

# Carlisle Herald and Expositor.

A FAMILY NEWSPAPER—DEVOTED TO NEWS, POLITICS, LITERATURE, THE ARTS AND SCIENCES, AGRICULTURE, AMUSEMENT, &c. &c.

Printed and Published, Weekly, by George M. Phillips, in Carlisle, Cumberland County, Pa.

VOLUME XL—No. 47.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, AUGUST 21, 1838.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 2—No. 39.

## TERMS.

The "Carlisle Herald & Expositor," will be issued every TUESDAY AFTERNOON, at Two Dollars, per annum, payable in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted at the usual rates. Letters addressed to the editor, on business, MUST BE POST PAID, otherwise they will receive no attention.

## AGENTS.

The following named persons have been appointed Agents for the "Carlisle Herald & Expositor," to whom payment for subscription and advertisements can be made.

D. SHELLY, Esq. Shiremanstown, Camb. Co.
SCOTT COYLE, Esq. Newville do
P. KOONTZ, Esq. Newburg do
THOS. W. HINES, Esq. Shippensburg do
JOHN WERNER, Esq. do do
J. MATZER, Esq. Logansport do
R. WILSON, Esq. Mechanicsburg do
WILLIAM RUSSELL, Esq. Hopewell do
R. STURGEON, Esq. Carlisle do
DR. ASA WHITE, New Cumberland do
TROS. BLACK, Esq. Bloomfield, Perry county do
A. BLACK, Esq. Landisburg do

## POETRY.

Selected for the Herald & Expositor by a Lady.

### Dear Woman.

Let us think—in the bow of no reason—  
No malice preposse in good cheer—  
From our head, if it pilfer the reason,  
It least leaves our hearts more sincere;  
A toast, or a song, or a story  
Of woman can never come amiss;  
For woman is the theme and the glory  
Of man, in a moment like this—  
Whatever the future may promise—  
Whatever the present may give—  
There is something they cannot take from us  
While woman and memory live—  
With their sighing, and sobbing, and weeping,  
All day they are all that they seem!  
But Lord pardon them! when they are sleeping  
There is no telling what they would dream.

Of women, dear mystical creatures—  
The Titan I never believed—  
Who can look on their forms and their features  
And dream he will e'er be deceived?  
When they're saddest, they sing like a linnets—  
When they're fatter, they betray with a tear,  
Their lips can pledge more in a minute,  
Than their hearts can redeem in a year,  
They shrink when their bosoms are boldest,  
And blush to dissemble their wiles—  
They smile when their hearts are the coldest,  
And man is seduced by their smiles—  
And their sighing, and sobbing, and weeping,  
All day they are all that they seem!  
But Lord pardon them, when they are sleeping  
There is no telling what they would dream.

Yet love them, how madly, how blindly!  
For love sees no faults so they say—  
But all we would blame is most kindly  
Conceal'd from our eyes all the day.  
We have glimpses of genius in the morning,  
Our brows and our bosoms adorning—  
And bliss by the light of the moon—  
We have spells that we would not have broken—  
We have raptures and wishes suppress'd—  
We have thoughts that have never been spoken—  
We have look'd—when we imagine the rest—  
With their sighing, and sobbing, and weeping,  
All day they are all that they seem—  
But Lord pardon them, when they are sleeping  
There is no telling what they would dream.

### A Dream.

I dreamed a dream in the midst of my slumbers,  
And as fast as I dreamed it came into numbers.  
My thoughts ran along in my sweetest meter—  
I'm sure I never saw any poetry better.

It seem'd that a lady had been recently made  
That a tax on old bachelors' noses should be laid,  
And in order to make them all willing to marry,  
The tax was as large as a man could well carry.

The bachelors grumbled, and said 'twas no use—  
'Twas a horrid injustice, and awful abuse,  
And declared that to save their own hearts' blood from  
Spilling.

Of such a vile tax they would not pay a shilling,  
But the rulers determined them still to pursue,  
So they set the old bachelors up at vendue.

A clerk was sent through the town to bid and fro,  
To rattle his bell, and his trumpet to blow,  
And to call out to all his mightiest in his way:  
'Ho! forty old bachelors' sell here to-day.'

And presently all the old maids in the town,  
Each in her very best bonnet and gown,  
From thirty to sixty, fair, plain, rosy, and pale,  
Of every description, all flock'd to the sale.

The auctioneer then in his labour began,  
And called out aloud, as he held up a man:  
'How much for a bachelor? Who wants to buy?'  
In a twink, every maiden responded 'N—L.'

In short, at a highly extravagant price,  
The bachelors all were sold off in a trice;  
And forty old maidens, some younger, some older,  
Each hugged an old bachelor home on her shoulder.

### Sleeping Simons.

It was on a shining summer's day,  
As stories quite old-fashioned say,  
A sleepy set of sinners,  
To church agreed that they would go,  
Their zealous piety to show.

When they had cut their dinners,  
Scarcely had the Parson taken his text,  
When he fell exceeding vex'd,  
To see his leeches nodding.

Proceeding with religious lore,  
He quickly heard the sleepers snore,  
Forgetting him and God.

And lo! descending from his seat,  
The parson fell of holy heat,  
At losing thus his labor,  
Tuck'd one's stout nose, then graceful bow'd  
And said—'Good Sir, you snore so loud,  
I fear you'll wake your neighbor.'

## The Village Bride's Farewell.

My village home! my village friends farewell—  
For proud domains I quit your lowly bowers;  
But where could I find such a love as he?  
Upon the scenes where pass'd my childhood's hours.

The fivesth wealth that here so oft I've worn  
As Queen of May, is chang'd for costly pearls—  
Lace and jewels walk in her carriage borne,  
But still I am the simple cottage girl!

I know not how I came to be allied  
To one of wealth and proudest dignity—  
He might have found a richer, fairer bride—  
But where could I find such a love as he?

He so my life, when no one else would dare  
To smother me from the rude wave's stormy whirl—  
And it is strange that I his heart should share,  
Though I was but a simple cottage girl!

My mother dear! my father's soul above!  
My little sisters, yet too young to know  
The easy change from gratitude to love!

Come kiss me all, and bid me ever I go!  
To be the lady of a lovely earl—  
'Tis for the riches his dear heart can give—  
For still I am the simple cottage girl.

## Sixteen Persons Sentenced to Death.

Correspondence of the N. Y. Com. Intelligencer.

TORONTO, Aug. 6, 1838.

Previous to the departure of the boat on Saturday, from Niagara, I had barely time to inform you that sixteen of the state prisoners had been that morning sentenced to death; four are Americans and twelve subjects of the Queen.

On Friday, several pleaded guilty, and William Yerks was tried and acquitted. On Saturday William S. Wilson was tried and acquitted. The law of England for high treason requires that when a bill of indictment is found, the prisoner must be furnished with a copy of the bill, and with a list of all the jury that have been summoned to attend, and ten days must elapse before the trial can be brought on.

A bill of indictment for high treason having been found, at the close of the week, against Jacob Beamer, of whom I have before spoken, he could not be tried forthwith, consequently the court determined to adjourn over for the coming ten days, and to postpone the farther trials until Beamer's case could be brought on. They therefore gave notice that the prisoners who had been tried should be brought up for sentence, together with those who had pleaded guilty.

About one o'clock the jury which had been with the case of Wilson, returned with a verdict of *not guilty*. The Court then directed the sheriff to bring in those sixteen prisoners who were to be sentenced. The sheriff expressed some doubts as to the propriety of bringing in so large a number at once. The judge very properly remarked that there was no danger; that if the civil force was not sufficient, a detachment of the military were at hand. About half past one o'clock, the prisoners came in attended by a military and civil guard, and were seated in the jury box.

I was favored, with a very eligible seat, being close both to the bench and the prisoners. I was surprised to find so many of the prisoners very young men—some of them mere boys—and two or three looked more deserving the ordinary chastisement of a parent, than the heavy penalty about to be adjudged them. Two or three were handsome, and with a few exceptions, nothing unfavorable could be drawn from their appearance. They were all well dressed—Miller in a suit of black. He had been, you will recollect, a law student at Maysville, in Ohio; a country student, and would probably have defended himself, had not his counsel offered, at the outset, a plea of insanity.

After the clerk had made proclamation for all persons to keep silence while his lordship the queen's justice pronounced the sentence of death. Mr. Justice Jones called over the names of four American citizens, who had been tried under the act of the last session of the provincial parliament. The first was *Linus Wilson Miller*. After a brief recapitulation of the evidence, he was asked whether he had any thing to say why sentence of death should not be pronounced on him. After pausing a few moments, he spoke, in a fine melodious voice, in substance as follows:

MY LORD: Your lordship has asked whether I have anything to offer why sentence of death should not be pronounced against me. I shall, with the permission of your lordship, offer a few remarks, not however with the belief that I shall be able by anything that I might say, to turn aside the impending fate that awaits me.

In reference to the statute under which I have been tried, I am under the full conviction that it is unconstitutional, and in this opinion I believe I am sustained by some of the legal gentlemen now present. I am of opinion that no statute affecting the life of an individual, whether a subject or not, can be considered the law of the land until it shall have received the sanction of the sovereign. I know, my lord, that under this act others have suffered, and I have no reason to suppose that my pleading its unconstitutionality will be any bar to the awful fiat which is about to fall from the lips of your lordship.

I am, indeed, asked why sentence of death shall not be passed upon me. If I have done a deed worthy of death, I would say, let it come; and I declare to your lordship, that according to the dictates of my own judgment, I deserve neither death nor bonds.

## Political.

### To the Honest Opponents of Joseph Ritner.

"COME, LET US REASON TOGETHER."

Believing that there are among the opponents of the FARMER GOVERNOR many who oppose him merely on party grounds, and through the misrepresentations of the leaders of the Loco Foco party, we willingly venture to "reason" with them, and endeavor to win them from the support of a man who is not only dishonest, but the advocate of measures destructive to the best interests of the Commonwealth.

First, then, why do you oppose the election of Joseph Ritner? Is it because he has been incompetent to the discharge of the high and responsible duties to which he has been called? You cannot, after going back to the day of his inauguration and taking up again and examining into them with the greatest scrutiny, answer the question affirmatively. No, Joseph Ritner has discharged every duty devolved upon him, not only to his own credit, but to the especial benefit and honor of his native State. The rights of the Commonwealth and of the People have at all times and on all occasions been zealously and faithfully protected. He has used the strictest economy in the administration and management of the affairs of the State. The State Revenue has been greatly increased; the State Tax has been repealed, and large appropriations have been made to bestow upon the poor and the destitute the benefits of Education. In short, in every thing that could benefit the people or the State, has Joseph Ritner exerted himself successfully. Then, we ask, if these things are so, and you can judge for yourselves, why oppose him—why wish to place in his stead a man like David R. Porter, who has, in all things, been the tool of a corrupt cabal out of the State, and consequently the opponent of the best interests of Pennsylvania?

Besides, take the two men and examine into and compare their private and public characters, and then determine which should be the Governor of an honest and virtuous people. From the cradle to the gubernatorial Chair can be said to sully the public or private character of Joseph Ritner. In private life, he has acted as became a good citizen and useful member of society. In public life, so well and faithfully has he executed all that was required of him; that no act now causes a blush to mantle his cheek. The malice of his opponents has stopped at no invention to bring reproach upon him, but the "poisoned chalice" has returned to their own lips.

As he meets a week a thousand waves,  
So has he met his enemies.

and at all times come out with "flying colors." He is honest and capable—firm and decided, and just the man for the people for this great and growing State.

Then why wish to change? Why wish to elect a man like David R. Porter, who is, from a knowledge of his private and public life, destitute of those noble traits so prominent in the character of our Farmer Governor?

If any advantage could be gained by the change, there would be some excuse. But no earthly advantage to the State would result from the election of David R. Porter.

It has been shewn, by the records of Huntingdon county court, that he was incapable of managing his own business prosperously, and was led to avail himself of the benefit of the Insolvent Laws of the Commonwealth. It is also alleged, and with much apparent truth, that he did not act altogether like an honest man in preparing to "take the benefit." Examine even the statement of his Lawyer (Mr. Allison), in one case in a different county, and you will find a great mystery about certain bonds; how he assigned them before taking the benefit and receiving money three or four years afterwards—Other transactions also go to show a want of honesty in David R. Porter, and place him in an unfavorable contrast with the honest, upright Farmer Governor.

But above all others, there is one fact which should influence you to withhold from him your votes and influence: It is the fact of now being worth forty thousand dollars and refusing to pay his honest debts, because he has made this fortune since he took the benefit of the Insolvent Act! This we conceive to be a good and sufficient reason to induce honest Pennsylvanians to hesitate before they countenance dishonesty out of respect to party and party leaders.

Is there a man in Adams county who would, after laboring years to accumulate a handsome and productive property, agree, knowing him as he now does, to place that property into the keeping of David R. Porter? No, we venture to assert, there is not one, however he may feel and act for his party.

Then why, for the sake of party, wish to place your rich and productive Commonwealth, the home of your wives, your children, your friends and yourselves, into the keeping of such a man as David R. Porter—a man whose moral life has been a reproach to him, and whose public life has been of no service to you or to your State?

We appeal to your reason, your good sense and sound judgment, Fellow-Citizens of Adams! Examine and judge for yourselves.—Giltysburg Star.

## Political.

### COME TO THE POINT?

Under the above head, the "Advocate" asks eight questions, then requests definite answers, *yeas or nays*. We shall "come to the point," and as one good turn deserves another, we will propose a few brief questions—and request definite answers, *yeas or nays*; we shall expect them to "come to the point."

The following are the questions in the Advocate and their answers.

1st Question. Is the commencement of a suit evidence, that the plaintiffs claim is honestly due?

Answer. Not. But the written acknowledgment of the debt by the defendant, written and signed by himself, is evidence—and this is Porter's case.

2nd. *Ques.* Is it true, that to defend a suit is to act fraudulently?

Answer. Not. But it is evidence of FRAUD, if not PERJURY, when a man secretes his property, takes the oath of an insolvent, and then takes back his property, after he has made his creditors believe that he is not worth a groat.

3d. *Ques.* Is there any other way, than by a full and fair investigation before a jury according to the "laws of the land?"

Answer. Not. Where the defendant will deny his own hand writing and his own written contract. But D. R. Porter **DARE NOT** let a jury of his peers decide upon the justice of the claim against him, at the August court. JUST OR UNJUST, he dare not meet the issue. Although he has known that the plaintiff was anxious, and ready to try; Porter will not have his witness here: Mark that!

4th. *Ques.* Does or can the taking of the benefit hinder a man from prosecuting his suit?

Answer. Not. But the old proverb "sue a beggar and catch a louse," often keeps men from doing so. And no one in this place ever knew that David R. Porter, had property until within a few years; for rich as he was, his own residence was always supposed to be held in the name of another, and the records to this day, will not tell the people where his princely domains are located. If Porter will let the suit on the trial list be tried; he will find that it does not hinder the obtaining of a judgment either.

5th. *Question.* Can any defendant hinder the trial of a suit for even two years; if the plaintiff demands a trial?

Answer. Porter has done so, right or wrong, we believe; at least we know he "went to Virginia" as was given out; when his suit was on the trial list, before; although the truth was, he went no further than Western Pennsylvania, to give out the "hunting sign" for his nomination.

6th. *Question.* When in 1819 a defendant was arrested on a capias, and detained until discharged under his insolvent laws, was it not legally incumbent on him to give notice to the person at whose suit he was arrested, although at the time, so far from acknowledging, he should dispute conscientiously every cent of the claim?

Answer. As this question implies that D. R. Porter was arrested on a capias at the suit of Mr. Murtrie or Sturgeon, and was detained until discharged we must deprecate a little to set the matter right. Mr. Porter was put to jail on a *subpoena* issued out by his bosom friend Geo. Davis, Esq.; who was secretly, and in every way his friend. The truth is, that many people would say that Porter put himself to jail, after he got his property all put out of his hands, and our readers by referring to Mr. Allison's statement will see that he assigned one bond to Stonebreaker, after he applied to the court for the benefit; such is the fact, and consequently the whole question is intended to deceive the reader. But to answer the question directly no defendant would notify such a person, because if as Porter says he was "prepared to prove his claim unjust" it was not incumbent on him to notify the person—because that person could only have prosecuted; and then the prepared testimony, that there was no claim, would have at once relieved him from any after clap; and if Porter could have proved there was no claim against him he would not have waited twenty years; until his witness had moved to Green Bay.

7th. *Question.* Would such notice be considered acknowledgement of a debt in court?

Answer. It would be considered very strong circumstantial evidence.

8th. *Question.* Would the plaintiffs testimony be taken; as to the justice of his claim, or the dishonesty of his adversary.

Answer. He would have a right to swear to this original entries, if a book account!

The eight questions thus paraded before the public are definitely answered; they are not evaded, we consider them almost unworthy of notice, but as the "Advocate" is determined to keep them at the head of its columns until answered; we hope they will be satisfied.

## SHINNY ON YOUR OWN SIDE.

We have "come to the point," and in order not to be behind our neighbors, we shall propose a few definite propositions, and such as admit of definite answers, *yeas or nays*.

1. Which David R. Porter took the benefit in his hand, and swore that he had turned all his goods and chattels, did he include in his schedule all the notes, bonds, &c. delivered into the hands of John Stonebreaker? Let the answer be *yea* or *nay*.

## THE SCENE SHIFTING.

When the charge was first made against David R. Porter of defrauding Samuel Sturgeon out of \$700, the papers in his favor denied every thing in regard to the matter—denied that Porter owed a cent to the man, and declared and offered to prove that the arbitrators in the suit of Sturgeon vs. Porter, had made out their award and declared that there was nothing due the plaintiff. The certificates, however, of the arbitrators were obtained, and they testified that no award had ever been made, nor was the business ever settled. With those certificates in hand Mr. Sturgeon called upon David R. Porter, and demanded his claim. Mr. Porter offered to compromise by paying \$150. Mr. Sturgeon would not endorse his character. This Mr. S. refused to do. He could not give a certificate of character to a man who had attempted to cheat him out of his hard earnings. These facts were all sworn to and published, for weeks, unswerving. The consequence was that the honest portion of the people who had been Porter's friends began to drop off. His friends became alarmed, and saw that something must be done to counteract the influence of the facts brought to bear against their candidate. They now abandon their first ground,—admit that there was no award made, and bring forward the certificate of Patrick X. Madden, a fellow, (if he has an existence at all) who cannot write his name, but has to make his mark; and another individual named Fulton, who was but 12 years of age when the transaction to which he swears took place. The friends of Porter have taken the pains to get the certificates of these two unwashed rascals, and what is the amount of their testimony even if true? They have only endeavored to make out STURGEON, what we have proved DAVID R. PORTER to be from the Court Records—a defrauder of his creditors—who took the benefit of the Insolvent Laws, and swore that he had delivered up his property, while he kept it in the hands of his friends, and went through the *whitewashing* operation in the Court Room! Does such evidence prove any thing in favor of Porter? Not at all. His friends only endeavor to blacken the character of the man whom he has defrauded. That Porter does owe his man is proved from the papers filed in the Prothonotary's office of Cambria county by Mr. Patton the partner of Porter, when he took the benefit of the Insolvent Laws—this paper contains a

## MOST TRUE.

The New York Evening Post, a regular and consistent Loco Foco paper, says:—"We are sick, as Charles Lamb would say, of perpetual Biddle." But what can we do? Ay, there is the rub—what can the party do? They succeeded by a most infamous course, in preventing the renewal of the charter of the United States Bank, by their perpetual cry of Biddle-rule, Biddle-power, Biddle-bank, &c. &c.—and when the people of Pennsylvania granted a charter—Biddle-corruption and Biddle-triumph, were sounded until the ear ached with the infamous sounds. But, the Government having wasted its treasury, spent and squandered its income, found itself unable to pay its pensions. The United States Bank was appealed to, and Biddle! Biddle! Biddle saved them from the disgrace of protested drafts in favor of the old soldiers and their widows. The Starlings of the Loco Foco press again cried Biddle! Biddle! Biddle!—and the members of Congress, echoed the sound, shaking their Jackson collars as accompaniment. But again the Government went dry—again she is distressed—again she applies for aid, and again she is relieved. Well! may the Loco Focos exclaim, what can we do? The Post is sick of perpetual Biddle—so were the Athenians sick of hearing the perpetual cry of Aristides! Aristides! Aristides! the Just. But what could they do?—Ostracize him? U. S. Gazette.

DECENCY.

The Milton Advocate mentions the arrival in that place of Governor Ritner, and the general civilities extended towards him by the citizens generally. But it gives a different account of affairs in Bellefonte. It says:—"Insult and abuse was heaped upon him when he arrived in Bellefonte. Here he put up at the public house of a Mr. Williams, a supporter of David R. Porter, and retired to rest. About 12 o'clock at night, a number of Porterites collected in front of the hotel, and commenced their shameful operations by GROANING and BELLOWING like a herd of mad horned cattle. They continued their noise until the landlord, unable to suffer it any longer, arose, went out and remonstrated with the mob, but all to no purpose. They persisted in their outrages, and after some time erected a long pole in front of the house, with a flag on which was inscribed 'Porter and Democracy.' Thus they continued their brutal outrages until their malignity was sated, when they retired and permitted the Governor and others in the house to enjoy an hour's sleep. It is due to Mr. Williams to say that although unsuccessful, he did all in his power to quiet the mob, and in order that the Governor should not be made fully acquainted with the outrages of his opponents by seeing the pole erect in the morning, he had it cut down before daylight.

Latest Case of Absence of Mind.—The latest case of which we have heard, recently occurred in Carlisle. A young lady was dressing herself to attend a party, and after having blacked her shoes in the best style, went to put away the brushes, but instead of taking them, she picked up her shoes and very carefully laid them by, and did not discover the mistake until she attempted to put on the brushes.