DORCHESTER AURORA.

"PRINCIPLES AND MEASURES, AND MEN BY THEIR PRINCIPLES."

VOL. 4. CAMBRIDGE, MD.—MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1839. NO. 34.

DORCHESTER AURORA,
EDITED AND PRINTED BY
WM. H. BARROW.

TERMS.

The "AURORA" is published every Monday at $2 50 a year, one-half to be paid upon the receipt of the first number. Subscribers may discontinue the paper at any time by paying for the time they have received it, but not without, except with the assent of the Editor.

Advertisements not exceeding a square, inserted three times for $1 00; each after insertion 25 cents—when larger, in proportion.

Advertisements continued until instructed to omit them and charged accordingly.

Communications addressed to the Editor, must be post paid.

SPEECH OF MR. DUNCAN,
OF OHIO,

In the House of Representatives, January 17, 1839—On the resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the defalcations of Samuel Swartwout.

(CONTINUED.)

In 1811, when the recharter of the Bank of North America was under Congressional discussion, Mr. Clay, the now leader of the Federal party, denounced the Bank as unconstitutional. He contended that Congress had *no power* to incorporate a bank or any *other* institution, and that a Bank was a dangerous and unsafe institution; but now, sir, without any change or amendment of the Constitution, & without any material change in the policy of our country or difference in our institutions, a bank is the very thing we want, and is perfectly constitutional. In 1816 Daniel Webster, whose opinions on constitutional law is the political Koran of the Federal party; and before whose opinions they fall prostrate, kiss the ground, and worship as before Omnipotence, said that gold and silver was the only currency recognised by, and known to the Constitution. It was the law of the land at home, and the law of the world abroad. But now the rag-tag shinplaster currency answers all the purposes of a national currency, and is perfectly constitutional with that gentleman and all his party. In 1830, when the great political question, in which all others were merged, was the recharter of the Bank of the U. States, Mr. McDuffie, chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, made a report in favor of the recharter of the Bank, which was popular with the Federal Bank party. Every sentence and word of that report was hailed as good orthodox Bank Federal doctrine, and no part of it was more popular than the following passage, which constituted the objections of the committee to a *National Bank*, and the avowed objections of the Federal party to such an institution.

In relation to a National Bank, (speaking of the number of agents which the *United States Bank* employed, and their political influence,) he says: "But the patronage resulting from the appointment—the annual appointment of these agents, great as it would doubtless be, would be insignificant and harmless when compared with that which would result from the dispensation of Bank accommodations, to the standing amount of fifty millions of dollars! The mind almost instinctively shrinks from the contemplation of an idea so ominous to the purity of the Government and the liberties of the people. No Government of which the committee have any knowledge, except, perhaps, the despotism of Russia, was ever invested with a patronage at once so prodigious in its influence, and so dangerous in its character. In the most desperate financial extremities, no other European Government has ever entered upon an experiment so perilous. If the whole patronage of the English monarchy were concentrated in the hands of the American Executive, it may be well doubted whether the public liberty would be so much endangered by it as it would by this vast pecuniary machine."

This was the opinion of the Federalists in 1830, '31, and '32, in relation to a National Bank. So it was then, always was, and will be, the opinion of the Democracy of this country. This document had a circulation throughout the United States that no other document ever had. It flew through the country like leaves in the fall, fell upon the highway, on cross-roads, in the fields, and in every door-yard; those who could read, were compelled to read it; and those who could not, had it read to them; and no part of that report was used in argument in favor of the recharter of the United States Bank more than that part which I have cited. It was used to put down and nullify the *mere suggestion* which Gen. Jackson advanced, that a National Bank *might*, perhaps, be established, within the power of the Constitution, and of less dangerous tendencies. But what will you think, sir, of Federal consistency, when I tell you that no sooner had Gen. Jackson vetoed the Bank of the United States, and the people had, by an overwhelming majority, sustained him in his course, than the Federalists were for "*a National Bank!*" Yes, sir, for a National Bank, with all its subjugating tendencies and '*Russian despotism*;" and in 1834, the Congressional elections turned upon the question of a National Bank.

In 1834 5, when the General Government was receiving the notes of specie paying banks in liquidation of the land purchases, the Administration was denounced and the practice deprecated as destructive to the rights of the people and their interest in the public domain. It was rung upon every change that the Administration was frittering away the public lands, which were reserved in trust for the use of the people, and taking in consideration the shinplasters of irresponsible banks. True it was, sir, that the spirit of speculation was about to draw the whole public domain in its vortex. Those who had credit could obtain bank notes by the quire, and purchase hundreds of thousands of acres of the public lands, perhaps to the loss of the Government, as there was an uncertainty of the power of the banks to redeem their paper, and to the great injury and prejudice of the poor and industrious man, for whose use the land is, and really of right ought to be held. Such was the rage for speculation, and such was the system of monopoly, that the country was threatened with the introduction of the feudal system, with the vacillating and degrading tendencies peculiar to a system of landlords and tenants.

General Jackson, seeing the progress of these overwhelming evils, recommended what was called the specie circular to the Secretary of the Treasury. The policy was adopted which was to prohibit the sale of a greater quantity of land than 320 acres to one individual, for any other kind of currency than gold and silver. This measure had the desired effect, viz: to ring a sound currency into the Treasury, and in some degree to check the rage for wild speculation and to secure the public domain from the grasp of the wealthy monopolizer. But no sooner was the specie circular put into successful operation, than the whole pack of the Opposition again raised the howl. The Administration was denounced for declaring war upon the banks, war upon the credit system, and making an odious distinction in the currency between the Government and the people.—There was not a whig whiffet in the country, but could ask with great emphasis, 'What, is the Administration going to establish two currencies, one for the Government, and one for the people?' 'The Government must have gold and silver, while the people are to have shinplasters.' Again, in 1834-5, and '6, the Federalists said it was unsafe to deposite the public revenue in the local banks. They were unfit for financial agents, and the 'banks and local bank deposite system was in character with the ruinous and destructive policy of the Administration.' Well, in 1837, when the banks suspended payment, locked up the public revenue, and proved themselves faithless agents, and unworthy of the confidence of the community and the Government; and when, in consequence thereof, it became the duty of the President of the United States to recommend a separation of the Government finances from the banks, and the establishment of an independent constitutional Treasury, then, again, was the whole force of the Federalists arrayed against the Administration, and every possible motive but that which was good or patriotic attributed to them. Ruin to the country, desolution to commerce, destruction to the banks, and prostration to every interest, public and private, was sung from Maine to Mexico, & as in the case of the Treasury circular, two currencies!!' 'one for the Government, and one for the people,' was exclaimed and vociferated by every Whig *thing* in the country.

Further, when Gen. Jackson was run for President, in 1824, '28, and '32, the Democracy were warned most solemnly and lovingly not to support a military chieftain for the Presidency. We were told and admonished, in an apparent spirit of patriotism and love of country, that all Governments had fallen, & all Republics had been subverted, by the destroying hands of military chieftains and military ambition. Yes, sir, we were told that 'war, pestilence, and famine,' would be our fate, if we should place a military chieftain in the Executive chair. The hero of New Orleans ought not to be made President of these United States; we must have a civilian for a President. But General Jackson was elected; he served his first term, but no military despotism made its appearance. He was elected a second time, and served out his term, but no military despotism yet appeared. But there were some honest persons of the Democracy who perhaps thought there would be more safety in bestowing the Presidency upon a civilian; and a distinguished one, in the person of Martin Van Buren, was presented to the American people as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. But now it was discovered that a civilian was not so safe as was thought, and particularly the one now offered; and a millitary chieftain was brought forward in the person of Major General William Henry Harrison, commander in chief of the northwestern army, and offered as the competing candidate against the civilian already named. Yes, sir, in 1832 there was danger, ay, ruin to the country and downfall of the Government attendant on the election of the hero of New Orleans to the Presidency; but in 1836 there was no danger in electing the hero of Tippecanoe to the same high station.

Again: when Gen. Jackson was President, the Federalists said Martin Van Buren administered the Government. Jackson's messages were splendid documents in point of talent; they could not be surpassed. All the objections the Federalists had to them consisted in their hostility to the Democratic doctrines they contained; but they said General Jackson neither composed nor wrote them—they were Martin Van Buren's messages.—But now that Martin Van Buren is President, every leading measure and proposition of the Administration comes from the Hermitage. Sir, I repeat the question again:—What confidence is to be placed in a party who change their name and their principles with the return of every election?

Sir, in the ordinary pursuits of life, you would repudiate a man who would be guilty of such conduct; you would consider him unworthy of your confidence, or even of your charity. Such conduct in an individual would justly make him the subject of suspicion and criminal arrest. What confidence, then, should be placed in such a party, when the great principles of liberty are involved in their political creeds and names.

But, sir, I have presented this array of Federal inconsistencies not merely for the purpose of exposing the base practice of changing names and principles for the unhallowed purposes of political deception, but, also, to prove what I have already stated, and what has been well known in reference to the principles of the Federal party; which is, that it is a part of their faith, and a fundamental principle of their doctrine, that the common people have not the intelligence, firmness and moral integrity necessary for self government; and all these changes of names, and professed changes of principles, is base and black hypocrisy.

Sir, it is all stratagem and political fraud. They have but one name, & that name they have had from the commencement of the Government, and is significant of their principles. Their principles are well established and well understood by the reading and thinking community, and simply consist in an attachment to all those institutions which have for their object the dwarfiing the sovereignty and independence of the States; aggradizing and strengthening the Federal Government; the establishment of monopolizing institutions, which, in their nature and all their tendencies, are calculated to establish inequalities among mankind, and 'to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer;' consequently, it is a cardinal point with them to subdue the principles of Democracy, and prostrate every man who has the patriotism and independence to avow them. Sir, the siege of Democracy is older than the siege of Tyre; and, like her besiegers, the Federalists of this country have toiled to demolish the institutions of Democracy, until their 'heads are bald, and their shoulders peeled,' yet they endure, and strengthen by duration.

Sir, we have had a prophetic destruction from the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. Prentiss,] as blighting as that pronounced by the inspired prophets against Babylon. He has told us, in substance, that, if this Administration is to be continued, this Government must fall; your Constitution will be rent, & scattered to the four winds. This would be bad. Your free institutions will be prostrated and levelled with the earth. This would be worse. This magnificent pile of noble architecture will totter, tumble, crumble, and mingle with the dust of the pyramids of Egypt, the temples of Greece, and the obelisks of Rome! Hardly a scratch or scroll will be found upon the lofty columns that now surround us, to give name to this magnificent temple of liberty to the curious and romantic wanderer in after ages. All this is withering prophecy to the philanthropist and the lover of liberty, but the worst is yet to come; that which will be far more distressing to the lover of science, literature, and politics. The gentleman concluded his prophecy by the chilling threat, that if Martin Van Buren is again to be elected President of these United States, he, the gentleman, will do—what, sir? Take the Great Western, and go to Liverpool! Yes, sir, the gentleman will expatriate himself from this Government.—What a calamity! It will be the footing up of all the other calamities that await this people and this Government, if this wicked Administration is to be continued.

I think the Democracy, sir, will have to take this last threatened calamity seriously into consideration. When I go home I will lay the matter, in a proper manner, before the first Democratic convention which may be held in the district I have the honor to represent. I will also consult some of my old and well tried friends in Democracy. Father Felter and father Dawson are patriarchs in Democracy. They are experienced in political matters. They are doctors in Democracy and, withal, sound, pure and upright patriots at heart. Their opinions on this important question will be of great weight. I think the Democracy, so far as my district is concerned will take such order on the question as will operate to the best interests of the country. Should I have the honor of a seat in the next national convention, which will be held for the Presidential nominations of 1840, I will lay the matter before the convention, and if it shall be thought that the loss of the gentleman as a citizen of the U. States will be an injury paramount to the benefits of Mr. V. Buren's administration, why, Mr. Van Buren 'then, and in that case,' will be withdrawn, and some less dangerous man shall be taken up in his place. I know that the Democracy will do what is right in the premises. But, sir, I hope, if the gentleman should expatriate himself, and 'take the Great Western for Liverpool,' still it may not prove the final end of this Government. When Alexander the Great planted the Grecian standard in the soil of India, and was carrying his conquests into the interior thereof, and one victory seemed to gained to the glory of the Grecian arms but to give way for another equally glorious, in all these battles Alexander was found in the front ranks. (A most happy admonition to some of our liveried gentlemen, who had better be in Florida, or at some other post where they would be doing more service to their country, than hanging and lounging about the city of Washington, each occupying the room of two at all your balls, routs, and assemblies, where, in some instances, there is nothing but *women* to fight.) Some of his officers, in the most friendly manner, admonished the King of the danger he was risking in thus exposing his royal person, & the great interest that Greece had in the preservation of his life. The King answered that the welfare of Greece did not depend on the life or death of one man. So I would hope, sir, that the duration and welfare of this Republic does not depend on the presence or absence, or life or death, of any one man. But this Republic may fall; yes, sir, it will fall, as did the Assyrian empire, when the Medes were governed by a mule, and from the same cause. Cræsus, King of Assyria, consulted the oracle Delphos, for purposes that related to his future prosperity, and the prosperity of his empire. He was told that when he crossed the river Hallis, that a great empire would be destroyed; and that when the Medes should be governed by a mule, he would be in danger. He never dreamed that it was to be his own empire that was to be destroyed when he should cross the river Hallis, and he thought the thing impossible that ever the Medes should be ruled by a mule. But after his empire was destroyed, and he made prisoner by Cyrus, King of Persia, he sent a gold chain, with a reprimand, to the Delphic oracle for so deceiving him; he was informed by the oracle that it was his own empire it was meant should be destroyed, when he should pass the river Hallis, and that Cyrus was the mule who was to govern the Medes—a mule being a mongrel beast, half ass and half horse. And that Cyrus, being the son of Cambyses, king of Persia, and Mandanis, daughter of Astyages, king of the Medes, he was of mongrel composition—one half of his blood Persian, by his father, and the other that of the Medes, by his mother. So, sir, when this Republic comes to be governed by a mule, (Federal sway) it will fall, or it will be subverted. Sir, what is the Federal party? A mongrel composition consisting of part Bank and part anti Bank, Masonic and anti-Masonic, Abolition and anti-abolition, &c. Made up, sir, of the factions and fractions, and odds and ends of all factions, bound together by no common principle or tie but natural and unrelenting hostility to the Democratic party, and the Democratic principles. When the day shall come that this mule shall govern this country and this people, then will our Republic fall, and our free institutions crumble to the ground, and mingle with the dust of the free institutions of other Republics which have fallen by the misrule of similar factions and ambitious demagogues.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Resignation.—Mr. Hubley a member of Congress from Pennsylvania, has tendered his resignation as member of the present House of Representatives of the U. States.

Going the entire swine.—Married in *Porking* Ohio, on the 27th ult, by the Rev. Mr. *Shoat*, Mr. *Hog* to Miss *Bacon*.—Ledger.

COMMUNICATED.

Cambridge, Feb. 19th, 1839.

MR. EDITOR: In reply to my friend "Agricola," who appeared in your paper of the 18th, in collision of opinion with "Agricultor" of the previous paper, on the subject of the proposed Transquakin Canal, I will premise, frankly and truly, in justice to myself, as well as to him, that I did not, as he supposes, view his refusal to subscribe my petition for the Canal, as proceeding from "a captious disposition," or, "a want of inclination to oblige,"—but, from an honest difference of opinion; and I informed him, at the time I offered him my petition, that, as others, as well as himself, had expressed the same sentiment, that he then did, I would endeavour to demonstrate his, and their error, in a printed paper, which would afford opportunity for reflection; and, as I believed, a consequent correction of the error maintained by them.

No argument was held at the time; but, simply the position was taken by him, which had been, previously, by others, "that, from the contiguity of the Black Water, & Transquakin rivers, and their emptying into one common estuary, the two rivers must be on the same level, and the Engineer must necessarily, have committed an error, in his reports of their difference of level:" this, with my remark, that I would write a paper, and prove him in error, was, to the best of my knowledge, and that of other gentlemen present, whom I have since consulted, the whole amount of our conversation on the subject.

In the performance of my promise, "Agricultor" appeared soon after; in which was introduced some of the relative phenomena of physical science; and some acknowledged positions were taken,—not, as a "rebuke" to him as he supposes, for his "incredulity," in regard to their truth, which, really, was not contestable: but, solely, as a basis for the erection of my argument against his opinion, before named; and he has unfortunately, mistaken these materials of my argument, viz: my positions in regard to the phenomena of rivers—springs—rain, &c. &c., for the question in dispute; and he remarks, "I can only say (for his satisfaction) that there is no difference of opinion, whatever, between us, upon this subject" (the *source* of rivers.)

Then, at least, it seems, my premises are admitted by "Agricola"—and, I have looked in vain, to find any part of his paper, which detects the fallacy of my argument; though I have diligently searched.

It would seem, also, by a subsequent part of his paper, that he agrees with me in my conclusion, as well as my premises, that is, on the very point, which I undertook to establish, "that the level of the two rivers may differ, even by six feet, or more—and that the Engineer had not, on the face of his two reports, committed an error."

He admits, that he did deny, that there could be so much difference of level, as the Engineer had reported:—I maintained there might be;—and this difference of opinion, gave rise to the paper of "Agricultor," maintaining my opinion, and denying his; and further, as if to leave no doubt of the true *issue* joined, in the case before us, which he now seems inclined to change, "Agricola" continues, "and I could not in my own mind account for such a *variation*"—and he adds, "but, from *further reflection*, and a *recurrence* to the *map*, (possibly he might have added and to the paper of "Agricultor") I *can account*, at least to my own satisfaction, for the *variation*"—he continues, "then, *upon this point* there is *no disagreement*."

Thus, by reflection and study are conflicting opinions often reconciled;—heterodoxies corrected; and orthodoxies confirmed.

But, Agricola asks, "where is the great reservoir, which is to counteract the outporings in opposite directions, from the summit of the ridge, which divides the waters of Fishing Bay from the Choptank?" he exultingly answers "I say there is *none*." I answer with him, there is *none*: in this also, we agree.

Then, if there be nothing to *counteract* the outporings, in opposite directions, why should not the outporings *continue*, in opposite directions; yet, he says, they will not; this, using his own language, is too plain to require any further comment;—but take his own words, "so that according to my (Agricola's) opinion, they will both flow the same way; while," he continues, "according to 'Agricultor,' they will flow in opposite directions,—and he adds "this is the great rock on which we split." I submit it to himself, has he not removed that rock and come safely into port?

Further, he says "If with all its (Black Water river) resources of tide—rain—springs &c. &c., it can maintain a given elevation, how can it maintain the same, when a sluice (into Choptank river) is opened in an opposite direction?' he continues "the consequence must, necessarily, be, that the apex of this ridge would be *bare*, or, the ridge must be cut down, &c &c'—true, if the sluice is two feet higher, at the appulse of the Canal on the Black Water river, than at the other end of it, at Cambridge Creek, which by the measurement of the Engineer, and now conceded by Agricola, is the fact, then, the water will run into Cambridge Creek;—and, inasmuch as the depth of Black Water river, as I am informed, is not more than two feet, for a distance of about five miles, extended from the termination of the Canal line, and down the river, it follows that the bed of the Black Water river would be *drained* and *bare*, for the said distance of about five miles, by the operation of the Canal proposed—in throwing off its water, into the creek, until its two feet of depth was exhausted, to level it with the lower end, at the creek;—and, as rivers generally slope towards their mouths, a very partial replacement could be expected from the lower section of the river; whose influx of water at so high a point, and through a long winding, and obstructed channel, and consequently feeble tide, could not be equivalent to its discharge by a short and nearly straight canal.

But, he says "or, the ridge must be cut down to make the current set down Black Water river."

Now, let it be remembered, that by the actual measurement, by the Engineer, of the canal route from Cambridge Creek to its terminus on the Black Water, it is four miles—and by his estimate made, he says, on the usual terms of excavation, its cost will be thirty two thousand dollars; and, as we have seen, about five miles more, must be done, to make it effectual;—that is, the whole distance of the shallow water;—to excavate this space would cost, by the ratio of the former, forty thousand dollars; and the two spaces added, would cost seventy two thousand dollars;—quite an impracticable attainment, I presume, at present.—Then, it would seem, that to make the additional excavation is *essential* to the useful, and effective completion of the Black Water canal, according to Agricola himself; and it certainly is so;—for without it, most unquestionably, a considerable extent of the river would be closed, even to canoe navigation; or, probably, bared, and converted into marsh, to the injury of owners on that portion of it; and the current of the upper portion, would, unquestionably, set into Cambridge creek, as "Agricola" now admits; and by means of the soft bed of mud, flowing with it, would produce there a similar accumulation—a fac-simile of the far famed Pontine marshes—spreading infection among all who may inhale its deadly blasts.

Why then, it may be asked, do I advocate a *canal* from the Choptank to the Transquakin river?

I answer in a few words this seeming paradox; & at the same time I wish it distinctly understood, that in my remarks throughout this paper, I design nothing particularly for "Agricola," excepting only, such as I may have so named—my chief object, being to induce a public consideration of the subject.

I answer, then, the "Transquakin" is, comparatively with the "Black Water," a *deep* river—and *cæteris paribus*, the deeper the water, the greater is its tendency to flow with velocity,—the Choptank being four feet higher than the Transquakin, at the respective points of appulse of the proposed Canal; and the *slope* uninterrupted, to Fishing Bay, the current would set through the whole route, to the Bay, from the Choptank;—and, too, without *further* excavation, cost, or labor, than had been incurred, in the measured line of the canal proposed; and it would wash, and cleanse, with its pure, and abundant waters, the muddy bed of the Transquakin, and, much of that of the Bay, itself,—improve the navigation of the whole—drain the low lands—and supply health—fertility, and energy, to a country—much of it, at least, now abounding in sickliness—barrenness—and apathy.

This canal having also, by the measurement of the Engineer, only three and a half miles, on its line; (that of the Black Water having by the same authority four miles,) and its termini, in deep water, it is complete and effective when that is executed; and, it will cost, as herein before shown, thirty five thousand dollars, less than the other, supposing the other to be continued to a point, before named, as essential to its objects.

The comparison I have concisely drawn, not from a taste for oppugnation; but, to present fairly, the facts and probable results—their respective costs, to make them useful, and effective—their objects—purposes—consequences, beneficial, or pernicious, which, as my mind is forcibly impressed, may reasonably be anticipated;—in fact, to call the attention of the interested portion of the public, seriously, to the consideration of the subject, and of the relative merits of the two proposed canals;—not, to discourage either, as an ultimate, and valuable object,—but, to settle, in the first instance, the one, which may appear the most desirable, and the most practicable.

Finally, it has been objected, to either, or any scheme, for the internal improvement of our county,—I think, by "Agricola" as well as others—that it will not yield a profit to the State. I ask, does not common experience justify the practice of a present outlay, for future and undoubted advantages? Suppose it may not yield a six per cent profit, for a few years, what can be more flattering in prospect, than the necessary results of a well constructed canal, through an inundated country, destitute of navigable waters? Shall the State withhold a few thousands, for this purpose, in one portion of her territory, and to others grant millions? Common justice will answer in the negative.

Few governments, it is hoped, are to be found, acting upon principles so narrow and partial. The first precepts of political economy, and political justice look to the welfare of each of the members of a State; and disbursements for these purposes, yielding no present profit, may richly compensate a temporary loss;—by a result in the happiness and enjoyment of its citizens, for which the government was instituted.

Your politeness, my dear sir, will, I hope, excuse the trouble I give you, in this undesignedly long discourse, by the interest I take in the subject; and the assurance, that with me, it is final. AGRICULTOR.

From the Washington Globe.

"A CHANGE CAME O'ER THE SPIRIT OF HIS DREAM."

In the Senate to-day Mr. Clay appeared in a new part. For some years past he was one of those who saw no harm in the abolition movements. His biographer, Mr. Prentiss, (of the Louisville Journal) in his sketch of his life, has taken pains to varnish up for display in the light of Northern philanthropy, Mr. Clay's early emancipation principles.—This, Mr. Clay carefully kept alive himself by proposing to set apart in his distribution of the public lands a portion to carry out this scheme. In 1836 he voted against the effort made by the Administration to prevent the circulation of incendiary prints in the South, tending to excite insurrection; and even as late as the last session, he voted against Mr. Rives' resolution throwing cold water on the fire brand petitions continually sent into Congress. But, to day, what a sudden change we have had in all the Senator's courtesy, kindness, and forbearance for Abolition—no sudden flaw of our variable city weather equals it. During the first part of the session, Mr. Clay dodged every vote, and avoided, by a retreat behind the columns, any expression of opinion about the reception of Abolition petitions; but, to day, he brought in an anti-Abolition petition, and never was a party so