

JEFFERSONIAN REPUBLICAN.

THE WHOLE ART OF GOVERNMENT CONSISTS IN THE ART OF BEING HONEST.—JEFFERSON.

VOL. 12

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1852.

No 51

Published by Theodore Schoch.

TERMS—Two dollars per annum in advance—Two dollars and a quarter, half yearly—and if not paid before the end of the year, Two dollars and a half. Those who receive their papers by a carrier or stage drivers employed by the proprietor, will be charged 27 1/2 cents, per year, extra.

No papers discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Editor.

Advertisements not exceeding one square (sixteen lines) will be inserted three weeks for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion. The charge for one and three insertions the same.—A liberal discount made to yearly advertisers.

All letters addressed to the Editor must be post-paid.

JOB PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large, elegant, plain and ornamental Type, we are prepared to execute every description of

FANCY PRINTING.

Cards, Circulars, Bill Heads, Notes, Blank Receipts, Justices, Legal and other Blanks, Pamphlets, &c. printed with neatness and dispatch, on reasonable terms.

AT THE OFFICE OF THE Jeffersonian Republican.

From the Daily News.

George W. Woodward.

Although we have never had any exalted opinion of the character or qualifications as a political leader of the Hon. George W. Woodward, the Locofoco candidate for Judge of the Supreme Court, we had heretofore always supposed him to be an high-minded and honorable man who would scorn to do any of the dirty work of the party, or to be guilty of any act of doubtful propriety, even to advance his own political interests. It is however now apparent that we mistook the man, and that he is pre-eminently entitled to the title and character of a political demagogue of the worst kind. Connected and associated with the Buchanan wing of the mis-called Democracy in this State, he has evidently become nervously alarmed at the apprehension that the anti-Buchananites will play the same game towards himself and Mr. Hopkins, the candidate for Canal Commissioner, which the Buchananites were playing towards Mr. Searight previous to his death.

Aware that the Cassites know full well who it was that originated and perseveringly spread the charges against Searight with a view to defeat him, and equally well aware that "revenge is sweet," and that those opposed to Buchanan now have him and Mr. Hopkins in a position where they can pay back, with compound interest, those who made and conveyed at the war against Searight, he has become alarmed at the doom which awaits him and Mr. Canal Commissioner Candidate Hopkins. Thus alarmed, he has made up his mind to play the demagogue outright, and, in a fit of desperation, deliberately plunged into an effort to falsify history, and to lie himself straight out from the charges made against him. He has accordingly written a letter to certain Locofoco leaders at Pittsburg, and as it is a rare specimen of demagoguism, full of untruth and misrepresentations, which we purpose to notice and refute, we give him the benefit of an insertion of it at length in our columns. It is as follows:

Pittsburg, Sept. 14, 1852.

Gentlemen:—The official duties which brought me to Pittsburg, keep me constantly engaged. My answer to your letter must therefore, be brief.

From my earliest youth to this present moment I have been an earnest and hearty supporter of the Democratic party, and an equally zealous opponent, so far as my political action could decorously and properly go, of whatever opposed it. I am not and never have been a "Native American," in any political sense, any more than I am or have been a whig, abolitionist or an abolitionist.

The charge of "Nativism" is attempted to be sustained by a motion which I made in the Reform Convention of 1837. That was simply a limitation of a motion made by Mr. Thomas, a whig member from Chester county, and was calculated to compel his party (who were in majority in the Convention) to come up to the mark or back out. They chose the latter branch of the alternative, and my motion having answered its purpose, was withdrawn. The sin of introducing this subject into that body lies at the door of a whig, and not at mine.

The speech so often quoted against me, I am not responsible for. It was introduced into the debates by a whig reporter, in violation of the rules of the body which required him to submit it for revision before publication, and which he never did. I made one observation explanatory of my amendment of "Thomas' motion," but that speech is not a fair report of them. My other speeches were submitted for revision. This one I never saw till the book was printed, and I have never ceased to condemn it.

During the session of the Convention, namely, on the 10th of January, 1838, a member in debate alluded to the motion, not the speech, as indicative of hostility to foreigners. I promptly denounced the imputation, there in the face of the Convention, as I have done many a time since, as a gross misrepresentation.

See debates of the Convention, vol. 10, pp. 33, 34.

I have retained the undiminished confidence of the Democratic members of the Reform Convention, several of whom were adopted citizens, and all of them opposed to Nativism. Would this have been possible if the whig reports of my sayings and doings had been true.

The Native American Party itself is my witness. Seven years ago I was the caucus nominee for U. S. Senator. The County of Philadelphia was represented by Natives.—They asked me, whether, if elected by their votes, I would favor their measures for changing the naturalization laws. I answered them no, and they threw every vote they could command against me, and raised a shout of triumph over my victory.

You refer to statements in the Whig pa-

pers of this city. One of them was shown to me a few days ago, in which was a garbled extract from a letter written by me about a year ago, in which I repelled the imputation of Nativism as distinctly as I deny it now.—Yet the editor told his readers that the letter contains an admission that my sentiments were at that time adverse to the rights of foreign born citizens. A copy of the letter thus misrepresented by the Pittsburgh Gazette, I send you herewith in the Keystone of Sept. 23d, '51.

When men will allow their political passions to get the better of their veracity so far as to impel them to acts and assertions like this, it is easy enough to understand how and why I was misrepresented by a reporter of the Convention whose motives for doing so were just as strong as those which actuate political opponents now.

Another allegation, that I opposed Judge Campbell last fall, is as false as any other of the numerous misstatements recently made against me. I never opposed any nominee on account of his birth or religion, and I supported no nominee last fall more heartily than I did Judge Campbell.

It is with infinite reluctance I appear before the public at this time, even in self defence. A candidate for a judicial office is, perhaps, more than any other candidate, required to await quietly the decision of the people. I am as sensible as any man can be, that politics ought to be kept away as far as possible from judicial elections, but the terms of your letter leave me no choice but to answer. I have answered, by giving you briefly the truth. I give it because it is the truth; and I accompany it with no appeal to party passion or prejudice.

If industrious defamation can succeed in representing me as having ever sustained any liberal or proscriptionist, then the Truth and a Lie are powerless against slander.

There are some presses and many men opposed to me in political sentiments, who are disposed to treat me fairly, and who will not descend to base appliances to accomplish a party purpose. Such men and presses command my respect. Against others who are less scrupulous I have no shield but the truth and my life, and relying on these, I can afford to wait, in patience, the verdict of the people.

Thanking you, gentlemen, for the kind feelings manifested in your letter I am, with great respect, your obedient servant,
GEORGE W. WOODWARD.

The first paragraph of the above letter is a mere quibble, and might be pardonable in a small pettifogger from whom nothing better could be expected, but cannot be regarded otherwise than discreditable in one who holds a seat upon the Supreme Bench, by Executive appointment and seeks to retain it by an election therefrom from the people. No person that we know of ever charged him with being a member of the Native American organization. It was therefore wholly unnecessary for him to make so positive, and so formal an avowal that he has never been anything but what in plain terms may be called a Locofoco. Never having been charged with belonging to the Native American organization, his remarks on this point can only be regarded, as they were doubtless intended, to mystify his past career, or in other words, thrust dust in the eyes of the people and thereby mislead and deceive them.

But Judge Woodward has been charged with having offered a resolution in the Reform Convention to exclude foreigners from the right of suffrage, and with having made a speech in support of his resolution. The evidences of the truth of that charge are to be found in the published Debates of the Convention, Volume V, pages 443, 5, 6, 7, &c. We have in our possession the Debates of the Convention, and those who doubt the truth of the charge can have the opportunity of examining them if they call at our office. We have not the required space to give the whole proceedings, but shall submit enough to make good the charge. On the 443d page of the 5th volume of said debates, will be found the following resolution offered by Mr. Magee, from Perry county.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to inquire into the expediency of so amending the Constitution of Pennsylvania as to prevent the future emigration into this State of free persons of color, and fugitive slaves from other States and Territories.

A motion was made to amend by offering to insert the word foreigners, between the words of and free. This motion was pending, where we are informed on page 444 of volume 5 of said Debates, that—

"Mr. Woodward moved to amend the amendment, by adding thereto the words, and that the said committee be also instructed to inquire into the propriety of so amending the Constitution, as to PREVENT ANY FOREIGNERS who may arrive in this State after the 4th of July, 1841, FROM ACQUIRING THE RIGHT TO VOTE OR TO HOLD OFFICE IN THIS COMMONWEALTH."

Not content with submitting this proposition, Judge Woodward followed it up with a speech, which we find in the same volume of the Debates, pages 446 7, and from which we make the following choice extracts:

"Sir, I appreciate, as much as any man living, the many political rights and privileges which I, in common with the people of the United States, am now enjoying; and it is my honest impression that WE LO BUT SQUANDER THOSE PRIVILEGES in conferring them upon every individual who chooses to come and claim them. He knew that a great portion of those who came among us from foreign parts consist frequently of the WORST PART OF THE POPULATION OF THOSE COUNTRIES, and that they are UNACQUAINTED WITH THE VALUE OF THESE PRIVILEGES, and that, therefore, they DO NOT KNOW HOW

TO VALUE THEM. I think that in thus conferring indiscriminately on all, we are DOING INJURY TO OUR INSTITUTIONS; and I believe that, if the time has not yet come, it will speedily come, when it will be indispensably necessary either for this body, or some other body of this State, or of the United States, to inquire whether it is not right to put this plan into execution, by which foreigners should be prevented from controlling our elections, and brow beating our American citizens at the polls."

We apprehend the above extract is quite sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind as to what Judge Woodward's views and feelings then were; but we may as well add another still more conclusive:

Judge Woodward continues: "And what claim have foreigners from any country—aye, sir, from any country—which is strong enough to justify us in PROSTITUTING OUR POLITICAL PRIVILEGES, by conferring them carelessly and indiscriminately on every individual who may reside here for two or three years, become a naturalized citizen, and then command our offices? There are very many of these emigrants who know nothing of political privileges in their own country before they emigrate to this.—The world is unknown to them, or if they hear of it at all, they hear of it as something in which they have no participation. Is not this the fact? Sir, we all know that it is; we know that very many of these emigrants never enjoyed any political privileges themselves—that they HAVE NO KNOWLEDGE OF THEM, AND LEAST OF ALL HAVE THEY ANY KNOWLEDGE OR OUR PEOPLE, OUR GOVERNMENT, OR OUR INSTITUTIONS. The acquirement of this knowledge is not the work of a day. They have no sympathy in common with us; they have no gratifications in RENDER THEM FIT RECIPIENTS OF THESE HIGH POLITICAL PRIVILEGES."

Judge Woodward has been further charged with having, no later than last fall, justified and vindicated the resolution offered, and the speech made by him in the Reform Convention. The evidence to sustain this charge is to be found in an address issued by him on the 6th of September, 1851, and which he states, in the foregoing letter of his, published in the Harrisburg Keystone, of the 23d of September, 1851, and from which, as proof of the charge, we make the following extract:

"Who could complain of my proposition? Certainly no foreigner then in the country, none on his way to this country, none who would choose to come before the fourth of July, 1841, for none of these were to be excluded from anything, either a residence or political privileges amongst us. Nor could those who should choose to come after the fourth of July, 1841, complain, for they would have had nearly four years' notice that they were not to share in our political privileges."

How does Judge Woodward now, in his Pittsburg letter, which we have published at length, meet the charges made against him, and refute or explain the overwhelming array of testimony adduced in its support? He says the charge "is attempted to be sustained by a motion which I made in the Reform Convention in 1837," and proceeds to explain the resolution offered by him as a mere limitation of an amendment proposed by Mr. Thomas, of Chester. So far from this being true, his resolution proposed to extend the scope of inquiry. Instead of confining the inquiry as designed by the mover of the original resolution, Judge Woodward voluntarily, and of his own accord, without a word of debate having previously taken place to direct attention to the subject, or elicit such a proposition, thrust his motion upon the Convention to add to the duties of the proposed committee the labor of inquiring into the propriety of excluding foreigners from the right of suffrage. That he was in favor of such a measure at that time no candid man for a moment can doubt; and we may add, if he was an honest and truthful man who would rather compromise his prospects of an election than his personal honor and character for veracity, there can be no doubt he would himself say so.—But these considerations, it would seem, have but little effect upon his mind when such a course might destroy his political prospects. Devoid of that manly courage which prompts the man of truth and of honor to make a frank and honest admission, avow a change of opinion, and give his reasons therefore he seeks to escape the dilemma in which his own indiscretion and folly has placed him, by skulking out of it by a deliberate equivocation and misrepresentation of his own acts.—His effort to escape thus, if made without any attempt to shield himself by falsely attributing the blame to those who are innocent of it, might be palliated and excused, if not justified. He is known to be of a nervous temperament, timid as a hare, and altogether devoid of that kind of manly courage, which would impel many men to make an honest confession and give the reasons for changing their opinions, and he might therefore be excused, if not justified, for shrinking from such an avowal; but when he seeks to shield his own folly, as he now does, by an attempt to saddle the odium thereof upon the Whigs, he is guilty of a meanness which no language can too strongly portray. To attempt such a thing is what we might expect from the notorious Rynders, and Locofocos of that ilk; but we have a right to expect better things from one who aspires to a seat upon the Supreme Bench.

"The sin of introducing this subject into that body lies at the door of a Whig, not mine," says Judge Woodward. This

in plain English, is a falsehood. How can such an assertion be reconciled with truth? Neither Mr. Thomas, nor any other Whig in the Convention, had said or done anything which forced Judge Woodward to offer his resolution. He thrust it upon the Convention of his own accord, without any previous action having taken place which made it either necessary or proper to offer such a proposition. He embraced the opportunity to do what he had, no doubt, long before he thought of doing, and on which, it is apparent from the speech which he made, he had reflected and intended to speak. But he would have us now believe that he only offered it to compel the Whigs in the Convention "to come to the mark or back out," and that they having chosen the latter course his object was accomplished, and therefore his resolution withdrawn. Here is another attempt at explanation, which is in the highest degree discreditable. He only designed to make the Whigs "come to the mark or back out." Come to what mark? The mark of the slavery question? That was the subject embraced in the original resolution, and as the course of the Whigs on that subject was known to all, and needed no stratagem, to bring them to the mark upon it, he cannot refer to that subject. On what then was it his object to make them "Come to the mark or back out?" As there were no other subjects embraced in the original proposition, or the amendments, but his own to exclude foreigners from voting, he must have reference to that. That subject had not before been introduced or agitated in the Convention. No Whig had expressed any such views, but, on the contrary, when his own proposition was brought forward, it was denounced by one or two Whig members of the Convention, as the Debates will show, and by the Whig press throughout the entire State.—What then does he mean by saying that his resolution having answered its purpose was withdrawn? His remark is either unmeaning tattle, or he must mean that he only intended to sound the Whigs, and finding that they were all opposed to it, he knew he could not carry it and therefore withdrew it. Whether he was sincerely in favor of such a proposition at that time we leave to those who will take the trouble to read his speech to say.—That he was honestly in favor of it, and uttered the honest convictions of his own mind, no man in the Convention then for a moment doubted, nor do we now, notwithstanding the effort now made to repudiate his own offspring by assailing the motives and the integrity of the Reporter of the Convention. But more of this hereafter.

As some evidence in support of his assertions, Judge Woodward refers to vol. 10, pages 33-4 of the Debates of the Convention, to show that on the 10th of January, 1838, some months after the time he offered the resolution, he disowned being in favor of excluding foreigners from the right of suffrage. By reference to said Debates, it will be found, at the pages designated by him, that reference was made to his resolution by Mr. Earle, a member of his own party, whereupon the Judge interrupted Mr. Earle and explained, as he states. Admit all this, and we have no disposition to deny it, what does it prove? It only confirms the charge against him. Mr. Earle, a member of his own party, and well known in this community as an honest, upright, and fair-minded man, understood him to be in earnest, and as having honestly and in good faith offered the resolution, or he would not have referred to it. True it is, the Judge denied, when Mr. Earle referred to it, that he was in favor of his own resolution, or entertained the hostile views to foreigners which were proclaimed in his speech. But was there any other member in the Convention who rose, as is the custom on such occasions, to corroborate his statement? Not one in the Convention did so. They knew that he had been driven from his position by the outburst of indignation with which his proposition was received by the public press in the State, and that he was skulking out of the position then assumed by him. Glad to get rid of the subject, they let his explanation pass for what it was worth, but took good care not to corroborate it by any endorsement of theirs.

For the speech made by him, reported by the official reporter of the Convention, and published in the debates of the Convention, Judge Woodward now attempts to say that he is not responsible. He does not dare to say that the speech was not made by him, or that he did not utter the sentiments therein contained; but would have us infer that he did not, by saying that he never revised it, that it is not a fair report, and that he has never ceased to condemn it. To give the coloring of plausibility to this vague explanation, and show a motive on the part of the reporter of the Convention to misrepresent him, he shows himself not only mean enough to assail the integrity of the reporter but resorts to a falsehood to fasten upon him that of which he knows him to be innocent. He says "it was introduced by a Whig reporter," and follows up the assertion in a subsequent paragraph of his letter, when he refers to what he is pleased to denounce as misrepresentations on the part of the Whig press of his conduct, with the fol-

lowing remark: "When men will allow their political passions to get the better of their veracity so far as to impel them to acts and assertions like this, it is easy enough to understand how and why I was misrepresented by a reporter of the Convention, whose motives for doing so were just as strong as those which actuate my political opponents now." Without the manly courage to assail the reporter outright, and pronounce his report to be false, he first takes the pains to state that he was a Whig, and then prates about his having the same motives to misrepresent him as Whigs now have. It matters not to us what were the politics of that reporter. He was an officer of the Convention, duly chosen, and acting under the responsibility as such official incumbent.—To suppose that Judge Woodward would have permitted himself to be thus misrepresented without bringing the matter before the Convention, and having the delinquent officer dismissed, would require a greater amount of credulity than we possess. But we are, fortunately for the vindication of truth, left to no such uncertain surmises or inferences. Mr. John Agg was the stenographer to the Convention, and was assisted by Messrs. McKinley, Drake, Kingman, and Wheeler.—We know not what were Mr. Agg's politics, but we do know that three of the assistants, and probably the fourth, were and still are Locofocos. Mr. McKinley is the present editor of the Democratic Union, published at Harrisburg, Mr. Drake is a legislative reporter, and known to many of our public men as a Locofoco. Mr. Kingman is, we believe, now the Washington correspondent of the New York Evening Post, an out and out Locofoco. Mr. Wheeler is also a congressional reporter, but we do not know his politics. With such a corps of reporters to compare notes, and revise their reports, most of whom, if not all, of the same party to which the Judge belongs, the idea of his being misrepresented, designedly or otherwise, is too improbable to be entertained by any impartial and fair minded men for a single moment.

Deny it as Judge Woodward may, explain it away as he may attempt to do, there are other evidences to which we shall now refer, which shows that he was in earnest when he offered the resolution and that he had no such purposes in view as he stated when Mr. Earle referred to it some months thereafter, and as he now alleges he had. To show that his object was not, as he now says, to limit Mr. Thomas' motion, or to make the Whigs come to me mark, we need but refer to the 5th volume of debates, page 445.—It will be there seen that the Chair ruled Judge Woodward's amendment out of order, and stated that it could only be introduced by moving to strike out Mr. Thomas' amendment, and adding his, Judge Woodward's, to the original resolution. Had Judge Woodward been opposed to Mr. Thomas' proposition as he now states, he would have thereupon moved to strike out Mr. Thomas' motion and add his own. Did he do so? Not he. His reply to the Chair was that "his impression was he could substitute his own proposition as an amendment" to the one offered by Mr. Thomas. In plain English, he was in favor of Mr. Thomas' amendment, and would not move to strike it out so as to enable him to offer his.—All he wanted was to add his own to Mr. Thomas', and then the resolution would have exactly suited him. "Mr. Thomas then said"—we quote from the Journal of the Debates—"that with a view to enable the gentleman from Luzerne (Mr. Woodward) to bring forward his proposition, and to take away all obstruction to its immediate consideration, he (Mr. Thomas) would withdraw his own amendment." The amendment of Judge Woodward then came up, not as he now states, to limit Mr. Thomas' motion, but as an independent proposition of his own. Mr. Cox, a Whig member, from Somerset county, then took the floor, and denounced the proposition in strong terms, concluding with expressing a hope that it would be voted down by a decided majority. Thereupon Judge Woodward made his speech, from which we have already given several extracts; but we will now add a few to show that he made the proposition in earnest, and not for the purpose which he now alleges. These extracts are as follows, and may be found in vol. 5, pages 445, 46, 47, 48, of the Debates of the Convention:

Mr. Woodward said that he had not anticipated this morning that an opportunity would be presented to him to introduce this subject to the notice of the convention; he was not, therefore prepared at this time to say more than a few words; although, it was a subject which had been on his mind for some time past, and had claimed his serious consideration.

"I have long felt a desire, said Mr. W. that something should be done in relation to it,—that the facts should be investigated, and that some proper and efficient measures should be adopted, if, upon that investigation, it should turn out that measures of some kind were requisite."

"I have a strong feeling on the subject, though I confess that I entertain doubts whether this convention has the power to act. I am well aware of the nature of the provision in the Constitution of the United States, and which has been referred to by the gentlemen from

the county of Philadelphia, (Mr. Martin.) I would do nothing in contravention of that provision; I merely wish that the question should be referred to a committee, that they may inquire whether this convention has the power to act at all in the premises; and if it has the power, whether it would be expedient to act. I am, however, surrounded by many valued friends, whose opinions and judgment I appreciate; and it appears that they are unanimous in thinking that I should withdraw it. I, therefore, yield my own judgment to theirs, and having explained my views, I withdraw the amendment."

Here we have his motives, his views and his purposes mirrored to us. He had the subject "on his mind for a long time," it had "claimed his serious attention" many a sleepless night, and he had "long felt a desire that something should be done." Though he entertained doubts about the power of the Convention, to insert such a provision in the Constitution, he had "a strong feeling on the subject," but finding that many valued friends surround him, who saw he was committing political suicide, were "unanimous in thinking" that he should withdraw it, he yielded his "own judgment to theirs," and having had the opportunity to "explain his views," he would withdraw it. So far from having made the whigs come up to the mark or "back out," as he now boasts, the backing out was altogether on his part. He it was, according to his own admission, that ingloriously backed out at the "unanimous" suggestion of his friends, and, having thus backed out, when the subject was alluded to some months afterwards by Mr. Earle, he backed out still further. This is the true state of the case, and no one can truthfully gainsay it.

But the Journal of Debates furnishes evidence in relation to another point now denied by Judge Woodward. The discussion, as there recorded, furnishes proof that he uttered the sentiments in his speech which it contains as published.—For proof of this we refer to volume 5, pages 448, 49, 50. Mr. Cummin, a Democratic member, from Juniata, made a speech, from which we extract the following:

Mr. Cummin, of Juniata county, rose and said that he thought it was a very hard case that a member of this convention should introduce a proposition like that brought forward by the gentleman from Luzerne, (Mr. Woodward)—that he should support it by a strong argument against all foreigners, and that he should then withdraw it, and thus cut off all opportunity of replying to his elaborate address. Such has been the course of the gentleman from Luzerne. He had offered his amendment—he had made a speech in its favor—and he denied to other members the privilege of showing that he was entirely mistaken in his aristocratic argument.

Sir, (said Mr. C.) the gentleman from Luzerne is the last man from whom I should have expected an action of this kind. I would have been glad that the gentleman would have left the way open, for a short time at least, that we might examine the subject in relation to the foreigners of this country, from the time of the revolution down to this day, and that we might demonstrate, even to his satisfaction, that his speech contains one of the most exclusive and aristocratic arguments ever submitted to a republican assembly.

The whole tenor of the gentleman's argument, went to cast reproach upon foreigners, and to show that they were not worthy to be trusted.

The gentleman reasons rather out of the book in one point, when he says, that the time is now come, when the United States can do without foreigners—that there is no necessity for them—that the people of the United States are now able to fight their own battles, and they can live safe and free without their presence. He is mistaken if he supposes that he can find a justification, in such reasoning as this for the argument which he has offered. There is no ground on which it can be justified. I hope, therefore, that he will withdraw his amendment; and that he will make an apology for what I regard as a gross insult upon the Irish, and the other foreign population of this State.

Mr. Woodward said, that he had not risen for the purpose of making the apology called for by the gentleman from Juniata county, (Mr. Cummin) for he (Mr. W.) knew well, that, to an American assembly, no apology could be necessary.

But Judge Woodward appeals to the Native American party as his witness, and he refers to a correspondence which took place between him and the Native members from Philadelphia county during the Legislative session of 1845, when he was a Locofoco caucus nominee for U. S. Senator, and defeated in the election by Gen. Cameron. He says that, in reply to their inquiry if he would, if elected by their votes, favor their measures for changing the naturalization laws, he answered no, and that they thereupon voted against him. It is a plain and well recognized principle of the law of evidence that no parol evidence can be given of an instrument of writing where the instrument itself can be produced. Why does not the Judge append a copy of his answer to the Native members to his Pittsburg letter, and thus move all doubt as to what he said to them? We should like to see it published; for it would be as great a curiosity in its way as his Native speech, and would make it necessary for him to write another letter of explanation on another subject of public policy. We too have some recollection of the letter referred to by the Judge. It was addressed to William Hollishead, Esq., a member of the Legislature from the county—