ABOLITION PETITIONS.

Letter of the Vice President to Lewis Tappan, of New York, upon declining to present to the Senate an Abolition Petition signed by 140 women.

WASHINGTON, March 23, 1840.

SIR: Your letter of the 7th instant was duly received, enclosing a petition to Congress, signed by 140 women of the city and county of New York, praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and in those Territories of the United States where they exist and to admit no new slave State into the Union, requesting me to lay the same before the Senate. I have also received your letter of the 17th instant, requesting me to inform you when I would present the petition. Having declined to present the petition, it is, perhaps, due to the fair petitioners, and to you, their organ, as well as to myself, to state some of the reasons which dictate my course. The constitutional right of petition is contained in the first article of amendments, as follows;

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, & o petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Congress has never made a law abridging this right; but the people assembled at pleasure, and petition at pleasure, for a redress of grievances. Of course, this part of the Constitution has not been violated; and if it did not exist, Congress could not, constitutionally, have passed such a law, because no such power is delegated to Congress. This right, reserved to the people, does not devolve upon the presiding officer of the Senate the obligation of presenting petitions of every conceivable description.

There are considerations of a moral and political, as well as of a constitutional nature, which would not permit me to present petitions, of a character evidently hostile to the Union; and destructive of the principles on which it is founded. The patriots of the Revolution made great sacrifices of blood and treasure to establish and confirm the doctrines set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Each State was then an independent sovereignty; and to form a perpetual Confederacy for the safety and benefit of the whole, embodying the great doctrines of the Declaration, a compromise of interest and feeling was necessary. That compromise was made; and the principle which your fair petitioners are now agitating, was settled. The right of regulating and abolishing slavery was preserved to the States; and Congress have no more right to destroy slavery in Virginia and Maryland than they have to establish slavery in New York or New England. The right of petition for these objects is reciprocal; and the obligation of the presiding officer to present a petition to the Senate, if it exist in either case, is equally strong in both. But I cannot recognise the obligation in either case, though I acknowledge the right of the people in both. Is a difference made between the District of Columbia, and the States of Maryland and Virginia, from which it was taken? The question was settled in relation to this District by those States, by the formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution, when it was a part of those States; and a subsequent cession of jurisdiction could not deprive the citizens of the rights already secured to them by both the Federal Constitution and the Constitutions of their respective States. The right of Congress to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatever, does not mean omnipotent legislation. Congress have no right, in the District of Columbia, to take away the right of trial by jury; to pass an *ex post facto* law; to abridge the freedom of speech or of the press; to establish religion by law! nor to destroy the rights of property, or the personal liberty of the citizen. The reserved rights are as sacred in the District of Columbia as in the State of New York. They have the same right to consider the abolition of slavery in New York a grievance, and petition to Congress to establish it there, as the citizens of New York have to consider it a grievance in the District, and petition Congress to abolish it. Their right in either case to assemble peaceably and make their petition, I do not call in question; but the obligation on my part to present it to the Senate, I do not admit.

If a number of citizens should consider a Republican Government a grievance, and petition Congress to establish a monarchy; if others should consider religious toleration a grievance, and petition Congress to destroy, heresy, by abolishing all religious sects but their own, I should not consider it my duty to present their petitions to the Senate, nor do I consider it my duty to present a petition, the certain tendency of which is to destroy the harmony, and eventually to break asunder the bonds of our Union.

In regard to new States, the case is, if possible, still stronger. They must be united upon terms of equality. Each State having reserved the right of regulating this subject for itself, no one can be constitutionally deprived of the right. The State of New York has abolished slavery; but this abolition is not the conciliation on which she holds her place in the Confederacy. It is her own policy; & if it shall be her pleasure to change it, Congress cannot interfere. So, if new States are admitted into the Union, when admitted, they will stand upon an equality with New York. They may establish or abolish slavery at their pleasure, and neither Congress nor any other State, will have any more right to interfere with the subject, than with the laws of primogeniture in the British empire. The object of the petition does not affect the abstract question of slavery; that it is a subject which the Abolitionists of the free States can no more affect than they can that of the privileges of the British nobility. The plain question is this; shall we continue a united confederated Republic, or shall we dissolve the Union? If the prayer of this and similar petitions should be an immediate destruction of the Confederacy; and, with it, those bonds of affection which have united us as one great, one harmonious family. It has been my grief to observe a recklessness on the part of some, whom I otherwise highly esteem, showing an utter disregard of all consequences which must result from the perpetual agitation of this subject. We have an interest at stake too dear to be compromitted for a phantom which we can never gain, however enthusiastically we may pursue it. As a free, a powerful, and a happy nation, we stand unrivalled in the annals of the world.

Turning the eye alternately to every region of our country, it is greeted with the smiles of happiness, amid the scenes of liberty and peace, and plenty; and yet imagination frequently pauses upon the localities which remind us of the price at which these blessings were gained. Do we compare our condition with that of adjoining colonies!—We look to Quebeck—and there Montgomery fell. We return to view the beautiful town of Boston and take our stand on Bunker Hill—there Warren died. We cross the delightful fields of Connecticut—there Wooster bled. We continue our observation through the Jerseys, till we reach Princeton—there Mercer perished.

Even from the Capital in which we are assembled, we cast a look to the South, and the heights of Vernon remind us that the mighty Washington slumbers there, who forsook these peaceful shades, for the toils and dangers, and the privations of the sanguine field, where, with thousands of others equally brave and patriotic the enemies of our rights were defeated. It is at the price of their blood that we, in common with your fair petitioners, now enjoy these blessings. When these rights were again threatened, I regarded it my duty, in humble imitation of those apostles and martyrs of liberty, to offer my life upon the altar of my country, to confirm to you and them the permanent enjoyment of those blsssings. A merciful providence protected me, and I find a twofold recompence in the preservation of our institutions.

With these views I cannot reconcile it to my sense of duty to present the petition. I shall enter into no discussion on the principle of slavery, as that is not involved in the subject. I can view it in no other light than that of an interference with the constitutional rights of others, and in such a way as tends to the destruction of the rich inheritance purchased by the blood and toil of the fathers of the Revolution. Another circumstance exists aside from what I have noticed above, which would make me reluctant to present this petition—it comes from ladies, ordained by nature and the custom of all civilized nations, to occupy a higher place in society than that of petitioners to a legislative body.

If courtesy could induce me, on a subject that could not become a matter of injurious notoriety, to present a petition from females, yet I should regard it purely as a matter of courtesy and not of constitutional right.—The rights of women are secure through the coarser sex—their fathers, their husbands, and their brothers. It is the right of a woman to maintain a modest retirement in the bustle and politics of war. She does not appear at the polls to vote, because she is priviledged to be represented there by a man. She does not serve on juries, nor perform the duties of the Baliff or executioner, because it would be a degradation of her dignity. She does not take up arms and meet her country's foes; because she is a priviledged character, a man is her substitute, who represents her in all these drudgeries. Every man is bound by the perfect law of custom, of nature, and of honor, to protect and serve her. This is the light in which the law of God places the woman. She is veiled and silent even in religious discussions, not because she is unworthy, but because she is exempt from the strife of man: and it is her right to observe that retired modestry which renders her the object of admiration and esteem. In this respect, the constitution of our country is established upon the principles of the Divine law. If the rights of man are inviolable, they are of course confirmed to women; and the most dignified of the sex are the least inclined to meddle with public matters. I presume females, who sign petitions, would not consent to the publication of their names. I should be very reluctant to be accessory to an act which should, in any degree cast a shade of reproach upon an individual of that sex, whose modest dignity is the glory of man.—Thus, sir, I have frankly stated my views in returning the petition, as I now do.

I trust you will not deem it disrespectful to you, nor the ladies for whom you act. Be assured that, for yourself individually, I entertain high respect; and could I serve you personally, it would give me great pleasure to do so. Though a stranger to the signers of the petition, I do not doubt the respectability of their character and I deeply regret being requested, on their behalf, to perform an act with which I cannot consistently comply; but with the views, which I entertain, I cannot better testify my regard for them than by returning the petition.

Most respectfully,
RH. M. JOHNSON.

Lewis Tappan, esq. New York City.

Daniel Webster's opinion of William Henry Harrison—Mr. Webster when asked, in 1835 if he would be placed on the same ticket with General Harrison, replied, "I cannot be *guilty* of an act that shall, in the remotest degree, tend to the elevation of a man to the presidency who is *justly the scorn and rediculе of his foes, and the pity and contempt of his friends*,

From the Balt. Republican.

PRICE OF LABOR.

If we had not long known that the whig editors and the leaders of that party generally, would descend to any act of meanness and dishonesty to effect their sinister purposes, by deceiving the public, the course they have pursued, and are continuing to pursue, in relation to the remarks made by Mr. Buchanan, in his speech upon the subject of the Independent Treasury, and the provision of them by Mr. Davis would prove the fact. If they have read Mr. Buchanan's speech, in which he is alleged to have advocated the adoption of the Independent Treasury system, because it would have the effect to reduce the price of labor, they know that the charge is palpably and flagiciously false. So far from advocating the measure on any such ground, the chief object of Mr. Buchanan in that speech was to show the beneficial results which would flow from the adoption of the measure, to the community generally, and to laboring portions in particular. If they have not read the speech, and have drawn their conclusions respecting its contents from reading the perversions and misrepresentations of Mr. Davis, they must have seen from the subsequent remarks of Mr. Buchanan, that the statements of Mr. Davis were basely and wickedly false. In making this remark we take it for granted that they have read the subsequent remarks of Mr. Buchanan; for if they really supposed there was any truth in what Mr. Davis had asserted, they would naturally be anxious to see what reply would be made to the charge. If, however, they have not read those subsequent remarks, it proves conclusively that they are not disposed to arrive at a knowledge of the truth themselves, and are not destrous to communicate a knowledge of the truth to others. In any event therefore, the public may perceive that they are knowingly and wilfully asserting what is false, to mislead the public mind and to promote their party purposes by means of the vilest misrepresentations.

But that our readers may see for themselves, what Mr. Buchanan has said in reply to the misrepresentations of Mr. Davis, on which the whigs have founded the charge against the Administration and its friends, we copy the following extract from the speech of the former, delivered in the Senate on the 3d of March.

"And all this the Senator says in a professed reply to me. He thus charges me with having ascribed to the Independent Treasury bill the power of reducing the income of every man in the country "ONE half, in the value of wages and property." Had I contended in favor of any such power, well might the Senator have said it was a "flagitious proposition." He would almost have been justified in the use of a term so harsh and unparliamentary.

Self-respect, as well as the respect which I owe to the Senate, restrains me from giving such a contradiction to this allegation as it deserves. It would surely not be deemed improper, however, in me, if I were to turn to the Senator, and apply the epithet which he himself has applied to the proposition he imputes to me, and were to declare that such an imputation was a "flagitious" misrepresentation of my remarks."

From this extract it will be seen that Mr. Buchanan has denied in the most positive and explicit terms the imputation of having advocated the measure in question, upon the grounds alleged by the whigs, and has characterized the allegation against him as it deserved to be, as a flagitious misrepresentation. And yet, notwithstanding this plain, palpable and positive denial of the flagitious misrepresentation, the whigs are still actively employed in circulating the charge, and endeavoring to impress the public with the belief that the friends of the Administration desire to reduce the price of labor.

In another speech delivered by Mr. Buchanan on the 6th of March, he notices the charge against him as follows, and shows that his object in supporting the Independent treasury system, was to advance the best interests of the laboring man.

"Now as to the wages of labor: I really thought it was impossible that I could have been misunderstood, until I read the speech of the Senator. In combatting the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay) I proved that what the laboring man ought, above all things, to desire, was, such a reform in the banking system as would afford him "constant employment and regular wages, paid in a sound currency." It is ruinous to him for his wages to be rising with the kite of speculation one year, and the very next year to have them reduced to almost nothing, and even to be without employment altogether. He never benefits by extravagant speculation. It brings to him nothing but unmitigated evil, because the increased prices which he is obliged to pay for the necessaries and comforts of life, counterbalance, and more than counterbalance, this advantage. What he desires is stability and regularity in the business of the country. He ought to be able to raise his family in peace and comfort, and to look forward to the next year for the same reward for his honest toil that he received the last. On this subject no anxious doubts ought to harass his mind. He ought to feel himself independent so long as it shall please the Almighty to give him health and strength to earn his bread by the sweat of his face, without being involved in those periodical crashes of the banking system, which are produced by extravagant expensions of the currency. Under the present system the laboring man cannot calculate what a day may bring forth. He receives high wages to day and is starving for want of employment tomorrow. In illustrating these views, I most cheerfully admitted in my speech that "that country is most prosperous where labor commands the greatest reward; where one day's labor will procure not the greatest nominal amount of a depreciated currency, but most of the necessaries and comforts of life." And I said that by correcting your bloated credit system in such a manner as to reduce "the amount of your bank issues within reasonable and safe limits, and establishing a metalic basis for your paper circulation," you would greatly benefit the laborer. He could then purchase more of the necessaries and comforts of life for one dollar "than he could have done in the days of extravagant expansion for one dollar and a quarter." Besides, he would then enjoy the advantages which he never can do under the present system, "of constant employment and regular wages," without being involved in ruin by a recurrence of those periodical expansions and contractions of the currency, which have hitherto convulsed the country." The last thing of which I ever dreamed, was to bring his wages down to the pure metalic standard. I wished to adopt that safe mixed currency which I so fully described in the course of my remarks, and which would be a blessing to manufacturers, merchants, mechanics, laborers, and all the people of the country, because it would produce certainty and stability in all the transactions of life."

From the Ohio Statesman.

A COLD BATH FOR FEDERALISM.

We have no longer any room left to doubt the triumphant result of the Ohio elections next fall, in favor of VAN BUREN and SHANNON. With the evidences before, us, it would be treason to doubt In addition to what we make public, our private letters are full of the most flattering accounts of the progress of the cause of democracy. From old Stark, Licking, Greene, Madison, Muskingum, Belmont, Fairfield, Highland, Holmes, Knox, and from all the counties northwest, there is an enthusiasm and onward course of democracy never before known. In this county, and down the Scioto its mouth all is on fire, and the democrats are preparing for a most vigorous and successful struggle. A letter a few days ago from the Western Reserve, is full of the most encouraging details. So from Columbia, Jefferson, Harrison, &c. &c. In Clermont the feds are putting the knife to their own throats—they are forming *Tip Clubs*, at the head of which they put the bitterest old federalists in the country. This will arouse the democracy to full action, and the result will be the defeat of whigery by 6 or 700. In Hamilton, the residence of Harrison, all is well we are assured. The act to amend the city charter of Cincinnati, so as to protect the market people from taxation, will add greatly to the democratic strength—a public dinner is proposed to the able firm republican members of the Legislature from that county, Messrs. Faran and Holmes of the Senate, and Messrs. Henderson and Moore of the House. Truly do they merit such a mark of distinction.

A letter from a noble advocate of democracy in old Stark, speaks of a 100 majority for Shannon and Van Buren; and a citizen of that place, just returned from Massillion, says the enthusiasm of the democracy is beyond all parallel which goes to confirm our private letters.

In Licking the debates are kept up at all the school houses nearly in the county. Our friends, B. D. Taylor and Messrs. Parker, Brigs, Elis, &c. are carrying the war into the enemies camp, and pushing their labors into every township. Their eloquence and unanswerable arguments are doing up the work for Whiggery in Licking in fine style. So says the Newark papers and reports.

In Fairfield, Charles Brough, Esq. the Editor of the Eagle, has issued proposals for the Little Magician, until after the election, which we are told already counts 1000 subscribers! The traitor in Hocking county has only added enthusiam into our ranks there, and the Little Magician will more than make up for the loss in that quarter.

The Norwalk Experiment *dares* the feds to count and compare the changes in Huron Co. The energetic editors of that paper says, that they will show TWO changes from federalism to Van Buren, for every one the other way. And this is the word from all parts of the State. The Experiment also says, that one of the Whig delegates to the 22d baboon convention, returned to his home a raving lunatic.—Rowdying and song singing does not take with an intelligent people—nor hard cider with sober voters.

Now for the *proofs*? First we give the renunciations from Madison Co. Abolitionism will not aid the federal cause, it is very evident.

Madison Co. March 16, 1840.

Mr. Medary—Sir:—We, the undersigned believing that Gen. Harrison is supported by the ancient federalist Tories, and the modern abolitionists and antimasons, and believing as we do, that these isms threaten the disunion of the Union, therefore we withdraw from the Whigs, and will vote for the little Dutchman.

J. C. CLOUSE,
ABNER FOUTS,
JAMES C. RYAN,
SAM'L. CLEGG,
PETER VANHORN.

Now for a dose or two from Knox county. Read and understand. He is one of the delegates to the 22nd convention, and he is not the only one that returned *disgusted*, with the fooleries of federalism.

From the Mt. Vernon Banner.

MORE SCREWS LOOSE.

Mr. Ellis—This is to certify that I used to belong to the *whig party*, but have left them because they support the Banking institutions which are not bound for the redemption of their notes, and I will now support the Democratic party because they are in favor of making stockholders individually bound for the redemption of their notes. I went to Columbus to the Federal Harrison Abolition convention, and seen the performance, and thought it was disgusting to any decent man.

HENRY ARMSTRONG.

Centersburg, March 18, 1840.

Mr. ELLIS:—This is to certify that I did vote the whig ticket in 1838, but I have seen the falsity of the sentiments of that party; and shall now support the Democratic party, for I believe in the principles of the democratic party.

W. H. MARSHALL.

Centersburg, Hilliar township, Knox co. March 18, 1840.

By request we publish the annexed card of Mr. Robert P. Gaw. He was placed upon the Whig Committee of Vigilance for this county and his name and politics thus made public. He has seen fit to change his course, and we in justice to him publish his present political opinions.—Woodstock Sentinel.

TO THE PUBLIC!!

Last summer, I was placed on the Whig Committee of Vigilance for this County.—Since that time, a radical change has taken place in my political sentiments. At that time, it was thought, Mr. Clay would be selected by the Whig party, as their candidate for the Presidency; and I was induced to support him by some Whigs, who said, that if Mr. Martin Van Buren was not defeated at the next Election, so as thereby to defeat the leading measures of his administration, the country would be ruined; and that if Mr. Clay was elected, it would be saved.

I believed what was told me about Mr. Martin Van Buren, and said I would vote for Mr. Clay. ☞This was before the Harrisburg Convention met. This Convention nominated General Harrison, a man, I could not support under any circumstances; for he is an Old Federalist, and, moreover, he is the candidate selected by the Abolitionists and Anti Masons, &c. He will not say, whether he is an abolitionist or not; neither will he say, whether he is in favor (directly) of a National Bank. I cannot vote for such a man. Mr. Martin Van Buren has fully committed himself upon these questions. In short, He is the unwavering friend of the South; and has pledged himself to veto any bill upon the subject of Abolition, and also any bill rechartering a U. States Bank. I will certainly vote for him. He has been a friend to the Institutions of his country, and deserves the support of every true Democrat.

☞I admire the splendid and eloquent speech of Mr. BUCHANAN, and cordially approve of it. It is a triumphant vindication of Mr. Martin Van Buren and the policy of his administration. I urge all true democratic republicans to come to the polls in November next, and vote for him.

ROBERT P. GAW.

Woodstock, Va., March 26, 1840.

From the Baltimore Post.

FURTHER DISCLOSURES.

THE NAYLOR FRAUD ESTABLISHED.

The Philadelphia Pennsylvanian states that the examination of witnesses in the Third District investigation, was closed on the part of Mr. Ingersoll, on Monday. The following facts were disclosed on the last day of the examination.

Two of the last witnesses examined by Mr. Ingersoll, were William G. Conrow and Earnest C. Smith—the former the whig return judge for Spring Garden, who signed Mr. Naylor's return—the latter the Chairman of the Whig Committee of Superintendence for Spring Garden in 1838. Both these gentlemen testified to their having learned from Mr. Bela Badger, at Harrisburg, in December, 1838, the addition of 900 to 1000 name to the Northern Liberties registry list, also proved by other witnesses to have been confessed by John C. Gill.—Mr. Conrow was asked in the course of his examination, whether he or any of the election officers for Spring Garden, in October, 1838, were sworn or affirmed according to law—a question which he declined to answer; and being desired to state his reason for declining, the witness assigned as his reason that he was not bound by the law of the land to give evidence which criminated himself. Mr. Earnest C. Smith afterwards swore that Mr. Courow had informed him that not one of the election officers in Spring Garden were under oath or affirmation; Mr. Conrow and Mr. Smith are both well known to be men above contradiction or impeachment.—Thus the whole election in Spring Garden is "as if it had not taken place," and upon this testimony alone, Mr. Naylor must loose his seat by an unanimous vote of the House of Representatives, should he not immediately resign it—a measure which Mr. Conrow swore he had expressed his opinion Mr. Naylor had declared to him in his own office in December, 1838.

DAVID CROCKETT ALIVE!—An extra from Austin (Texas) Gazette received at New Orleans, contains a letter written to the editor of the Gazette by an American in Mexico, stating that he saw David Crockett alive and well in a mine in Mexico. The circumstances detailed, give an air of plausibility to the statements, and render it not improbable that the hero of the Alamo is still alive. At any rate the story must have received credit at Austin, or it would not have been published as a coarse jest or hoax, on the very spot almost where the heroic backwoodsman is supposed to have fallen.

STATIONS

Of Preachers of the M. E. Church for 1840.

SNOW-HILL DISTRICT.

Presiding Elder—J. Massey.
Dorchester.—J. D. Onins, J. Quigley.
Cambridge—T. J. Quigley, G. Barton.
Salisbury—William Quinn.
Princess Anne—S Drain, M. Oldham.
Nassweddusc—J. Hargis. —— Way.
Snow-hill—J. S. Taylor.
Milton—S. Townsend, J. A. Watson.
Lewes—Wm. Spry.
Laurel—J. Allen, J. D. Long.
Accomac—C. Karsner, J. R. Willett.
Northampton—J. Hazzard.

EASTON DISTRICT.

Presiding Elder—D. Lambdin.
Fredericca—R. E. Kemp.
Milford—Wm. Connelly, J. Carlisle.
Wye—J Cazier.
Easton—J. Houston.
Denton—J. Bayne, —— Farmeter.
Caroline—E. Reed.
Talbot—J. Bell, W. Henderson.
Centreville—E. R. Williams. ——Asprel.
Church Hill—Wm. Allen, M. Kurtz.
Kent—L. Storks, J Mason.
Millington J. Pierson.

WILMINGTON DISTRICT.

Presiding Elder—H. White.
Wilmington—J. Lybrand.
New Castle—J. McFarland.
Middletown—E. Janes.
Smyrna—J. B. Ayres, W. C. Thomas.
Dover—J. Humphreys.
Delaware City—Wm. Williams.
Cecil—E. Kennard, J. Ruth.
Elkton—J. Curtis.
Nottingham—Wm. Torbert, ——Sheck.
North East—J. Henry.
Port Deposit—Wm. A. Wiggins.

DEMOCRATIC YOUNG MEN'S STATE CONVENTION.

At a meeting of the Democratic members of the Maryland Legislature held at Annapolis prior to the adjournment, the Hon HUGH ELY was called to the Chair, and JOHN J. GRAVES appointed Secretary.

Francis Gallagher of Baltimore City offered the following preamble and resolutions which were unanimously adopted.

Whereas, there is a crisis in the affairs of this nation which imperiously demands the attention of every citizen who is attached to our republican institutions: and whereas there have been ever since the formation of our government two parties in this country distinguished from each other by the different tendencies of their doctrines, the democratic party aiming at the perpetuity not only of the liberties but the hippiness of the people, the tendency of the other, the Federal party, averse to the welfare of the people, although its numbers are to some extent increased by those who are animated in support of its tenets by patriotic motives, and whereas the Federal party are confidently on the principle which is at the bottom of all their political movements—the *supposed ignorance of the people*, and calculated by additional real activity to bring into the administration of the national government doctrines which an immense majority of the people of the country have ever and again pronounced destructive to the truest and dearest hopes of freemen, and whereas it is the duty of the young as well as the old by exertion to prevent as far as possible the realization of the hopes of the federal party, therefore

Resolved, That the services of Martin Van Buren, our present able chief magistrate, are and have been of such a character as to eminently entitle him to the support and confidence of the American people, for whose interest and rights he has ever been the unequivocal and fearless advocate.

Resolved, That the democratic young men of this State be earnestly requested to meet in their respective election districts on or before the first Saturday in August next, to appoint delegates to attend a Convention to be held in the city of Baltimore on the first Monday in September following, for the purpose of furthering the great interests of the Democratic party at the coming fall elections.

Resolved, That a committee of nine be appointed by the chairman to draft an address to the Democratic young men of the State.

Resolved, That the several democratic papers in the State be and are hereby requested to insert these proceeding as often as convenient.

The following gentlemen were appointed to prepare the address to the young men of the State.

FRANCIS GALLAGHER, Baltimore.
WILLIAM P. MAULSBY, of Carroll.
DANIEL LLOYD, of Talbot.
WILLIAM MATHEWS, of Allagany.
WILLIAM R. SANGSTON, of Caroline.
ROBERT S. WELSH, Baltimore Cy.
SAMUEL B. FOORD, of Cecil.
EDWARD HAMMOND, of A. A. County,
EDWARD LONG, of Somerset.

The address will be prepared in a few days, and sent to all the democratic papers in the State for publication.

HUGH ELY, Chairman.
JOHN JAMES GRAVES, Secretary.

OFFICE HOLDERS.

The whigs call the administration party, the "officeholder's party." Who has ever been a longer office holder than their candidate for the Presidency?