

THE JOURNAL.

"ONE COUNTRY, ONE CONSTITUTION, ONE DESTINY."

Vol. VIII, No. 4.]

HUNTINGDON, PENNSYLVANIA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1843.

[Whole No. 368.]

PUBLISHED BY THEODORE H. CREMER, TERMS.

The "JOURNAL" will be published every Wednesday morning, at two dollars a year, if paid IN ADVANCE, and if not paid within six months, two dollars and a half. No subscription received for a shorter period than six months, nor any paper discontinued till all arrearages are paid. Advertisements not exceeding one square, will be inserted three times for one dollar, and for every subsequent insertion twenty five cents. If no definite orders are given as to the time an advertisement is to be continued, it will be kept in till ordered out, and charged accordingly.

MISCELLANEOUS.

From the Ladies' Garland, for Jan. 1843.

THE WEDDED LIFE.

BY MRS. SANZORD.

The first year of a young woman's wedded life is generally the most unhappy, and the most trying one she experiences. However intently we may have studied the character of our affianced, in all its narrow windings, still shall we find when we become wives, that we have yet something to learn. By actions are the affections on either side shown, and although it is in the power and nature of woman to manifest her devotedness by a thousand little attentions, she must not repine if she receives not the like.

The feelings of the other sex are not so soft and exquisite as those of our own; if they were, we might possibly be happier, and we may for a moment wish they were so, but we shall restrain so selfish a desire if we reflect how much more unfit they would be by such a constitution to bear the crosses and the buffets of the world.

It is said that lovers' quarrels are but the renewal of love, but it is not so in truth. Continued differences and bickerings will undermine the strongest affection, and a wife cannot be too careful to avoid disputes upon the most trivial subjects; indeed it is every-day occurrences which try the love and temper of the married life; great occasions for quarrels seldom occur; every wish, every prejudice must meet attention, and the first thought of a woman should be the pleasing and providing for her husband. It is impossible to enumerate all the little incidents which may annoy married men, or the little unobtrusive pleasure which is in the power of a wife to give; but throughout her life and employments, she must bear her pleasures on her mind. She must act for him in preference to herself, and she will be amply rewarded by witnessing his delight in her and his home. To a woman who loves her husband with all the devotedness of her nature, this will be a pleasure, not a task; and to make him happy, she will never grudge any sacrifice of herself.

The greatest misery a woman can experience is the changed heart, and the alienated affections of her husband; but even in that painful case she must not upbraid; she must bear with patience and fortitude her great disappointment; she must return good for evil to the utmost, and her consolation will be the consciousness that her trials have not their rise or continuance in any decline of affection or duty on her part.

Some women in order to win back their husband's wandering love have recourse to attempt to arouse his jealousy; but they are much mistaken in pursuing such a course. A man, however debased his conduct, never entirely forgets the love he once bore to the wife of his youth; there are moments when feelings of tenderness for her will return with force to his heart; to reap the benefits of such moments, the injured, and forgiving wife, must still be enshrined in the purity of former times.—A husband will excuse his fault to himself, and, in some measure, stand exonerated in the world, if the wife relax to the propriety of her conduct; while on the contrary, the gentle forbearance, the uncomplaining patience, and the unobtrusive rectitude of the woman he injures, will deeply strike to his heart, and do much to win him back to his former love, and the observance of the vows he breathed at the altar where his heart was devoted to the being from whom it has wandered. A kind look, an affectionate expression half uttered, must bring his wife to his side, and she must with smiles of tenderness, encourage the returning affection carefully avoiding all reference to her sufferings or the cause of them.

This will not be difficult for good, sensible women, to perform. Our love which before marriage is constrained by the modesty and reserve natural to our sex, increases in fervency and depth afterwards; it enables us to bear unfeigned the world's scorn; all is swallowed up in it. An affectionate wife clings to her husband thro' poverty and riches; and the more the world recedes from him, the more firmly will she stand by him; she will be his comforter when all earthly comforts have

slid from him. Her devotedness will be his rock when he has no other support; she will smile at the frowns of the world; she will not heed its censures; he is her all, and in love are all other feelings to be forgotten or absorbed. No sacrifice will be too great—the faintest smile will not be regarded too little; quick at feeling unkindness, we are also quick at feeling tenderness; and a very trifling circumstance is sufficient to awaken or still the pain of our heart, and bring us misery or happiness.

The Chip Basket.

An old lady in Bangor has drunk tea until the tea plant has begun to sprout out between her shoulders.

"O the pain, the bliss of dying," as the dandy said when he scalded his carrotty head in coloring it.

The Cincinnati Sun says that Miss Cohen a young danseuse, is making rapid strides to secure public favor.

A traveller perceiving two crows flying side by side, exclaimed, 'Ay, that is as it should be; I hate to see one crow over another.'

Ovid finely compares a broken fortune to a falling column—the lower it sinks the greater weight it is obliged to sustain.

Woman's love is compared to a beautiful flower, that blossoms by its sweetest fragrance man's existence.

The sign of the doctor in ancient Egypt, was a duck, but etymologists must determine whether that sign had any thing to do with the word "quack."

There is a lady in town so modest, that she took her sister away from school because the master gave her a spelling lesson in which was the word 'man.' A lock of that lady's hair would be acceptable to us. We hope the bare mention of it won't shock her!

The editor of the Louisville Pennant is curious to know why hogs are killed before they are cured.

Here's some Kitchen talk. "Do you sing?" says the tea-pot to the kettle.—"Yes, I can manage to get over a few bars." "Ha!" exclaimed the tea-pot. "Do you smoke?" "Not exactly, but our kitchen chimney does confoundedly."

A man with eleven daughters, was lately complaining that he found it hard to live. "You must husband your time," said the other, "and then you will do well enough." "I could do much better," was the reply, "if I could husband my daughters."

A village dentist advertises that he will "spare no pains in his operations to render them satisfactory." An honest confession is said to be good for the soul, and perhaps it may be equally good for the toothach!

Some wag has introduced a new theory relative to the phrenological developments. He says that the "organ of combativeness" is so concerned with the nerves that run to the fists—and alleges, also, that on that spot in the head more dandruff collects than anywhere else.—Therefore, when a man is ready to fight, people say "his dander is up."

The Troy (Ohio) Times says, that a man was fined ten dollars by the Court in that place, for kissing a married lady; and adds, "it may be well to state, for the sake of the girls, that there is not any law against kissing them."

When Aristotle was asked what a man could gain by telling a falsehood, he replied, "Not to be credited when he speaks the truth."

A wag who deals in borrowing and lending, or in other words, a broker on being asked to pay a small bill the other day replied, he could not be troubled with such applications—in these hard times he had quite enough to attend to those of a more extensive character.

"Tom, what sort of a waistcoat is that you have on?"

"Why it's a cloth waistcoat to be sure."

"Didn't it come from old Threadneedle the tailor's?"

"Yes."

"Well, then, it's a vegetable waistcoat."

"A what?"

"A vegetable waistcoat! It's made of cabbage!"

"HIGHLAND MARY."—A monument to this favorite of poor Burns has been completed at Greenock, Scotland.

"LUCKY LONE."—The popularity of this piece of musical composition is not derogatory to the public taste. The air was composed by the celebrated Bellini and occurs in "Il Puritani."

"A GRACEFUL DRINK."—Take a can and fill it with fresh spring water from the nearest pump. Serve up in a clean tumbler, and drink only as much as may be agreeable.

SPEECH

Of Mr. MILTON BROWN, of Tennessee, on the Bill to repeal the Bankrupt Law. Delivered in the House of Representatives, January 3, 1843.

Mr. BROWN addressed the chair as follows:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is neither my purpose nor desire to enter the wide field of general politics, unexpectedly opened by this debate, but to confine myself strictly to the pending question of repeal. No law has ever been more misrepresented or misunderstood than the bankrupt law passed at the extra session. Provisions not contained in the law have been ascribed to it, while those it does contain have been so perverted and misrepresented as to make a false and delusive impression on the public mind. In its enactments, in its general provisions, and in its details, in its spirit and meaning, in its tendencies, and in its practical influences upon the morals and general welfare of society, it has every where been misrepresented, and almost every where misunderstood. Its plain provisions, calculated and designed to protect the rights and advance the best interests of both debtor and creditor, saving the former from oppression and the latter from fraud, have been represented as adverse to all the best interests of the community. A thousand popular prejudices have been most unjustly waked up, having no just foundation in the provisions of the law itself, but springing from a desire of politicians to operate on pending popular elections. This is to be regretted, deeply regretted, as calculated to mislead the popular mind, and prevent a fair and calm decision of the people.

Before the late Presidential election, both political parties professed themselves in favor of a bankrupt law, and stood committed before the country for its passage. The proof of this is clear and positive, and is to be found in the recorded votes, the debates, and general history of the times. General Harrison and Mr. Van Buren, the candidates of the respective parties for the Presidency, while in the Senate of the United States, had declared, by their votes and speeches, that they were in favor of the passage of the bankrupt law, with only this difference: Mr. Van Buren thought it should embrace merchants and traders only, while Gen. Harrison contended that it ought equally and without distinction to extend its benefits to all classes of society. Which of these plans is preferable is not my purpose now to examine; certainly, however, it may be safely assumed that the plan advocated by General Harrison was then, and is now, most conformable to popular sentiment. It is my sole purpose at present to show that both General Harrison and Mr. Van Buren were the open and avowed advocates of a bankrupt law.—Mr. Van Buren was a member of the committee that reported the bill of 1826; and in his remarks in the Senate on that bill, avowed himself strongly in favor of a bankrupt law, and declared he was in its favor, (to use his own language,) "not only because he was satisfied that a great proportion of his immediate constituents desired it, but because he believed their claim upon Congress for the exercise of its constitutional powers in this respect could be sustained on the ground of policy as well as justice." Mr. Van Buren, on the first vote taken, voted against the bill, not on account of the general principle, but on account of a feature contained in it which he objected to; but on the other friends of the bill agreeing to remove this objection, he voted for the reconsideration, and he and General Harrison, side by side, voted for the bill on the question of engrossment for its final passage.

Mr. Tyler and Col. R. M. Johnson, the candidates for the Vice Presidency, were also in favor of a bankrupt law, and have since reiterated their opinions—the former in a message to Congress, the latter in a published letter. With these candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, all avowedly and openly in favor of the passage of a bankrupt law, did the respective political parties enter the contest which resulted in the Whig victory of 1840. If the question was not fully discussed before the people, it was because both parties being in favor of the measure, it was not made a matter of controversy. Politicians then, of all parties, saw wisdom, beauty, good policy, and humanity, in a bankrupt law. It was inscribed on every banner, and the unfortunate and the friends of the unfortunate, who were, and I hope now are, far more numerous than the unfortunate themselves, were told that, no difference where victory might perch, the passage of this measure, at least was safe.

But the proof that both parties in that contest were for a bankrupt law, and stood pledged for its passage, does not stop here. There is still behind clearer and more unanswerable evidence; not only that both parties were avowed advocates

of the measure, but showing also what were the principles and proposed provisions of that measure. For this I refer to the Congressional Globe and Appendix of 1840. Two bills, each providing for a uniform system of bankruptcy, were reported to the Senate, emanating from the two political parties. Mr. Benton, speaking of these two bills, (see Appendix to Congressional Globe, page 502,) said:

"Three members of the Judiciary Committee have reported one bill; two members have reported another; and these two bills emanate from the two political parties which, under whatsoever names, have existed in this country for fifty years."

These two bills were reported, one by Mr. Clayton, (Whig,) the other by Mr. Wall, a leader of the Van Buren party.—After giving his objections to Mr. Clayton's bill, objecting to it on the ground that it was, as he alleged, partial and unequal, not extending its benefits alike to all, and limited to two years' duration, Mr. Benton then turned to Mr. Wall's bill and said:

"The other (that is Mr. Wall's bill) is a general bill, looking to the rights of creditors as well as to the relief of debtors—intended for the future as well as for the present and past—applicable to corporations as well as to persons—embracing the compulsory as well as the voluntary feature—and making provisions for those who are not, as well as those who are, technically merchants and traders."

Another prominent objection urged by Mr. Benton against Mr. Clayton's Whig bill, and reason why he preferred Mr. Wall's Democratic bill, may be seen by the following extract of his speech:

"There is to be (said Mr. BENTON, referring to his objections to Mr. Clayton's bill) a line of division between the debtors—a horizontal line; those above the line are to have relief—those below it are denied it. This results from the amount which the debtor must owe in order to entitle himself to the benefits of its provisions. The bill provides for an amount, and leaves the sum in blank. Will the reporter of the bill, said Mr. B., (addressing himself to Mr. Clayton, of Delaware,) name the amount which it is proposed to insert?"

Mr. CLAYTON said he had not been instructed to move a particular sum, but five hundred dollars had been mentioned in the committee.

Mr. B. continued. Five hundred dollars. That was the sum mentioned in the committee, and no other sum is mentioned here. Five hundred dollars must be considered, then, as the amount necessary to be owed, to entitle a person to the relief of this act. Now, this is arbitrary and unequal; it cuts off the small dealers, the persons of little property, the laborers; it cuts them off from the benefit of the act, and operates as an encouragement to people to go largely in debt, as the large debtors are to be relieved and the small ones not. It makes the act exclusively for large dealers, and this contrary to the principle of equality which is professed in the bill, and without any foundation in reason and justice. The weight of debt is relative, not absolute. It depends on the amount of the debtor's property, and not upon the amount of the debt. To one man a debt of one hundred dollars is as much as a hundred thousand or a million is to another. To one man five hundred dollars is as much as five hundred thousand is to another; and, beyond question, the most numerous class of debtors in the U. S. are those who owe less than the minimum proposed in this bill. But these small debtors, numerous as they are, are disregarded and overlooked by the bill. They are to work out their debtless load to the grave; while the dashers, the large debtors, clear out theirs by a declaration and surrender."

Again: Mr. BENTON said, speaking with reference to the coming Presidential election:

"I do not think the present session the propitious one for beneficial action on this subject. Five hundred thousand voters, demanding the passage of a law, on the eve of an election, must have an influence on the hopes and fears of the lawgiver, as well as on his judgment and conscience. Since they have waited so long, I should have preferred a delay of a few months more. Still, the subject is before us, and we are here: and I am willing to act, and to do what I believe to be my duty. I am ready to assist in framing an act which shall be general in its provisions and just in its application; which shall do justice to the creditor as well as the debtor; which shall apply to trading and money dealing corporations as well as to trading and money dealing individuals; which shall be compulsory with regard to traders and dealers, whether natural or artificial; which shall be optional with respect to other classes of the community, and which shall distinguish between misfortune and misconduct."

Again in another place, he adds: "The bill of the minority (Mr. Wall's bill) furnishes the true basis for the enactment of a bankrupt system."

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the direct testimony of Mr. Benton on two points: First, that Mr. Wall's bill originated with, and emanated from, the Van Buren party, to which he and Mr. Wall belonged; and, second, that it furnished the true basis for the enactment of a bankrupt system. He says: "These two bills emanate from the two political parties which, under whatsoever names, have existed in this country for fifty years." He also says that Mr. Wall's bill, emanating from the Van Buren party, was the true basis for the enactment of a bankrupt system.

Buren party, furnished "the true basis for the enactment of a bankrupt system."

Now, sir, it is material, in tracing the standard of parties on this question, to know what were the democratic features of this Democratic bill reported by Mr. WALL, and held forth to the anxious hopes of a suffering country by the Van Buren party, during the pendency of the Presidential election. What were its features? Did it embrace the past as well as the future? Did it discharge contracts made before the passage of the law? Did it, in a word, contain any or all the provisions that have been urged as objections to the law of the extra session? The original bill is now before me. Its provisions may be seen, and I invite investigation. It was reported in April preceding the Presidential election, by Mr. WALL, as the organ of the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary, and is Senate bill No. 324. What does Mr. WALL himself say of this bill, which, according to the then opinions of that party, was the true basis for the enactment of a bankrupt law? Mr. WALL says, (Appendix Globe, 462:)

"It is intended to act both retrospectively and prospectively. It looks upon the past, not to condemn, but to believe. The whole land is strewn with the wrecks of bankruptcy, and we cannot look in any direction without perceiving the jetsam et flotsam of trade cast upon the shores. All must admit the fact, however much they may disagree as to the causes, that the state of things has resulted from the contractions and expansions of the currency; and that the fluctuations growing out of it have impaired all business depending on prices, the hazards and vicissitudes incident to the country have been paralyzed, the brightest visions of gain have disappeared, and the wisest and most prudent schemes, uniting public improvement with individual interest, have perished, as if by magic, in the universal revulsion that has destroyed the country. This bill proposes to cast the mantle of oblivion over the past conduct of the debtor, over his acts which may have been compelled, or the preferences which may have been extorted, in his struggles to prolong his existence in the marts of trade. All that it demands from the debtor who seeks its benefits is, that he should honestly surrender what is left, however small, for the general benefit of his creditors."

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the lights thrown upon this subject by Mr. BENTON and Mr. WALL, and with the bill itself before us, let us compare its features with the one passed at the extra session, against which so much prejudice has been excited; and, to effect this the more clearly, let us trace the leading objections raised to the bill passed at the extra session, and which have been seized upon to render it unpopular.

The first and chief objection to that law has been its retrospective operation—that is, its operation on contracts entered into prior to the passage of the law. Did Mr. WALL's bill contain this feature? Mr. BENTON and Mr. WALL settle this in the affirmative. Mr. BENTON says "it was intended for the future as well as the present and past," Mr. WALL says "it was intended to act both retrospectively and prospectively;" that it looked to "the past, not to condemn, but to relieve;" and that all it demanded from the debtor was, "that he should honestly surrender what is left, however small, for the general benefit of his creditors."

It is certain, therefore, that this plan of a bankrupt law, emanating from the Van Buren party, and promised to a suffering country, in the event of the continuance of that party in power, did embrace past transactions; it was designed to wipe out debts contracted before the passage of the law.

It is true that Mr. BENTON was a little afraid that so many voters, who were unfortunately ruined, and now demanding relief, might, on the eve of an election, have an undue influence on the "hopes and fears" of the lawgiver, and he preferred, that as they had waited so long and suffered so long, they would wait on and suffer on, until after they had given their votes at the then approaching Presidential election. But after they had given their votes, and the election was over, and the danger of the "judgment and conscience" of the lawgiver being improperly influenced by the "hopes and fears" growing out of that election had passed, then these unfortunate men were to have relief. Yes, relief! And that, too, at the hands of the Van Buren party. Not relief from debts that might be contracted after the passage of the law; not from future debts—for in this these unfortunate men had no more concern than others—but from present and past contracts—from debts contracted before the passage of the law. And this promise to the unfortunate was not allowed to hang on general and vague declarations; but the bill itself, Democratic in all its features, and emanating from the hands of the Van Buren party, was held up to the hope of those whose fortunes left but their good names,

box. Mr. BENTON even then declared his readiness to act, and to act promptly; and others declared the same, but it so happened that nothing was done. The subject was left open, both parties professing to be for the measure, and standing pledged for its passage. Did we then hear any thing of the demoralizing consequences of a bankrupt law? Did we then hear any thing of this effort now making all over the country to degrade and dishonor those who ask relief? Nothing of all this was heard. It was then regarded by all as right, virtuous, and honorable, for the unfortunate to ask relief, and a constitutional, virtuous, and patriotic duty in Congress to grant it. Seeing this, Mr. Webster rose and congratulated the Senate and the country, that this subject "did not connect itself with any of the party contests of the day," and spoke of it "as a green spot in the midst of the fiery deserts of party strife."

This, sir, is the manner in which this subject was treated by all parties before the Presidential election.

And here let me pause and ask a question obviously suggested by these facts. I invite a response from the candid and honest of all parties. Seeing that both parties during the Presidential canvass had promised relief to the unfortunate, and given assurances of the passage of a bankrupt law; seeing that all the candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency had inscribed this promise on their banners and none objected to it; seeing that two plans emanating from the two political parties, both retrospective in their operations, had been held out as rivals for popular favor—was not the extra session of Congress bound to conclude that these facts had given undoubted evidence of public opinion on the subject?—Add to this, that a flood of petitions rolled in from every quarter of the Union, signed by men of all parties, by those who were insolvent and by those who were rich, and presented here on this floor by members of all parties, with scarcely a petition of other evidence of popular opinion on the other side, was it not reasonable to arrive at the conclusion, that the public judgment was in favor of a bankrupt law?—Sir, this was the impression made on my mind, and I doubt not was made on a majority of the House at the time. Sir, it cannot be concealed that the reason why many, very many, of the opposition on this floor voted against the law, was not because of their convictions against it, but because of a determination founded in party policy, to throw the responsibility of all measures on the Whigs. But to return.

Another objection to the law of the extra session is, that it embraces not only the compulsory but the voluntary feature also. Mr. WALL's bill did the same, for which we also have the direct testimony of Mr. BENTON. He says it embraced "the compulsory as well as the voluntary feature."

Another objection to the law of the extra session is, that it includes those who are not, as well as those who are, merchants and traders. Mr. WALL's bill did the same. It included all classes; none were left out of its provisions, "for those who are not, as well as those who are, technically merchants and traders."

Another objection to the bill of the extra session is, that it extends down to sums too small. Mr. WALL's bill extended to all sums, and Mr. BENTON lauded this as a most Democratic feature; it was, indeed, and emphatically, the poor man's bankrupt law—not for your large debtors and dashers merely, but for small debtors also. Yes, sir; and I venture to say that, if the law of the extra session had failed to include small debtors, and had been confined to large ones, it would have been pronounced a most odious discrimination, designed to favor large and reckless speculators.

Another objection to the the law of the extra session is, that it discharges the debtor without the consent of the creditor.—Mr. WALL's bill did the same. The debtor's discharge depended not on the consent of a part or of all his creditors, but on the decision of a court and jury.

Again: it has been objected that the provisions under this law of the extra session allowing the bankrupt an amount, at the discretion of the court, not in any case to exceed \$300, was too liberal.—Mr. WALL's bill went much beyond this. It allowed the bankrupt his clothes, &c., his tools of trade, household and kitchen furniture, two cows, &c., and also all that was allowed by the insolvent laws of the respective States. Not only this; but he was to be allowed one dollar a day for attendance before the court, and also not exceeding three dollars per week for each member of the family for their support for a time not exceeding two months. And if, on final discharge on an appeal, the bankrupt's estate paid fifty cents on the dollar, he was to be allowed five per cent. of his estate, provided the per cent. did not amount to over \$500. Mr. WALL's bill was therefore far the most liberal.