

THE SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

THE INVIOIABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IS THE ONLY SECURITY TO PUBLIC LIBERTY.

T. FOSTER,
G. BECKLEY, Editors.

ANN ARBOR, MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1844.

VOL. 4, No. 35.
WHOLE NO. 191.

THE SIGNAL OF LIBERTY

Will be published every Monday morning, in
Ann Arbor, Michigan, by

BECKLEY & FOSTER,

FOR THE MICHIGAN STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

TERMS.

ONE DOLLAR a year, in advance; if not paid,
in advance, TWO DOLLARS will be invariably
required.

Old subscribers can have their papers at
One Dollar a year, by forwarding that amount,
and paying arrears.

All subscribers will be expected to pay within
the year.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

For each line of brevity, (the smallest type),
for the first insertion, 3 cents.
For each subsequent insertion, 1 cent.
For three months, 7 cents.
For six months, 10 cents.
For one year, 15 cents.

Orders by mail will be promptly attended to.
Legal Advertising by the folio.

Manufacturers, Booksellers, Machinists,
Wholesale Dealers, and all others doing an
extensive business, who wish to advertise, will
find the Signal the best possible medium of com-
munication in the State.

All Remittances and Communications
should be addressed, Post paid,

SIGNAL OF LIBERTY: Ann Arbor, Mich.

MISCELLANY.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS.

BY MRS. CHILDS.

You ask what are my opinions about 'Women's Rights.' I confess, a strong distaste to this subject, as it has been generally treated. On no other theme, probably, has there been uttered so much of false, mawkish sentiment, shallow philosophy, and spitting, farting, candle wit. If the style of its advocates has often been offensive to taste, and unacceptable to reason, assuredly that of the opponents have been still more so. College boys have amused themselves with writing dreams, in which they saw women in hotels, with their feet hoisted, and chairs tilted back, or growling and bickering at each other in legislative halls, or fighting at the polls, with eyes blackened by fisticuffs. But it never seems to have occurred to these facetious writers, that the proceedings which appear so ludicrous and improper in women, are also ridiculous and disgraceful in men. It was well that men should learn not to hoist their feet above their heads, and tilt their chairs backwards, not to growl and snap in the halls of legislation, or give each other black eyes at the polls.

Maria Edgeworth says, "We are disgusted when we see a woman's mind overwhelmed with a torrent of learning; that the tide of literature has passed over it should be betrayed only by its fertility." This is beautiful and true;—but is it not likewise applicable to men? The truly great never seek to display themselves. If they carry their heads high above the crowd, it is only made manifest to others by accidental revelations of their extended vision. Human duties and proprieties do not lie so very far apart, said Harriet Martineau; if they did, there would be two gospels, and two teachers, one for man, and another for woman.

It would seem, indeed, as if men were willing to give women the exclusive benefit of gospel-teaching. Women should be gentle, say the advocates of subordination; but when Christ said, "Blessed are the meek," did he preach to women only? "Girls should be modest," is the language of common teaching continually uttered in words and customs.—Would it not be an improvement for men, also, to be scrupulously pure in manners, conversation, and life? Books addressed to young married people abound with advice to the wife, to control her temper, and never to utter wearisome complaints, or vexatious words, when the husband comes home fretful or unreasonable, from his out-of-door conflicts with the world. Would not the advice be as excellent and appropriate, if the husband were advised to conquer his fretfulness, and forbear his complaints, in consideration of his wife's ill-health, fatiguing cares, and the thousand disheartening influences of domestic routine? In short, whatsoever can be named as loveliest, best, and most graceful in woman, would likewise be good and graceful in man. You will perhaps remind me of courage. If you use the word in its highest signification, I answer that woman, above others, has abundant need of it in her pilgrimage; and the true woman wears it with a quiet grace. If you mean mere animal courage, that is not mentioned in the sermon on the Mount, among those qualities which enable us to inherit the earth, or become the children of God. That the feminine ideal approaches much nearer to the gospel standard, than the prevalent idea of manhood, is shown by the universal tendency to represent the Saviour and his most beloved disciple with mild, meek expression, and feminine beauty. None speak of the bravery, the might, or the intellect of Jesus; but the devil is always imagined as a being of acute intellect, political cunning, and the fiercest courage. These universal and instinctive tendencies of the human mind reveal much.

That the present position of women in society is the result of physical force, is obvious enough; whosoever doubts it, let her reflect why she is afraid to go out in the evening without the protection of a man. What constitutes the danger of aggression? Superior physical strength, uncontrolled by the moral sentiments. If physical strength were in complete subjection to moral influence, there would be no need of outward protection.—That animal instinct and brute force now govern the world, is painfully apparent in the

condition of women everywhere; from the Mordman Tartars, whose ceremony of marriage consists in placing the bride on a mat, and consigning her to the bridegroom, with the words, 'Here, wolf, take thy lamb,—to the German remark, that 'stiff ale, stinging tobacco, and a girl in her smart dress, are the best things.'—The same thing, softened by the refinements of civilization, peeps out in Stephen's remark, that woman never looks so interesting, as when leaning on the arm of a soldier; and in Hazlitt's complaint that 'it is not easy to keep up a conversation with women in company. It is thought a piece of rudeness to differ from them; it is not quite fair to ask them a reason for what they say.'

This sort of politeness to woman is what men call gallantry; an odious word to every sensible woman, because she sees that it is merely the flimsy veil which foppishness throws over sensuality, to conceal its grossness. So far is it from indicating sincere esteem and affection for women, that the profligacy of a nation may, in general, be fairly measured by its gallantry. This taking away right and condescending to grant privileges, is an old trick of the physical force principle; and with the immense majority, who only look on the surface of things, this mask effectually disguises an ugliness, which would otherwise be abhorred. The most inveterate slaveholders are probably those who take most pride in dressing their household servants handsomely, and who would be most ashamed to have the name of being unnecessarily cruel. And profligates, who form the lowest and sensual estimate of women, are the very ones to treat them with an excess of outward deference.

There are few books, which I can read through, without feeling insulted as a woman; but this insult is almost universally conveyed through that which is intended for praise. Just imagine, for moment, what impression it would create on men, if women authors should write about their 'fey lips,' and melting eyes, and voluptuous forms, as they write about us! That women in general do not feel this kind of flattery to be an insult, I readily admit; for, in the first place, they do not perceive the gross chattel-principle, of which it is the utterance; moreover, they have, from long habit, become accustomed to consider themselves as household conveniences, or gilded toys. Hence, they consider it feminine and pretty to abjure all such use of their faculties, as would make them co-workers with man in the advancement of those great principles, on which the progress of society depends. 'There is perhaps no animal,' says Hannah More, 'so much indebted to subordination, for its good behaviour, as woman.' Alas, for the animal age, in which such utterance could be tolerated by public sentiment!

Martha More, sister of Hannah, describing a very impressive scene at the funeral of one of her Charity School teachers, says: 'The spirit within seemed struggling to speak, and I was in a sort of agony; but I recollected that I heard, somewhere, a woman must not speak in the church. Oh, had she been buried in the church yard, a messenger from Mr. Pitt himself should not have restrained me; for I seemed to have received a message from a higher Master within.'

This application of theological teachers carries its own commentary. I have said enough to show that I consider prevalent opinions and customs highly unfavorable to the moral and intellectual development of women; and I need not say, that, in proportion to their true culture, women will be more useful and happy, and domestic life more perfected. True culture, in them, as in men, consists in the full and free development of individual character, regulated by their own perceptions of what is true and their own love of what is good.

This individual responsibility is rarely acknowledged, even by the most refined, as necessary to the spiritual progress of women.—I once heard a very beautiful lecture from R. W. Emerson, on Being and Seeming. In the course of many remarks, as true as they were graceful, he urged women to be, rather than seem. He told them that all their laboring education of forms, strict observance of genteel etiquette, tasteful arrangements of the toilette, &c., all this seeming would not gain hearts like being truly what God made them; that earnest simplicity, the sincerity of nature, would kindle the eye, light up the countenance, and give an inexpressible charm to the plainest features.

The advice was excellent, but the motive by which it was urged, brought a flush of indignation over my face. Men were exhorted to be, rather than to seem, that they might fulfil the sacred mission for which their souls were embodied; that they might, in the freedom, grow up into the full stature of spiritual manhood; but women were urged to simplicity and truthfulness, that they might become more pleasing.

Are we not all immortal beings? Is not each one responsible for himself and herself? There is no measuring the mischief done by the prevailing tendency to teach women to be virtuous as a duty to man rather than to God—for the sake of pleasing the creature, rather than the Creator. 'God is thy law, thou mine,' said Eve to Adam. May Milton be forgiven for sending that thought out into everlasting time in such a jewelled setting. What weakness, vanity, frivolity, infirmity of moral purpose, sinful flexibility of principle—in a word, what soul-stifling, has been the result of thus putting man in the place of God!

But while I see plainly that society is on a false foundation, and that prevailing views concerning women indicate the want of wisdom and purity, which they serve to perpetuate—still, I must acknowledge that much of the talk about Women's Rights offends both my reason and my taste. I am not of those who maintain there is no sex in souls; nor do I like the results deducible from that doctrine. Kinmont, in his admirable book, called the Natural History of Man, speaking of the warlike courage of the ancient German women, and of their being respectfully consulted on important public affairs, says: 'You ask me if I consider all this right, and deserving approbation? or that women were here engaged in their appropriate tasks? I answer, yes; it is just as right that they should take the interest in the honour of their country, as the other sex. Of course, I do not think that women were made for war and battle; neither do I believe that men were. But since the fashion of the times had made it so, and settled it, that war was a necessary element of greatness, and that no safety was to be procured without it, I argue that it shows a healthful state of feeling in other respects, that the feelings of both sexes were equally enlisted in the cause; that there was no division in the house, or the State; and that the serious pursuits and objects of the one were also the serious pursuits and objects of the other.'

The nearer society approaches to divine order, the less separation will there be in the characters, duties and pursuits of men and women. Women will not become less gentle and graceful, but men will become more so. Women will not neglect the care and education of their children, but men will find themselves ennobled and refined by sharing those duties with them; and will receive, in return, co-operation and sympathy in the discharge of various other duties, now deemed inappropriate to women. The more women become rational companions, partners in business and in thought, as well as in affection and amusement, the more highly will man appreciate home—that blessed word, which opens to the human heart the most perfect glimpse of Heaven, and helps to carry it thither as on an angel's wings.—[Letter of Mrs. M. L. Child.]

A FORTUNE MADE BY PICKING UP A PIN.

Important results often follow from the most trifling incidents. A remarkable instance of this kind is found in an English paper of Lafitte, the French Banker, of whom we gave a somewhat extended account last week—and was the foundation of the immense fortune he afterwards accumulated. When he came to Paris in 1788, the extent of his ambition was to find a situation in a banking house, and to attain this object he called on M. Perregeaux, the rich Swiss banker, to whom he had a letter of introduction. This gentleman had just taken possession of the hotel of Mad'le Gurnard, which had been put up in a lottery by that lady and won by the fortunate banker. It was to this charming habitation, which has since been demolished, that M. Lafitte paid his first visit in Paris, and, as it were, took his first step in the Parisian world. The young provincial—poor and modest, timid and anxious—entered by that gateway which had witnessed so many gaities of the last century. He was introduced into the boudoir of the danseuse, then became the cabinet of the banker, and there modestly stated the object of his visit.

'It is impossible for me to admit you into my establishment, at least for the present,' replied the banker, 'all my offices have their full complement. If I require any one at a future time, I will see what can be done; but in the meantime I advise you to seek elsewhere, for I do not expect to have a vacancy for some time.'

With a disappointed heart the young aspirant for employment left the office, and while with a downcast look he traversed the court-yard, he stooped to pick up a pin which lay in his path, and which he carefully stuck in the lapel of his coat. Little did he think that this trivial action was to decide his future fate, so it was.

From the window of his cabinet M. Perregeaux looked out. The Swiss banker was one of those keen observers of human actions who estimate the value of circumstances apparently trifling in themselves, and which would pass unnoticed by the majority of mankind. He was delighted with the conduct of the young stranger. In this simple action, he saw the revelation of a character; it was a guarantee of a love of order and economy, a certain pledge of all the qualities which should be possessed by a good financier.

A young man who would pick up a pin could not fail to make a good clerk, merit the confidence of his employer, & obtain a high degree of prosperity. In the evening of the same day, M. Lafitte received the following note from M. Perregeaux:—

'A place is made for you in my office which you may take possession of to-morrow morning.'

The anticipations of the banker were not deceived. The young Lafitte possessed every desirable quality, and even more than was first expected. From simple clerk he rose to be cashier, then partner, then head of the first banking

house in Paris, and afterwards in rapid succession, a Deputy and President of the Council of Ministers, the highest point to which a citizen can aspire.

On what a trifle does the fortune of a man sometimes depend. But for the simple incident of the pin, M. Lafitte would, perhaps, never have entered the house of M. Perregeaux; another employer might not have opened to him so wide a field of action, and his talents and intelligence would not have led to such magnificent results.

Little did M. Perregeaux think that the hand which would pick up a pin was that of a man generous to prodigality in doing good—a hand always open to succor honor and misfortune. Never were riches placed in better hands; never did banker or prince make a more noble use of them.—Boston Traveller.

THE MANUFACTURE OF INDIA RUBBER SHOES IN BRAZIL.

A correspondent of the Journal of Commerce, writing from Para, in Brazil, gives the following interesting description of the manufacture of India rubber shoes:—

'We found Senhor Angelica's family, like himself, very hospitable and very talkative. After dinner we were shown over the place, and entering the neighboring forest, were shown the caoutchouc trees. They grow, in general, to the height of forty or fifty without branches, then branching, run up fifteen feet higher.—The leaf is about six inches long, thin and shaped like that of a peach tree. The trees show their working by the number of knots or bunches made by tapping; and a singular fact is that like a cow, when tapped, they give most milk or sap.'

'As the time for operating is early in the day, we were obliged to content ourselves with viewing the utensils and moulds used by the shoemakers, awaiting until next morning to see the *modus operandi*. Accordingly, before sunrise we were on hand. The blacks were first sent through the forest, armed with a quantity of clay and a small pickaxe.—On coming to one of the trees, a portion of the soft clay is formed into a cup and stuck to the trunk. The black then striking his pick over the cup, the sap oozes out slowly, a tree giving daily about a gill. The tapper continues in this way, tapping perhaps fifty trees, when he returns, and with a jar passing over the same ground, empties his cup. So by seven o'clock the blacks come in with their jars ready for working.'

'The sap at this stage resembles milk in appearance, and somewhat in taste.—If left standing now, it will curdle like milk, disengaging a watery substance like whey.'

'Shoemakers now arrange themselves to form the gum. Seated in the shade with a large pan of milk on one side, and on the other a fagon, in which is burned a nut peculiar to this country, emitting a dense smoke, the operator having his last, or form, held by a long stick or handle, besmeared with soft clay, (in order to slip off the shoe when finished,) holds it over the pan, and pouring on the milk until it is covered, sets the coating in the smoke; then giving it the second coat, repeats the smoking; until the shoe is of the required thickness, averaging from six to twelve coats. When finished, the shoes on the forms are placed in the sun the remainder of the day to drip. Next day, if required, they may be figured, being so soft that any impression will be indelibly received. The natives are very dexterous in this work. With a quill and sharp pointed stick, they will produce finely lined leaves and flowers, such as you may have seen on the shoes, in an incredible short time. After remaining on the forms two or three days, the shoes are cut open on the tops, allowing the last to slip out.—They are then tied together and slung on poles, ready for market. There peddlers and Jews trade for them with the country people; and in lots of a thousand or more, who have them stuffed with straw and packed in boxes to export, in which state they are received in the United States. In the same manner any shape may be manufactured. Thus toys are made over clay forms. After drying, the clay is broken and extracted. Bottles, &c., in the same way. According as the gum grows older, it becomes darker in color and more tough. The number of Caoutchouc trees in this Province is countless. In some parts whole forests of them exist, and they are frequently cut down for firewood. Although this tree exists in Mexico and the East Indies, there appears to be no more importation into the United States from these places. The reason, I suppose, must be, the want of that prolificness found in them here.'

'The Caoutchouc tree may be worked all the year; but generally in the wet season they have rest, owing to the flooded state of the woods; and the milk being watery, requires more labor to manufac-

ture the same articles than in the dry season. This, to these very reasoning people, is sufficient to deter them from working in winter; extra labor giving them unpleasant feelings.'

SIGNAL OF LIBERTY.

ANN ARBOR, MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1844.

One Dollar a Year in Advance.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The annual message of the President arrived at so late an hour last week, that we were unable to accompany it by any remarks of our own. But there are several points in it which deserve attentive consideration.

The first column of fulsome, though accustomed eulogy upon our "glorious institutions," seems to have been designed as an introduction to an exhortation for the vigorous defence of Slavery, and a devout and earnest expression of hostility to the Liberty party, and its objects. Gen. Jackson, in one of his annual messages, cautioned the people against foreign Abolition emissaries, meaning especially Geo. Thompson; Mr. Clay in 1839, denounced the carrying of Abolitionism to the polls, through the Whig and Democratic parties, as alarming; but John Tyler, in 1844, feels it necessary to warn the Slaveholding States against the organized Liberty party, as calculated to involve them in "one general destruction!" At least, we suppose the allusion is to the Liberty party. We know not to whom else the expressions can apply. Here is the paragraph itself:

'It therefore may, in the progress of time, occur, that opinions entirely abstract in the states in which they may prevail, and in any degree affecting their domestic institutions, may be artfully, but secretly, encouraged with a view to undermine the Union. Such opinions may become the foundation of political parties, until at last the conflict of opinion, producing an alienation of friendly feeling among the people of the different states, may involve in one general destruction the happy institutions under which we live. It should ever be borne in mind that what is true in regard to individuals, is equally so in regard to States. An interference of one in the affairs of another is the fruitful source of family dissensions and neighborhood disputes; and the same cause affects the happiness and prosperity of States. It may be most devoutly hoped that the good sense of the American People will ever be ready to repel all such attempts should they ever be made.'

Next, hear what the President says on the subject of

NATIONAL PEACE.

'There has been no material change in our foreign relations since my last annual message to Congress. With all the powers of Europe we are on the most friendly footing. Indeed, it affords me much satisfaction to state, that no former period has the peace of that enlightened and important quarter of the globe ever been, apparently, more firmly established. The conviction that peace is the true policy of nations, would seem to be growing and becoming deeper amongst the enlightened every where, and there is no people who have a stronger interest in cherishing the sentiment, and adopting the means of preserving and giving it permanence, than the American People.'

In this paragraph it is expressed or implied—

1. That peace is most "important" with European powers.
2. That with "all" of them we are on "the most friendly footing."
3. That peace between them and our own country is "firmly established."
4. That an inclination for peace, "seems to be growing and becoming deeper amongst the enlightened every where."
5. That the United States should be first "in preserving and giving permanence" to this growing inclination for peace.

Well, among other means of doing this, Mr. Tyler recommends—

1. That a large number of "fortifications should be erected and finished."
2. That we should be "active and vigilant" in placing our "cities and roadsteads" in a state of security.
3. That "an extensive steam marine" is important to the defence of the country.
4. That the United States should add "LARGE NUMBERS of steam ships to our naval armaments."
5. "The establishment of military posts" between this country and Oregon.
6. The carrying into effect the propositions of the Secretaries of the Army and Navy.—The amount last year appropriated from the Treasury for the warlike purposes of the American people if we rightly remember, was about two-thirds the entire amount of the national revenue, amounting to nearly \$16,000,000. With "large numbers of steam ships" added to our Navy, and fortifications to reach to Oregon, the war expenses proposed this year cannot be less, but will probably be greater.

Now, before the American people vote this tax of some fifteen millions of dollars, or more, it might be well to ask Mr. Tyler what foreign power is there sufficient dangerous of war to render these vast annual appropriations necessary? What will he answer to it?

1. There is no danger of a war with England; for he has expressly told us, that peace is "firmly established," and we are on "the most friendly footing" with her.
2. There is no danger of war with any other European power; for he himself tells us in the message—

'We continue to receive assurances of the most friendly feelings on the part of all other European powers; with each and all of whom, it is so obviously our interest to cultivate the most amicable relations; nor can I anticipate the occurrence of any event, which would be likely, in any degree, to disturb those relations.'

It must be the height of folly to make vast preparations for a war with nations with whom you acknowledge you cannot anticipate the smallest thing that will disturb "amicable relations." According to Mr. Tyler's showing, the chances of war with European nations are small enough. But the same high authority informs us that

3. "ENLIGHTENED" nations "every where" have a growing and deepening conviction that "Peace is the true policy of nations."—It follows, then, that there is very little prospect of fighting any "enlightened" people, and the chances for it constantly diminish.

The conclusion, then, is inevitable from Mr. Tyler's positions, that the fortifications of our cities and frontiers, which have cost a hundred millions of hard days work to some body—and the vast annual expenses of our Navy, with its constant additions, are necessary to defend the American people against the "barbarous—the savage—the unenlightened nations of the earth!"

We apprehend, however, that the chief reason why Mr. Tyler is so anxious to enlarge the Navy, is to find abundance of berths for the sons of Slaveholders, who have neither fortune nor profession, and are too lazy to work. A situation as officer in the Navy, with a salary of from ten to twenty dollars a day, and permission to be idle and absent half the time, is not so despicable a situation, especially when the pay comes chiefly from the laborers of the North. Hence the slaveholders have the Navy Department usually under their absolute control. The President is commonly a Virginia slaveholder; the Secretary of the Navy is one of his subordinates; and the Committees of the two houses are usually so constituted that the reports represent the wishes of slaveholders. But we shall refer to this subject again.

TEXAS.

On this subject, as was to be expected, Mr. Tyler is quite rabid. He argues for Annexation at much length, with great zeal, and recommends that it take place through a Joint Resolution or Act of Congress, forthwith.—He assumes that through the recent Presidential election, the people have decided in favor of immediate annexation, through the States, and through the popular vote. Mr. Tyler says:

'A controlling majority of the people, and a large majority of the States, have declared in favor of immediate annexation. Instructions have thus come up to both branches of Congress, from their respective constituents, in terms the most emphatic. It is the will of both the people and the States, that Texas should be annexed to the Union promptly and immediately.'

We surmise, however, that Mr. Tyler will not be able to add the vast territory of Texas to our national domain, as the last crowning monument of his administration. The "will of the people" will be differently expressed.

One of our Democratic exchanges, we think the Niles Republican, brings against the Liberty party the charge of threatening to dissolve the Union, and cites as proof the declaration of "the Whig Liberty Governor of Vermont, Slade, who said in his late message to the Legislature, that should Texas be annexed, Vermont was no longer a portion of the Union."

We would have the writer and all others understand, that the Liberty party has no connexion with the "Whig Liberty party," nor is it responsible for the anti-slavery course of any who vote for Slaveholders. We have no political fellowship with them: for they are not of us.

THE ANNIVERSARIES.

The Annual Meeting of the Michigan Total Abstinence Society will be held at Jackson, on the first Tuesday in February, at 2 o'clock, P. M.

The Anniversary of the State Anti-Slavery Society will be held immediately after the adjournment of the Temperance Society.

RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS.

The American Almanac for 1845 puts up the members of the different religious denominations as follows:

Methodists of all kinds	1,255,249
Baptists " "	928,451
Presbyterians and Congregationalists	701,097
Various sects	330,990
Add for the Catholics	500,000
" " Universalists and all others	200,000

Total Church Members, 8,925,697
This number is said to be rather less than one half the population over 21 years of age.

The official result in the first Congressional district of this State, is as follows:

Counties.	Dem.	Whig	Ab.
Monroe	1,425	782	24
Lenawee	2,316	2,222	151
Hillsdale	1,102	995	212
Washtenaw	2,583	2,408	593
Wayne	2,756	3,350	182
	10,182	8,667	987

McClelland's majority over Lawrence, 1485.

That Chinese Treaty, completed by Mr. Cushing, has been received by the Government, and Mr. Cushing is expected to arrive in this country in a few weeks.

The Liberty vote in the Fourth Senatorial District was 877, Whig 4,351, Democratic 5,063.

From the Indiana State Sentinel.

A SLAVE CASE.

A good deal of interest has been excited for a week past, in relation to a question involving the right of citizens of Slave States to arrest fugitives in the N. W. Territory, and the States formed of the same, which has been pending in the U. S. Court, during its recent session in this city. The case in itself is one of great importance, and the condition of the public mind at the present time, serves to increase the interest with which it would at all times be regarded. We are indebted to Hon. JOHN H. BRADLEY for the following summary of the points in question:

Singleton Vaughn, } In the Circuit Court of
vs. } the U. S., for the Dist.
David M. Anthony, } of Indiana, Nov. term.
This is an action of debt brought by the plaintiff, to recover the penalty of \$500, assessed by the act of Congress, of 1793, for obstructing the plaintiff, and preventing him from arresting three fugitive slaves claimed by him.

The declaration states in substance, that the plaintiff is a citizen and resident of Missouri; that some seven years ago his slaves escaped from him and came to Hamilton county, Indiana. That last spring he obtained a warrant for their arrest from an officer of Hamilton county, and proceeded to arrest them, and that the defendant interfered and prevented him in obtaining them.

The defendant demurred to the declaration, and assigned for the ground of his demurrer. That by the 7th article of the compact, between the United States and the people of the North West Territory, the right of pursuing and reclaiming fugitives from labor, is only given to the citizens of the original States. That Missouri is not an original State, nor within the meaning of that article.

That the compact being declared unalterable forever, neither the constitution of the Union, nor any act of Congress can affect it.

That the act of Congress 1793, made some six years after the compact, interferes with and violates it, and is an assumption of power, over a resident of a State, without authority.

That by the laws of Indiana every man within her territory is *prima facie* free, and that the laws of another State cannot make such resident a slave.

That though any one of the citizens of any original State may claim his fugitive slave in Indiana, yet no citizen of a new State can.

That the only conditions by which the plaintiff, being a citizen of a new State can hold his slaves, are, first, that he lawfully acquired them in the State of Missouri, and secondly, that he keeps them there, or without the boundaries of the North West Territory.

The cause is continued on demurrer, until the next term of the court.

For Plaintiff, Wick and Barbour, and Smith.

For Defendant, W. Quarles and John H. Bradley.

Polk a Minority President.—The N. Y. Herald has a table of the electoral and popular vote of the several States, giving Polk 170, and Clay 105 electoral votes, and at the same time showing that by the popular vote, Polk falls behind the united Clay and Birney vote, nearly 15,000.—The Herald says:

'It will be seen from these returns that, although Mr. Polk is elected by a majority of nearly two to one over Mr. Clay, in the electoral vote, yet he will probably be 15,000 of the popular vote behind the aggregate vote cast for Clay and Birney united. This would make him what is strictly termed a "minority President."—Yet it is no less true, that even if the great State of New York had gone for Clay, Mr. Polk would have been elected without it. For it is a singular fact that nearly the whole of the valley of the Mississippi, with the exception of Kentucky and Ohio—under the immediate personal influence of Mr. Clay and his friends—has gone for Mr. Polk by a large popular majority.'—Middlesex Standard.

CONGRESSIONAL VOTE.

The following is the official vote for members of Congress in the several Districts of this State, as returned to the Secretary of State's office:

FIRST DISTRICT.
Robert McClelland, Dem. 10132
Edwin Lawrence, Whig 8677
Chas. H. Stewart, Abolition 973
Scattering, 3
McClelland's maj. over Lawrence, 1455.

SECOND DISTRICT.
John S. Chipman, Dem. 9433
Henry W. Taylor, Whig 3987
Edwin A. At Lee, Abolition 1240
James Ballard and scattering, 130
Chipman's majority of Taylor, 463.

THIRD DISTRICT.
James B. Hunt, Dem. 8501
Geo. W. Wisner, Whig 6987
Wm. Canfield, Abolition 854
Scattering, 10
Hunt's majority over Wisner, 1334.—Free Press.

Hon. J. Q. Adams attended the Anniversary of the New York Historical Society, in company with many of the greatest lights of the nation. The dinner is represented by the Tribune as being one of the most sumptuous ever got up in America. The wines were especially costly and exquisite. At Philadelphia, on his way to Washington, Mr. Adams honored the Chestnut Street Theatre with his presence.

NOTICE.

The Liberty Association of Ann Arbor, will meet at the Mechanics' Hall (Mundy's Block) this (Monday) evening at 8 o'clock.
A general attendance is requested.

MR. BIRNEY TO THE LIBERTY PARTY.

[CONTINUED.]
The following letter, referring to the same occasion, is from Mr. J. R. Stafford (a Whig,) of Cleveland, Ohio.

"NILES, MICHIGAN,
Nov. 19, 1844."

JAMES G. BIRNEY, Esq.:

Sir:—Yours of the 1st, directed to me at Cleveland was received by me to-day.

Having been a passenger on board of the Great Western, and hearing your remarks "in relation to the Whig and Democratic parties and their candidates for the Presidency," you request of me to know, whether you expressed a preference of Mr. Polk over Mr. Clay or of the Democratic policy over the Whig policy.

On that occasion you said, that for yourself and for your party you deprecated the annexation of Texas, it being a measure that would perpetuate Slavery and establish a preponderance of the political slaveholding power, and that there was more danger of annexation if Mr. Polk was elected, than there was if Mr. Clay was elected. The reasons you assigned were, that Mr. Clay was personally in favor of annexation as well as Mr. Polk, and that Mr. Clay could, and would lead his party, but that the Democrats could not, nor would be led into the measure, for Mr. Polk had not the influence with his party that Mr. Clay had.—The inference to my mind was that you favored the Democratic party. Being a Whig, and knowing that Mr. Clay was only in favor of the measure under restrictions that did not admit of a possibility of annexation, and wishing to do away the impression that your logic might have made upon the minds of the others present, I obtained the consent of the passengers to have Mr. Cassius M. Clay's speech (which had recently been delivered at Boston) read, as an antidote to your remarks.

Your obedient servant,
J. R. STAFFORD."

In the Detroit Daily Advertiser of Oct. 4 is the following:

"His (my) present mission to the East, we have also reason to believe, has been undertaken at the instance of leading Locofocos as well as abolitionists of New York, though cloaked under the pretence of a visit to one of his children in Connecticut. His conference with General Hascall at Flint, if divulged, would doubtless disclose that fact."

As soon as I saw this statement, which I did, for the first time, in the New York Tribune of the 10th Oct., I contradicted it in a note addressed to that journal. As it was wholly false, I thought it not unlikely that it might have grown out of some mistake of my person. What was my surprise, at finding, on my return to Buffalo, the falsehood repeated in the face of my denial, in the Detroit Advertiser of 21st Oct., with the addition of circumstances to give it color! I immediately addressed the following note to the Buffalo Commercial Advertiser, a Whig paper.

"BUFFALO, Oct. 28, 1844.
To the Editor of the Commercial Advertiser:

I have just now seen the Detroit Advertiser of the 21st inst. That print revisiter the false statement that I held a private conference with General Hascall, a democrat, at Flint, in relation to making my present visit to the East, subservient to the Democratic party in New York. As soon as I saw the original statement I pronounced it false in a letter addressed to the Editor of the Tribune.—The Advertiser has the hardihood to reiterate it in the face of my denial, saying that a respectable (anonymous) gentleman on whose authority we confide, assured us that he saw Mr. BIRNEY and Gen. HASCALL, in a private conversation in a room in a tavern, at Flint, and overheard enough from both, to disclose that Mr. Birney's visit to the East, had been sought by leading Locofocos as well as Abolitionists of New York. Our informant knew by sight both Birney and Hascall, but was himself unknown to either." The circumstances here mentioned strip the account of all excuse on the ground of mistake. I pronounce the statement false throughout. I did not see Gen. Hascall as I came through Flint, nor did I ever have an interview or any communication with him, public or private, in relation to my journey to the East, or to any party or political movement whatever. The sole object of my visit was to fetch home before the winter set in, two of my children who were attending school in Connecticut.

On the occasion referred to, I arrived at Flint after 9 o'clock at night. I do not remember to have seen at Hickock's tavern where I stopped, any other persons than the barkeeper and Mr. Clifford, the stage proprietor—the inmates generally having retired to bed. A matter of business called me away from the tavern to a store and flouring mill not far off, for half an hour. On my return to Hickock's I paid my stage fare to Clifford; and, as I was to be called up before daylight next morning, I went to bed without delaying even to take supper. Accordingly I was called up in the morning about daylight. The stage set off immediately—stopping a moment at the gate of General Hascall, as it left the village, to take in a young woman who was going a short distance into the country. Gen. Hascall did not make his appearance—if he was at home.

Farther than this—on no occasion have I met with General Hascall at any hotel in Flint, nor do I remember even to have seen him any where, since last winter, except as a hearer, at a lecture delivered by me on the evening of the 4th July, in Flint, when on passing each other after I had finished my remarks, we exchanged the ordinary salutation of acquaintances, but nothing more. I have therefore

to charge the conductors of the Detroit Advertiser, the organ of the Whig party in Michigan, unless they bring forward the "respectable gentleman" on whose authority they have professed to confide, with the wilful and deliberate fabrication and reiteration of a falsehood.

As the original statement appeared in the Whig papers generally, and as the reiteration of it has already as I have been told, appeared to some extent, in them also, the insertion of my denial, in the Whig press, is asked as an act of justice only.

Respectfully, &c.
JAMES G. BIRNEY."

Even this circumstantial account of my night's sojourn at Flint did not abate any thing of the harshness of the Advertiser. Without bringing forward any evidence—without even giving the name of the informant, the charge is again repeated in the following paragraph of the Advertiser of Nov. 2—two days before the State election:

"MR. BIRNEY AND GEN. HASCALL.—James G. Birney, in a note published in the Buffalo Com. Advertiser of Tuesday, denying that he met General Hascall at Flint, uses the following language:

"I have, therefore, to charge the conductors of the Detroit Advertiser, the organ of the Whig party in Michigan—unless they bring forward the 'respectable gentleman,' on whose authority they have professed to confide—with the wilful and deliberate fabrication and reiteration of a falsehood."

We have already twice stated that we received the information from a respectable and credible gentleman, who assured us, that he was present. We have not professed to speak from personal knowledge. We now add, that our informant made the same statement to others in this city.

Mr. Birney is welcome to charge us "with the wilful and deliberate fabrication and reiteration of a falsehood, as often as he pleases. Wherever we and our columns are known, such charges will fall harmless to the ground. The causes of his bitterness, are perfectly understood and appreciated, at home and abroad.—Let him rail on."

It will be seen from one of the letters below, that I demanded of the Editors, the name of their informant, and that they refused to give it me.

The following affidavit, in the form of a letter, is from Gen. Hascall:

"FLINT, Nov. 30, 1844.

DEAR SIR:—

I am just in receipt of your letter of the 16th inst. in which you request me to make a statement in the form of an affidavit, relative to the conversation alleged (by the Detroit Daily Advertiser) to have taken place between James G. Birney and myself previous to his departure for New York last fall.

In complying with your request, I can only say, that I read the article in the Advertiser alluded to in your letter, and that every word of it is false. I never had any conversation with Mr. Birney upon political matters but once, to my recollection, and then but a few words, which was at the Court House on the evening of the 4th of July last, relative to the Mass Meeting at Pontiac.

Mr. Birney never intimated to me that he was in favor of the Democratic party, neither have I seen Mr. Birney at a Tavern in this village (to the best of my recollection) during the present year, nor have ever had any written correspondence upon any political subject, or any political understanding, directly or indirectly.

CHAS. C. HASCALL.

Subscribed and sworn before me this 30th day of November, 1844.

R. J. S. PAGE,

Justice of Peace,

Genesee Co., Mich."

An anonymous correspondent of the Rochester Democrat—who, on a demand made by me of the Editor of that print, turned out to be a Mr. George N. Williams, formerly of Palmyra, New York, now an itinerant speculator in land-tax titles in this State—writing from Flint, Oct. 2, relates the following story:

"I was also assured this morning, on my way between Saginaw and this place, by Mr. Fitzhugh, the nephew of Mrs. Birney, that he has propounded to Mr. Birney the following enquiries, and received from him the following answers:

"Are you in favor of the present tariff?"
"I am not."

"Are you in favor of free trade?"
"I am."

"How do you feel personally in regard to the annexation of Texas?"

"On this point I have never expressed myself publicly but my own private sentiments are, that it is the safest and most effectual way of getting rid of Slavery."

"This," continues Mr. Williams, "I had from Mr. Fitzhugh not four hours ago. Now, I should like to know what sincere, conscientious abolitionists will say to this. I think they must, without hesitation, make substantially the same answer which Mr. Fitzhugh did:—'Good Heavens, Mr. Birney, if you are an abolitionist, pray tell me what a locofoco is!'"

If there were any truth in this story, I might say in reply to it, that I had previously published, as extensively as I could in the public journals, that I was in favor of continuing the present tariff, as long as it should be found beneficial and acceptable to the country;—that I had never spoken or written any thing, from which the commonest understanding could infer that I was favorable to what is generally understood by "free-trade," and that I had been unremitting, both in public and in private in my opposition to Annexation, from 1837, when that nefarious

"The conversation relative to the Mass Meeting at Pontiac must have been very slight, as I had no impression on my memory."

project was first seriously broached, up to that moment. But the falsehood is destitute of even a particle of truth. In confirmation of what has already been published, as authorized by Mr. Fitzhugh, I have to say, that neither the dialogue itself, nor any other, bearing the least semblance of it, ever occurred between that gentleman, or any other person, & myself.

That it may be seen into what hands the management of the Whig cause in this State had fallen, and how carefully every clue to the detection of their late conspiracy against you and against me is attempted to be concealed, take the following correspondence:

"DETROIT, Nov. 2, 1844.

Sir:—In a letter addressed by you to Mr. Winthrop, of Boston, bearing date October 7, 1844, and now generally published in the journals of the day, this expression occurs:—'He (meaning me) is fully committed to the Locos, except as to annexation perhaps.'"

I ask as due to me, that you state explicitly, whether this statement was made on your own responsibility, or on the information of others; if the latter, I ask the name of your informant.

Respectfully, &c.

JAMES G. BIRNEY.

J. M. HOWARD, Esq., Detroit.

REPLY OF MR. HOWARD.

"DETROIT, Nov. 7, 1844.

Sir:—Your friend, Mr. Holmes of this city, has this morning handed me a letter from you of the following tenor. (Here my letter is inserted in full.)

From its peremptory tone one might expect to find in your note some allegation of mistake or injury; at least a denial; but as nothing of the kind appears, I must decline any further answer until I am informed by you in what respect you feel yourself aggrieved, and for what purpose you solicit the information. As the matter stands, I can see no practical purpose in your inquiry.

I am sir,

Very respectfully,

Your obt. servant,

J. M. HOWARD.

Jas. G. BIRNEY, Esq., Lower Saginaw, Mich.

To the Editors of the Detroit Advertiser:

GENTLEMEN:

Some time ago, in an article that appeared in your journal headed "ANCIENT GRUDGE," you stated as on the authority of a "common friend" that I entertained an "inveterate hostility" (personal ill will) against Mr. Clay.

As the charge implies, in my view, some moral imputation, and as it is unfounded, I ask of you the name of the person on whose responsibility you made the statement.

As you have also again reiterated the statement, that I had an interview with Gen. Hascall at Flint, I demand of you to furnish me with the name of the person on whose representation the statement has been made.

Respectfully, &c.

JAMES G. BIRNEY."

REPLY.

DETROIT, Nov. 2, 1844.

"JAMES G. BIRNEY, Esq.:

Sir:—I have just received your note of to-day, demanding the name of a "common friend," and also of another person, to whose statements with regard to yourself we have referred in our columns.

Mr. Williams, one of the Editors of the Advertiser is absent from the city.—But for myself, I do not feel at liberty to furnish the names—certainly not without obtaining their consent.

Yours respectfully,

F. A. HARDING."

ANOTHER LETTER THE EDITORS OF THE ADVERTISER.

DETROIT, Nov. 2, 1844.

"GENTLEMEN:—In the Advertiser of October 16, you publish extracts of a letter, which you assure your readers is 'from a gentleman of the highest standing in Saginaw.' There are parts of the extracts which reflect strongly on my integrity and veracity. I therefore, demand, as an act of justice on your part, that you make known to me in reply to this the name of the gentleman who has hazarded his own character, by calumniating mine.

Respects, &c.

JAMES G. BIRNEY."

REPLY.

DETROIT, Nov. 2, 1844.

JAMES G. BIRNEY, Esq.—I have received your note demanding the name of a gentleman in Saginaw from whose letter we published extracts some weeks since. I do not feel myself at liberty to furnish it, especially as it was not addressed to ourselves.

Yours respectfully,

F. A. HARDING."

Remainder next week.

"The following is the letter referred to in full:

"DETROIT, Oct. 7, 1844.

DEAR SIR:—Mr. James G. Birney has been nominated by the Locos Focos of Saginaw for a seat in the Legislature of the State. I send you a number of the Detroit Advertiser containing the proceedings of the Democratic Convention at which he was nominated.

He has accepted the nomination, and is fully committed to the Locos, except as to annexation perhaps.

There is no earthly doubt of all this—use it then. It will influence twenty thousand votes in the North. I have addressed a note to the Editor of the Atlas.

Yours truly,

J. M. HOWARD.

Hon. R. C. WINTHROP, Boston, Mass."

Among our miscellaneous articles, will be found one upon "Women's Rights," by an elegant and sensible writer of their own sex. We commend it to the attention of our female readers. It has some suggestions that may profit them.

Charge of Harboring Slaves.—On Friday last, a negro man, named Henry Simpson, who lives near the brick yards, below Canton, was arrested by officers Campbell and Myers, on a charge of harboring two slaves belonging to J. B. Kendall. Upon an examination, he was committed to jail to await a trial at the County court.—Balt. Sun.

MR. ADAMS AND SLAVERY.

Mr. Adams advocates the right of petition, and opposes the Annexation of Texas; but he is a zealous antagonist of the immediate abolition of slavery in the Federal District. He lately made a labored speech at North Bridgewater, Mass. on this subject. He would be very glad to see slavery abolished there, and hopes that 20 years hence not a single slave will be found there. He says the number is constantly diminishing, though "the operation of an influence in full and constant activity." What this "influence" is we know not, unless it be the *Slave Trade!* Mr. Adams then predicts the results of emancipation in true pro-slavery style.—He says that "multitudes of the inhabitants of the cities would be irretrievably ruined."—the emancipated slaves would be an "idle, breadless, houseless, lawless population, more likely to consume the cities themselves by fire than to add to their comfort or prosperity"—and finally gives us to understand that the people of Virginia and Maryland might become "exasperated beyond endurance," and be "driven by desperation to deeds of violence," and thus "a civil war would be the first fruits of Abolition!" Yet in the same speech, Mr. Adams quotes the favorable results of West India emancipation, and speaks of the anti-slavery cause as "an effort to purify and redeem the human race from the sorest evil with which they are afflicted in the mortal stage of their existence." Strange inconsistency! To wish and argue for the removal of the shackles of man generally, and then, in that single instance where he can aid in removing them, plead and argue and vote for their perpetuity!

MR. TORREY'S CASE.

The enemies of Mr. Torrey have succeeded in securing his condemnation.—His trial excited considerable attention, and he had the benefit of able counsel.—The plea of Reverdy Johnson of Baltimore, in his behalf, was an eloquent one. Mrs. Torrey and her father were present in Court, and had an affecting interview with him immediately after his conviction. Three several indictments were preferred against him for helping slaves away, on each of which he was found guilty. The statute prescribes two years hard labor in the Penitentiary for each offence, making six years in all. A motion in arrest of judgment was made, but without success. Heckrotte, the slaveholder, has also commenced another suit against Torrey for the value of the slaves abducted. But could Torrey by any possibility escape all the Maryland suits and prosecutions, he stands demanded as a fugitive from justice by the Governor of Virginia, on a charge of aiding in abducting three slaves from that State. The penalty there is 21 years in the Penitentiary for each offence, making 63 years in all. So that, without a special combination of circumstances, his full release can scarcely be looked for until the anti-slavery influence shall have loosened the shackles of the slave.

Various opinions of the propriety of Mr. Torrey's conduct will be entertained by different persons, from the warmest approval to the most unqualified censure. To say that he was imprudent, should be far from cutting him off from our sympathies. He stands unconvinced of any offence against the laws of God. His conduct will be so regarded by posterity.—To help a man to obtain liberty, will not be recognized by future generations as a crime. And the imprisonment of Mr. Torrey for such an act, will be ranked with the persecutions by our Puritan ancestors of the Baptists and Quakers of their day, because, like Mr. Torrey, they would act out their conscientious convictions.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

The annual messages of the slaveholding Governors may be expected to contain the usual tirades against Abolitionists, and Northern Fanaticism. The Governor of South Carolina leads off this year in the usual style of bombast. He declares that these fanatical efforts "must be arrested," and that "it is indispensably necessary that they should be arrested in the shortest possible period of time." Well, admitting the premises of the Governor, what does he intend to do about it? Some very terrible thing, no doubt, as will be seen by the following extract:

"I cannot doubt that you will be justified by God and future generations, in adopting any measures, however startling they may appear, that will place your rights and property exclusively under your own control, and enable you to repel all interference with them, and to shape it to your own use. As you incur a danger of no ordinary character—one so subtle and insidious in its approaches that there is no ascertaining how soon it may be too late to resist it—I believe you will be equally justified in taking these measures as early and decisively as in your judgment you may deem proper."

There, that will do for a quietus on Abolition till next year, when the dose can be repeated, if necessary.

Charged with aiding Slaves to Escape.—At St. Louis, Mo., 20th ult., a free black man calling himself John Dean, was arrested, charged with aiding slaves in effecting their escape from their owners. Dean is a resident of Alton, Ill., and his movements have been narrowly watched by the police some time past. St. Louis papers say he pretends to be a sort of magician or conjurer, and under this pretext has obtained general access to and acquaintance with the slaves of the city.

THE GARLAND FORGERY.

The Detroit Liberty Committee notices in the Detroit Advertiser of 16th inst. an article purporting to reply to the Committee's statement of facts respecting this forgery. The statement was made in compliance with the Advertiser's own repeated demand for investigation. It was courteous in language and respectful in style, and was politely sent for publication to the paper which had courted the investigation. Refused there, it was then published in the Signal of Liberty, and thence copied into the Free Press of the Editor's own free will, without suggestion of the Committee or any member, and as an avowed reprint.

With untruth palpable as discourtesy gross, the Advertiser calls the statement "Mr. Stewart's expose," and mentions the committee throughout but as "Mr. Stewart's Committee." It also avers that "the expose is at length published in the appropriate and congenial columns of the Free Press," wholly omitting to inform the Public that the insertion was an avowed copy and that it was first printed in the Committee's proper organ. On the contrary, it leaves its readers to draw the unavoidable inference, that the committee has used the Free Press, and it only, as its organ. This unfair abuse of public confidence, and the facilities of the Press is evidently for the purpose of keeping alive Whig prejudices against the Liberty party, by a continued raving of "the coalition," so echoed during the late contest, and which had for its only basis just such suppression of truth as is now again manifested.

The committee much mistakes the intelligence and feeling of its fellow citizens, if a signal rebuke does not await all interpositions between the people and truth, whether arising from actual misstatement of fact—or from its twin brother—suppression.

The puerile jibe of the Committee's being under the control of any member, is too insignificant for notice. It shows enough of bad temper—bad taste—and bad cause—to win for its hapless users but public pity. The committee will not aggravate the punishment inflicted by such exciting tormentors.

Nor would the Committee deem this or any part of the Advertiser's article deserving even this passing notice, did it not feel that explanation is due to a passage in its own statement, not expressed with sufficient accuracy and fullness.—The passage is this:

"We believe the Detroit Advertiser or leading whigs can, if they please, name its actual parents. It is certain that they—and so far as is known, they only have made enquiry into the fact. Will they disclose the result and all they know?"

Instead of answering this simple question, the Advertiser pounces upon the mode of expression, and avoids the issue by alleging "that the Birney men have done nothing" to ferret out the forgery,—that the Whigs have—and calls upon "the public to judge, who is most likely to be found in fault in the end," and then—vouchsafes not another word.

The Editors of the Advertiser are lawyers, and to them this quibble upon words, in avoidance of an ugly answer to an awkward question, may be convenient and professional. But a plain citizen is not used to the dealing of law Courts. He expects a manly answer to a plain question.

That the Birney men have done nothing is falsified by the very statement commented upon. The mass of important facts there collected, shows industrious investigation, and materially narrows the question of authorship. But there was a limit to enquiry impossible to the committee. Its members never saw the original forgery—never received it—never heard of it, till it became public. They could not therefore trace the matter to its source. But they did not track it up Channel for a certain distance: there they found the Advertiser in the middle of this channel, blocking up the road to further enquiry, they showed the document in the hands of the Advertiser, and there it may rest as long as suits the Advertiser's taste. If it prefers the odium of silence to an honest avowal, it is not for the committee to quarrel with its unenviable task. In this silence, however, was a barrier impassable by the committee.

The Advertiser enjoyed all the advantages of enquiry denied to the Committee. It saw: it held: it handled: it used the document.—The type, the execution, and the paper of the forgery were before its eyes. It knew how it got the forgery: the person from whom—and the place where it was delivered. To trace it to its fountain were easy. Nay, it, or its friends actually sent Mr. Smart to Pontiac on the subject.

Says the Advertiser's "private and confidential" letter to the Boston Atlas, and which "private and confidential" communication the general reputation of unpurged forgery obliged the Atlas to publish to the world.—"A gentleman has been dispatched north, to ascertain the facts, if possible."

Long before the Committee saw this letter, they had charged the fact, that the inquiry alluded to had been made. It was in reference to this enquiry that the language, which has been quibbled over, was used. The two passages in the Committee's statement, i. e. the one in reference to Mr. Stewart's enquiry—and that which alleges that the whigs

alone had made certain enquiries—should be taken in connection: they refer to one and the same matter. The latter passage means thus: that the whigs alone, having the power to make certain enquiries, did make them!—not that they alone (as stated by the Advertiser) made all the enquiries, and the Liberty men none. Indeed it was obvious by the very statement itself that the Committee had made diligent and fruitful enquiry; and it was also notorious that Mr. Birney was engaged in a similar effort. That the Committee did not express this meaning in clear, and technical language of special pleading precision and adequate to the test of every hair splitting and prying criticism, must be attributed to two facts—the incompetence or carelessness of the committee—and that it wrote for the honest sense of a candid people, and not for the Court or pettifogger.

A. L. PORTER,

Chairman Ex. Com. of Liberty Association of Detroit.

From the Liberator.

JONATHAN WALKER SENTENCED, AND BRANDED!!

The following letter has been received in due course of mail from Pensacola, and though it was sent without the name of the writer, we have every reason to believe that its statements are strictly to be relied on. It appears by it, that the amiable, noble-hearted Walker, has not only been sentenced to imprisonment, but to be flogged, for aiding the oppressed, and branded in the hand with the letters S. S. (Slave Stealer is meant, we suppose) made with a red hot iron! And this in democratic, christian America! Horrible, horrible, beyond all expression. This is not all. Suits for damages have been brought against him to the amount of \$106,000!

ESCAMBIA COUNTY, 11th Mo. 17th, 1844.

HENRY W. WILLIAMS:

RESPECTED FRIEND.—Being under the impression that there are some persons in your section of the country who are anxious to learn the result of Jonathan Walker's trial at Pensacola, I hasten to inform you that it took place on the 14th, and terminated on the same day. Between 10 and 11 A. M. the prisoner was arraigned before the Court; but, not having any counsel, the Judge appointed Benjamin D. Wright, a member of the bar, to defend him. The District Attorney, who was the prosecuting officer, presented to the Court four indictments against the prisoner—one for aiding and assisting, and one for enticing slaves to run away—and two for stealing slaves.—The prisoner was put upon his trial, and found guilty of all four indictments by the jury, and a verdict rendered as follows:

1st. To be BRANDED IN THE RIGHT HAND with the letters S. S.

2d. To stand in the pillory one hour.

3d. To be imprisoned fifteen days.

4th. To pay a fine of one hundred and sixty dollars.

Prisoner Walker was again conducted to jail until the 16th, at 10 A. M. when he was again conducted to Court, and the Judge pronounced the sentence upon him, viz.—To stand one hour in the pillory, (which was in front of the court-house), and be branded in the right hand with the letters S. S.—after which, to be remanded to prison for fifteen days, and there to remain committed until the fine and cost of prosecution should be paid, which cost I have not been able to ascertain.

The first two specifications were executed, and prisoner Walker was again placed in jail, to undergo the third, but was not put in irons, as before, greatly to his relief.

A few hours after he had been committed, the sheriff came and served three writs upon him, for trespass and damage to the amount of \$106,000—viz.—Byrd C. Willis, \$3000; Robert C. Caldwell, \$3000; George Willis, \$100,000!! Upon each of these writs, the prisoner was summoned to appear at the May term, 1845, and answer, &c. The three above named persons are the reputed owners of the slaves named in the indictments. Good order and quietness prevailed through all the proceedings, with one exception. When the prisoner had been in the pillory about half an hour, the aforesaid George Willis stepped to the prisoner, from the crowd of spectators, (who were very peaceably beholding the execution of the laws of Florida,) and snatched from his head a handkerchief, which the deputy marshal had placed upon it, to screen the prisoner's head from the violent heat of the sun which shone upon it, and took from his pocket two rotten eggs, and hurled them at the prisoner's head, which took effect. This excited a burst of indignation from many present. I was satisfactorily informed that he had been very solicitous among the boys, offering them a great price for some rotten eggs, and any person who would throw those eggs at the prisoner; but he could not bribe or find any one inhuman or vile enough to do the deed but himself. The prisoner remained silent throughout, except to officers who had him in charge. He is in good spirits, and thinks that, if it is for the best, he shall weather the storm by and by.

AN EYE WITNESS.

The following advertisement is from the Mississippiian, a paper which sometimes finds its way into our Post office box, by mistake. What must be the public sentiment of a community, in which such advertisements can be published as matters not at all out of the ordinary way? The Mississippiian, by the way, is a thorough democratic paper.—Penn. Freeman.

"COMMITTED to the jail in this place, on the 29th of April last, a runaway slave—a negro woman who calls her name CREESEY, and says she belongs to William Barrow of Carroll county, Mississippi, said woman is stout built, 5 feet 4 inches high, and appears to be about 20 years old; she has a band of iron on each ankle, and a trace chain around her neck, fastened with a common padlock."

J. N. SPENCER, Jailor.

