

THE FARMER.

From the Main Farmer.  
Do Sandy Lands leech the Manures through them?

This question has heretofore caused considerable discussion among farmers, but there have been no very accurate experiments to settle the question. It is however well settled that such kinds of soils are sandy and porous do not retain manures so long, or, in other words, need manuring oftener than those which contain a large quantity of clay. This may not be owing to the manure dissolving by rain, trickling through the soil, and passing off out of the way. It is a common remark that warm, sandy soils feel the manure quicker, and that the first crop after the manure is applied is larger than the same manure would cause, in a retentive soil, no more fertile than was the sandy soil.

In the last number of the Working Farmer, the editor has some remarks upon the subject of rendering sands retentive, by adding clay, which we copy in part. "It is a common error," says he, "to suppose that in sandy loams manures in solution leech downwards and thus during growth of a single crop a full manuring seems to pass from the soil. The facts are, that free sandy loams, when containing manures ploughed under but a few inches, receive the atmosphere, dews, heat of the sun, &c., very freely, and hence the manures are decomposed more rapidly than they can be decomposed by plants, and the organic manures pass off into the gaseous form and escape into the atmosphere, while the inorganic portions in solution sink down to undesirable depths. To correct this evil without rendering the soil more difficult to work, we have only to add large portions of carbonaceous matters, such as charcoal dust or tan bark, decomposed peat, decomposed sawdust, burnt bones, after being used by the sugar refiners, &c. &c. Any, or all these ingredients, will render sandy soils retentive of manures without altering them into soils more difficult of tillage, and after a sufficient quantity of carbonaceous matters have been added, they will last in the soil fifty years, re-performing their office of retaining the gases until wanted for the use of plants, to each new manuring, and during the whole time will assist in retaining new portions of ammonia from the atmosphere, which clay alone would not do. If these carbonaceous matters be added to the manures in compost, they will retain all their parts which might otherwise be lost during decomposition; nor does the benefit end here, for if six bushels of common salt be added to the acre, the sandy loam will be rendered sufficiently retentive of moisture and free from grubs and wire worms, nor will the inorganic constituents of manures filter down and pass beyond the point of use as readily as if these manures were not in the soil.

To prove this fact, fill a tub with sandy loam, containing fair portions of carbonaceous matters, throw upon the top of it one thousand gallons of water in which ten pounds of potash or soda has been dissolved—let the water leech through the soil in the tub and run out of the bottom—then evaporate the water to dryness, and it will be found that the alkali is not in the water, but remains in the soil. Make a similar experiment with the soil simple, without the carbonaceous matters, and the alkali will be found in the water."

GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of Pennsylvania:

GENTLEMEN: The States of Virginia and Georgia have transmitted to the Executive Department of this Commonwealth, Resolutions in reference to the preservation of the Union—the institution of slavery—and complaining of certain alleged violations of the Constitution of the United States.

A respectful courtesy to these distinguished members of the confederacy, demands from the Government of Pennsylvania an early and calm consideration of the grievances thus presented. The known character of the citizens of this Commonwealth for their faithful adherence to the National Constitution, their deep veneration for, and attachment to, the National Union, and their uniform respect and regard for the rights, privileges, and happiness of the citizens of other States of the confederacy, is a sufficient pledge that they would feel deeply wounded should their representatives by silence and acquiescence seem to admit, that they or their Government were justly obnoxious to the assertion that they "had commenced, and were persisting in, a system of encroachment upon the Constitution and rights of a portion of the people of this confederacy, which is alike unjust and dangerous to the peace and perpetuity of the cherished Union."

Persuaded that there exists no unkind feeling among our citizens to any other portion of the confederacy, and that a cordial love for the National Constitution and Union pervades our entire population, it is deemed a pleasant duty to transmit those resolutions to your honorable bodies, that the necessary measures may be adopted, after a candid consideration of the whole subject, to give a decided negative to the complaints of our sister republics, if they have done our people and Government in-

justice in these charges; and if otherwise, to offer the amplest assurance that the speediest remedies will be provided to redress any just grievances. This action is necessary in order that no truthful accusation of a wilful and wanton breach of the Constitution, infidelity to the National Union, or invasion of the rights of others, shall stain the social history of Pennsylvania.

The wrongs alleged may be classed as follows:

First, That the people of the non-Slaveholding States have encroached upon the Constitution of the United States.

Second, That they have done acts hostile to the peace and perpetuity of the National Union.

Third, That they have unjustly, dangerously, and injuriously trespassed upon the rights of other portions of the confederacy.

These are grave charges against the faith and honor of this Commonwealth, and hence the necessity of a careful examination of their justice and truth.

Questions connected with the slavery of the colored race, have given origin to these complaints.

It is not necessary to discuss the abstract question of Slavery. If it were now to be established—if the footprints of the bondman were now for the first time to press the soil of our common country—if the Constitution were now to be formed, it would be our duty to enter our solemn protest against its introduction or recognition. We should feel a pleasure in the adoption of a different policy from that imposed upon us by our British progenitors. Where they forged and riveted, we would strike the chains of bondage from human limbs.

The Constitution of the United States, however, having guaranteed, to a certain extent, the existence of slavery, and recognized the rights of the people of the Slaveholding States in their peculiar property, all such discussions in reference to the institution as it exists in those States are properly precluded by a just sense of constitutional duty. With slavery, therefore, in the several States, there is not now, and never has been, any disposition, on the part of the Government of Pennsylvania, to interfere.

Let us examine how far the general charges, made against the people of the Free States, apply to our citizens. To do so with more clearness, a recital of the events preceding and attending the formation of the Constitution, is deemed necessary and proper.

Pennsylvania had been a Slaveholding State. The introduction and use of servile labor, and the moral and political degradation of the colored race, had been engrained upon her liberal institutions by the cupidity of our British ancestry. While the Revolution and the separation of the Colonies from the mother country were in progress, and before the recognition of their independence by the Government of Great Britain, her Legislature, by the act of the 1st of March, 1780, abolished slavery within her borders. A copy of that statute is heretofore annexed.

The preamble to this act, in strong and appropriate language, expresses an abhorrence of that condition of civil bondage to which the arms and tyranny of Great Britain were exerted to reduce us; acknowledges the beneficent agency of the Supreme God in our deliverance from the threatened dangers, and admits the great injustice and wrong done to the servile race, by means whereof they had been "deprived of the common blessings to which they were by nature entitled," and then, in commemoration of our own happy escape from tyrannic and despotic power, provides that all persons, as well negroes and mulattoes as others, who shall be born within this State, from and after the date of the said act, shall not be deemed and considered servants for life, or slaves.

The further provisions of this humane law relate to the registry of slaves—the service of their children—their support when left indigent—their trial for offences; and whilst it thus declares, in most express terms, that no man or woman, of any nation or color, except registered slaves, shall at any time thereafter be deemed, adjudged, or holden within the territories of this Commonwealth as slaves, or servants for life, but as free men, and free women—it makes provision for the protection of the property of non-residents in slaves, or servants for life, who may be sojourners for a period of six months. On the 29th March, 1788, another act, intended to cure the defects of the act of 1st March, 1780, was passed, and is heretofore annexed.

These enactments made Pennsylvania a non-Slaveholding State, and in terms of the clearest and strongest character marked the determination of her people to abolish, for ever, servile labor within her borders. Whilst the preamble to the first act recited and embodied the reasons for the abolition of, and expressed her feelings in relation to, the institution of slavery, it furnished notice, of the most authentic kind, of her determined resistance to its increase and extension.

The Congress of the States in session in New York, (Virginia, Georgia and Pennsylvania being represented therein,) on the 13th July, 1787, passed an ordinance with great unanimity, that Slavery, or involuntary servitude should never be established, except for crime, within the then territories of the confederated States. There is

no exception, or saving clause; no line of compromise, or designation of degrees of latitude, to limit the area of freedom; but an entire, absolute, and unconditional prohibition of the institution in all the territories then under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

The act of 1780 had given notice to the other States, of the views entertained by Pennsylvania, on this important subject. The ordinance of the 13th July, 1787, was conceived in the same spirit, and gave an assurance that the evils of human bondage should never be extended, and would eventually cease to exist among a free people. It was in this belief that the citizens of Pennsylvania consented to a Constitution, which recognized to some extent the institution of slavery.

The Constitution being adopted went into operation on the 2d April, 1789. It contains the following provisions, directly or indirectly connected with the servitude of the colored race:

First, as regards representation, it provides "That representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included in this Union according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, (including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed,) three-fifths of all other persons."

Second, "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year 1808; but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars on each person."

Third, "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on the claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

The provision in the Constitution limiting the slave traffic, and the act of the National Congress, immediately preceding its adoption, in relation to its non-extension to the territories of the Union, would seem to leave no doubt upon the mind, that it was the intention and meaning of the framers of the Constitution, to prevent the extension and increase of human slavery; and, at an early period, to secure its entire abolition in the several States.

The qualified representation of the servile race, and the delivery of fugitives, were concessions made to the people of the slaveholding States. To this organic law, containing these provisions, Pennsylvania gave her assent; and it is therefore a duty on her part to respect, with religious fidelity, the rights therein guaranteed to other States.

That this Commonwealth has been faithful in the discharge of all her federal obligations, it is believed can be made manifest. It is true, that her business pursuits have been frequently interrupted; it is true, that her just weight in the national councils has been lessened by the representation of the servile race; it is true, that the representation of property instead of people, has been felt by her citizens as anti-republican and wrong—nevertheless, she has always felt it a duty faithfully to discharge her obligation as a member of the National Union.

The institution of Slavery has assumed a new position and importance, by the successful attempt to extend it beyond its original limits. In every instance of the kind, this Commonwealth has raised her voice in earnest protest. In the written Constitution, to the observance of whose provisions her faith had been pledged, there was found no authority for its introduction into new and after-acquired territory.

With the knowledge that the framers of the Constitution had taken a part in the deliberations of the Congress of 1787, and that the intention of their Ordinance was the preservation, from the malign influences of Slavery, of all the territory then belonging to the Union, it was reasonable to suppose that any acquiescence, on her part, in the acquisition of immense regions to be covered with slavery, would be given with great reluctance. The same liberality of sentiment that breathed in the Declaration of the National Independence—the same ardent love of human freedom that conceived the Ordinance of 1787—the same hatred of human bondage that induced the abolition of the slave-trade, it was believed would influence and direct the opinions and actions of those illustrious fathers who placed these proud memorials among the venerated archives of the Republic.

prohibited Slavery in the territories of the then confederation, and the reasons for its enactment applied as forcibly to the West bank of the Mississippi, as they did to the North bank of the Ohio. The National Constitution contained nothing to authorize the acquisition of new territory, and the erection of further slave institutions. On the contrary, by its provisions in reference to the slave-traffic, and the concurrent events attending its formation, it appeared to mark limits to the extent and duration of the institution; hence, any action enlarging its boundaries, was an unwarrantable assumption of power. The Union of the States was endangered by the erection of imaginary lines, tending to engender and keep alive sectional jealousies and prejudices. Pennsylvania desired no new Mason and Dixon's line to mark distinctive characters and tastes among a homogeneous people.

In the powers of the National Congress is found no authority to create Slavery, unless its introduction formed a portion of a treaty acquiring territory, or was the condition of a grant of lands. The spirit of universal liberty guarded, all soil blessed by the institutions of freedom; and to establish bondage, positive enactments were necessarily required. These sentiments of Pennsylvania remain unchanged, and if their expression, with a perfect willingness to submit their accuracy to the supreme judicial tribunals of the country, were aggressions on the rights of the citizens of Virginia and Georgia—if they were an infraction of the National Constitution, or tended to the dissolution of the Union—the demonstration thereof has not been made manifest to our citizens.

The National Government is admitted to be a government of limited powers, and that no authority can be exercised by it unless conferred by the Constitution. In the Constitution is found no express authority for the acquisition of territory by purchase—no express authority to admit new States into the Confederacy, formed from the acquired territory—no express or written power to absorb and annex another and a distinct sovereignty; to assume its debts, finish its unsettled warfare, or to take charge of its public domain—no express authority is given to plant the institution of Slavery where it does not exist, and certainly none to guarantee it, in its new home, the unequal and anti-republican representation to which it is entitled in the original States. The practical and common sense exposition of the Constitution, it is freely conceded, would invest a government of limited powers, with all the authority necessary to carry into effect its expressly granted powers.

The powers of Congress over the Territories of the Union, and the District of Columbia, are embraced in the following provisions:

First—New States may be admitted by Congress into the Union. Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or any particular State.

Second—Congress has the right to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, such district, (not exceeding ten miles square,) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States.

The parts of the Constitution heretofore detailed and mentioned below, embrace all the provisions necessary or essential for our present purpose.

1. The slave representation in the National Congress.
2. The non-importation of slaves after 1808.
3. The extradition of fugitives from labor.
4. The authority of Congress over the District of Columbia.

Which of these provisions of the National Constitution, has been encroached upon by Pennsylvania? There is no part of her history, legislative, executive, or judicial, that shows any interference with the rights of representation belonging to Virginia or Georgia. No charge has been made against her faithful observance of that portion of the Constitution in relation to the importation, or non-importation of slaves. The authority of Congress to establish slavery in territories wherein it does not exist, this State has denied, in mild and friendly terms; and in submitting heretofore to the exercise of the power when new Slaveholding States have been admitted, no bitterness has marked her complaints and protests. The authority of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, is apparent, unless the words employed conferring it, give less and a different power when inserted in Constitutions, than when used in other portions of the written and spoken language of the country.

The complaint in relation to the non-delivery of fugitives from labor will be best answered by a review of the laws enacted on the subject.

The act of 1780, although it denied the use of slave property to her own citizens, with a careful regard for the rights of the Slaveholding States, permitted sojourners to retain the ownership of such property for six consecutive months within the State. The frequent evasions of this part of the statute, and the effort made to extend sla-

very to the offspring of slave mothers caused the act of 29th of March, 1788. The constitutional provision before mentioned for reclamation of fugitives followed soon after, and was supposed to place all power over the subject in the National Legislature. The act of Congress of 13th February, 1793, entitled an act "respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their masters" appeared to confirm this opinion. It was believed, however, that a concurrent jurisdiction vested in the National and State Legislatures. At the request of a number of gentlemen of the neighboring State of Maryland, as is stated in the argument in the case of Prigg vs. Commonwealth, the act of 29th March, 1826, was passed. Three objects were intended to be secured by this legislation, to wit, the delivery of fugitives from labor, the protection of free colored people, and the prevention of kidnapping.

The 1st and 2d sections describe the offence of kidnapping, and prescribe its punishment. The propriety and justice of its enactments can not be questioned. The other sections of this statute, relative to the reclamation of fugitives from labor and the powers given to the owner to retake his property, and the obligations to aid and cooperate with him imposed upon the officers of this Commonwealth, was of such character as ought to have satisfied all reasonable and fair-dealing men of the disposition of this Commonwealth and the acts of Congress completely carried into effect. While the law provided ample security for the safe keeping of the alleged fugitive, until the owner might have an opportunity to obtain the proof of his former condition, it required other proof of this fact than the oath of the interested claimant or his agent or attorney. The provisions of this law were fair and equitable, and well calculated to aid the owner in the recovery of his property; and it is deemed a matter of surprise that it was contested and annulled, through the agency of the same State whose citizens had procured its enactment. The guards, in the statute, intended to preserve the liberty of the free man, would by the investigation it demanded, cause some trouble in procuring the final extradition of the fugitive slave. The proof of property, by other evidence than the oath of the claimant, was certainly demanding as little as our Southern friends in justice should have desired, when they asked the aid of official power of the Commonwealth to send from her jurisdiction and territory human beings invoking the protection and guardianship of her laws. The Supreme Court, however, decided, that the provisions of said law, imposing restraints upon the claimant's power to remove the alleged fugitive, were unconstitutional. If the restrictions imposed by the statute were intended to aid the escape, or to prevent the extradition of the fugitive, the accuracy of the decision can not be doubted, but if these guards were inserted as necessary to protect the liberty of the freeman, the decision was wrong, unless it was adjudged that the sole authority to claim as provided in the Constitution, and also authorized him to seize and remove the individual whom he alleged was his property, and to use for that purpose the official power of the State, without permitting to her the right to control and regulate the manner of the procedure or to determine the truth and justice of the alleged claim. It established the principle that a stranger to the soil of Pennsylvania, might enter upon it, and by possibility inflict the deepest injustice upon her sovereignty by the abduction of her citizens on false pretences: the supreme jurisdiction having so decided the question, our law-abiding citizens submitted, but with the determination, that in the spirit of that decision the officers of this Commonwealth should not be made the instruments, even by possibility, on such slight foundation as a claimant's interested demand, of enslaving free men. To prevent this great possible wrong, the act of 3d March, 1847, repealing all legislation on the subject, and forbidding the officers of the State to take any part in the recapture of such alleged fugitives, was enacted. The constitutional provision, and the act of Congress, our State has endeavored to carry into full effect. She has denied, and it is hoped, ever will deny, the power of Congress to impose the performance of duties upon her municipal and judicial officers, without her consent.

An act of Congress, providing a mode of procuring due proof of the correctness of the claim of the reputed owner of a fugitive from labor, and requiring satisfactory evidence from disinterested parties of the former condition of the person claimed, would receive the sanction of our citizens, and their co-operation in carrying it into effect. No enactment would satisfy the citizens of Pennsylvania, that failed to require strict proof of the right of the master. In this recital of her Legislative history, it is impossible to discover wherein this Commonwealth has been unfaithful to the National Constitution.

If the obligations imposed upon us by the Constitution, have been thus faithfully discharged; and if every page of our history, every volume of our laws, demonstrate, that our federal relations have been honestly regarded; it is not an act of injustice, on the part of Virginia and Georgia, to charge us with a wilful neglect and infraction of our duties to the National compact? Is it an aggression on our people,

in the exercise of the liberty of speech, to proclaim that slavery is an evil, and a wrong, and that at the adoption of the Constitution these principles were avowed and maintained? Is it a wrong in them to say that power is vested in Congress to prohibit the introduction of slavery into the Territories, and to abolish it in the District of Columbia? The federal Constitution denies to them no right to speak freely on these subjects. If it did, this Government never would have existed clothed with power so despotic and unjust.

Whether it is expedient to legislate upon the subject of the exclusion of slavery from the Territories, and of its abolition in the District of Columbia, at the present time by the National Congress, or to permit the people of the respective Territories, and the District of Columbia, to act for their own best interests and according to their own views of policy and right, is no part of our present duty to determine. These questions may well be left to the Representatives in Congress, under the instructions of the people, to decide as may seem most conducive to the welfare of all sections of our common country; but it is, nevertheless, right and proper, and a duty we owe to the people of Pennsylvania—to the memory of her early and patriotic statesmen—to the reputation of the public men of the past generation, and to those now entrusted with her destinies, to deny, in dignified and decided terms, the insinuations and charges made against her faith and integrity.

The allegation of infidelity to the National Union, is best answered by the history of her devotion and attachment to this palladium of our civil and religious freedom.

The alien and seditious laws of the national Congress, while they found no sympathy in the hearts of her citizens, but roused their deepest and dearest opposition, failed to provoke her people to enter into any arrangements for their resistance by force, even to the destruction of the Union. The extension of slavery over portions of the vast domains of the Louisiana purchase, although in direct opposition to her united and solemn protest, and calculated to outrage the feelings of her people, produced no threats of dissolution.

The prostration of her industrial pursuits, caused by the influence of the augmented slave representation in the national Congress by the admission of Texas, while it deeply wounded, could not destroy her confidence and love for the national compact.

The compromise of the revenue laws, made to win an erring sister to the duty of obedience to the Constitution and laws, by which wide-spread ruin swept over her borders, wrung from her citizens no denunciations of the federal Union.

The refusal on the part of certain Slaveholding States to deliver up, although required so to do by express provision of the Constitution, kidnappers, whose wrong-doing, and which wide-spread ruin swept over her borders, wrung from her citizens no denunciations of the federal Union.

All these acts, so injurious to her people, might have authorized deep and loud complaints, but her love for the Union rendered her silent, and induced the hopes that different and more friendly counsels would prevail. Her voice was heard only in kind remonstrance. No harsh complaints of a violated Constitution and invaded rights were uttered, to wound a brother's ear, and interrupt the social and kindred friendships of a united people. She remembered that we were a common people—that a common purpose, for the advancement of human rights, had produced our connection—that a common danger had united us in fraternal bonds—and that a common destiny awaited us. She reflected that the same soil had been red with the blood of a common ancestry, and that the same religion, laws, institutions, habits and pursuits, governed and guided and marked our common pathway. Relying on the justice and fraternal feelings of a common country, she believed that her rights and interests would be, in proper time, admitted, recognized and protected. The attachment of Pennsylvania to the Union during her entire career, has been as pure and ardent as it was in the first hours of its existence, and her faith in its stability and permanent preservation has never changed. She feels that the cement of the Union is the heart-blood of the entire people; and that in the hands of the masses the fabric of liberty is placed beyond the reach of its secret foes. She confidently believes, that to prevent its disruption and overthrow, in the common danger, would be found side by side, as of old, the sons of Virginia, Georgia, and Pennsylvania, patriotically and nobly striving, in a common purpose, to plant on a higher, safer, holier, and more stable basis the National banner, and united therewith, for ever and indestructible, the "Virtus, Liberty, and Independence," of Pennsylvania—the "Sic semper Tyrannia," of Virginia—and the "Wisdom, Justice, and Moderation" of Georgia.

In obedience to the constitutional duty, requiring me to transmit such information to the Legislature as may be deemed pertinent to the welfare of the people, I beg leave to submit these resolves of Virginia and Georgia, with this message; and to request the passage of such resolutions, to be forwarded to the Executive of Georgia

and Virginia, as may indicate the injustice done to this Commonwealth, in the declarations made by their Legislatures, while at the same time we offer assurances of our cordial respect for, and faithful support of, the National Constitution and Union; and of our sincere, and fraternal feelings towards their people as citizens of a common country. WM. F. JOHNSTON. Harrisburg, March 22, 1850.

and Virginia, as may indicate the injustice done to this Commonwealth, in the declarations made by their Legislatures, while at the same time we offer assurances of our cordial respect for, and faithful support of, the National Constitution and Union; and of our sincere, and fraternal feelings towards their people as citizens of a common country. WM. F. JOHNSTON. Harrisburg, March 22, 1850.

THE CHRONICLE.

H. G. HICKOK, Editor.  
O. H. WOODRICK, Publisher.  
At \$1.00 each in advance, \$1.25 in three months, \$1.50 within the year, and \$2.00 at the end of the year.  
Agents in Philadelphia—V. B. Palmer and E. W. Carr.

Lewisburg, Pa.

Wednesday Morning, March 27

As part of the history of the times, we lay before our readers the Message of Gov. Johnston on the complaints made by the States of Georgia and Virginia, against Pennsylvania, of encroachments upon the Federal Constitution and the rights of the South. Our Democratic readers may dissent from the drift of some portion of it, but as an important Executive document it is worthy an attentive perusal.

Letter from the Editor.

New BEXLEY, March 26.  
The Special Court called for the trial of the case of Hayes vs. Gudykunst, is in session. The trial of that cause will probably occupy the whole of this week.

The Democratic County Convention met yesterday, and appointed JAMES K. DAVIS, jr., of Selingsgrove, Representative Delegate to the Williamsport State Convention, with instructions to support EDWARD B. HURRY, of Schuylkill county, for Canal Commissioner. They also concurred in the appointment of Wm. P. Cooper, of Juniata county, (Editor of the Juniata Register,) as Senatorial delegate.

The Democratic County Meeting called in reference to the slavery agitation, and the tariff, assembled in the Court House this afternoon. I will send you the proceedings in extenso for publication, and therefore content myself now with a brief sketch of the sayings and doings upon this occasion.

Maj. C. H. Shriver first took the floor, and advocated, in bold and animated style, the orthodoxy of the Jeffersonian ordinance of '87, and the Resolutions of the Pittsburg Convention of July last—opposed the extension of slavery—commented in strong terms upon the extreme Southern tendencies of the meeting in the Chinese Museum, Philad., on the 22d February—and, in a warm and pointed manner, contrasted the present position of Mr. Casey on the Slavery question, with the professions he made in the campaign of 1848.

Isaac Slesker, Esq., followed with a statement of the origin of the Baltimore platform in 1840, and its subsequent history, and proved by a clear and conclusive argument that the Baltimore resolution on Slavery did not, and could not from its phrasing, fully meet the exigencies of the times, and the issues which have since been raised upon this subject, and he tho't a democratic National Convention if one were now assembled would not adopt it without essential modification. He tho't the resolution of the Pittsburg Convention in July last, embodied sound and reliable principles very happily expressed—that it had carried the party safely through a triumphant victory at the late election, and said that he would stand firmly by the future platforms of the democratic party when established by its authorized delegates in State and National Conventions, yet until other and better standards of political faith were thus laid down, he would adhere to the doctrines of the Pittsburg convention as right in principle, and an authorized exposition of the sentiments of the democracy of Pennsylvania. He next referred to the extradition of fugitive slaves, and said that under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, he thought the Pa. act of 1847 was right, and that slave owners could properly invoke only the aid of the U. S. Courts and the assistance of the U. S. Marshals and their deputies to recapture fugitives from service—but he was of opinion that laws imposing severe penalties should be passed by Congress, and enforced, to punish all persons who interfere with the proper officers or their assistants in the recapture of runaways. He also said that Mr. Casey had abandoned the ground he stood on in '48, and had come over a great ways onto the democratic platform, in opposition to which he had been elected.

Edw. John Snyder made a few remarks denying the power of Congress over Slavery in the territories, and vindicating Mr. Calhoun.

H. C. Hickok replied briefly, dissenting from the novel doctrines on the Slavery question broached lately by Mr. Calhoun, and sanctioned in whole or in part by other Southern gentlemen, and endorsed by some small portion of the North.

R. B. Barber Esq. denounced in severe terms the abolitionists of New York and New England and their condottieri in Philadelphia who were petitioning for a dissolution of the Union.

All the speakers advocated an unyielding adherence to the compromises of the Constitution, and urged the immediate admission of California into the Union.

Ms. SLIFER—This gentleman, the talented and amiable Representative from Union county, who has been detained by sickness from the House for nearly two weeks, was happy to see again at his seat, and we understood in a conversation with him, that he has pretty much recovered from his illness, though the effect was pretty plainly visible in his countenance. His constituents will be glad to learn, as were we, that he has recovered, and is again at his post as faithful and able sentinel.—Harrisburg Telegraph, March 25, 1850.

Ms. SLIFER—This gentleman, the talented and amiable Representative from Union county, who has been detained by sickness from the House for nearly two weeks, was happy to see again at his seat, and we understood in a conversation with him, that he has pretty much recovered from his illness, though the effect was pretty plainly visible in his countenance. His constituents will be glad to learn, as were we, that he has recovered, and is again at his post as faithful and able sentinel.—Harrisburg Telegraph, March 25, 1850.

Ms. SLIFER—This gentleman, the talented and amiable Representative from Union county, who has been detained by sickness from the House for nearly two weeks, was happy to see again at his seat, and we understood in a conversation with him, that he has pretty much recovered from his illness, though the effect was pretty plainly visible in his countenance. His constituents will be glad to learn, as were we, that he has recovered, and is again at his post as faithful and able sentinel.—Harrisburg Telegraph, March 25, 1850.

Ms. SLIFER—This gentleman, the talented and amiable Representative from Union county, who has been detained by sickness from the House for nearly two weeks, was happy to see again at his seat, and we understood in a conversation with him, that he has pretty much recovered from his illness, though the effect was pretty plainly visible in his countenance. His constituents will be glad to learn, as were we, that he has recovered, and is again at his post as faithful and able sentinel.—Harrisburg Telegraph, March 25, 1850.

Ms. SLIFER—This gentleman, the talented and amiable Representative from Union county, who has been detained by sickness from the House for nearly two weeks, was happy to see again at his seat, and we understood in a conversation with him, that he has pretty much recovered from his illness, though the effect was pretty plainly visible in his countenance. His constituents will be glad to learn, as were we, that he has recovered, and is again at his post as faithful and able sentinel.—Harrisburg Telegraph, March 25, 1850.

Ms. SLIFER—This gentleman, the talented and amiable Representative from Union county, who has been detained by sickness from the House for nearly two weeks, was happy to see again at his seat, and we understood in a conversation with him, that he has pretty much recovered from his illness, though the effect was pretty plainly visible in his countenance. His constituents will be glad to learn, as were we, that he has recovered, and is again at his post as faithful and able sentinel.—Harrisburg Telegraph, March 25, 1850.

Ms. SLIFER—This gentleman, the talented and amiable Representative from Union county, who has been detained by sickness from the House for nearly two weeks, was happy to see again at his seat, and we understood in a conversation with him, that he has pretty much recovered from his illness, though the effect was pretty plainly visible in his countenance. His constituents will be glad to learn, as were we, that he has recovered, and is again at his post as faithful and able sentinel.—Harrisburg Telegraph, March 25, 1850.