

# STAR & REPUBLICAN BANNER

"I WISH NO OTHER HERALD, NO OTHER SPEAKER OF MY LIVING ACTIONS, TO KEEP MY HONOR FROM CORRUPTION. —SHAKS"

BY ROBERT WHITE MIDDLETON.]

GETTYSBURGH, PA. TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1833.

[VOL. 9—NO. 27.]



BY ROBERT WHITE MIDDLETON.

GETTYSBURGH, PA.  
Tuesday, October 2, 1833.

## Important Election Law.

In the laws of the last session of the Legislature, page 598, the following important law may be found. We invite attention to it.

Certain officers of state and United States prohibited from holding certain offices at elections.

"That no Inspector, judge or other officer of any election, shall be eligible to any office at such election, nor shall any person holding an office under the general or state government, be an Inspector, judge or other officer of any such election, nor shall any person holding an office under the U. States be allowed to serve as a member of any county, commissioner of a district, or burgess."

Justices of the Peace are included in the officers referred to by the above law. Let it not be forgotten.

## The Gettysburg Rail Road.

The charges against Gov. Ritner seem to be narrowed down to the fact of his having signed the bill which appropriated money to the Gettysburg Rail Road. There is no other sin alleged against him. Even the Abolition hussy has ceased to be ridden, and their State Conventions and grog-shop mobs are alike boisterous about the "Gettysburg Rail Road!"

But this charge is not a bit less inconsistent than the hundred other charges which were made and abandoned—because, as an intelligent Porterian observed, "they cut both ways, and rather deeper into Porter than Ritner." Now, this charge is of the same sort. "It cuts rather deeper into Porter and his party than into Ritner"—because the York and Gettysburg Rail Road was chartered under Gov. Wolf's administration, and David R. Porter himself voted for an appropriation to the Gettysburg Extension (this "Cretan Labyrinth," as the Reading Loco Foco Convention call it) of \$150,000. The bill making this appropriation was voted by Gov. Ritner, because it appropriated upwards of \$2,000,000, a part of which was to commence new works, which would have involved the State in an additional debt of \$35,000,000 before they were completed!

This is the consistency of the gang of political desperadoes who lead the Van Buren party! They charge Gov. Ritner with having committed a political sin in signing a bill appropriating money to the Gettysburg Rail Road, when their own candidate, David R. Porter, voted for an appropriation of \$150,000 to the same road!!!

## The End is not yet!

The evidence of Porter's fraudulent insolvency is increasing hourly. Read the subjoined publication, from the Butler Intelligencer; it fastens the charge of fraud upon Porter, fully and conclusively.

From the Butler Intelligencer.  
THE FRAUDULENT CONDUCT OF DAVID R. PORTER.

CONFIRMED BY THE RECORDS OF BUTLER COUNTY.

From the subjoined, it appears that David R. Porter, by the will of his father, owned a tract of land in Muddy Creek township, in this county—and that about three weeks previous to his application for the benefit of the Insolvent Laws, he conveyed said land to John Stonebraker. That after Porter took the benefit, the land was sold to John McDermott, the bonds taken in the name of Stonebraker, and by him assigned to Porter, who sold McDermott's property, including valuable improvements, at Sheriff's sale, for \$460, and afterwards sold it at private sale at an increased price. Here you have the records, examine for yourselves.

## BUTLER COUNTY, ss.

David R. Porter, assignee } In the Court  
of John Stonebraker, } of Common  
vs. } Pleas of said  
John McDermott, } county, Nos.  
20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27, of April  
Term, 1821, each for the sum of seventy-  
five dollars with costs. Entered 19th of  
April, 1821, by John Gilmore, Esq., by  
warrant of Attorney. Also, Nos. 38 and 39  
of April term, 1822, entered by same attorney  
for David R. Porter, the one on the 4th  
May, 1822, and the other on the 8th May,  
1822. On No. 39, execution No. 19, Octo-  
ber term, 1833, levied on 200 acres of  
land in Muddy Creek township, about 70  
acres cleared, cabin house and barn thereon  
erected. Vendition Exponas, No. 33, Janu-  
ary term, 1824, on which levy sold to  
plaintiff's attorney, John Gilmore, Esq., for  
\$460. Date of the bonds on which the  
above judgments are entered, 19th August,  
1820. Date of Assignments on the same  
from John Stonebraker, to David R. Porter,  
is 23rd August, 1820.

I, JOHN SULLIVAN, Prothonotary in and for said county, do in pursuance of the call of the Committee of Vigilance, certify that the foregoing is correctly taken from the Records of said Court.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court, this 7th day of September, A. D. 1833.

JOHN SULLIVAN, Proth'y.

## BUTLER COUNTY, ss.

I, JOHN WELSH, Recorder of Deeds, &c., in and for said county, in answer to the call of the Committee of Vigilance, do hereby certify, that there is on record in my office, in Book D., page 508 and 509, a deed of conveyance, dated the 19th of August,

1820, from John Stonebraker and wife, Franklin township, Huntingdon county, to John McDermott, for a tract of land, No. 149, in the first district, Donation land, (being in Muddy Creek township,) being the same tract of land patented by the Commonwealth to E. Beatty, dated 28th June, 1790, who conveyed to Andrew Porter, 30th December, 1804, and said Andrew Porter, by his last will, bearing date 15th September, 1806, devised the same to David R. Porter, who by deed dated 10th Dec. 1818, conveyed the same to the said John Stonebraker.

Given under my hand, and the seal of said office, this 7th day of September, 1818.  
JOHN WELSH, Recorder.

The Pittsburg Gazette, says, in reference to the Butler County transaction:

"David R. Porter, on the 10th December, 1818, the very seed time of his preparation for taking the benefit of the Insolvent Laws, conveyed a tract of land, 149, to John Stonebraker, who on the 9th of August, 1820, conveyed the same to McDermott, and took in payment ten bonds, eight for seventy-five dollars each, and two for sums which are not stated, but probably for the same sum, making altogether seven hundred and fifty dollars. On the 28th of June, 1820, just nine days after the sale, the whole ten of these bonds are assigned by Stonebraker to Porter."

"Before April 1821, and to that term, no less than eight different judgments, on eight of these bonds were entered against the purchaser, in the name of 'Porter assignee of Stonebraker,' and before April 1822, judgments were also entered on the two remaining bonds."

"If too much time had not elapsed, any honest jury would convict him on that evidence alone. Look also at the records of Butler county. The bitterest foe of Porter could not have devised more damning evidence against him. It is full, clear, conclusive, and no less than ten times repeated."

Is such a man as David R. Porter, morally qualified to fill the Executive chair of the Keystone State!

## Look Here!

Behold how the Agents of the General Government are laboring to secure the election of the Sub-Treasury candidate for Governor!

Extract of a letter to the Editor, dated BERLIN, Sept. 20, 1838.

DEAR SIR—To give you some idea of the desperate means resorted to here, by the Office-holders of the General Government, to sustain the sinking cause of their candidate, David R. Porter, I will merely state one fact: About a hundred copies of a small sheet denominated the "Iron Grey," manufactured, it is believed, by the venacious Patrick Madden, are sent to this office weekly, which are distributed in parcels by the Postmaster (the agent of the General Government) and his chills among the office-holders, who scatter them among their neighbors and strangers who happen to come this way!!!

It is confidently believed here, that every one of them is received free of postage—thus illustrating the principles of the General Government, that the office-holders and their lackies are a favored portion of the community!

What think you, Farmers and Mechanics, who are the bone and sinew of our country, of this? For every newspaper and every letter you receive, you are obliged to pay postage, to enable the agents of the General Government to send those filthy sheets among you to vilify and abuse your candidate, who is a Farmer like yourselves! You will not, you cannot submit to this!

Many, we learn, have already become disgusted with this proceeding, and are more determined to support "Old Joe," who never was ashamed to follow his plough and drive his own team.

Yours and &c.

## Ritner in the West.

Extract of a letter, dated, BEAVER, August 20, 1833.

I am told it is proclaimed in the east, that the west will go universally for Porter.—This I believe, is the statement of travellers. Now for the comfort of these political brawlers, I will authorize you to say, that Ritner will cross the Allegheny mountain, with at least 6000 majority. This estimate is low.

## Henry Clay.

The following allusion to this great man, is extracted from "My Recent Journey," by the Rev. S. W. HARKEY, Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Frederick, Md., as published in the "Visitor" of that place. Mr. Clay was in the same Steambost with Mr. Harkey during a trip from Wheeling to Cincinnati. Describing the company, Mr. Harkey says—

We had a mixture of "all sorts" of persons on board, from the Hon. United States Senator down to the humblest deck hand. There was the far-famed, the Hon. Henry Clay, the great orator and statesman of America, and doubtless one of her noblest sons, who was, of course, the centre of attraction. Without any regard to his political character or views, (with which I have nothing to do,) I must say that I was highly pleased with him. His appearance is noble and manly, and his conduct dignified and gentlemanly. I neither saw nor heard of anything to which I could take exception, or which was becoming the high and honorable station which he holds. I did not see HIM VISIT THE BAR OR DRINK ANY THING AT ALL, NOR HEAR AN OATH OR IMPROPER WORD FALL FROM HIS LIPS. I do not pretend to say what his moral character may have been, or what it now is, but I speak of what I saw and heard.

## Vote! take care of the Constitution!

FROM THE YORK REPUBLICAN.

At the approaching election we are to determine by our votes whether the constitution of our state—framed and adopted by our fathers—approved by the wise and the good, and under which we have prospered for nearly half a century—is to be preserved sacred and inviolate, or whether, to suit the views of the visionary—the ambitious and mutilated, and changed.

That the permanency of our institutions, and our future prosperity and happiness, greatly depend on the preservation of the constitution, but few amongst the sober and reflecting are to be found who doubt; that it is the duty of every good citizen to step forward and defend it, against the attack which is made upon it, but few amongst the intelligent and the candid, will deny.—Knowing our duty then let us see that we do it—let us resolve, each for himself, not only to go to the polls, but to warn his neighbors that they go also, and by voting against the proposed amendments, preserve the constitution from impending danger, and avert those evils which would so surely result from their adoption.

In matters of party politics we are not often wanting in zeal. The administration of the Government each one conceives should be according to the principles of his own party, and hence, in contests for the ascendancy, we find no want of vigilance and activity; and yet the political ascendancy of one party or another which merely affects the administration of the government, is scarcely worthy of a thought when compared with the importance of the constitution, which may be said to be the very foundation on which it is to be administered. The constitution may be compared to the titles by which we hold our lands, and those who administer the government to our tenants. If they are wasteful and farm badly, we can turn them off and get new ones, our lands are still left; but if our titles are destroyed, then all is lost. As he would be a foolish man who, after having enjoyed his lands for nearly half a century, would at the suggestion of the lawyers hand his deeds and title papers over to them, to be tampered with and altered to suit their purposes—so he would be no less foolish who having long enjoyed every civil right which government can confer, or protect, should at the suggestion of political quacks surrender up, or join in destroying, the Constitution of that Government under which he had been so signally blessed. The idea that the constitution should be changed because all are not satisfied with it, is not for a moment to be endured; for were it the perfection of Divine Wisdom, there would be those who would complain of it for that very cause. If the majority of the sober, reflecting people, such as live by honest industry, and would thrive only by that which is right and just, are satisfied, it is all that can be expected or desired. Who are they then that are dissatisfied? They are the restless—irresponsible and disappointed politicians of all parties—men, who despising the ordinary means of livelihood, make politics their trade, and thrive best when things are most unsettled. There may be exceptions, and doubtless are, but mainly are we indebted to such men for the Convention and its first fruits, which though bitter enough, are sweet compared to those which may follow.

It was brought about at their instigation, and through their means. It was they alone who got up petitions for it—and not the honest, hard-working farmers and mechanics. The petitions originated in the cities and not in the country. They were circulated by those who would profit by unsettling our title to every thing we value, and removing the landmarks established by our fathers. The law authorizing a vote for calling a Convention, was thus brought about—and not at the instance of the people. When the time came for voting for, or against a Convention, so little were the people aware of the fact in many of the country districts, that more than FORTY THOUSAND voters attended the polls and voted for the common tickets without voting on the Convention question or probably knowing that such a question was to be voted upon. In the two German counties of Berks and York alone, whose citizens are strongly attached to the Constitution, there were nearly THREE THOUSAND who thus lost their votes. Those who were in favor of the Convention were every where active, and favoured by the circumstances referred to, as well as the excitement and confusion attendant on the gubernatorial election, they obtained a majority of votes for calling a Convention. One Hundred and Thirty-three delegates were accordingly elected to meet at Harrisburg on the first Tuesday of May, 1837, to propose such amendments as they should think proper, a matter which it was supposed, by the people, would take but a few days, or weeks, for they never had dreamed that their constitution was to be subjected to dangerous operations, much less to emboweling and dissection. They were however doomed to disappointment. The delegates assembled at the appointed time, and after providing themselves with the necessary officers, such as Clerks, Sergeant-at-arms, Doorkeepers, &c. and with Printers and Stenographers, they fell to work upon the constitution. Some were for killing it outright—some were inclined to be a little more merciful—while others, regarding it as too sacred to be rudely handled, took a manly stand in its favor, and defended it with all the zeal and constancy which true patriotism could inspire. All may have voted equally conscientiously—and we are bound to suppose they did, and the fact that they so

widely differed in their views, furnishes the strongest evidence of the danger always incurred in attempting to disturb ancient and long cherished institutions. It proves that when the door is once opened to innovation, those who enter upon the work of revolution, however learned or wise they may be, cannot agree in opinion as to the kind and extent of the changes which should be wrought. It tends to prove, what the experience of the world confirms, that bad governments or bad laws are better than frequent changes; and that those which are good should never be changed. The trite admonition, "Let well enough alone," applies to all the concerns of life; to none more justly than to our civil institutions. The man who is well should not take physic, nor should he who is not wronged go to law. The attempt to cure a slight disease, or to obtain redress for a slight injury, often costs the patient his life, or the suitor his estate; and the attempt to change the principles of government often costs the people their liberties. But to return to the Convention. It continued in session from the 2d of May to the 22d of February, excepting two vacations amounting together to about three months, and when at length it rose, it is believed that a large majority of the members were dissatisfied with the result of their long and arduous labors. Of those who were for radical change scarcely any two could agree in sentiment as to the extent and details; and that which was finally offered to the public as a substitute for one of the best constitutions which human wisdom ever devised, was the result of contention and compromise. The question to be decided is, whether we will accept it, or whether we will stand by the constitution which was framed by our fathers and hand it down unimpaired as a blessing to our children. The principal changes proposed are these:—(The Prothonotaries and Clerks of the Courts, (except of the Supreme Court) Recorders and Registers to be elected,) instead of being appointed by the Governor. To this alteration there would seem to be no very serious objection. Those however who framed our present constitution thought it better that they should be appointed, and experience has by no means proved that they were wrong. It will not be denied that those officers have been generally found quite as competent as Sheriffs, who are elected, and while the people would gain nothing by the change, they would be greatly annoyed by the swarms of office-seekers, who would be beating up for nominations, or courting about the country for votes, for months before the election. Slander and detraction would be heaped upon the candidates, and the excitement and disorder attending elections would be greatly increased.

(Justices of the Peace and Aldermen to be elected for the period of five years) instead of being appointed by the Governor, during good behaviour. This amendment is to the last degree objectionable, and must be condemned by every lover of Justice who will take the trouble seriously to think on the subject. At the very first thought, the mind is shocked at the idea of a man offering himself as a candidate for the votes of the people for the office of Justice of the Peace. No decent man would be found to do it. Like our candidates for Sheriff, he would be assailed on every side; he would be slandered in every quarter—labeled in every newspaper, and handbilled and caricatured at every corner and in every market-place.

When we see the best men in the county who are brought forward by their fellow citizens as candidates for the highest offices, blackguarded and abused like felons, swindlers, and blockheads (and who amongst them escapes!) it would be folly to suppose, that any man of modest worth would be a candidate for a Justiceship. The fact that a man would consent to be a candidate for it, would be sufficient evidence of his unfitness for it. The office would become contemptible, and none would seek it, but such as would be willing to wade through filth to get it. From such Justices as we should have, made up of broken-down politicians and the tide-waiters and lackeys of all political parties; may God deliver us! The strife and litigation with which the country would be overwhelmed would be worse than famine or the plague. Seeking the office, not for the honor of it,—for it would be dishonourable, but for profit, the commission to administer justice, would be treated by the magistrate as a warrant for PRIVATEERING, for plundering at least his enemies who would not be a few. In canvassing for the office, he would have his rivals, his bitter enemies, and his warm and devoted friends. Between them, he would be called upon to sit in judgment,—none would apply to him but his friends, and they too often. Few would be brought before him but his enemies, for such he would consider all who had opposed him. A case comes before him. The plaintiff has voted for him,—perhaps lustily electioneered for him—distributed handbills, &c. The defendant has voted and used his influence against him, and under those circumstances, he is to be the judge between them. Can he be trusted? No prudent man would trust himself in such a situation. It would be a snare for his conscience, and in deciding against the defendant (which he would be sure to do) should his decision, perchance, be ever so just, the defendant would not think so. Should the sum be so small as to allow of no appeal, in being compelled to pay it, he would think himself robbed of his money. Should an appeal be admissible, it would be entered—the cause would go into a higher court, and all the expense and vexation of protracted litigation would follow as a consequence of a want of confidence in the magistrato who was so circumstanced as

not to be entitled to confidence. Admitting that Justices elected in the manner proposed would be as competent and as impartial as they are under the present mode of appointing,—still the want of confidence in them would destroy their usefulness—but that they would be as competent and impartial, no sensible man will admit. They would be one-sided magistrates,—more tools in the hands of their friends, to be used for bleeding and skinning their enemies.

(It is proposed that Judges be appointed for a term of years) instead of good behaviour. As we all know the importance of having good judges, and of consistency and uniformity in judicial decisions, our only desire, in the adoption or rejection of this amendment, should be, to secure in the best possible manner those primary objects. Can that best be done by appointing them during good behaviour, as heretofore under our present constitution?—or by appointing them for a term of years, as proposed? That is the question, and let us examine the matter and candidly decide upon it. Men of learning and experience in the law, and of high standing in their profession, are generally to be found, who are willing to give up their professional business, though lucrative, for an appointment to the bench during good behaviour. The station is honourable; it affords the means of gratifying a laudable ambition to be useful, and if the incumbent properly discharge the duties of it, it is permanent. Would such men accept the same office for a term of years? There may be some who would, but the instances would be rare. A man of high reputation and good practice at the bar, properly regarding his own interests, would hardly be willing to accept of an appointment for a few years, and take the chance of being thrown back upon his profession, at the expiration of the time,—perhaps in the decline of life, his habits changed and his practice gone, to toil for an uncertain livelihood. It would require years to regain his practice, and in nine cases out of ten it could never be regained. It is quite plain then that appointments during good behaviour, would be likely to secure the services of better men, than appointments for years. But supposing men could be found equally competent who would accept of a tenure for years, let us inquire which tenure would be the better calculated to make them independent of all undue influence, to secure their fidelity, and insure a fair and impartial administration of law and justice. Judges, it is to be remembered, are like other men, and above all others, they should be placed as far as possible from temptation. They should be so circumstanced as never to have an inducement to do wrong,—as never to be afraid to do right, that is to do their duty, and should be liable to removal for sufficient cause.

Under the present constitution, a judge being appointed during good behaviour, with a knowledge that he can hold his situation, provided he be competent, just as long as he behaves himself well in his office, which means as long as he shall be upright and faithful in the discharge of his duties, knows he is beyond the reach of party revolutions, of the effects of popular feeling, and of individual wealth. In coming before him, the active and influential politician, has no advantage over the comparatively obscure, but worthy farmer or mechanic. The weak and defenceless man, however unpopular he may be, or however much public indignation may be excited against him, can look with confidence for the strict measure of justice, to which the law entitles him, and the poor man feels assured that the wealth and power of his adversary will not cause the scales of justice to preponderate against him, and why? Because the judge, who is naturally disposed to be just, has no temptation to be otherwise. He knows that as long as he is honest, doing equal and exact justice to all, he has nothing to fear, and that to hold his office, he has only to be worthy of it. To secure his continuance in it, he wants not the services and intercession of the influential politicians, or the out door applause of an exalted populace, or the rich man's influence. He neither fears nor desires the favor of any man. He is not to be bought, doing equal and exact justice to all, he has nothing to fear, and that to hold his office, he has only to be worthy of it. To secure his continuance in it, he wants not the services and intercession of the influential politicians, or the out door applause of an exalted populace, or the rich man's influence. He neither fears nor desires the favor of any man. He is not to be bought, doing equal and exact justice to all, he has nothing to fear, and that to hold his office, he has only to be worthy of it. To secure his continuance in it, he wants not the services and intercession of the influential politicians, or the out door applause of an exalted populace, or the rich man's influence. He neither fears nor desires the favor of any man. He is not to be bought, doing equal and exact justice to all, he has nothing to fear, and that to hold his office, he has only to be worthy of it.

Placed beyond the want of the one, and the reach of the other, he holds the scales of justice with a steady hand, and as they determine, so the cause of the high and the low, the strong and the weak, the rich and the poor, must be judged. Now place the same judge in office for a term of years, and he is not the same man. He is no longer to be feared, he is no longer to be respected, he is no longer to be honored. He knows that at the expiration of his term, he must leave his place, unless he can obtain a re-appointment, and he is scarcely warm in his seat, before, looking ahead, he begins to cast about for the means of securing his object. He is dependent on the bog in him, not a day passes when he is engaged in the performance of his official duties, that he does not feel the necessity of estimating the consequences (in regard to his own prospects) of decisions he is about to make. He is disposed to do justice; but, under the continual influence of temptation and fear, he finds it difficult. His conscience gradually yields to small requisitions upon his integrity, and deviating a little from the direct course of justice, he yields a little to one suitor (who can serve him) at the expense of another. As each day brings him nearer the time when his commission will expire, so each day admonishes him of the necessity of using means for his re-appointment. Perhaps he is poor and has a family to support. The idea of going back to the bar, he cannot endure, he is getting too old for that. The ardour and ambition of youth, the thirst for professional fame, which once impelled him to action, and led to his former success and reputation, are quenched or extinguished. His former patrons and clients have gone to other lawyers; and an attempt to recover his former practice would be utterly hopeless. He gives up the idea of returning to the bar; and now all his thoughts and hopes centre in one object, a re-appointment. How is that object to be attained?—Not through the assistance of the obscure, the weak, or the poor. They can neither help nor hurt him; from them he has nothing to hope or fear. He knows the industrious farmer, the mechanic, who have little to do with politics, will exert no political influence either for or against him. From whom then is he to expect assistance, or apprehend opposition? From the active and influential political partizan, the often ill-judging and ill-directed populace, the rich and the powerful. It is they whose favour he covets and would win, and whose opposition he dreads and would avoid. Laying aside the dignity of a man, he sup-

plies the politician, courts the rabble, and fawns upon the rich. The politician brings a vocalous suit against an unpretending farmer. A quiet citizen comes into court and claims protection, or indemnity, against the acts of a lawyer; his head o' bob; and the obscure poor man, against the high-handed oppression of a wealthy adversary; and the judge must determine between them. By favoring the cause of the politician—the mob—and the rich man, he would win their favour, bring them into support, and probably, secure his re-appointment. By acting uprightly, he would incur their enmity, and their opposition, which would probably defeat it. So circumstanced; is he free and independent? If he is, the slave is, then chains is so. Is his conscience safe? If it is, then poor, frail humanity is proof against temptation.—Is Justice safe? If it is, it would be safe were it not for the judge in his own cause. No man can be found who would be willing for a moment, to risk the trial of his cause, with such fearful odds against him. No man who thinks aright, would say that the judge would be fit to try it; or that it would not be sinful to load him into such temptation, and endanger the administration of justice by voting for the proposed amendment. If then, it is manifest, and it must be so to all, that the old constitution gives us better judges than the new one would, and that they would be more likely to remain faithful and honest, so far the old one is better than the new.

A few words as to the bad effects of frequently changing Judges. We all know that to improve the law as it stands, the law should be settled and certain. Were it not so, no man would be safe. That which would be lawful one day, might be unlawful the next. There would be no fixed rules of property. A mortgage—a deed—a purchase of land at Sheriff's sale—good to-day, might be good for nothing to-morrow. As far as all these matters must be expounded and settled by the Judges, and the Judges are changed the more certain and well established is the law. "Now-lords, now laws," is an old saying. Now Judges, now laws, is just as true an one. No two men always think alike; and when a judge first takes his seat on the bench, generally thinking himself wiser in some respects at least than his predecessor, he is apt to overturn their decisions, and introduce new principles and establish new rules. Turn out all the Judges in the state and appoint others, and thousands would be injured, if not ruined in their estates, by new decisions, in regard to matters which are now well settled and understood. The honest and industrious, who have labored to lose, would be the sufferers. The artful, the crafty, and the unprincipled, seeking advantage wherever they could find it, would be the gainers. It is the former who always suffer by change of political institutions; by convulsion and revolution; it is the latter who promote them and fatten on the miseries they produce.

Here I might stop, for none but the blind can fail to perceive that the direct and inevitable consequence of adopting the new Constitution would be to give us worse Justices, worse Judges, and worse Laws; and none but the thoughtless can be indifferent to the train of unforeseen evils to which we should be exposed; but there is one more amendment over which I cannot pass without remark. I refer to the provision by which amendments to the constitution may be proposed in the Legislature.

It is a part of that project which is at the bottom of destroying our present constitution, which would rob the many and give to the few—the prostitute the industrious and pander the idle. No man can fail to see its consequence—EVIL LEGISLATURE would be a Convention to amend the Constitution, and instead of making such laws as we might need and then adjourning, it would be hammering the whole year round at amendments, and we should have one perpetual session. As now members are elected having new views, they would be satisfied with neither the Constitution, nor the work of their predecessors; but would hammer out their year, leaving off at last moment, only to make room for their successors. And at whose expense is this perpetual Convention to be kept up? Let the "VAN BUREN ANSWER." If they are to answer for such abuses, let them vote for the amendments. But if they love their country, love their Constitution, and venerate the memory of their patriotic fathers who established it, they will go to the polls and vote "AGAINST THE AMENDMENTS." To do so is MORAL, RELIGIOUS, AND POLITICAL DUTY.

## CONSTITUTION.

N. B. In order that those who wish to save the old constitution may know how the law requires them to vote for that purpose, they are informed that their tickets must be labelled on the outside "AMENDMENTS;" on the inside must be the words, "AGAINST THE AMENDMENTS." C.

## More Declensions from the Porter Party.

Mr. Charles W. Koleso, and Elias Bruch, two respectable and influential gentlemen in Erie county, have left the ranks of the Loco Focos, published their renunciation of Portorism in the Erie Gazette, and declared themselves openly for Ritner.

## Mr. STEVENS.—The Republican sneers

because Mr. STEVENS recommended Sunday, and other, schools to be taught along the Punkhannock and other Divisions of the Punksyanna canal, and places the recommendation to the score of electioneering.—Granted. The object is laudable, and even if it was not consecrated by purity of motive, if the ignorant are enlightened, if the vicious are reformed, or the young mind led into the proper path, and directed onward in intelligence and morals, what boots it that the originator sought for popularity? Such an action ought to be popular with every well regulated mind. But, judging from the past course of Mr. STEVENS, his recommendation is the result of that unconquerable spirit which has shown itself upon every occasion in favor of information and in opposition to ignorance, and which seeks to place, and is fast accomplishing its object, every child in the Commonwealth upon the equality brought by the blessings of education. Let the sordid and the base assign base and sordid motives, the good citizen will see in this matter nothing but a following out of as noble a course as was ever commenced, and the name of Thaddeus Stevens and Education will be associated together and honored by Pennsylvanians long after his traducers and its opponents shall sleep in deserved forgetfulness. He who is the friend of intellectual and moral culture is the friend of mankind; his course will endure him to the affections of the people, and his name can no more be sullied by the slanders of an enemy than the sunbeam can be swallowed by darkness.

## SPUNKY.—"A Democrat," in the Anti-

can Sentinel—the Anti-Sub-Treasury Porter paper of Philadelphia—tells the Loco Focos that "if they are determined to wage a war of extermination against the Conservatives, they will find it a war in which there are blouses to receive—as well as blows to give!"