John Eaton jr

EASTERN-SHORE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE.

"THE PRICE OF LIBERTY IS PERPETUAL VIGILANCE."

NEW SERIES. EASTON, MARYLAND, TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1837 VOL. III.---No 5

THE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE
Is Printed and published every
TUESDAY MORNING,
BY
GEO. W. SHERWOOD.
(PUBLISHER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.)

TERMS:—Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, payable half yearly in advance.

No subscription will be received for less than six months, nor discontinued until all arrearages are settled, without the approbation of the publisher.

Advertisements not exceeding a square, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion—larger advertisements in proportion.

☞ All communications to insure attention should be *post paid*.

POETRY.

LIFE.

BY WILLIAM C. BRYANT.

Oh Life, I breathe thee in the breeze,
I feel thee bounding in my veins,
I see the in these stretching trees,
These flowers, this still rock's mossy stains,

This stream of odours flowing by
From clover fields and clumps of pine,
This music thrilling all the sky,
From all the morning birds, are thine.

Thou fill'st with joy this little one,
That leaps and shuts beside me here,
Where Isar's clay-white rivulets run
Through the dark woods like frighted deer,

Ah, must thy mighty Breath, that wakes
Insect and bird, and flower and tree
From the dark trodden dust, and makes
Their daily gladness, pass from me—

Pass, pulse by pulse, till o'er the ground
These limbs, now strong shall creep with pain,
And this fair world of sight and sound
Seem fading into night again?

The things, oh Life, thou quickenest all,
Strive upward towards the bread bright sky,
Upward and outward, and they fall
Back to earth's bosom when they die.

All that have borne the touch of death,
All that shall live, lie mingled there,
Beneath that veil of bloom and breath,
That living zone 'twixt earth and air.

There lies my chamber dark and still;
The atoms trampled by my feet
There wait, to take the place I fill
In the sweet air and sunshine sweet.

Well, I have had my turn, have been
Raised from the darkness of the clod,
And for a glorious moment seen
The brightness of the skirts of God;

And knew, the light within my breast,
Though wavering oftentimes and dim,
The power, the will, that never rest
And cannot die, where all from him.

Dear child: I know that thou wilt grieve,
To see me taken from thy love,
Will seek my grave at Sabbath eve,
And weep and scatter flowers above.

Thy little heart will soon be healed,
And being shall be bliss, till thou
To younger forms of life must yield
The place thou fill'st with beauty now.

When we descend to dust again,
Where shall the final dwelling be
Of Thought and all its memories then,
My love for thee and thine for me?

I WISH HE WOULD DECIDE.

I wish he would decide, mamma,
I wish he would decide;
I've been a bridesmaid twenty times,
When shall I be a bride?
My cousin Anne, my sister Fan,
The nuptial knot have tried.
Yet come what will, I'm single still,
I wish he would decide.

He takes me to the play, mamma
He brings me pretty books
He woos me with his eyes, mamma,
Such speechless things he looks!
Where'er I roam—abroad, at home—
He lingers by my side;
Yet come what will I'm single still—
I wish he would decide!

I throw out many hints mamma,
I speak of other beauxs.
I talk about domestic life,
And sing, "They don't propose."
But ah! how vain each piteous strain
His wavering heart to guide;
Do what I will, I'm single still—
I wish he would decide!

I really shall insist, mamma,
If nothing intervenes,
My brother Thomas questions him,
And asks him what he means?
And if he wants to "break, mamma
My passion or my pride,"
Unconquered yet shall scorn regret,
I wish he *would* decide!

Civilization.—A year or two ago, a traveller in the Sandwich Islands, mentioned as a remarkable proof of advancing civilization among the natives, the erection of a gallows. When they get Bowie knives, and build stone penitentiaries, they will have advanced much further.

Worthy of Attention.—The English papers say—"One of the brightest matrimonial prizes of the day is Miss Saville, niece of the present Duke of Dorset." This lady is said to be worth a million sterling

REMARKS OF MR. BUCHANAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

In Senate of the United States, Jan. 3, 1837.
On the bill to admit the State of Michigan into the Union.

* * * * * * *

The case of Missouri was a very strog one. Congress agreed to admit her into the Union upon the condition that her Legislature should substantially change a provision in her constitution touching a very delicate subject. Under her constitution the Legislature had no power to make this change; nor could it have been effected without a long and troublesome process. But Congress cut through the gordian knot at once, and agreed to accept the engagement of the Legislature as the voice of the people. We have never had any occasion to regret this regard of forms.

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. Ewing) has contended that the second Michigan convenhad no power to assent, because the first convention which was held had refused.

[Here Mr. Ewing dissented.]

Mr. B. I understood the Senator to state that as the first convention had dissented, the power was spent and a second could not be held.

[Mr. EWING said he had not touched this point.]

Mr. B. said, I should be glad the Senator would restate his position.

[Mr. EWING said, he had asked whether if the first convention had assented to the condition proposed by the act of Congress, there would have been any objection to this assent, because it had been called by virtue of an act of the Legislature?]

Mr. BUCHANAN said certainly not. It never could have been contended that this act of the Legislature had vitiated the subsequent proceedings of the convention. Although it was necessary to give them validity, yet it would not destroy them. It would neither make the case better nor worse. I am confident it might be demonstrated that the people of Michigan, under the act of Congress had power to make a second trial, upon a failure of the first; as this point has not been contested by the Senator, I shall not now enter upon its discussion.

I now come, Mr. President, to speak upon subjects concerning which I should gladly be silent. The internal concerns of the States should never be introduced upon this floor when it can be avoided; but the Senators from South Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) and Ohio (Mr. Morris) have thought differently, and have rendered it necessary for me to make some observations in reply.

First, then, I would ask what possible connection can be imagined between the conduct of the Senatorial electors of Maryland, who refused to execute a trust for which they were elected, and that of the people of Michigan, who choose delegates to a convention upon the express invitation of an act of Congress? The Maryland electors refused to perform their duty under the State constitution; but the people of Michigan did give their assent to the condition which we had prescribed to them, and upon which alone they could enter the Union. There is as great a difference between the two cases, as "between a hawk and a handsaw." Standing here as a Senator, I have no right to pronounce judgment upon the conduct of these electors. They are responsible to the people of the State of Maryland, not to me.

The other Maryland question to which the Senator adverted is one of a very different character. It involves the decision of the important principle, whether, under a settled form of constitutional Government, the people have a right to change that form in any other manner than the mode prescribed by the constitution. If I were to admit that they did not possess this power, still the Senator is as much of a revolutionist as myself. He admits that if the Legislature of Michigan had passed a law authorizing this convention, and fixing the time and place of its meeting, then its proceedings would have been regular and valid. But who gave the Legislature of Michigan this authority? Is it contained in the constitution of the State? That is not pretended. Whence, then, shall we derive it? How does the Senator escape from this difficulty? Upon his own principles it would have been a legislative usurpation; and yet he says, if the Legislature had acted first, the convention would have been held under competent authority.

Now, for my own part, I should not have objected to their action. It might have been convenient, it might have been proper, for them to have recommended a particular day for holding the election of delegates and for the meeting of the convention. But it is manifest that as a source of power to the convention, legislative action would have been absurd. The constitution of Michigan fixes the boundaries of the State. For this purpose it refers to the act of Congress of the 11th of January, 1805, establishing the Territory. How could the boundaries be changed? If in no other manner than that prescribed by the constitution of Michigan, it would have delayed for at least two years, the admission of the State into the Union.

First, such an amendment must have been sanctioned by a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives. Then it must have been published for three months. Afterwards it must have received the approbation of two thirds of both houses of a Legislature subsequently elected. And, after all these pre-requisites, it must have been submitted to a vote of the people for their ratifications. It was to avoid these very difficulties that the Senate, at their last session, adopted, by an unanimous vote, the measures which the Senator now calls revolutionary, and referred the decision of the question directly to the sovereign people of Michigan in their primary capacity. Then was the appropriate moment for the Senator to have objected to this course. That was the occasion on which to convince us that this was an unconstitutional and lawless proceeding.

He suffered the precious moment to escape, and it is now too late to tell the people of Michigan that they shall be punished by an exclusion from the Union, because they thought proper to take us at our word That would have been the time to have inserted an amendment in the bill requiring a previous act of the Legislature, prescribing the mode of electing the delegates. But the Senator was then silent upon this subject. There had then been no proceedings in Maryland such as he now calls revolutionary. A word upon that subject. We are told in that sacred and venerated instrument which first proclaimed the rights of man to the world, that "all experience has shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." But suppose the case of a State, whose constitution, originally good, had from the lapse of time and from changes in the population of different portions of its territory, become unequal and unjust.

Suppose this inequality and injustice to have gone to such an extent that the vital principle of representative republics was destroyed, and that the voice of a citizen in one county of the State was equivalent to that of six citizens in another county. Suppose that an equal disproportion existed between taxation and representation, and that, under the organic forms of the constitution, a minority could forever control the majority. Why, sir, even under such circumstances, I should bear with patience whilst hope remained. I would solicit, I would urge the minority, I would appeal to their sense of justice, to call a convention under the forms of the constitution, for the purpose of redressing these grievances; but if, at last, I found they had determined to turn a deaf ear to all my entreaties, I should then invoke the peaceable aid of the people, in their sovereign capacity, to remedy these evils. They are the source of all power, they are the rightful authors of all constitutions.—They are not for ever to be shackled by their own servants, and compelled to submit to evils such as I have described, by the refusal of their own Legislature to pass a law for holding a convention.

Whoever denies this position condems the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the American Revolution. There is not one of the old thirteen States whose Governments were not called into existence upon these very principles. It is now too late in the day, in our favored land, to contend that the people cannot change their forms of Government at pleasure. The glorious experiment which we are trying in this country would prove a total failure if we should now decide that the people, in no situation, and under no circumstances, can hold a convention without the previous consent of our own Legislature. It is not my province to say whether the proper time for this peaceful action of the sovereign people, in their primary capacity, has yet arrived, or will ever arrive, in Maryland. That question may safely be left to them; but I feel no terrors, my fancy conjures up no spectres, from such doctrines as I have advanced.

I am exceedingly sorry that another topic has been introduced into this debate, by the Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Morris,) which if possible, has still less connection with the question before us than the recent conduct of the Senatorial electors of Maryland. The Senate will at once perceive that I refer to the letter of Mr. Dallas on the subject of the repeal of the bank charter. I regret that this letter has become the subject of debate here. We are abundantly able to settle all our local differences in Pennsylvania; and we are justly jealous of foreign interference. This is not the proper form in which either to argue or decide the Pennsylvania bank question, and I call upon the whole Senate to bear witness that nothing but necessity compels me to speak here of the subject. The letter of Mr, Dallas has been denounced by the Senator from Ohio as incendiary, as revolutionary, and as calculated to excite the people to rise up in rebellion against the laws. Would I not then be recreant to my own character if I should not raise my voice in defence of a distinguished citizen of my own State against such an unfounded assault.

The letter of Mr. Dallas has been much and greatly misrepresented. Garbled extracts from it have been published throughout the whole country, without the context; and innumerable false commentaries have attributed to him sentiments and opinions wholly at war with its general tenor. In speaking upon this subject, I am fully sensible how liable, I am myself to misrepresentation; but I shall endeavor so plainly and so clearly to present my views that at last they cannot be misunderstood by any person present.

In the first place, then, Mr. Dallas never did assert that the convention about to be held in Pennsylvania, will possess any power to violate the constitution of the United States. He never did maintain the proposition that this convention would be the final judge, and could decide, in the last resort, that its own decrees were no violation of that sacred instrument. Why, sir, such propositions would be rank nullifiers; and although I have never had the pleasure of being on intimate terms with Mr. Dallas, I can venture to assert that he, is opposed to this political heresy. For my own part, I can say, that however much I may admire the apostles of this new faith, their doctrines have never found any favor in my eyes. No, sir; Mr. Dallas has expressly referred to the Supreme Court of the United States as the tribunal which must finally decide whether the convention possesses the power to repeal the Bank charter.

From what we have heard on this floor, it is manifest that public opinion is greatly in error as to the principles of the anti-bank party in Pennsylvania. I profess to be a member of that; and I now propose briefly to state their principles. If I should err in presenting theirs, I shall at least place my own beyond contradiction.

The constitution of the United States declares that no State shall pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts. This is a most wise and salutary provision; may it be perpetual! It secures the private rights of every citizen, and renders private contracts inviolable. It imparts a sacred character to our titles to real estate, and it places the seal of absolute security upon the rights of private property.

Still the question remains, is a privilege granted by a State Legislature to a corporation for banking purposes a contract, within the spirit and intention of the United States? In other words, is the authority, which the Legislature of Pennsylvania has given to the Bank of the United States to create and circulate a paper currency of thirty-five millions of dollars, irrevocable by any human power short of an amendment to the federal constitution? My own convictions are clear that such an act of legislation is not a contract under the constitution. It is true that the instrument speaks contracts in general terms; but there is no rule of construction better settled than that of straining the universality of general words so as to confine their application to such cases as were exclusively within the intention of those by whom they were used. It would be useless to enumerate instances under this rule. Its existence will not be denied by any.

If this can be made manifest, that the framers of the constitution, by the use of the word "contract," never could have intended to embrace the creation of such a bank by State Legislature, then the question is decided. It would be an easy task for me to prove, from the history of this provision, that its object was to secure rights arising from private contract; and that a State bank charter was not within the contemplation of those by whom it was inserted. But I forbear. My sole purpose, at present, is to state general principles.

It never can be imagined that the sovereign States, who are the parties to the federal constitution intended, by this prohibition, to restrain themselves from the exercise of those great and essential powers of government which vitally affect the general interests of the people, and the laws regulating which must vary with the ever varying changes in society. If they have been guilty of this absurdity, they have acted the part of suicides, and have voluntarily deprived themselves of the power of rendering the people under their charge prosperous and happy.

I think, therefore, it may be stated, as a general proposition, that the constitution of the United States, in prohibiting the Legislatures of the respective States from passing laws to impair the obligation of contracts, never ended to prevent the States from regulating, according to their sovereign will and pleasure, the administration of justice; their own internal commerce and trade; the assessment and collection of taxes, the regulation of the paper currency, and other general subjects of legislation. If this be true, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that if one Legislature should give away any of these general powers, either to corporations or to individuals, such a grant may be resumed by their successors. Upon a contrary supposition, the legislative power might destroy itself, and transfer its most important functions for ever to corporations. In these general principles I feel happy that I am sustained by the high authority of the late Chief Justice Marshall, in the celebrated Dartmouth college case—4 Wheaton, pages 627, 628, 629 and 630.

I shall not consume the time of the Senate in reading the whole passage; but shall confine myself to the conclusion at which he arrives. He says, if the act of incorporation of Dartmouth college be a grant of political power; if it creates an institution to be employed in the administration of the government, or if the funds of the college be public property; or if the State of New Hampshire, as a Government, be alone interested in its transactions, the subject is one in which the Legislature of the State may act according to its own judgment, unrestrained by any limitation of its power imposed by the constitution of the United States. He then proceeds to decide the case of Dartmouth college, on the principle that it is not a public, but a private eleemosynary corporation, and therefore, with the prohibition contained in the constitution.

Here, then, the principle is distinctly recognised, that if a corporation created by a State Legislature be a grant of political power, if it create a civil institution to be employed in the administration of the Government, then the charter may be altered or repealed at pleasure by the State Legislature. The distinct principle, clearly deducible from this principle from this opinion, as well as from the nature of our Government, is, that contracts made by a State Legislature, whether with corporations or individuals, which transfer political power, and directly affect the administration of government, are not such contracts as the constitution intended to render inviolable. In other words, although these contracts may be within its general words, they are not within its intent and meaning. To declare that they were, would be to say that the people had surrendered their dearest rights into the keeping of the Legislature, to be bartered away for ever at the pleasure of their own servants. This would be a doctrine utterly subversive of State rights and State Sovereignty.

Let us now illustrate these principles by a few examples.

The judges of the Supreme Court of several of the States hold their offices under the State constitutions.—They have abandoned the practice of a lucrative profession, and the State has entered into a solemn contract with them, that they shall hold their offices during good behavior, and receive a fixed annual compensation which shall not be diminished during their term of service.—Here is a solemn contract, founded on a valuable consideration; and yet in all the changes which have been made in the different States, it has never, to my knowledge, been seriously contended, that judges, under such circumstances, might not be removed, or have the tenure of our salary of their office entirely changed. This has been done in repeated instances. And why? Because although this be a contract, it is one not of a private, but of a public nature. It relates to the administration of justice, which is one of the most important concerns of government; and the interests of the individual judge must yield to that of the whole community. It is therefore not a contract within the meaning of the constitution of the United States.

Again, suppose the Legislature of a State should create a joint stock company, with a capital of thirty five millions of dollars, and grant them the exclusive privilege of purchasing and vending all the cotton, the flour, the iron, the coal, or any of the other great staples of the State which might seek a market in their commercial metropolis. Will any Senator contend that such a charter would be irrevocable? Must the great agricultural and manufacturing interests of the State, which may have thus been sacrificed by the Legislature, remain palsied by such an odious monopoly? Certainly not. The next Legislature might repeal the obnoxious law: because it concerned not private interests or private property merely, but those great and leading interests which vitally affect the whole people of the State. No one can suppose that the Constitution of the United States ever intended to consecrate such a charter.

Again, if the Legislature of a State should transfer to a corporation, or to an individual, for a period of years, the power of collecting State taxes, and thus constitute farmers general of the revenue, as has been done in other countries, would not this be a contract, in the language of Chief Justice Marshall, creating a civil institution to be employed in the administration of the Government. and therefore a subject in which the Legislature of the State may act according to its own judgment, unrestrained by any limitation of its power imposed by the Constitution of the United States.

Let us proceed a step further. One of the most essential powers and duties of any modern Government, is that of regulating the paper currency within its jurisdiction. This is emphatically the exercise of sovereignty, and is, in its nature, a high political power. It is scarcely second in importance to the power of coining money; because the paper circulation represents the current coin. This power is now exclusively possessed by the State Legislatures; whether rightfully, or not, it is now too late to enquire. By means of its exercise, they can raise or they can sink the value of every man's property in the community. They can make the man who was poor yesterday, rich to day. They can elevate or depress the price of necessaries of life, and the wages of labor, according to their pleasure By creating a redundant currency, they may depreciate the value of money to such a degree as to ruin our manufactures, depress our agriculture, and involve our people in rash and demoralizing speculations.

What use have these Legislatures made of this sovereign power? They have transferred it to a thousand State banks; they have yielded up all control over it; and if the doctrine now contended for be correct, these banks cannot be disturbed in the exercise of this attribute of sovereign power by any human authority They hold it under the sacred shield of the constitution of the United States. It is now deemed a matter of immense importance to restrain the issue of small notes and substitute a specie circulation in their stead. But the banks can laugh you to scorn. The whole power of Congress, and that of the Legislatures of all the twenty six States of this vast Union, cannot prohibit the circulation of notes of a less denomination than five dollars. If this be the case, did ever so great an absurdity exist upon the face of the earth under the Government of any people? Congress have, by some means or other, lost the control over the paper currency of the country, The State to whom it belongs have granted it to a thousand banking corporations; and although the people of the States may change and modify their fundamental institutions at pleasure, yet this banking power remains unhurt amidst the general wreck. If this be true the people of the United States are completely at the mercy of these institutions. The creature will give the laws to the creator. But here the great and wise judge and expounder of the Constitution interpose for our relief. He declares that, if the act of incorporation be a grant of political power, the subject is one in which the Legislature of the State may act according to its own judgment unrestrained by any limitation of its power imposed by the Constitution of the United States. Who doubts but what the power to regulate the paper currency of a country is in its very nature a political power?

From what I have said, the Senate will perceive, that there is no foundation whatever for the panic which has been excited lest the State might resume its grants of land, might violate the rights of private property, or take what belongs to one man to give it to another. The prohibition contained in the Constitution of the United States clearly embraces these cases.

It is not my intention here to discuss either the merits or demerits of the Bank of the United States as rechartered by Pennsylvania. In my opinion, a large majority of the people of that State, and myself among the number, believe that the creation of this vast moneyed monopoly, with the privilege of issuing bank paper to the amount of thirty-five millions of dollars, is dangerous to our liberties, and to our dearest interests. We desire to try the question before the supreme judicial tribunal of the land, whether its charter is protected by the Constitution of the U. States It will be admitted by all, that a more important question has never been presented for adjudication before any court. By what means, then, can we raise this question for decision? We must submit in silence, or the charter must be repealed either by the Legislature or the approaching convention. There is no alternative. And because we are anxious to have this question decided, by the only means in our power, a deafening clamor has been raised against us, that we are revolutionists, radicals, violators of vested rights, and every thing else which is calculated to alarm the people. We wish to ascertain the truth of that which is taken for granted by our adversaries, whether the charter is a vested right, protected by the Constitution of the United States, or not. This is the whole front of our offending. Is this not just, is it not reasonable, is it any thing but a fair appeal to the laws of the land.

Different opinions exist in Pennsylvania as to whether this repeal should be effected by the Legislature or the convention. For my own part, I decidedly prefer the latter, if it can be accomplished. The convention will possess no power but merely that of proposing amendments to the people for this adoption or rejection. They can place this question before the electors distinctly, and detached from all other amendments.—Each citizen, at the polls, will thus be enabled to vote upon the single question, bank or no bank. This is due to the bank as well as to the people. I need scercely add, that no citizen of Pennsylvania with whom I have ever conversed upon the subject, entertains a doubt of the propriety and justice of refunding the bonus which the bank may have paid, with interest and damages sufficient to place it in the very same situation it was when it received its charter. This might properly be made a constituent part of the question to be submitted to the people

These desirable objects could not be secured by means of a repeal by the Legislature. So many questions both of a political and local character, influence the election of its members, that the friends of the bank might complain that the people had not sanctioned the repeal. I would, therefore, be sorry, if necessity should compel us to adopt this alternative as the only means left of trying the question.

Again, should the bank appeal from the decision of the people of Pennsylvania, in their sovereign capacity, to the Supreme Court of the United States, the question will, be presented before that tribunal in a more solemn and imposing form than if the repeal should be accomplished by an ordinary act of legislation. The people of the State of Pennsylvania, complaining that their legislative servants had despoiled them of one of the highest attributes of an independent Commonwealth, and had bartered away, for a period of thirty years, the political power which they enjoyed of regulating the paper currency, within their own limits, would then be the party on the one side, and on the other, the Bank of the United States, contending that transfer of this power has been irrevocably made to it, under the sanction of the Constitution of the United States. Of the result I entertain not the slightest apprehension. Should it, however, be adverse, which Heaven forbid! I can tell the Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) that we shall never resort to nullification as the rightful remedy.

Thus, sir I have been drawn into a discussion utterly repugnant to my own feelings. I hope I may never again have occasion to allude to the subject on this floor. It is entirely foreign from the question in debate. Nothing could have urged me to make the remarks which I have done, but the unwarranted attack of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Morris) upon the party at home with which I am proud to act.

Daring Attempt to Rob the Mail.

A most audacious, and as we are happy to state unsuccessful attempt was made on Friday evening, to rob the mail between this place and the City Post Office. We understand that the mail carrier, a youth of about seventeen years of age, and son of Mr. Jas. Williams, was attacked as he was riding on horseback with the mail bags, by three men near the Round-Tops, and near the house of Mr. Forsyth, the Secretary of State.—The ruffians succeeded in dismounting the rider, and had possession of the mail bags and saddle, but the former could not be immediately detached from the latter, and while the rascals were trying to take off the bags, a young man came in sight. The fellows then took to the commons abandoning the bags and saddle, which were safely carried to the city Post Office. We understand that the robbers had possession of the horse, which they took along with them; it was, however, recovered the next morning. The mail rider declares that one of the men exclaimed, when the attack was made, "Kill him, kill him" We have seldom heard of a more barefaced attempt at highway robbery. The mail carrier attacked on Pennsylvania Avenue, in the city of Washington, between eight and nine o'clock in the evening! When robbery has arrived at such a pass as this in the National Metropolis, it is high time for the citizens to go armed.

We understand that a young man named Remington, a printer, was attacked and maltreated a few evenings before the foregoing robbery, between the city and Georgetown.—*Metropolitan.*

Medical Testimonies. Many of the highest medical authorities in the world unite in proclaiming that all spirituous and alcoholic drinks are stimulants, not nutritives, that they drive on the circulation of the blood, and give a temporary vigor to the system, which is always speedily followed by weakness; that so far from diminishing thirst they have a powerful poison, gradual or hasty in undermining the constitution, in proportion to their strength and the quantity consumed If you are in earnest to remove drunkenness, strike at the root, by abstaining from every kind of intoxicating liquor, and you may cure the most dreadful disease that has ever plagued the human race. Every other experiment to banish the scourge of nations will prove vain as the attempt to arrest the lightning in its flight, or check the mountain torrent. Those who abstain from brandy, rum, whiskey and gin, may strip off the leaves—those who abstain from wine also may break off the twig but it is those who abstain from every thing that intoxicates that will tear up by the roots the poisonous Upas of our moral atmosphere, which has for ages scattered poverty, crime, disease, and desolation over the world.

The following are the testimonies of medical gentlemen:—

Dr John James.—"No man is safe who cannot without inconvenience, omit for days and weeks all kinds of intoxicating drink. No man is safe who cannot sleep without something generous before he goes to bed; by frequent repetition, a glass of wine or a tumbler of beer becomes dangerous. The moderate use of ardent liquors undermines the constitution without exciting the suspicion of the victim, until reformation is all but hopeless. No quantity of spirituous liquor, however small, can with safety be taken daily, much less several times the day, with impunity. We should never taste vinous or other fermented liquors without remembering that danger lurks in every cup."

Dr Rush—"Spirituous liquors always render the body more liable to cold; the temporary warmth they produce is always succeeded by chillness: nor do these liquors lessen the effect of hard labor on the body. The horse, toiling from morning to night, requires nothing but water and substantial food. There is neither strength nor nourishment in spirituous liquors; if they produce vigor in labor, it is transient, and is speedily followed by fatigue I have repeatedly seen men, who never tasted strong drink, perform the greatest exploit in work, both as to degree and duration."

Joy flutters past like a gay and harmless butterfly but, unfortunately, often lays eggs which engender devouring catterpillars.

Some would be thought to do great things, who are but tools and instruments like the fool who fancied he played upon the organ when he only blew the bellows

A simile.—A writer on swearing says that an oath from a woman's lips is unnatural and incredible, and he would as soon expect a bullet from a rose bud.

A bad workman quarrels with his tools.

A man at Niagara Falls, who had become intoxicated, fell from a precipice, eighty feet perpendicular, among some rocks, and was taken up alive. His leg was broken, and he was shockingly mangled, but it is said he will recover.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13074-0740