

THE COLORED SABBATH SCHOOLS.

We have a short answer to Mr. William Phelps communication in the last Signal. We did not say that "a delegation of the two schools," but only that "a delegation of colored men, waited on the committee of arrangements, &c. We did not say this delegation was from both, or from either colored school, but that application was made for both schools. Mr. Phelps denies that any delegation of colored men waited on the committee, &c., but admits that a colored man called on a member of the committee, &c. The exact truth we have ascertained to be, that several members of the colored Baptist church had a consultation among themselves, and deputed two of their number to call on the committee of arrangements, and make application for the two colored schools. In pursuance of this object, one of them (Mr. Lightfoot) called on Mr. Hallock, and the other (Mr. Doullson) on Mr. Owen, and thus the matter was brought fairly before the committee. How pitiful then their quibbling about the precise manner of the application, when the substance of our charge is fully admitted by Mr. P. himself; how broad the foundation for the charge of falsehood!—Admit that the colored Methodist school had no desire to attend the celebration, but the Baptist school had and were refused; how does this vary the real character of the transaction. Why were they refused? we believe no candid person can read Mr. Phelps's letter, and not be convinced of the substantial truth of every statement we made in relation to this matter.

With regard to the defence set up by Mr. P. for the majority of the committee of arrangements, in excluding the colored schools, viz. that there was not time to make the arrangements, if it be not a fiction of the gentleman's own brain, we are fully assured that no embarrassment of this nature was felt by the minority. As to the plea that there was no time to consult the schools in regard to the application, it is in our view childish in the extreme. If four adult men who were deemed of sufficient intelligence to instruct children in the Christian religion and direct the affairs of Sunday Schools, could not of themselves solve the mighty problem, whether it were right to exclude little children from a Sabbath School celebration, on account of their color, we humbly think they would do well not to occupy so perilous a post in future.

We alluded to a reported argument of Mr. Owen's in favor of excluding the colored children, and at the same time expressed our unwillingness to believe it. Mr. P. denies having heard it and says that "others in the minority as well as the majority" [of the committee] "state that he made no such allusions." On more careful enquiry we are assured that Mr. Owen not only did use the argument attributed to him, but in much stronger language than we expressed it. If that gentleman shall deem the matter of sufficient importance to publish a denial, we shall feel called upon, in self defence, to produce the proof.

WILBERFORCE & Co. Detroit, Aug. 9, 1843.

OAKLAND COUNTY CONVENTION.

On the 19th of July, 1843, pursuant to public notice, a meeting of delegates from the various towns of Oakland County was held at Pontiac for the purpose of nominating six men suitable to represent the rights of the Black man, as well as the interests of community in general.

Whereupon, Joseph Morrison was called to the chair, and Erastus Ingersoll was appointed Secretary. After a few desultory remarks made by various members of the meeting,

Resolved, That the meeting proceed to an informal balloting for six nominees for the next Assembly of Michigan, and on canvassing the votes it was found that Erastus Ingersoll, of Novi, Wm. G. Stone, of Troy, Jesse Tenney, of Highland, George Sugden, of Commerce, Joseph Morrison, of Pontiac, and John Thomas, of Oxford, had a large majority of the votes given, and accordingly by acclamation it was

Resolved, That the above named gentlemen be recommended to the electors of Oakland County as suitable men for their suffrages at the next November election.

Resolved, That E. H. Fairchild, J. Morrison, and J. Adams, be a committee to prepare a circular address to the electors of the County.

Resolved, That E. Fish, and J. A. Peck, be a committee to obtain and circulate tickets.

Resolved, That J. Morrison, Wm. G. Page, and J. A. Peck, be a County Corresponding committee.

Resolved, That we all join in prayer to God, that He would crown our efforts with success, whilst the Rev. E. H. Fairchild led in prayer.

Adjourned, sine die. JOSEPH MORRISON, Pres't. ERASTUS INGERSOLL, Sec'y.

The assets of the Northampton (Penn.) Bank, an insolvent swindling shop, amounts to just two dollars and nineteen cents cash!—only sixty nine cents of which are in specie.—The probable deficit is only about half a million dollars, which its creditors, of course, can very well afford to lose, for the beautiful exhibition of morality which it furnishes them. The State suffers to the amount of about \$10,000—but the State is rich in relief notes.

Usury Laws.—The Philadelphia Ledger refers to the present low interests of money, which is below the legal standard of every State in the Union in our commercial cities, as an argument against usury laws.

SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

ANN ARBOR, MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1843.

THE LIBERTY TICKET.

For President, JAMES G. BIRNEY, OF MICHIGAN. For Vice President, THOMAS MORRIS, OF OHIO.

For Governor, JAMES G. BIRNEY, OF SAGANAW. For Lieutenant Governor, LUTHER F. STEVENS, OF KALAMAZOO.

For Representatives to Congress, FIRST DISTRICT, A. L. PORTER, OF WAYNE. SECOND DISTRICT, R. B. BEMENT, OF CALHOUN. THIRD DISTRICT, WILLIAM CANFIELD, OF MACOMBE.

STATE LEGISLATURE.

THIRD DISTRICT, For Senators, J. P. MARSH. SIXTH DISTRICT, JOHN C. GALLUP, URI ADAMS. KALAMAZOO COUNTY, For Representatives, ROSWELL RANSOM, DELAMORE DUNCAN.

NATIONAL LIBERTY CONVENTION, AT BUFFALO—WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY, 30th and 31st of August, 1843.

The Convention will organize at 10 o'clock, A. M., on the 30th, in the Park, in front of the Court House, in a Great Tent which has been engaged for the sittings of the Convention, and which will accommodate five thousand persons. Seats will be reserved for two thousand ladies.

All delegates to the Convention are requested immediately on their arrival in the city, to call at the Court room in the Court House, and register their names in a book prepared for the purpose.

At 9 o'clock, A. M. of the 30th, a consultation meeting of delegates will be held in the Court House.

Arrangements will be made for the gratuitous entertainment of as many of the delegates as possible, which arrangements will be made known at the Registry Room, or at the close of the first session of the Convention.

For the information of such delegates as may not wish gratuitous entertainment, or as may be unprovided for, the Committee announce that good accommodations, at low prices, may be had at respectable Temperance houses.

CHARLES O. SHEPARD, W. H. CHILDS, GEO. W. JOHNSON.

LIBERTY CONVENTIONS!!

A County Convention of the Liberty party will be held at Cassopolis, August 22, for the nomination of Members of the Legislature.

A Liberty County Convention will be held at Niles, August 23, to nominate suitable candidates for the Legislature.

It is expected that Dr. Bement and C. Gurney will be present, and lecture at both these places.

BRANCH COUNTY CONVENTION.

The friends of Anti-Slavery in Branch County, are invited to meet at the village of Coldwater, on Friday, the 18th inst., at 11 o'clock, A. M. for the purpose of

- 1st. Forming a County Anti-Slavery Society. 2d. Nominate candidates for County officers and Representative. 3d. Hear addresses, in the afternoon and evening, from gentlemen fully competent to entertain and enlighten.

LIBERTY MEETINGS.

Dr. BEMENT will lecture at Centerville on the twenty-first of August next at early candle lighting.

C. GURNEY Esq. and Dr. BEMENT will lecture at Edwardsburgh, Cass Co. on the 24th of August.

Centerville, July 27, 1843.

The news by the last arrivals from England is not important. The state of Ireland remained the same. The repeal agitation continues undiminished. Despatches had been sent to the Pacific, acknowledging the independence of the Sandwich Islands.

To their honor the Common Council of Marshall refused to license a recent Theatre exhibition in that place. Two of the Town Board however, granted a license subsequently.

We regret to learn that Mr. FITCH, of Marshall, our esteemed friend and coadjutor, has been reduced very low by protracted sickness, and is not expected to recover.

The Michigan Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church commences its session in our village on Wednesday the 16th inst. Bishop Soule is expected to preside.

The Chancellor has issued an injunction against the Merchant's Bank of Jackson.

Wheat sold in Buffalo on the 7th, at 80cts. Flour was worth in New York, Aug. 5, \$4.75 to \$5.00.

Read the Bible argument on the first page. It is brief and conclusive.

REV. MR. WEST'S THIRD LETTER.

Before we proceed to an examination of the particular propositions contained in this letter, let us take a slight review of the circumstances out of which our differences of opinion have grown.

The first occasion on which Mr. West became generally known to the abolitionists of Michigan, was at the Anniversary of our State Society in February. Here, in a lengthy and eloquent speech, he denounced slavery in the strongest terms, as cruel, inhuman, and directly withstanding the progress of the Gospel. He expressed his belief that cruelty was the general rule in the treatment of the slave, and kindness the exception, and he defied gentlemen to show a condition on this side of Hell worse than that of the slave. He urged the duty of Christians to do all they could for the overthrow of the system, and he admonished them that although it was fortified by legislation, yet it was right to disobey all laws which contravene the legislation of heaven.

These sentiments were cordially received by our noble hearted friends, and they considered him among the number of their decided and energetic co-adjutors.

The next we heard from Mr. West was from the General Assembly. What was his course there? Sixteen memorials came up before this body asking them to take some efficient action against this iniquity, by which if we may believe Mr. West, many members of the Presbyterian church were in a condition more wretched than any this side of Hell! Was he in favor of any expression of disapprobation of this abomination? He was not! When the slaveholders, like the evil spirits of old, asked to be let alone, Mr. West seconded their request with a warmth and earnestness which was noticed by every reporter whose statement we have seen. The Pennsylvania Freeman speaks of him as "one of the most, determined opponents of anti-slavery action in the Assembly."

When we read the final determination of the Assembly, we thought, with Dr. Beecher, that a very different result was due "to the cause of Truth and Justice, and the character of the Presbyterian Church." We expressed our convictions in the plainest and most simple language we knew how to use, yet, as we thought, with the utmost kindness of feeling. We also expressed our disapproval of the course of Mr. West in urging the Assembly not to interfere. We supposed we had a perfect right to say in what light we viewed the whole matter, especially as Mr. West represented a portion of our churches, and conveyed the impression to that Assembly that the Abolitionists of this State were of a "rampant spirit," that they were "goading the church to action on this subject reckless of its interests," that they were for "using the Assembly for party purposes," and that attempts had been made to "make a cat's paw" of him.—These were certainly grave charges to bring against a very respectable class of his fellow Christians, and although they were made in that Assembly, and thus disseminated all over the Union, they have not been supported, so far as we know, by the least particle of evidence.

Mr. West thought we had done injustice to him as well as to the Assembly, and forwarded a communication, correcting our errors.

In the first place, he assured us that "there was not a pro-slavery man in that Assembly." We suppose Mr. W. will admit that all the members were either anti-slavery, pro-slavery, or neutral. To ascertain their character, let us listen to their opinions. In most cases we give the language of the reporters. REV. DR. ELY, of Missouri. "He did not think that all slaveholding was sin; he could prove it was not. But then this was a free country." "There were some sores in the human system, which can only be cured by letting them alone—sometimes by covering them up. So that plastered up, and exempt from external irritations, the natural absorption of the system will gradually remove the disease. So it was with slavery."

REV. MR. GRAY, of Maryland. "God does not require us to declare slavery a sin; he has not so declared it himself." "Where does God justify us in taking his place, and declaring that slavery is sin? In taking these positions, we are making war on the laws of the land, which neither Christ nor his Apostles did, in their contest with the evil."

REV. DR. HILL, of Virginia. "I love the Abolitionists. I love the ultraists. But from my soul I pity them. I pity their ignorance—their exclusiveness. They are under a fearful delusion. ABOLITIONISM IS A MASTER STROKE OF THE DEVIL."

We will submit the matter to our readers, whether these are the sentiments of an anti-slavery man, or of one who was neutral, if neutrality on this question were possible. If these are anti-slavery doctrines, of what character must they be to be pro-slavery, in the estimation of Mr. West?

In our remarks on the action of the Assembly, we spoke of slaveholders as "men-stealers" and "sinners of the first rank," and as such, we thought them improper persons to sit in such a judicatory. The Confession of Faith of this Church, of 1794, says:

"Stealers of men are all those who bring off slaves of freemen, or keep, buy or sell them."

Hence we called Presbyterian slaveholders, men-stealers, according to this definition of their own Judicatory. In extenuation, or as we then supposed, in defence of his slaveholding colleagues, Mr. West advanced another proposition thus:

"We had not a man in that Assembly" who was either a sentimental or voluntary slaveholder. Every one who spoke cleared himself in this respect."

This proposition was new and strange to us. We examined it carefully, and could make nothing else of it than this: that so far as the guilt of holding slaves was concerned, every member "cleared himself" of all culpability in the matter. We knew of only one kind of slaveholding, and had never heard Mr. West mention any other. We therefore charged Mr. W. with justifying rascal slaveholders, and showed that upon his principles, he could be a slaveholder in Monroe, did the law permit it. But it seems that Mr. W. intended to extenuate, not justify, such slaveholding as the members of the Assembly practice. So much of our article as made Mr. W. a justifier of their oppression, we are bound to retract. As to his success in extenuating their sin, we will presently consider it. Mr. W. says this was "a great error" in us, but we assure him it was not a "wilful" one. And he will exercise much charity towards us, when he perceives how widely our theological views differ from his.

Mr. West contended that his slaveholding colleagues were involuntary in holding slaves, and we supposed, as a matter of course, that a man's involuntary actions cannot make him morally guilty. We supposed that sin was a voluntary transgression of a known rule of duty, and to be held as a sinner, a man must be sensible of a rule of duty, and must voluntarily transgress it. This, we thought, was the general impression with the vast majority of the people. But it seems that Mr. W., who is our senior in age, and our superior in literary attainments and theological knowledge, will have it that men are often "involuntary sinners." As this point has been a prominent topic in religious controversy for several generations, we shall not discuss it in its abstract form. But so far as the doctrine of "involuntary slaveholding" is advocated, we cannot let it pass without a rigid examination. Mr. West defines it thus:

"An involuntary slaveholder is one who may be opposed to slavery in his heart, who may nevertheless, under certain circumstances, hold men as slaves legally, but not on his own part act from choice, or sentimentally believe in the propriety of such a relation."

On this we have several remarks to make. 1. It is a new doctrine, not recognized by any anti-slavery society, paper, or lecturer, in the United States, or in Europe, or in the world, so far as we know.

2. It appears to us absurd to say that any man or set of men can make one a slaveholder against his choice, or volition. Suppose Mr. West lived in a slave State, and the mob should get together, and threaten to burn him alive, unless he would become a legal owner of a slave. This is the strongest possible case: and yet who does not see that he might resist all these "circumstances," and still refuse to accept the legal relation of master. All the world could not compel him against his will. But when he yields to these "circumstances," and says to the mob,

"I am opposed to slavery in my heart, and do not believe in the propriety of the relation, yet I will consent to it rather than be burned to death."

Does he not act voluntarily—from his own volitions? And are these "circumstances" any justification or palliation of slaveholding? No man can be made to act as a slaveholder against his will.

3. If slaveholders are to be divided into two classes, voluntary and involuntary, according to "circumstances," why not extend the distinction to all other crimes? Why not say there are involuntary horse-stealers, involuntary gamblers or adulterers, involuntary thieves and incendiaries? Where is the criminal who cannot plead circumstances in his favor? Why has this plea never been set up in our Courts of Justice? Suppose a criminal to be arraigned at the bar for theft, and he should plead that he stole involuntarily, against his choice, being compelled to do it by "circumstances," he would be told that there can be no stealing without an intention to steal. Why has not the law divided all criminals into these two classes?

4. It appears to us that this "involuntary" system of wickedness, if generally believed, would have a powerful tendency to break down all the barriers of virtue and good order.—Suppose every rumseller should say to himself:

"I have just learned that there are two kinds of rum-sellers, voluntary and involuntary: the last are not as bad as the first—Involuntary—let me see—a man cannot be very guilty for an involuntary act, can he? Here is Mr. West's definition—let me see if I can make it fit my case."

"An involuntary rum-seller is one who is opposed to rum-selling in his heart"—that's it, just my case—it is a horrid business—"who may nevertheless under certain circumstances, sell rum legally"—I am obliged to sell it for a living—I am poor—"but does not on his own part act from choice, or sentimentally believe in the propriety of the business?"—that's my case exactly—the Great searcher of Hearts knows that I abhor the business as wrong and wicked, and I do not follow it by choice, but am determined to get out of it as soon as I can find some other business.—Well, I am glad I have stumbled on this piece of information. I always thought there was but one kind of rum-selling, and I have felt bad about it. But involuntary rum-selling cannot be very bad. I will make use of this

distinction the next time I argue with a temperance lecturer."

This, it appears to us, would be the legitimate tendency of this doctrine, if practically carried out in the different departments of crime with which the earth is filled. This distinction would soothe the consciences of all the better classes of slaveholders, and a large portion of them could consistently take this prescription from Mr. West and range themselves in the involuntary class.

5. Admitting that there can be involuntary slaveholders, as Mr. W. contends, we are at a loss to know what good his proposition will do. We supposed he made this allegation in reference to his slaveholding brethren, as a justification of their acts; but we understand him now to disclaim any such intention, and we presume the plea is advanced as a matter of extenuation. But of this we have no positive evidence. We do not know, from anything he has said, to what extent he considers involuntary slaveholders guilty. He is entirely non-committal on this point. As this subject is new to us as well as our readers, we should be pleased if Mr. W. will give us more light on the subject.

6. We consider all slaveholders to be men-stealers, according to the Confession of Faith, and have so spoken of Dr. Ely and Dr. Hill. Will Mr. W. state whether he agrees with us in sentiment, or whether he disagrees?—An explicit answer to this, if Mr. W. can consistently give it, will enable our readers to determine at once whether there is a radical difference between us and Mr. West, or whether the differences are verbal and unimportant.

7. This involuntary slaveholding looks to us very much like the old doctrine of hating slavery in the abstract, and approving it in practice. Indeed, we suspect that a rigid examination would show that they not only look alike, but are identically the same; both proceeding on the assumption that holding slaves is not wrong in itself, or only a little wrong, and that nearly or quite all the guilt is derived from its attendant "circumstances." But we cannot pursue the subject now.

But is it true that there was not a voluntary slaveholder in the Assembly? Let us take the case of Dr. Ely.

1. He purchased a slave several years since whom he now holds. The price, we think was \$700. Was this an involuntary act?

2. He told the Assembly he had purchased more since that time. Were these purchases involuntary? Who compelled him to buy slaves?

3. He has held as slaves their children born in his house. Who compelled him to steal the liberty of these helpless infants?

4. He boasted how well off his slaves were—in better condition than the poor people of Philadelphia.

5. It is not known that he has made the least exertion to set them free.

6. He justifies slaveholding: "He did not think that all slaveholding was sin; he could prove it was not." He spoke of Abraham as a slaveholder, and quoted Paul as making the relation of master and slave perpetual. His expressions on this point have been understood out of the Assembly, so far as we know, just as we have understood them; and he has never disavowed such a construction. When he does, we will stand corrected.

Now when a man goes from a free State, and purchases slaves at several times, at a specified price, enslaves their children, justifies it from the Bible, boasts of their good condition, and makes no effort for their emancipation, nor even expresses a wish for it—are we to set him down as a poor unfortunate involuntary slaveholder, who is cursed with the institution against his will? Mr. West may have an amount of charity which may enable him to believe this; but the readers of the Signal, we suspect, will be slow to come to a conclusion so opposite to the dictates of common sense.

As to Dr. Hill, will Mr. West deny that he is a "slave-breeder," that he has "practically" sustained slavery, and that the system is "half-begotten"? If he admits these positions, why speak of them as he does?

Our differences with Mr. West are now considerably narrowed down by discussion, and will soon come to two or three points. We shall resume their consideration next week, in connection with the topics of his fourth letter, which we have now on hand.

Manners of the Slavery.—Quarrels of Gentlemen.—The Washington Capitol states that a son of Thomas L. Moore, of Warrenton, Fonguier county, Va. and a Mr. Robert E. Lee, met each other at the Court House, armed. Moore inquired of Lee, if he said he intended to cowhide his father; Lee replied in the affirmative. Moore then struck Lee with a small walking cane, and Lee fired a pistol at Moore without effect; Moore then fired at Lee, who returned the fire, but again without effect; Moore drew another pistol and the cap burst; Moore's father here handed him another pistol, but the by-standers interfered.—Mr. Lee was then taken to his room, where he died in a few minutes, the ball having entered his left breast, broke a rib, and took a direction to his right side, where it lodged.—Mr. Lee was a son of the late Charles Lee, of Va. (Attorney General under John Adams), and son-in-law of the Hon. John Scott, Judge of the General Court in Virginia. Mr. Moore is the cousin of Commodore Edwin Moore, and near relative of General Henderson, of Marines.

If "P. E." will send us his article written in a legible hand, we will publish it soon. The copy he sent to us cannot be deciphered by the compositor.

GENERAL CASS AND OREGON.

Gen. Cass seems to be the most warlike of all our political men, and to have a mortal antipathy to the British nation. In this respect he differs from all our statesmen, unless we include Mr. Wise among the number.—Messrs. Calhoun and Van Buren are quite peaceable in their deportment: Mr. Clay believes more in diplomacy than in violence; Col. Johnson seems to be satisfied with the glory of having killed Tecumseh; while Webster, on several prominent occasions, has taken occasion to congratulate the nation on its continual state of peace, and to deprecate war as disastrous, destructive, demoralizing and contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion. Similar sentiments have been expressed by Lord Brougham in England. Since his return from France, we have noticed in published articles of Gen. Cass, a war spirit, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter" against England, unless she will immediately comply with every iota of his demands. As we understand him, he would not even make a formal demand upon England for her ultimatum upon the disputed points between the two countries, but would proceed at once to seize on all we think to be our due, and keep it by the sword, if need be. He "would not waste the time in fruitless diplomatic discussions."

Any person of observation knows that such a principle, carried out in private life, would set every man to quarreling with his neighbor, and give rise to interminable lawsuits or personal conflicts. In the intercourse of neighbors, there is a kind of neutral ground where the boundaries between mine and yours are indistinctly marked, or not marked at all.—Each may honestly think he has as good a right to it as his neighbor, and if each determines he will have it all events, and proceed to take it without any attempt to arrange the difficulty, hostilities are inevitable, and must continue until one party or the other is so far discomfited as to be unable to continue the contest. The same is true with regard to nations. They may honestly differ in their opinion of what territory or privileges properly belong to them; but does it therefore follow that the difficulty must be adjusted by the test which brute beasts have adopted—the right of the strongest? If General Cass presents himself as a Presidential candidate pledged to make war with England, without further negotiations, in case of his election, the matter ought to be generally understood.

In his reply to an invitation to attend the Oregon Convention at Cincinnati, Gen. Cass says:

"I would take and hold possession of the Territory upon the Pacific, come what might. It is ours by all the principles which regulate the rights of nations. I would not waste the time in fruitless diplomatic discussions.—While we argue, England acts. She is already on the road towards universal domination. With words of Philanthropy and schemes of ambition, she is seizing station after station, wherever she can make a lodgment, and where she can best effect her designs of aggrandizement. For myself, I would not yield an inch to her unjust pretensions. We may as well meet her first as last, for meet her we must, or surrender our rights and our honor. I would have no red lines upon the map of Oregon. Let us keep our own, and keep it with a strong hand if need be. We may as well contend for Oregon, as for Washington, for our title to each is equally clear, and if from timidity, under the name of forbearance, we give up the former, we may soon again have to fight for the latter. No nation ever secured its own safety, or the esteem of the world, by pusillanimity, whatever guise this may have assumed. The province of Scinde in India, and the half civilized Sandwich Islands, have just been seized by the British force. And Oregon, and I believe California, will soon follow if our Government and people do not display more energy than we have recently put forth, and say to this ambitious nation, thus far shall you come, but no farther."

Rathburn's term of imprisonment expires in a few weeks. It is thought that he may be pardoned by Gov. Bouck before the expiration of the term, and thus his expatriation be prevented. It is said that he will come out poor, having almost nothing left of his former possessions. It is understood that no further legal proceedings will be instituted against him.

The Congregational Church in Waterbury, Conn. have censured their pastor for refusing to invite a slaveholder into his pulpit, and by a vote of 18 against 6, have

Resolved, That this church is of the opinion, that the simple fact of a person holding the relation of a master to a slave, otherwise in a regular standing, and having all other requisites, is not sufficient to preclude a minister from our pulpit, nor a brother from our communion.

"The Whig papers in this district will please copy."

This request follows the call for a Convention of the Whigs of this, the Third Congressional District, which now appears in the Detroit Advertiser. Will neighbor BATES inform us where the Whig papers of the Third District are?—St. Clair Banner.

OHIO.

The last Philanthropist contains an account of Liberty Nominations in the counties of Lorain, Knox, Medina, Harrison, Franklin, Champlain, Logan, Miami and Wayne. Liberty nominations for Congress will be made in nearly all the districts. We anticipate a much larger Liberty vote this year in Ohio than has been polled hitherto.

The Detroit Daily Gazette, a Cass paper, has been discontinued for want of adequate support.

A plan is in contemplation to establish a line of carrier pigeons from New York to Boston.

