

THE JOURNAL.

"ONE COUNTRY, ONE CONSTITUTION, ONE DESTINY."

Vol. VIII. No. 8.]

HUNTINGDON, PENNSYLVANIA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1843.

[Whole No. 372.]

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.



POETRY.

SONNET.

Beauty and the Wave.

BEAUTY sat tracing with sportive finger,
Names, on the ocean's sand one day;
Watching how long each wave would linger,
Ere it had washed the print away.
[kiss'd it,
First, HOPE's she sketched—the waves just
Then sank to ocean's breast again,
As half regretful for miss'd it,
And with the maid let Hope remain.
[ting,
Next, FRIENDSHIP's name, so fond, yet fleet—
The maiden on—the sand enshrined,
The wave flow'd on—but soon retreating,
No trace of Friendship left behind.
Love's then appear'd, 'twas deeply graven
On that frail page, by Beauty's hand;
The wave return'd; ah! silly maiden,
Love's vows were ever writ on sand.

When one by one, each name had perish'd,
Beauty grew weary of her play;
Finding that all most priz'd and cherish'd,
Some passing wave will sweep away!

MISCELLANEOUS.

From the Salem, Mass. Register.

Extraordinary Case.

We were informed of a case of insanity in this county, a few days ago, circumstances connected with which are so extraordinary as to be well worth recording. It seems there has been in the Ipswich Alms House, or House of Correction, for about twenty years, an insane man who was sent there from Salem, and had always gone by the name of "Captain."—Of his real name and residence nothing was ever known by the authorities, nor has any thing been discovered until within a few months past. The man is perfectly harmless, his malady tending rather to idleness, and he has long been allowed to go about freely, sometimes wandering into the neighboring towns, but always returning in safety.

A few months ago the keeper presented a card to him, and said, "Captain, will you give me your address?" The captain very readily took the card, and writing upon it, in an elegant hand, a gentleman's name, with the name of a town in the state of New York, returned it. As it was somewhat uncertain if this was really his name a few days afterwards another card was handed to him with the request that he would give his father's address. He immediately wrote the same surname and town, with another christian name. It was then supposed that he might have given his real address, and to ascertain the fact, a letter was forwarded to the place mentioned, directed to the person whose name was given as the father, with a request to the postmaster, if such a person had ever resided there and had removed, to forward the letter to the present place of residence of the gentleman or his family if it could be ascertained.

Nothing farther was heard until a few weeks ago, when a letter was received from New York on the subject. The letter was shown to the "captain," and as soon as his eyes fell upon the superscription, his countenance changed, his eyes were suffused with tears of joy, and he cried out in the most touching tone, "my mother! my mother!" It was in fact a letter from his mother—the father having been dead a number of years. She wrote that nothing had been heard of the son for twenty two or twenty three years and he was supposed to be long since deceased. The "captain" was extremely affected on perusing the letter. The mother is at present residing with another son in the city of New York. A farther correspondence has taken place between the parties, and some of the relatives are expected to come on shortly and take the lost restored home. With what fervor can this mother exclaim, when she greets the wanderer—"For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost and is found."

DEFERRED ARTICLES.



THE HUNTINGDON JOURNAL.

Huntingdon, March 8, 1843.

"One country, one constitution, one destiny."

DEBATE.

In the Senate of Pennsylvania, on the Veto of the Congressional Apportionment Bill.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21st, 1843.

The Secretary of the Commonwealth being introduced, presented a message from the Governor, announcing his veto of the apportionment bill.

Mr. PENNIMAN moved the printing of 1,000 copies.

Mr. DARRIE was opposed to the printing. He thought if it was put on the Journal, it would be sufficiently honoring it. He considered it as the most extraordinary document ever transmitted to a legislative body. The Governor had returned this bill, accompanied by reasons which, for the first time within his knowledge, were given for disapproving an important bill like the present. It had been the custom heretofore if a bill was to be vetoed, for an Executive to assign constitutional, or other equally imperative reasons for so doing. But what was the spectacle presented here? Has the executive in this case done so? No, Mr. Speaker; but instead of taking high and constitutional grounds for his opposition to it, he tells us his regard for the Democratic party will not allow him to sanction it! He hoped that this high handed attempt to frustrate the will of the People, as expressed by their representatives, would be treated with the scorn it merited, and that Senators by Executive dictation.

Mr. CRAIG hoped an abundant number of copies of the message would be printed. He wished every voter to see it. In his annual message, the Executive intimated, that as his friends had a majority in both Houses, care should be taken, in forming the apportionment bill, not to trample upon the rights of the minority. Accordingly, his friends had framed a bill, just such a one as he himself had recommended, which gave to the majority their full share, and to the minority, something like a fair number, if not entirely so. He had considered the bill passed as fair as could be expected, and therefore gave it his support. The Democratic party in the Senate had acted fairly and honorably—yet, now the Governor was determined, it seemed, to render their honest intentions of no effect.

Mr. SPACKMAN disagreed with the Senator from Washington in his opinions of the bill. He considered it far, very far, from being a fair bill. Bad as the bill was, yet it seems they [the Whigs] were to fare still worse; and he presumed if the Executive had the power, not a single Whig would be returned to the next Congress. But thank God, [continued Mr. S.] there is one district in the Commonwealth which it is not in his power to gerrymander to suit his unholy purposes, without a violation of the constitution—and that was the district he had the honor in part to represent on this floor. The Executive, in sending us his veto had embraced the occasion to appeal to the political passions of Senators—and for aught he knew, the mandate of power would be obeyed, and the privileges of the minority wantonly disregarded and trampled in the dust.—He hoped, however, that such might not be the case.

Mr. PENNIMAN had a few words to say, and considering the relation he stood to the bill vetoed, it was proper he should. He was not surprised at receiving the message,—on the contrary he had expected it. The people could have an opportunity of judging of the statesmanship of the Executive, from the fact of his sending such a message. It was a grovelling appeal to the worst passions of the party—more worthy of being addressed to low bar-room politicians, than to high-minded Senators. It was an appeal to party—and to party alone. The Governor complains that the bill concedes too much to the minority. Now, no person conversant with political events, would agree with the Executive that the minority has an equality of members, by this bill. It was untrue—and this attempt to impose upon the intelligence of Senators and the people, would not succeed. [Mr. P. here reviewed the bill at length, showing that the Whigs were allowed but 8 members certain, while the Democrats were sure of having 14, and stood an equal chance with their opponents, of securing the remain-

der.] The Whigs, (continued Mr. P.) have now 13 members of Congress; in 1838, they had 11. And now, sir, by the bill now vetoed, they had but 8. He considered that they were fairly entitled to at least 8 members, and would willingly submit his vote, granting them that number, to the People. What particular trust had been reposed in the Executive? They were also representatives of the People—and their immediate responsibility was greater than his. He thought the bill fair and honest—and had therefore given it his support. He would be the last to desert the party, or allow it to be sold—but he dared any Senator to rise and give the slightest reason, except it be a political one, why the Democratic party were entitled to all the districts in the State.—The idea was ridiculous—nay, outrageous, and he should for one, combat it to the last.

Mr. GIBBS considered the bill an obnoxious one; and it seemed as if every one on the subject, as well as the present, disfranchised his constituents. It would appear that the Democratic Senators from the county had said to the Whigs of this body—"give us 4 members and divide the rest of the State as you please." This was the *sine qua non*, and were that difficulty removed, we should long since have had a fair and honest apportionment bill.—Such, however, was not the character of the present one, by any means. He should oppose any bill that did not give to his constituents their rights. He was willing to grant the minority their just rights, but nothing more. Senators must not sell the Democratic party—they had no power to do so, except from the example set by Esau, who sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. Yet in this case, the member from the county had no control over the Democracy of the State, and therefore no right to sell them. The Senator from the county had called the Governor many hard names—for what reason, he could not say. He believed they agreed in most things—they were both responsible to the same party—and he believed they both supported Van Buren or Johnson for the Presidency.

Senator from Lehigh could vouch that the Governor was a Van Buren or Johnson man.

Mr. GIBBS could not vouch that such was the case—neither could he vouch for the course of the Senator from the county.

Mr. PENNIMAN could vouch for his own course.

Mr. GIBBS complained of the great injustice done his constituents—and said that he supposed if it had not been absolutely necessary to place the county of Lehigh somewhere, it would be—like the Irishman's horse—nowhere! [Laughter.] If a fair bill was wanted, it could be obtained by passing that now in the other house, which was defeated by the combination entered into on this floor.

Mr. PENNIMAN had a word to reply in regard to the combination spoken of. He had been accused of combining with the Whigs here. He himself could say something in that line. Senators had come to him, and offered to grant the city and county 4 members, provided he would consent to go into caucus to settle the remaining districts. Was this an attempt at combination? He contended that there had been combinations here in 1841, and, alluding to the passage of the suspension and Relief Bills, inquired if the Executive had any thing to do with the forming of the combinations then entered into. He [Mr. P.] had been accused of combining with Whig Senators; he cared not, he should go with them when they were right, but no further.

Mr. GIBBS wished to inquire whether the Whigs were always right?

Mr. PENNIMAN—In this case they were. The city and county were entitled to 4 members, and with the help of a right cause they would obtain them. The Senator from Lehigh complained of the manner in which the county of Huntingdon was distributed by this bill. So far as his [Mr. P.'s] knowledge extended, he could safely say, that it was fairly and justly dealt with. He was sure that it would not be opposed, except by some whose palms itched to represent that district in Congress.

Mr. STEWART rose to explain. He had not voted for the bill, as he considered it an unfair one.

Mr. KIDDER continued. He was happy to be corrected in this matter so far as the Senator from Mercer was concerned, who, he believed, was half a Democrat.—[Laughter.] But with this exception, such was the case. In the House the same late awaited it; it was pushed thro' with unexampled haste; the gag-law, by means of the previous question, applied,—and all to accommodate the members from the county who desired 4 members for their share. It was true, 41 staunch country Democratic members had opposed it with heart and hand, yet their efforts were of no avail. He deprecated the giving to the city and county of Philadelphia, representatives in Congress, at the expense of any portion of the Commonwealth. He considered the present bill as a very obnoxious one, and trusted that it had received its quietus from the Governor.

Mr. CHAMPEYNS said that as he had voted for this bill, he was willing to assume the responsibility. There were features in the bill he did not like, but on the whole, he was satisfied that no better could be obtained. He had been taken to task by the gentleman from Lehigh, for not disfranchising the district which he had the honor in part to represent on this floor.—Although the majority in that county differed in politics from himself, yet his conscience forbade him from taking any undue advantage of them. He would never consent to barter their rights away, while he held the position he did as their representative. He would never consent to discuss the merits of the bill in private subjects. A representative of the people should look to higher objects than party, and while he held a seat in that body, his constituents should find him prepared to defend their rights on all occasions, come from whatsoever quarter it may. Mr. C. declared that he had honestly and conscientiously believed the Whig party in Pennsylvania to be entitled to 10, or at least 9, members of Congress; and so believing, he should oppose any bill not granting them their just rights. He considered that he would prove recreant to the trust confided to him by his constituents, were he to suffer this occasion to pass by without defining his position on the matter in question, or without saying something in defence of that bill which had this morning been returned with the Executive veto. He considered the reasons advanced for his course, by the Governor to be specious in their character, and entitled to no force, from the fact that they were merely appeals to the political passions of Senators—appeals which, he sincerely hoped, would not be responded to by Senators on this floor.

Mr. COCHRAN had a word to say on this subject. He had voted for this bill, although reluctantly, believing it to be the best that could be had. The Whigs he considered, had been unfairly treated by the operation of it, and yet it seems that they were not to be allowed the small number of representatives arising from the manner in which this bill was apportioned. He supposed the Governor would not rest satisfied until he had such an apportionment effected as would entirely disfranchise the great Whig party of Pennsylvania. For one, he raised his voice against such injustice and oppression—such a gross outrage on the rights of a large body of citizens. The Whig party were fairly entitled to 11 members, although receiving but 7 by the present bill. He hoped that this high-handed attempt at Executive dictation would meet the rebuke it so richly merited.

Mr. FARRELY did not vote for the bill now under discussion because he considered it a fair one, but because he thought it the best that could be got. It did not do justice to the numerical strength of the Whig party, as any one conversant with the political statistics in the State would admit. So far as he was concerned, he had been influenced by no combinations, neither should he be. He should support any bill which he conceived honest and fair, despite of such accusations.

Mr. STEWART agreed with the Senator from Lancaster, [Mr. Champneys] that the Whigs of this Commonwealth were entitled to nine or ten representatives in Congress. Senators differing from him on this floor, had constantly referred to the Whig vote polled in 1841, as a criterion by which the State should be distributed. Was this fair, Mr. Speaker? Was it just? Why, he would ask, single out

that particular year, when it was well known the Whig party was completely disheartened and broken down, from causes to which he need not here allude. Neither would he [Mr. S.] desire the majority to apportion the State in accordance with the vote polled in 1840. For that year, he was willing to acknowledge, the Whigs had, perhaps, outstripped their actual force. But he wished Senators in framing a bill to take into consideration some intermediate year, [and there were enough of them] in which the Whigs polled a full and fair vote, and district the State according to the strength there exhibited. It seemed evident, that there was a disposition on the part of the Executive—and he was sorry to say on the part of some Senators—to disfranchise the Whig party of Pennsylvania—to trample their rights as citizens in the dust. It was true, the Executive and his friends could claim a majority in the State; but was that majority so great, and did their strength so far exceed that of their opponents, as to justify the disfranchisement of nearly one half the citizens of this Commonwealth? For one, Mr. S. protested against it; and while he had power to raise his voice, it should be heard in defence of the rights of the people.

DEBATE.

In the Senate of Pennsylvania, on the Communication of the Attorney General relative to the suit of the Commonwealth against Frederick Fritz late Collector of Tolls on the Columbia Rail Road.

TUESDAY, February 21, 1843.

The SPEAKER laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, Ovid F. Johnson, in reply to an inquiry of the Senate, made nearly two months ago, and repeated the 17th inst., in regard to the measures which he had adopted to recover for the use of the State, the defalcation of Frederick Fritz, late Collector of Tolls on the Columbia Rail road, the same amounting to 40,000 dollars.—The Attorney General accused the Senate body appeared to have forgotten, or at least disregarded the courtesy that was due from one department of the government to another.

He then proceeds to say, that some time since, suit had been brought against Fritz, and one, but not both of his sureties. The trial was put off from time to time, for reasons which were satisfactory to the court trying the same. He thinks it expedient not to push Henry Sprigman, the remaining surety—and concludes by observing that he has not yet collected any money, nor does he know when he will be able to do so, at all.

After the reading, Mr. SULLIVAN moved to refer the communication to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. DARRIE said, that as the Attorney General complained of injustice, he wished the Clerk to read the resolution of inquiry referred to. [The resolution was simply a call for certain information on the subject in question, couched in respectful terms, but noticing the fact that a former and similar call still remained unanswered.] Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts of the case? Why, sir, in 1839, it was discovered that this Frederick Fritz was a defaulter to the amount of \$40,000; and at the next session of the Legislature, the Senate passed a resolution, inquiring of the Attorney General what steps had been instituted to recover the same—to which he replied that suit had been instituted against Fritz, and that he had no doubt the whole would be recovered. But, now, it seemed, the Attorney General had altered his mind—for according to the present reply, nothing would be collected from him of his sureties. No progress whatever had been made in the matter for the space of three years—and when, a month and a half ago, he [Mr. D.] had submitted a resolution of inquiry on the subject—and subsequently, that remaining unnoticed—still another, the Attorney General had the audacity to send a communication to this body, taking them to task for daring to trouble him for the information required—and coolly winding up by saying that it is doubtful whether the whole or any part of the defalcation will ever be recovered to the use of the Commonwealth! The Attorney General must indeed have a poor opinion of the character for dignity which the Senators entertain, if he expected such a communication to pass unnoticed—or to be treated with courtesy.

Mr. CHAMPEYNS considered the language used by the Attorney General as very extraordinary, to say the least. He recollected the resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Allegheny, and thought at the time, they were respectful and courteous. He thought the same now, and yet the Attorney General had thought proper to send into this body a communication complaining of disrespectful treatment. It would seem that the Senate, if

desiring to learn something connected with the proper discharge of their duties, were to become supplicants to the individuals who might happen to hold any trifling office under the Commonwealth.

Mr. SULLIVAN recollected the resolutions of inquiry, and considered them perfectly free from offensive terms.—Ample time had been allowed that officer to make his report to the Senate—and common courtesy and duty required him to do so at the earliest opportunity. Mr. S. forbore to make any further remarks at the present time—but must observe that he thought it a very extraordinary answer, coming from the officer it did, to a simple resolution of inquiry. He concluded by so modifying his motion as to instruct the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the expediency of procuring private counsel to conduct the suit on the part of the Commonwealth.

Mr. PENNIMAN also viewed this document as a very extraordinary one. The Attorney General speaks of the courtesy due from different departments of the Government. Does the Attorney General constitute one of the departments? If so, he [Mr. P.] was not before aware of the fact. By whom, and by what authority, was he so constituted? So far from considering the office of Attorney General as constituting one of the Departments of Government, it was even suspected that there was no authority under the Constitution, for creating the office he held.—However, let that be as it may—we find this individual, besides taking his own time to perform his duties accusing this body of disrespectful treatment. For his own part, he would wish to see the communication returned to the author, were he worthy the contempt of the Senate. As it was, he was indifferent as to the course pursued.

Mr. GIBBS moved to lay the resolution on the table. The resolutions of inquiry, he had thought, were sufficiently respectful—but a mistake may have been made in transcribing—if so, very well. If not, he wished to have the matter fairly considered by the Senate.—It is to be out of order, there being one motion already before the Senate.

Mr. SULLIVAN accepted the views of the gentleman from Lehigh, and withdrew his motion—and the motion of Mr. G. postponing for the present was agreed to.

Awful Calamity—Great Land Slide at Troy, New York.

We have accounts of a fearful calamity at Troy, N. Y., occasioned by a land slide, which occurred on Friday last, scarcely inferior in extent, and it is feared, even more destructive of life, than that which occurred several years ago.

The slide occurred south of the former one, on the small hill—the avalanche crushing, and nearly burying several frame buildings, at the foot of the hill, and extending quite across Main street.

The accounts varying in particulars, but all concur in representing the loss of life, and the scene of distress as terrible beyond description.

The scene presented an awful and melancholy sight. Babies in their cradles, mothers with their children in their arms, and stalwart men, who but two hours before had breathed freely and in good health, had been taken from the ruins, mutilated and mangled corpses. The buildings destroyed were nearly all new, and had but recently been erected.

Some eight or ten of the dwellings, occupied by poor families, were crushed and buried beneath the mass of earth. In these, it is supposed, there were not less than thirty or forty persons, only ten or twelve of whom escaped.

Within an hour after the occurrence, nine bodies were dug out from the ruins, five of which were without life, one partially injured, and three not beyond recovery.

A man from the country, passing at the time with his team, leaped from his sleigh, and escaped. The horses and the load of wood were buried beneath the earth.

MESMERISM.—"Am you willin if I mesmerise you, Sambo?"

"Sartin I is Cuffy."

Here follow the passes, quite a la-Mesmer and the 'community of sensation' is soon established.

"Is you gone to sleep, Sambo?"

"Yes, Cuffy, fass asleep."

"Well, den, what hab I got in my mouf?" tasting a bit of sugar.

How dibil I know Cuffy? I'm fass asleep."

The unkindest CUT OF OIL.—A lard oil manufacturer, in Pittsburg has a cut over his advertisement representing two fat hogs eating a whale.—Boston Post.

Rough diamonds are sometimes mistaken for pebbles.