It created quite an animated debate in the senate. As the bill cannot be passed by two thirds, the legislature must now attempt to frame another more in accordance with his views. Of this, I do not anticipate any difficulty, if they would take hold of it with the right spirit.

Col. Charles M'Clure, of Cumberland, was yesterday appointed Secretary of the Commonwealth, in the room of A. V. Parson resigned, and E. W. Hutter, reappointed Deputy Secretary.

The Clay Convention will assemble in this place to-morrow. A large number of delegates have arrived. A large convention is anticipated by his friends.

The consideration of Headley's division bill was postponed in the senate, this morning. It is now gone to sleep in the tomb of the capulets. No action has yet been had upon the Removal bill in that body.

The Berwick Sentinel, as was anticipated when the Junier Editor was appointed Collector at Berwick, has shown its teeth in favor of Captain Tyler, for the Presidency, in 1844. This has been done, however, sooner than was expected, as it was supposed that the Cass flag, would be first hoisted to pave the way for a union upon the captain. But we suppose that the exposure, by Mr. Wight, in his speech upon the Canal Commissioners bill, of this scheme of transferring the democracy from one candidate to another, at the option of the holder as stock jobbers say, has made them fearful that the people will not, thus be sold, like sheep in the market, to the highest bidder, and they have concluded it was best to show their colors at once. We wonder if this arrangement was not made between the Canal Commissioners and new Collectors previous to the appointment. It is so said at Harrisburg by those who pretend to know.

**THE CANAL COMMISSIONER'S BILL.**

The project now before the legislature, for electing the Canal Commissioners by the people, is receiving a hearty response from every quarter of the state. It is a measure of immense importance, to the people. It renders the Commissioners and the whole batch of canal officers responsible to those who are immediately interested in the management of the public works, instead of a few designing politicians, who can wield this immense patronage to enrich themselves, or to make this or that man Governor, President, or VICE PRESIDENT. The appointing of these officers never should have been vested in the governor. It has been a source of unlimited corruption and extravagance, and of more heat burnings and bickerings in the democratic party than all other causes put together. Discharging good officers from the lines, not because they did not do their duty, nor that they were not decided democrats, but because they would not lend themselves to the board to be used to advance the interest of a certain clique, who were associated with the powers that be, or in other words were not of the "right stripe." Never has this evil shown itself more plainly than in the appointment made by the Canal Commissioners, since their late appointment. On the North Branch, John McReynolds, a Buchanan man must be removed to make room for David N. Kownover, a notorious Johnson, Cass, Tyler, or any other man's man, who would bid the most for him, like his master of the Intelligencer. To carry out the scheme, every hand upon the canal must be displaced, from the mud boss to the boy that drives the mud boat horse, to make room for those who have heretofore been the greatest street bawlers against the administration of the

**SALT AND SNOW.**

The Boston Journal says: "Spinkling salt on snow and ice, deposited on the side walks or foot-paths, is an improper practice and never should be resorted to. It loosens and destroys the snow or ice, it is true, but it also produces an intense degree of cold, and furnishes a strong solution of brine, in which the unfortunate foot passenger must immerse the soles of his boots or shoes, and thus render them hygrometric, so that while he continues to wear such boots or shoes, he may bid adieu to dry feet; as leath or any porous material soaked in brine, greedily attracts moisture. By this means it is not improbable that many coughs and colds have been caused or aggravated, and consumption and fever developed. When ever salt is spread over ice or snow, with a view to remove it, the melted snow should be swept away immediately, and the spot strewed with sand, saw dust or ashes."

When Washington took leave of Lafayette etc, at the close of the American Revolution, his parting words were—"You have served an apprenticeship to the liberty in America, now go to France and set up for yourself."

The picaune says they call gauging in New Orleans "operating for strabismus on the Kentucky system."