P. Sengstack, *Secretary* was published at the office of the "*Spectator*," in this city. I have reason to believe that this paper was prepared by the Hon. Robert J. Walker; certainly he carried large numbers of it in and superintended the inveloping of them with a watchful eye to prevent the escape of a single copy; and, after the folding was completed had the whole, by his direction, sent to his boarding-house. Having received several copies of this document, and understanding that Mr. Walker intended to circulate it only in the South, and to prevent, if possible, its appearance in the North, I thought this surreptitious and partial circulation of it would be a fraud upon the American People. I, therefore, sent to the office of the "*Spectator*" (where it was printed) to purchase a thousand copies, which I intended to send into the free States. The person applying was first told that he should have them, but on the second application; upon the faith of this promise, he was informed he should not have them and the copy which he took with him, to show what he wanted, was withheld from him against his consent, and he was further informed that the document was not intended to be circulated here. I then carried one of the copies which had been published at the "Spectator" office to the office of the Intelligencer, and had an exact reprint of it struck off which I am now circulating, & intend to circulate, throughout this wide republic. It is this reprint of a genuine Democratic document, put forth, under the direction of Mr. Senator Walker himself—who has according to his own letter to a committee of the Democracy of Tennessee, duties assigned him at Washington by the Democratic party which forbid his absence, (see Globe of August 26th, 1844,—and which reprint is faithful in every particular, that this card pronounces to be a "Base Whig Forgery."

I challenge Mr. Senator Walker, or any other person, to prove or to say that the reprint which I have caused to be made is not an exact and faithful copy of their own document. Forger, forsooth! Any newspaper in the country would have had the right to republish this paper without note or comment and would that have been a forgery? Every day newspapers republish from others such articles as they deem proper and is this a forgery? All that custom or morals require is, that the reprint shall be correct. The documents of the Whig committee give the truth; they are not intended to be read only by a portion of the people, or by one section of the Union to the exclusion of another section & thereby produce a false impression. They are addressed to the whole People of the United States, without regard to sections or parties. I will and so will the whole Whig party, not only concede this right, but will be much obliged to the "Democratic Association of Washington," or Mr. Senator Walker, the specially *assigned* sentinel at Washington of the Whole or at least the South-ern division of the Democratic party to reprint them, and thank them to do so, and place a copy of each in the hands of every voter in the United States. Is it not a curious fact that this Association should assail the Whig Congressional Committee, and charge it with "base forgery," for aiding it to circulate its documents in a genuine exact form?

But this transaction is characteristic.—It is but one evidence in a thousand of the system of fraud, misrepresentation, suppression and partial circulation of facts and documents, so as to produce different impressions in different sections, upon which the Locofoco leaders are conducting the present canvass. This card itself is but another instance. It says: "If, therefore, the Democracy of the free States should find any document of the character such as the title of this might indicate in circulation amongst them, they will denounce it as a Whig forgery, and treat the trick as it deserves." This admonition is addressed only to the Democracy of the free states, and leaves the whole Southern Democracy to be gulled by receiving as genuine this document, though it even come under the frank of a Whig. This proves the fraudulent purpose of the Democratic Association of Washington, and of Mr. Walker, to exclude this precise document from the free States. The copies sent forth by the Whig Committee are the identical document word for word, letter for letter, and comma for comma, with which Mr. Walker is now inundating the South, and which he is at the same time attempting to discredit as a forgery in the North. And yet this card, for I must so consider it, signed by James Towles, chairman, and C. P. Sengstack, secretary, reads a homily about morals! I stand ready to prove any and all the facts herein stated if Mr. Walker denies them.

WILLIS GREEN.

Chairman of the Whig Congress Committee.

Battles on the Sabbath.—Great men and military men, of whom it has been said of the latter, "they know no sabbath," are no more justified in violating the Sabbath on a large scale than on a small one, no more than the most humble in the land.

The battle of Waterloo was fought on the Sabbath, and Napoleon, who began it, was defeated. The battle of New Orleans was also fought on the Sabbath, and the British Army, who began the battle, were defeated, with terrible slaughter. The naval battle fought by Commodore M'Donough with the British fleet on Lake Champlain took place on the Sabbath. The British began the attack and were defeated, although their force was so great that it was matter of wonder that a small American force should have been able to capture a force so greatly superior. Here, then, are three battles, not to name more, which were fought on the Sabbath and in each case the force which began the attack were defeated. The coincidence is striking, however it be accounted for.—*N. Y. Am.*

PAINFUL DEATH.—Mr. G. M. G Wright, formerly of Queen Anne's county, died on the third inst., at his residence in Worton, Kent county, Md., after a brief illness, occasioned by the sting of a spider or some other poisonous insect.

From Hunt's Merchants' Magazine.

LABOR, ITS RELATIONS IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES, COMPARED.

BY NATHAN APPLETON.

Human labor is the only source of wealth. This is a settled axiom in political economy. Labor acts upon materials, furnished by nature; but nature is gratuitous in her gifts, and it is only when acted on by man that her productions acquire value in his estimation. This is no very new discovery; it is as old as the time of Locke, who set forth the principle with great clearness. It has been adopted and confirmed by the best modern writers. Labor, then, of the human body or the human mind, has furnished whatever exists of accumulated wealth. It continues, by daily action, to furnish the daily consumption of man, beside laying up a surplus for future use.

Whatever exists under the name of property, wealth or capital, is, therefore, the result or representative of previous labor—an accumulation not wanted for present, but put aside for future use.

Wealth is power. Its influence on society, on the character of man, is the subject of frequent contemplation and examination, in all its aspects. Its possessor is the object of envy and flattery, while, in its original humble state of labor, it is passed by, almost without notice, except sometimes a sigh of pity for its hardships.

Nothing is more striking than the distinction made, more especially in Europe, between labor in possession, and labor in action; in other words, between capital and labor. In Europe, and especially in England, we find the inheritor of wealth, of the accumulated labor of others, looking down with something like contempt, not only on labor itself, in its lowest form of mere manual occupation, but on all those employments whose object is the immediate accumulation of property. The possession, by the accident of birth, of wealth produced by the labor of others, is held vastly more honorable than the creation of wealth by one's own labor.

In the United States, it is quite otherwise. With all our inheritance of British notions and prejudices, there is nothing more striking than the change which has taken place in this country, in the estimation of wealth derived by inheritance, or acquired by the possessor himself. Here, all our wealth has been produced by direct labor. It has grown up in our sight, and it is impossible to attach any higher honor to him who obtains it by accident, than to him who possesses it by his own acquisition.

On the contrary, the inheritor of a fortune in this country, is judged wholly by the use which he makes of it. It gives him no advantage in the public estimation, any further than his own character will sustain itself, independently of the circumstance.

It is not difficult to perceive the causes which have produced this different estimate of the character of labor in action, in connexion with individual respectability in the two hemispheres.

It is an interesting inquiry; still more so, is an examination, how far this difference of estimate is amongst the most active causes, in giving an impress to society in America, essentially different from its character in Europe. There is no circumstance, in our institutions, more deserving the attention of the philosophic observer.

In tracing the history of European civilization, we find labor always and every where degraded. Under the Romans, labor was performed, and wealth produced, by slaves. The barbarians who overran the Roman empire attached no value to any acquisitions but those of the sword. Under the feudal system, hereditary honors were attached to the possessors of the fiefs, whilst the cultivation of lands was performed by the serfs, held in an estimation but one degree above the cattle, who were their fellow-laborers.

The present state of England is the result of the Norman conquest. The followers of the conqueror were permitted to divide that beautiful island amongst them, and from them are derived in succession the splendid and powerful aristocracy of the present day. Their wealth and honors were originally acquired by the sword. It is not surprising that they should continue to attach the highest honor to birth, to an hereditary succession to such honors and such estates. The present aristocracy of England, is, undoubtedly, the richest and most intelligent which has ever existed in any country. Fenced in by the rights of primogeniture, it has for centuries, possessed the political power of the country. It is not surprising that newly created wealth should there be held in far less estimation than that which descends from such an ancestry.

This feeling pervades the whole community. The distinctive appellation of *gentleman* and *gentry*, is applied to the inheritance of an estate, especially in lands, which enables the possessor to dispense with labor, or with any occupation, for the purpose of deriving profit from it. Even the inheritor of a fortune, so limited as to compel the possessor to a life of celibacy, prides himself as belonging to a caste elevated above the tradesman, with whatever fortune he may have acquired by his own industry. It is true, there are many degrees in the scale of human occupation. The higher offices in the church and the army, furnish convenient support to the younger branches of the nobility, and partake of their honor. The profession of the law produces talent, and trade produces wealth, which occasionally admit their possessors within the much coveted pale of the aristocracy. These new comers, however, require a generation or two to pass away, before they can take equal rank, in the public estimation, with the old families. The only occupation, compatible with the highest dignity, is the direct service of the crown in the highest offices of state.

Thus labor, in all is forms, stands in a secondary or degraded state. Nothing can be more abject than the condition of the lowest class of agricultural laborers, or of the manufacturing operatives.

How different thus, from the whole fabric of society in America! The founders of the American colonies, brought with them neither wealth nor titles of nobility. They had no accumulated stores of either wealth or honors, on which to subsist. Nature offered them this fertile domain, on the sole condition of appropriation by labor. Their earliest political institutions, establishing perfect equality, left no avenue open to wealth or power, but labor. Under these circumstances, it followed, of course, that active industry should be in the highest esteem. Industry was the only road to wealth, and wealth is power, in every part of the world. There are instances of fortunes accumulated in large masses, during the life of an individual, but, subject to our laws of equal distribution, they are sure to be absorbed or dissipated, in the course of one or two generations.

In this state of things, it is not surprising that the acquisition of property, by one's own labor and skill, should be held in equal, or even higher estimation, than the inheritance by accident of birth. It is true, that the sons of the rich usually receive a better education than their fathers; and we award higher honors to the successful efforts of intellect, than to those of mere industry in the accumulation of wealth. Such an estimation is, however, wholly founded on personal character.

Manual labor has a position with us, which it has never possessed in any period of the world.

Agricultural labor is, in a very great measure, performed by the owners of the soil and their sons. The universal diffusion of education places our mechanics higher in the scale of intelligence than the same class has ever stood in any country. They have the elements of character which enable them to rise to any position in society.

The high reward of labor, in all its branches, is the great, the important distinction, which diffuses comfort, intelligence, self respect, through the whole mass of the community, in a degree unknown in the previous history of civilization.

Titles of nobility we have none. We attach no respect to birth: The highest offices in our little army, and even of our navy, are of no peculiar esteem. There is enough in our position to be satisfied with—a diffusion of the comforts and even elegances of life, thought the whole mass of our population, in a degree never before seen. This is the result of an universal and well paid industry.

Ours is a great novel experiment in politics and civilization. Whatever the result it is our destiny to make it. It is our mission; our care should be to understand it, and make it succeed. It is an attempt to amalgamate, equalize and improve the whole mass of population, by elevating the lower portion from their usual abject state and depressing the higher, in dispensing with a privileged aristocracy. The process consists in the higher reward and higher estimation of labor, with the assurance of enjoying its own fruits.

There is another point of view in which this difference in the actual condition of our labor, compared with that of Europe, involves most important consequences; that is, in connection with the science of political economy.

The modern school of political economy is founded on the theory of Malthus on population. That theory, as is well known, supposes a tendency in the human race to increase in population in proportion to the means of subsistence; and that that tendency is kept in check, by the deficiency of those means, except during the existence of peculiar circumstances, which form an exception to the general rule. This theory, in its application to fully-peopled countries, with a circumscribed territory, like the British islands, is undoubtedly true; but the manner in which Malthus undertook to account for it involved the theory some discredit which does not belong to it. He undertook to account for it by the different ratioes in which population and subsistence naturally increase, applying a geometrical ratio to the former, and the slower arithmetical ratio to the latter. It was a fanciful idea but wholly false and absurd in its application. With room for expension food is increased more rapidly than population, as is abundently proved in the United States. Where there is no power of expansion, the greater power of increase in food is kept in check, as well as the lesser tendency in population. By this theory of Malthus population is constantly pressing on the means of supporting life; that is to say, a portion of the human race in its natural condition in every country, is in an actual state, or immediate danger, of starvation. In this extremity there is a constant struggle on the part of laborers to obtain employment as the means of preserving life by their wages. This struggle is supposed to keep wages at the lowest point which will actually support the life of the laborer and his family. This point is thus taken to be the natural rate of wages.

The history of labor, as far as we can follow it, during the whole course of European civilization, and its present actual state in Europe, and especially in England, furnishes but too sad a confirmation of the fact, that this has been, and now is, its actual condition.

This then is taken to be the natural state of labor—a power seeking employment beyond the means of finding it, which are limited by the amount of capital devoted to this object in the payment of wages. This low and abject state of labor is the original principle from which Mr. Culloch, Ricardo, Senier and others, of the modern school of economists, have drawn most important conclusions as the foundation of their system.

Labor is thus an indefinite quantity, limited in its action by the capital devoted to its maintenance. Without capital to set it in motion, it is an inert mass, useless and impotent. A result of this view is, that the increase of wealth in a community goes wholly to the owner of the capital as his profits. The laborer, obliged to be content with a subsistence, is not supposed capable of any accumulation. This is the rule, subject, of course, to occasional exceptions. It is, however, on this axiom, as its corner stone, that the whole modern doctrine of free trade rests. The question is the increase of national wealth. It being admitted that profits go wholly to the owners of the capital employing labor, and no part of the accumulation to the laborer himself, it follows, that legislative interference can only change the application of capital from one object to another, without increasing the quantity of labor which it sets in motion, and this change is sure to be from a more profitable application to one less so, since the sagacity of the capitalist, without this interference, would be sure to lead him to the most profitable employment of his capital. Hence is deduced another proposition—that no act of legislation can create wealth.

It requires little observation to perceive that views founded on such premises have no application to us. The unlimited quantity of fertile land, placed within the reach of every individual, is the distinguishing peculiarity of our situation in an economical point of view. This furnishes to labor the easy means of subsistence, and may be considered the controlling cause, whose effects are to be traced through all the ramifications of our society. This establishes the high reward; or wages of labor, elevating the lowest laborer from the position of a mere machine where the modern school of political economy has placed him to one in which he becomes, at his own will, the possessor of capital. The labor of a single year gives to every laborer, if he chooses to save his earnings, a very considerable capital. He takes, at his pleasure, a place in society.

It is true that the United States may be said to form an exception to the general rule, arising from the circumstance of its containing a quantity of unimproved land, but since this condition which forms the exception, this power of expansion, will necessarily continue for one or more centuries, it is sufficient for our present government; and we should be cautious in adopting, as rules of action, theories of political economy, drawn from a state of society so different from our own. They have no application to us.

When we see a house erected out of the clay of our fields, and the wood of our forests, we perceive that there has been a creation of wealth. When we see that this creation has been shared by the brickmaker, the mason and the carpenter, we cannot but laugh to scorn those theorists which tell us that labor cannot accumulate capital. We see the thing done before our eyes.

With us labor is, in fact, the great accumulator. It goes to work, without difficulty, on its own account. It is, therefore perfectly clear that that legislation which calls most labor into action, which gives it its fullest scope, is, with us, most productive of wealth. The doctrine of free trade is founded upon the assumption that labor is every where in excess, waiting to be employed by capital, in itself powerless dependent, only asking to live. With us, labor assumes a higher tone—it treats with capital on equal terms—It shares in the profits, hand in hand with capital. The protective system rests as its basis, on the principle of an enlarged field for labor, resulting from that legislation which restricts or shuts out the competition of the cheaper and more degraded labor of Europe.—The opposition comes from capital, which alleges that this system gives to labor too great an advantage, in the power of levying a contribution, in the prices of the commodities consumed by capital. The answer is, that, with us, labor and capital are so mixed together, that, in the general prosperity resulting from an active, well paid industry, capital is sure to get its share. All writers on political economy recognise the high reward of labor as indicating the highest measure of general prosperity. It elevates the industrial classes in the scale of society by giving them a power & a taste in the enjoyments of civilized life, and in the cultivation of their minds. With us it does more. In addition to all this, it enables them to lay by a surplus as capital.

Our great advantage lies in the abundance and cheapness of our lands. This gives to the immediate tiller of the soil an easier and more abundant subsistence that can be obtained, by the same labor, in any other part of the world. But he requires other enjoyments than food, and the whole question is, how can these be supplied in the manner most conducive to the wealth and happiness of the whole country. It would seem to be a simple proposition, that the application of a portion of our labor to the working up of the raw materials which we produce, into the manufacture which we consume, must be the simplest & most direct mode of equalizing and diffusing the peculiar advantage which we possess in the abundance of food, through all classes of society. As a question of political economy, of the increase of national wealth the whole consists in inquiry, whether this system does not call into action a greater amount of labor than would find employment without it? The answer would seem to be easy, and plain common sense can hardly mistake it. With the assurance of a home market, both capital and labor set freely to work to supply it.

The question is frequently complicated by the inquiry, why we should make at home what we can buy cheaper from abroad? This is a question which can only be put by capital. There is nothing cheaper to labor, which is purchased by idleness. A nation can buy nothing cheap which slackens the arm of its industry.—The term cheap, in such a case, has no application. The matter is only confused by reference to a money price. The real question is the best application of labor.

It is thus apparent, how different is the position of labor, in the United States, in relation to the science of political economy compared with labor in England. Free trade, in England, is quite a different affair from free trade in the United States. Its great effort, in England, is directed against the corn laws. It is labor, striving for cheaper food, against a landed monopoly. It rests there on the same principle, as the protective system with us—the benefit of labor. It is there resisting a monopoly against itself. It here establishes a monopoly in its own favor, if one may be allowed to apply the term to an object so universal. It will be seen at once that, both socially and politically, the position of labor in this country opens a wide field for speculation and observation. We are, in this respect, a world by ourselves. The country of Europe, which approximates nearest to us, theoretically, is France, since the revolution. She has abolished the right of primogeniture, and her peerage is a mere shadow; but with a crowded population, and so many old prejudices remaining, labor will find it a hard struggle to acquire much estimation there. Military glory, military command, will continue to be awarded the highest honors in France, as at all the courts of the continent, as the best security of their thrones.

It is true the present is a new era in Europe. The last half century has developed industrial power, under the direction of science, in a degree which has no parallel in previous history. This power has brought, and will continue to bring, into existence a mass of wealth capable of maintaining a claim for influence with the landed interest, which has heretofore been supreme. It has already produced a considerable change in raising the industrious classes in public estimation. But there is a wide gulf in public opinions, which will continue to seperate Europe and the United States, in their estimates of labor and industrious occupation, which will endure as long as their different institutions of government.

From the Philadelphia Inquirer.

A Great Day in Philadelphia. The Whigs of the Eastern Counties in Mass Convention. An imposing popular display. Fifty Thousand Whigs in Council.

A SPEECH BY DAN'L. WEBSTER.

The greatest Whig Convention, nay, the most extraordinary gathering of the people of the Eastern Counties of Pennsylvania that ever took place in Philadelphia, on any occasion, was held in the City and County on Tuesday, 1st October. We remember nothing like it, for display, enthusiasm, unanimity of feeling and immense numbers. Strangers began to pour into our city during Monday, while Tuesday morning, thousands upon thousands visited Philadelphia on foot, on horseback, in steamboats & railroad cars, and in vehicles of every description. All the roads were thronged in some measure, while the movements of the various clubs and delegations with their music, their banners, their badges, and their implements of trade, agriculture, and manufacture, were well calculated to attract attention and excite admiration. The display of flags and banners was truly splendid. Many of our principal streets presented a holiday appearance, & a stranger on a visit to the city, without being acquainted with the objects of the demonstration, would have imagined that the whole community were engaged in celebrating some glorious event in our National history. The streets through which the procession passed, were especially adorned by the extent and variety of their decorations. Many of the flags were remarkable or beauty, the mottoes of others were in excellent taste, while the representations of "that Same Old Coon" were numerous. Market street, Front street, Third & Fourth streets, with several other of the more prominent thoroughfares of trade and commerce, deserve particular mention, for the rich display of appropriate devices, superb streamers, the hundred of miniature flags, and the general spirit and effect of the patriotic manifestations.

Fortunately, the weather throughout the day was delightful, neither too cold nor too warm, but clear and bracing. All the avenues leading to the great places of meeting, were thronged at an early hour. The country people poured in in great numbers, while our citizens from all points hastened to the place selected for the immense gathering. It was on a beautiful field to the right of the Frankford Road, which was carpeted with verdue, and was admirably calculated for such an occasion. The great body of the Meeting convened on a hill immediately in front of the Chief Stand for the Speakers. Never was that hill covered with so many human beings.—Tens of thousands would not be a wild computation for the multitude assembled immediately there, and upon the neighboring acres. On the summit of the hill was a tall liberty-pole, from the top of which, and from ropes attached to which, a hundred gay streamers floated to the breeze.—The principal stand was capable of accommodating quite a large number of persons and it was occupied by the officers, guests, revolutionary soldiers, orators and committees.

Mr. Webster stood immediately in front and the view at the time he delivered his address, was one of the most imposing that could well be imagined. The great orator the multitude before and around him, Gen. Markle by his side, the green fields outspread before the mighty masses moving to and fro, the blue sky above, the music, the banners, the shouts—but we must leave the effect to the imagination of the reader.

The Convention was called to order by Hon. *Joseph R. Ingersoll.*

The meeting was then opened in an eloquent, impressive, and appropriate prayer, by the Rev. Dr. Higgins.

The Hon. John Sergeant then delivered an able address on the leading political topics of the day, in the course of which he paid an eloquent and glowing tribute to the services of General Markle.

Mr. Webster then came forward, and delivered the following address, which our Reporter has been compelled to condense, for want of time.

MR. WEBSTER'S REMARKS.

Fellow Citizens of Pennsylvania:—I am very happy to be among you in this assembly—to see this great multitude—and number of men with one vast and common interest at stake. I feel gentlemen, as you feel, that in the coming election—in its results, depend in a great measure, the future welfare and prosperity of this great country. (Cheers) But, fellow citizens, I have come here with no expectation of adding aught of information or argument to the question which is now of such all-absorbing interest. (Cheers) The question as to who shall be the President of the United States—as to what politics should be pursued, have been discussed by abler men than myself. Most reading men—most reflecting men, have had ample opportunities of examining the great question which naturally arise when a struggle of this kind takes place, (Cheers) The hour for decisive action is now approaching nay, it is at hand—and I feel cheered by the welcome I have received, that results of vast importance to this great country, will accrue not only to the country but to the State of Pennsylvania. I call on you to do and perform. (Cheers) Gentlemen! Although political questions have been discussed, and although many dissensions and divisions have taken place generally, there is something which bears peculiarly on Pennsylvania. We are divided into two grand parts;—we discuss two great topics—the Protective and the anti-Protective questions. They who oppose us, advocate, as you well know, what are called Free Trade principles, and are opposed to the Tariff protection. This, gentlemen is the general truth—a truth, not confined to localities (great cheering) but which is general. (Cheers) This, gentlemen, is a part of the country which I love deeply.—I love its soil and I love its people, and I do not believe that the Polk policy will meet with favour here. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, I am confident. I know that you will not be exceptions to the rule which decides against the policy of Mr. Polk. Gentlemen, we might say with truth, with considerable truth and propriety, that the great question of the day, is "Protection, or no Protection, Tariff or no Tariff." But here arises an interesting question. Pennsylvania is known to be a Tariff State, (great cheering), and the great mas of its people are in favor of the Tariff, great cheers.)—What then, is the course of those who desire to deprive them of protection? Would you sail into strange latitudes under a false flag?—(cries of no; no!). They come here under false colors, and they delude you by saying if you are Tariff, we are Tariff also. (Laughter and cheers.) Now Gentlemen, however respectably the Anti-Tariff party may have behaved to the intelligence of Pennsylvania, this was, certainly, a bold stroke of policy! Something presumptuous at least. (Cheers.) Gentlemen—Mr. Polk, in those States which we call Anti-Tariff, had one set of opinions, and in those favorable to the Tariff adopted another set.—Now, Gentlemen, should Mr. Polk find himself in a circle of very dear friends, he may perhaps, be at variance with the friends on his right and his left. Whilst addressing the Anti-Tariff friends, he would say I agree with you, and would make the same remark to the other section of the circle. (Immense cheers.) But, whatever his professions may be, let his speeches—let his votes show and prove his policy. (Cheers) It is my pleasure again to address Pennsylvania friends and you know I would not utter a word inconsistent with truth, or at variance with facts. (Cries of no, you would not.) [Mr. Webster then quoted from some speeches of Mr. Polk, which we could not catch, owing to the noise behind the reporters' bench, and proceeded:] Now, gentlemen, there is in dramatic literature, a very old and a very excellent Tragedy, called "Who's the Dupe?" That question is one which I think many here could answer. (Laughter.) If Polk with his Protection in one hand, and his Anti-Tariff in the other, should, I say, *should* be elected President of the U. States, at the very first meeting of Congress you would be quite as uncertain with respect to his opinions as you now are. I therefore advise you to consider well before you choose between the two candidates before you engage in that struggle in which your happiness is so deeply involved. (Great cheers.) And now, gentlemen, I have come here for no other end or design, than to lift up my voice in the cause of my country. I desire to be useful, in the little time which remains to me of life, and therefore shall speak to you without paraphrase or flourish, as a man to men—as one to those who are interested in their beautiful country and its glorious constitution. (Cheers) Gentlemen, this is no holiday business—the question is serious as it regards perpetuity. I need use no trope—no metaphor, for, gentlemen, I speak from the fullness of my heart. Gentlemen, when I look around me, I do not wonder that you show by your countenances, that you are opposed to the Anti-Tariff party. (Cheers) I say it is no wonder that Pennsylvania is favorable to

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11032-0544.jpg