CHRONICLE.

"SALUS POPULI SUPREMA EST LEX."

DAVID P. HOGE--EDITOR.

Cambridge, Md.

SATURDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 1, 1836.

WHIG NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON,
Of Ohio.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
JOHN TYLER, *of Virginia.*

ELECTORS.

For the Western Shore.—WM. PRICE.
For the Eastern Shore.—THOMAS BURCHENAL.
1st *District.*—JOHN S. PURNELL.
2d " JAMES B. RICAUD.
3d " ELIAS BROWN.
4th " GEORGE HOWARD, DAVID HOFFMAN.
5th " ANTHONY KIMMELL.
6th " JAMES M. COALE.
7th " ROBERT W. BOWIE.

FOR SHERIFF OF DORCHESTER COUNTY.
JAMES A. WADDELL.

DELEGATES.
THOMAS I. H. ECCLESTON,
THOMAS H. HICKS,
BENJAMIN G. KEENE,
WILLIAM FRAZIER.

The nineteen Van Buren Electors.

The course pursued by the nineteen Van Buren men who were deputed, under the Constitution, to elect, in conjunction with their colleagues, a Senate for Maryland, seems to meet with general reprobation. It is, in our opinion, altogether indefensible by any considerations of reason, moral obligation, or political duty. Their folly and recklessness are only equalled by their wicked and traitorous abandonment of acknowledged engagements, voluntarily entered into with those whose sovereign will clothed them with a sacred trust. Even upon the supposition that every principle contended for by the recusant members of the Electoral College, is in theory right, and in practice may be beneficial and salutary, still their conduct rests upon not even a plausible or specious ground of justification. It stands alone, without a precedent or a parallel in history. We do not, however, regard the Electors themselves as the immediate authors and advisers of a scheme fraught with so much *intended* mischief, and designed to bring the State to the verge of a fearful precipice.—They have been the culpable instruments in the hands of characters behind the curtain, whose magic power has been seen recently at work elsewhere, devising projects of destruction scarcely less reprehensible. But to the people of Maryland, these Electors (who have shamefully betrayed their trust) are responsible for the violation of their solemn pledge, and for the consequences which may grow out of their failure to discharge their duty. Under the pretext of necessity for reform in the Constitution, or the substitution of another form of government for that which wiser and better men than they established, the way is to be opened by violence for the advancement of themselves and their supporters to power. This is their true object—this the mainspring of their patriotism—and this the very essence of their vaunted republican principles, that are to be engrafted in the new Constitution, which the people of Maryland are *ordered* by a few designing men, to proceed forthwith to ordain and establish. And what is the reformation demanded—what the sore and oppressive grievances complained of? The Constitution (say they) is unjust, because "representation in the Electoral College and in the House of Delegates is not based upon population, nor territory, nor a mixture of both." This is the grievance; and the remedy sought to be applied, is such an apportionment of political power as will give to a very small portion of territory the absolute dominion of the State. Baltimore alone, if the principles of these would-be reformers are carried out, will in a few years give the law, and exercise supreme control over all the interests and all the rights of personal liberty and private property within the limits of the commonwealth. The representation is *now* settled upon a basis which is (for Maryland) the only just and equitable foundation on which it could be fixed—upon a principle which affords equal protection to *all* the interests in every part of the community, whatever may be their class or description. Why then this clamor for a change? Why this manifestation of a spirit to live no longer under ancient and established forms? Is any interest endangered—is any right assailed—are any laws affecting the rights of persons or of property, unequal or oppressive? Has the government failed to answer the purposes for which it was created? If it has not, why these revolutionary movements?—The nineteen Van Buren Electors admit, in their manifesto, that had they qualified in the Electoral College, and joined in electing a Senate, those whom they represented would not have been without redress for their supposed grievances. Why then did they not unite with the Whig Electors and choose a Senate? This certainly would have been better, than to send the vessel of state adrift on the boisterous ocean of anarchy and revolution; in which they, no doubt, *hope* to have succeeded. In fact, no reason, excuse, or pretext can be set up for the conduct of the minority of the Electoral College, since their own justification, in effect, admits "that the ends of government have not been perverted," and that public liberty is not in jeopardy. The truth is, they knew full well, that there exists no defect in the Constitution which could not be remedied according to the prescribed method; but they were also equally well convinced that such changes as *they* ask, could only be brought about by subverting the government. Knowing this, and conscious too that revolution (as it is commonly understood to imply force) would not be justified by the wise, the prudent and the virtuous of any party, who feel an interest in the continuance of peace and order, they have laid violent hands on the Constitution, in what they have the effrontery to call a *peaceable* manner. But how is it peaceable? It is true, no blood has been shed; but the act is not on that account less violent, and against the peace and good order of society. We should have an eye to the consequences *intended to be produced* by this glaring dereliction of duty, in determining the character of the act. To gratify a voracious appetite for power, the Van Buren Electors and their supporters have shown a disposition to overturn the pillars of social happiness, to give up the order of civil government for chaos and confusion, and sacrifice all that is dear and sacred at the polluted shrine of an unholy ambition. We trust and *believe* they will be disappointed.

Mr. Van Buren and Negro Suffrage.

The advocates of Mr. Van Buren, unable to devise an excuse for the vote which he gave in reference to a highly important subject, (the extension of the right of suffrage) agitated in the New York Convention, are driven in their desperation to the miserable subterfuge of diverting the attention of the public to *other* votes which their candidate gave in the same body, in relation to the same question—thus endeavoring to evade the true charge preferred against him.—Some indeed have been bold enough flatly to contradict the statements which have been made by the Whigs about this matter; but we have heard, that the loss of a small portion of their *change*, in consequence of their being so imprudent as to bet, has brought them to their senses, and taught them the propriety of abstaining in future from a hasty denial of the truth. The charge against Mr. Van Buren is simply this—that when a member of the New York Convention of 1821, called to revise and amend the Constitution of that State, he gave a vote upon a proposition submitted to that assembly, the necessary effect of which was, to place the free negro upon an equality with the white man, so far as the right of suffrage is concerned. This is the accusation, as plainly and as clearly stated as our command of language will admit of. It is admitted by our opponents, that a proposition *was* made in the Convention to extend the right of suffrage to all free white citizens of a certain specified age; and that a motion was thereupon made, to strike out the word "*white*." Now what would be the effect of striking out this word? Unquestionably to admit *all* free citizens, whether white or black, to the exercise of that high and inestimable privilege, which in this country, surely, ought to be held and prized as the sole prerogative of the white man. Mr. Van Buren voted in favor of the proposition to strike out; and upon this statement of *facts*, it is submitted to every man of plain understanding, whether he was or was not favorable to the adoption of a clause in the Constitution of New York, which would have placed *all* free negroes, untrammelled by any qualification whatever, on a footing of equality with the white suffragans of the State.

We might here remark, by way of strengthening the inference which every man of intelligence must necessarily deduce from the vote itself, that the name of Martin Van Buren stands recorded among the names of other distinguished personages, who *were* then, and are perhaps now, the avowed advocates of equality.

But this is not all—What was the situation of the right of suffrage previous to the time, at which the New York Convention assembled? By whom, and under what restrictions and limitations, was it exercised? Our adversaries assert that there was a property test; and that the right in question was possessed and exercised, both by whites and blacks, who were worth the amount designated as the necessary qualification. Be it so.—The white and black *voters* in New York were therefore on an equality. Has that equality been removed, or does it appear that Mr. Van Buren made the slightest effort to have it removed? Far from it.—The only change effected in regard to this matter, appears in the removal of the restrictive freehold qualification from whites, to which Mr. Van Buren was *opposed*, if we may judge from his votes, *except* upon the condition that the free negroes could be placed upon equal footing. In this however the Convention did not see proper to gratify him. As to the blacks, therefore, a freehold qualification was retained, and still continues, and consequently a portion of them *now* exercise the right of suffrage *together* with the whites, although Mr. Van Buren might, by his vote, his power, or his influence, have probably entirely excluded that class of persons from the exercise of this invaluable right, which should only be vested in the independent *free white citizen*. If Mr. Van Buren was not in favor of establishing an equality of right between whites and blacks, why did he vote for extending the right of suffrage to *all free persons*—a form of expression which every one of even the most superficial understanding must at once perceive, includes men of all colours? We therefore reiterate the charge, that Martin Van Buren *did* make the vote to which we have alluded. What may have influenced him so to do, we know not; but the journals of the Convention will exhibit the vote, and it requires no extraordinary acumen to discover what would have been its necessary effect.

Gen. Harrison's Letters.

We give publicity to day to a letter of Gen. Harrison, written in 1821, which constitutes a masterly refutation of the vile and slanderous imputations that have been cast upon his conduct while a member of the Ohio Legislature. Who has not seen (in bold relief) both in those public journals which have prostituted themselves to the base purpose of being the mere vehicles of falsehood and defamation, and in printed handbills, fresh from the laboratories of slander—who has not seen, we say, the reckless assertion, that this patriot and philanthropist—this friend of equal rights—this fearless advocate and defender of liberty—gave his voice to degrade the freeman to the condition of a slave? An extract from a law, or a supplement to a law, proposed in the Legislature of Ohio, having reference entirely to persons convicted of crimes, has been laid before the people; and they have been told in the very face of truth that the law authorized a debtor to be sold by a ruthless creditor. A slight attention to the phraseology of the section which has been published, will convince every one, (except those who are determined to be blind,) that the law alluded to, related to criminals convicted, and sentenced *to fine and imprisonment*. Even *these*, (criminals as they were,) the law did not, or would not, have ordained to be sold to abject servitude or slavery; it allowed them the privilege of coming forth from the damps and darkness of a dungeon to the free use of light and air, in order that by their labor as honest men, they might pay the pecuniary penalty which their previous villany had incurred. This was the law; and the object of it, as well as the humane and praise worthy feeling which induced Gen. Harrison to vote for it, may be seen from a perusal of the letter to which we have referred. We invite the attention of the people to this letter, and to another of a more recent date which we also spread before them. In connection with this subject, we think it our duty to inform the public, that in the publications which have been made in this county of the section referred to, the words "*for the non-payment of a fine or costs*" have been omitted; for what purpose this has been done we cannot perceive, unless it was intended to produce the impression that the law related to cases of imprisonment upon execution for the non payment of a debt, and not, as was really the truth, for non payment of a fine, imposed for criminal conduct. Has this suppression of the truth been intentionally perpetrated? Why were the words above quoted kept out of the extract, and then slipped in at the last publication of it, as if by stealth? Such conduct as this cannot be called a *pious fraud;* it is a wilful and culpable concealment, or it is a piece of the grossest negligence—we are inclined to think the former.

Advice.

We are always inclined to give ear to friendly advice or wholesome admonition; but the unasked advice of an adversary we are apt to regard as intended for no good. In reference, therefore, to what has come from a particular quarter, as gratuitous counsel, we might, with the true spirit of the cautious Trojan, say to the adviser—"*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*"

We give below the resolutions passed at a great meeting held in Baltimore, of citizens opposed to the late proceedings of the Van Buren Electors. Mr. McMahon presided and addressed the Assembly, with all the force and fervor of his commanding eloquence. He was followed and supported by David Stewart, Esq., who moved the adoption of the address and resolutions offered by Mr. McMahon. They were accordingly unanimously adopted, and are as follows:

Resolved, by us Citizens of Baltimore in Town Meeting assembled, that the nineteen electors of the senate, in their refusal to elect that body, in our judgments, have disobeyed the express command of our Constitution; have disregarded a high public trust involving the very continuance of Government and the security of our persons and property; have committed a high misdemeanor by their wilful abandonment of a high public duty to the discharge of which they stood pledged by their acceptance of it, and merit the sewerest reprobation of the people of Maryland and of the friends of liberty, order and good governmet throughout the Union.

Resolved further. That in their attempt to overthrow the Government of this State and to introduce anarchy and Revolution in its stead, the said nineteen electors have warred against the peace, order and happiness of society; have sacrificed the best interests of the people of Maryland; have endangered the present prosperity, and blighted for a time all the fair prospects of this city; and that in so doing, they have given us just cause to doubt their claim to the title of *Reformers*.

Resolved further, That in their proclamation of Revolution, and in their attempt to dictate to the people of this State the manner in which they shall form a new government to escape the consequences of anarchy, the said nineteen electors have usurped the sovereignty of the people of Maryland, and put in jeopardy the vital principle of all republican institutions.

Resolved further. That in the attempt by the disregard of a high public duty to prostrate the government, laws and institutions of this state for the accomplishment of *mere Party ends*, the said Nineteen Electors have lost all claim to the support of the virtuous and patriotic of all parties, who abhor the use of wrong means to accomplish any end, and who hold the welfare of their country and the permanent prosperity and happiness of their state and city above the mere expedients of party.

Resolved further, That the Twenty one Electors of the Senate who have qualified for the discharge of the duty, and who are still continuing their sessions at Annapolis from day to day, for their endeavors to preserve to us the inestimable blessings of Peace, Order and Government, are entitled to the confidence and affections of the people of Maryland; and that it is the most earnest wish and request of this meeting, that the said Electors will there remain prepared to discharge their duty of electing a Senate, until the People of Maryland shall have had time, by the power and majesty of public opinion, to quell revolution, and to return their Agents to the post of duty.

Resoved further, That the said 21 Electors, in refusing to receive propositions coming from individuals who would not assume the office under color of which they professed to act, and propositions too involving a degrading surrender of their duty, and asking nothing less than the commission of deliberate perjury in the surrender of their own right of choice, have acted the part of honorable men and faithful public servants.

Resolved, further, That we are for Reform and against Revolution.

Resolved, further, That to make manifest to the people of the State, and to our fellow citizens throughout the nation, that Baltimore prefers peace, order, good government, stable institutions, and inviolate public and private credit, to faction and revolution, this meeting will proceed forthwith to nominate two suitable individuals as candidates for the offices of Delegates from this city to the next General Assembly of Maryland; and that for that purpose the President of this meeting be requested to nominate forthwith a committee of twelve to select and report to this meeting for their approbation, two suitable individuals for those offices.

Resolved, further, That from this period until the first Monday of October next, we will devote our time and energies in the endeavor to make manifest, by the success of our candidates, "THAT BALTIMORE IS AGAINST REVOLUTION;" and that that day we will set apart as a day sacred to the cause of peace, order, and the preservation of our institutions, persons and property, and on that day, closing our shops, our stores and our offices, and abandoning all other avocations, we will devote ourselves to the endeavor to secure the success of the candidates whom this meeting may select.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Editor:—The following is an extract from the 19th section of a bill said to have been before the Ohio Legislature, as published on the 19th day of September, in a print conducted in the county of Dorchester, called the Dorchester Aurora:—"Be it further enacted, That whenever any person shall be imprisoned, either upon execution or otherwise, it shall be lawful," &c. In the same paper, under date of the 26th of September, the words "for the non payment of a fine or costs" are added, after the word "otherwise," making a very material alteration in the meaning of the first part of said section. Why were these words not in the publications of a date prior to the 26th September? Will the people countenance such a barefaced attempt to deceive them? Q.

Mr. Editor,—In the last Cambridge Chronicle we charged against Mr. Van Buren, among other things, that "He voted in the New York Convention, for giving negroes the right of suffrage, and for placing them *on an equal footing with white men*."—That "he advocated, in the same Convention, the aristocratic measure of preventing any persons from voting for members of the Legislature, who were not worth at least $250."

The editor of the "Aurora" offers "a bet of $10 or $20 on each charge," that the writer "cannot establish either." The bet on the first charge is accepted, whether by the subscriber or not is unimportant. My object in writing now is to disabuse the public, and mete justice to Mr. Van Buren. The last charge is not literally just—I spoke from memory only, having no means of referring to the journal of proceedings.

COMMON SENSE.

TO THE VOTERS OF DORCHESTER COUNTY.

A bold and daring attempt has been made, by the agents of the people of Maryland, to precipitate you, your wives and children and property, in the horrors of a revolution—to sever the ligaments of government, and leave you and your property at the will of lawless depredators and infuriated partizans. We shall see by the result of the *next election*, whether a desperate party, under the guidance of the "Kitchen Cabinet," shall be allowed to plunder their fellow citizens of their political rights, and of the property earned by honest industry, by such *nefarious* means. What did these deluded nineteen Electors *attempt* to accomplish, and in what attempt do a part of the Van Buren party try to sustain them? To use the most gentle words, they attempted to *coerce* the people of Maryland to have a Convention. Had their ability been equal to their depravity, what would have been our condition? The government could not have been reorganized without a *convention*. In the *mean time* what is our condition? By the admission of these "illustrious" nineteen Electors a *provisional* government would be necessary to "extend the authority of all civil and military officers." They admit that the *authority* of the officers would cease, and of course the laws too would cease to have any efficacy. They could not be enforced without the *ministers* of the law. But we have still higher authority than these infatuated nineteen Electors. On the 7th of July, 1836, Mr. G. M. Dallas, a talented and very distinguished member of the Van Buren party (see National Intelligencer, Sept. 17th, 1836,) tells you what are the powers of a Convention. He says:

"It may re-organize our entire system of social existence, exterminating and proscribing what is deemed injurious, and establishing what is preferred; it might restore the institution of slavery among us; it might make our penal code as bloody as that of Draco; it might *withdraw the charters of our cities;* it might supersede a standing *Judiciary by a scheme of occasional arbitration*, and umpirage; it might prohibit *particular professions or trades;* might permanently suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, and take from us" "the trial by jury."

Such are the powers of a Convention, as stated by one of the most able and distinguished members of the Van Buren party, and as recognized by the destructives at Annapolis. The charter of cities is a *vested right*, Mr. Dallas admits. The right of real estate and of personal estate are only *vested rights*, and in their judgment they might too be annulled by a Convention.—Fellow citizens, contemplate the *tremendous* powers of a *Convention*. Consider the dangers and perils you incur by the fatuity of these deluded nineteen Electors. And why is all this peril incurred? To promote a *party*, the very remembrance of which will soon pass away. The people of all parties should rise in their majesty, and by their votes declare them traitors to the Constitution, and false to the best interests of every party.

What is the attitude of the Electors before the people? On the first Monday in September, inst., under the provisions of the 14th article of our Constitution, an election was held for Electors, and their powers and obligations, when elected, are declared by the 15th, 16th, and 17th articles. The duties and obligations growing out of the 15th article, are the only ones to which we invite your attention. That article declares, "that the said Electors of the Senate *shall* meet at the city of Annapolis on the third Monday of September, 1781, and on the same day in every fifth year forever thereafter, and then they, or any twenty-four of them, so met, *shall* proceed to elect, by ballot, either out of their own body, or the people at large, 15 Senators, nine of whom to be residents of the Western, and six to be residents of the Eastern Shore, men of the most wisdom and experience, above twenty-five years of age, and residents of the State above three whole years next preceding the election." Agreeably to the Constitution 40 Electors were elected for the sole and specific purpose of discharging the aforesaid duties.

Nineteen of these Electors (every one a Van Buren man) refused to discharge the trust, "unless the 21 Anti Van Buren Electors would give them not only a *reform* Senate, but a reform Senate a majority of which shall be *Van Buren* Senators." The 21 Anti Van Buren Electors refused to accede to the *terms* prescribed by the *minority*, and for *that cause* the *Van Buren* Electors have plunged you, your wives, daughters, sisters, and your property, so far as they had *power*, and as they believe, in the vortex of a revolution. Every man knows that the above is a true statement of the case, as made by the Van Buren party themselves.

Some of the Van Buren party, we are proud to say, do not attempt to *justify* the nineteen Electors; others try only to *palliate* their offence, and to *divide* the censure.

Fellow citizens, you have reached an awful crisis. One party or the other, by misconduct and moral treason, has placed you, and your families, and your fortunes, at the mercy of lawless depradators, if the Van Buren Electors' views be carried out.—Condemn the *guilty*. *Which* is the guilty party?

It cannot be denied that the Whig Electors have ever shown a willingness to discharge their *constitutional* duty—the duty which they were elected to perform. They are now in Annapolis, indulging the hope that these deluded Electors will free themselves from party trammels, and discharge their trust with fidelity to the people.

For what were the Van Buren Electors elected? To discharge a constitutional duty, prescribed by the 15th article of the Constitution. Can it be said that they have shown a willingness to discharge these duties. 'Tis notorious that they have *refused*, unless they could accomplish *another* end *not* contemplated by the Constitution, either in its letter or spirit. They have refused to make the Senate, unless upon terms as *prescribed by themselves*. Should the Whig Electors have *gratified* these terms?

1st. Did the *Constitution*, which is the will of the people as deliberately expressed, require the *Whig* Electors to accede to the *prescribed* terms. By the Constitution, a majority of the whole number of Electors *voting* for the Senate shall elect the Senate. The Van Buren Electors, by their acts, insist that the Constitution is all wrong, and that a *minority* of the Electors, and *not a majority*, should elect the Senate. Which is the *guilty* party, those who revolutionize your government by obeying a rule prescribed by yourselves, or those who act in *violation* of that rule. The case needs no commentary.

2d. But admit that the Whigs were under no *constitutional* obligation to accede to the "bargain" of the Van Buren Electors, and that the latter were bound to go into the elections, still if *they* prove recreant to *their* trust, should not the Whigs have closed in with the *terms*, to save the people from the awful calamities of a revolution stained perhaps with the blood of thousands?

The answer is obvious. They had no such discretion. The duty imposed on the Electors will be seen by reference to the 15th article, already noticed. They were obliged by an oath to vote "for men of the most wisdom and experience," according to each Elector's own judgment, and not according to the judgment of others. Again, the Constitution allows and guarantees to the Eastern Shore six Senators. For what purpose? To protect the peculiar interests of the Shore. Could they, then, with *propriety* pledge themselves to vote for *reform* Senators, without knowing the *extent* of reform contemplated? without knowing how far the reform might *injuriously* affect the Eastern Shore and other parts of the State? Recollect, Electors are *special* agents, who derive all their authority from the Constitution, and were bound to make a Senate according to the Constitution. Every *reform* must make a *change*, but not always an *improvement*. And the Whig Electors had nothing to hope from the virtue and patriotism of those who threatened to place you and all that you hold most dear at the mercy of every invader, for the prospect, the chance of benefitting a *party*.

3d. Admit, for the sake of argument, that the Whig Electors could, without being recreant to their trust, have made the "bargain" offered—what then? Are you to be told, that a minority, when they shall fail to make a political "bargain" which the majority of Electors were at liberty to grant or refuse—that the *minority*, in their lust of office and emoluments, have a right to break all the ligaments of government in the unhallowed exercise of a trust which was given them to *sustain* it? The proposition is monstrous in a republican government.

These "illustrious" nineteen believed that their refusal to make a Senate effected an entire dissolution of the government in all its departments, and *therefore* advised a selection of a provisional government, "clothed with full power to *extend* the authority of all civil officers now in commission until a convention," &c. From their *own* showing, they were willing to do, and *they believed* they had done, an act which deprives us of all law and government; otherwise, why "extend the authority" of the officers till the convention? And what, then, were the frightful *powers* of the convention? See its powers, as given by Mr. Dallas, who advocates a convention in another State, in the extract of the letters as already given you. That such are the *powers* of a convention we have no doubt; their *exercise* is another question, and which we trust we shall never witness in this State. We do not wish to create unnecessary alarm. In our opinion, these deluded partisans, who love their *party* better than the people, cannot succeed in their nefarious attempts. We believe that there is a conservative principle in the *government*; but we fear the *example*. Though *this* attempt is impotent, in our opinion, yet if the people will bear *this*, the *next* attempt may be more successful, and plunge us into a bloody revolution, and some successful Jacobin may become the dispenser of your fortunes, honors and expectations. Tell me not that the General Government will guarantee to us a republican government. If not checked, the same feeling will control that too. Remember, all revolutions are progressive. The first attempt has seldom succeeded. We do hope the people of all parties, for the common good, will place in the lowest grade of disgraceful Jacobinism the principals and subalterns in this conspiracy against the interests and rights of every class in society.

The destructives can find no protection in the fact, that whenever the machinery of government fails to answer the ends proposed, it is the right of the people to demolish *that* government, and to establish *another*.—We admit that when the people *feel oppression*, and have tried every *constitutional* means of redress without effect, and the oppressions are too intolerable to be borne, *revolution* is their right. If you please that the people have a right to annul a government for every *sufficient* cause, and that they are to decide on the *sufficiency* of that cause—the question now is not, what is a *sufficient* cause of revolution, nor is it, what is the right of the *people* to destroy a government. The time and occasion will not allow the discussion of the above proposition. We may present them to your consideration hereafter. At present our business is with the Van Buren Electors.

The question is, what were the rights and obligations of the *Electors*? These Electors, as such are special agents, and have no power beyond that which is delegated to them by the people. What was the authority delegated to them? Was it to do, or to forbear to do, an act, which, in their judgment, revolutionized the government? No—They were clothed with a trust of an opposite character. They were the people's agents to make a Senate according to the Constitution. The Electors so understood it at the time of the canvass and election, and so did the people. It was an unwarrantable exercise of power to revolutionize a government to further the views of a party, however anxious some of its members may be for office and the "spoils of victory." We cannot persuade ourselves that the better portion of any *party* can be so regardless of the public weal, as to prostrate by one blow, a government, for the *chance* of promoting a *party*.—If the Van Buren party have no higher motive than the maintenance of their *party*,—they should disclaim the revolutionary acts of the "illustrious" nineteen, in their unavailing efforts to demolish the government. We say "unavailing;" but perhaps we are mistaken; it may be worse than we imagine—the *government* possibly may not have a conservative principle; and in the adjustment of conflicting interests, we may perhaps soon be in the midst of blood and carnage, flowing from an intestine war; and on one side or the other, may be arrayed a class of unfortunate people, who have, in times of political quiet, excited our fearful apprehensions. This reflection must strike deep into the hearts of the people; but prudence forbids us to press its appalling consequences.

JEFFERSON.

Gen. Harrison's Letters.

To the Editor of the Advertiser:

SIR:—In your paper of the 15th inst. I observed a most violent attack upon eleven other members of the late Senate and myself, for a *supposed vote* given at the last session, for the passage of a law to "*sell debtors in certain cases*." If such had been our conduct, I acknowledge that we should not only deserve the censure which the writer has bestowed on us, but the execration of every honest man in society. An act of that kind is not only opposed to the principles of justice and humanity, but would be a palpable violation of the constitution of the state, which every legislator is sworn to support; and sanctioned by a House of Representatives and 20 Senators, it would indicate a state of depravity which would fill every patriotic bosom with the most alarming anticipations. But the fact is, that no such proposition was ever made in the Legislature, or even thought of. The act to which the writer alludes has no more relation to the recovery of "debts" than it has to the discovery of longitude. It was an act for the "punishment of offences against the state; and that part of it which has so deeply wounded the feelings of your correspondent, was passed by the House of Representatives, and voted for by the 12 Senators under the impression that it was the most mild and humane mode of dealing with the offenders for whose cases it was intended. It was adopted by the House of Representatives as a part of the general system of criminal law, which was then undergoing a complete revision and amendment; the necessity of this is evinced by the following facts. For several years past, it had become apparent that the Penitentiary system was becoming more and more burdensome at every session; a large appropriation was called for to meet the excess of expenditure above the receipts of the establishment. In the commencement of the session of 1820, the deficit amounted to near $20,000.

This growing evil required the immediate interposition of some vigorous Legislative measure; two were recommended as being likely to produce the effect; first, placing the institution under better management, and secondly, lessening the number of convicts who were sentenced for short periods, and whose labor was found of course to be most unproductive. In pursuance of the latter principle, thefts to the amount of $50, or upwards, were subjected to punishment in the Penitentiary, instead of $10, which was the former minimum sum—this was easily done. But the great difficulty remained to determine what should be the punishment of those numerous larcenies below the sum of $50!—By some, whipping was proposed, by others, punishment by *hard labor* in the county jails, and by others it was thought best to make them work on the highways. To all these there appeared insuperable objections; fine and imprisonment was adopted by the House of Representatives as the only alternative, and as it is well known these vexatious pilferings were generally perpetrated by the more worthless vagabonds in society, it was added that when they could not pay the *fine and costs*, which are always part of the sentence and punishment, that their services should be sold out to any person who would pay their fine and costs for them. This was the clause which was passed, as I believe, by a unanimous vote of the House, and stricken out in the Senate, in opposition to the vote of the twelve who have been denounced. A little further trouble in examining the journals would have shown your correspondent that this was considered as a substitute for whipping, which was lost only by a single vote in the Senate, and in the House by a small majority, after being once passed.

I think, Mr. Editor, I have said enough to show that this obnoxious law would not have applied to unfortunate "debtors of 64 years," but to *infamous offenders*, who depredate upon the property of their fellow citizens, and who by the constitution of the State, as well as the principle of existing laws, were subject to *involuntary* servitude. I must confess I had no very sanguine expectations of beneficial effect from this measure, as it would apply to convicts who had obtained the age of maturity. But I had supposed that a woman or a youth who was convicted of an offence, and remained in jail for the payment of the fine and costs imposed, might with great advantage be transferred to the residence of some decent, virtuous private family, whose precept and example would gently lead them back to the paths of rectitude. I would appeal to the candor of your correspondent to say whether if there were an individual confined under the circumstances I have mentioned; for whose fate he was interested, he would not gladly see him transferred from the filthy inclosure of a jail, and the still more filthy inhabitants, to the comfortable mansion of some virtuous citizen, whose admonitions would check his vicious propensities, and whose authority over him would be no more than is exercised over thousands of apprentices in our country; and those bound servants which are tolerated in our, as well as every other State in the Union. Far from advocating the abominable principles attributed to me by your correspondent, I think that imprisonment for debt, under any circumstances, but that where fraud is alleged, is at war with the best principles of our constitution, and ought to be abolished.

I am, Sir, your humble servant,
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

North-Bend, 22d Dec. 1821.

RICHMOND, Sept. 15, 1836.

Dear Sir,—I acknowledge the receipt of your favor of this date. I have before heard of the accusation to which it refers. On my way hither, I met with a young gentleman of Maryland, who informed me, that a vote of mine in the Senate of Ohio had been published, in favor of a law to sell persons under a judgment for debt for a term of years, if unable otherwise to discharge the execution. I did not for a moment hesitate to declare that I had never given any such vote, and that if a vote of that description had been published and ascribed to me, it was an infamous forgery. Such an act would have been repugnant to my feelings, and in direct conflict with my opinions, pub-