ST. MARY'S BEACON

LEONARDTOWN, MD,

THURSDAY MORNING September 5, 1867.

THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

The Delegates to the late State Convention will address the people of St. Mary's county, in behalf of the New Constitution, at the following places on the following days:

At Chaptico, on Thursday, the 12th instant;

At Charlotte Hall, on Saturday, the 14th instant;

At Clifton Factory, on Monday, the 16th instant.

Distinguished speakers from abroad are expected to participate in these discussions.

On Saturday next, the Hon. Baker A. Jamison will address the people of St. Inigoes', at the "Pine," in advocacy of the New Constitution.

PUBLIC MEETING.

A very large meeting of the citizens of our county was convened in the Court House in this village on Tuesday last, in response to a call made by the members of the late Constitutional Convention. On motion, Col. Chapman Billingsley was called to the chair, and Major John H. Milburn and J. Thompson Yates, Esq., were selected as vice-presidents. On further motion, James S. Downs was appointed secretary.

Col. Billingsley, upon taking the chair, stated the object of the meeting, in his usual forcible and effective manner, and concluded his remarks by introducing to the audience Gen. Walter Mitchell, of Charles county.

Gen. Mitchell said that twenty-seven years ago he had appeared as a public speaker before this people. He recognized in the large audience before him many familiar faces, and it was a source of great gratification to him to be able to grasp the hands of many here to-day who had rallied around the old Democratic banner as far back as 1840. He was more than gratified to see that if time had left its frost-marks upon the exterior of many he had heretofore met here, it had failed to chill the deep current of their patriotism, or to lessen their attachment to the great principles of democracy. The people here love their country and are still proudly loyal to their revolutionary ancestors. In the great war which has swept over us, the country has drifted very far from the constitutional land-marks as established by our forefathers. A radical party now rules the country and ignores the constitution which our forefathers framed.—That party is now engaged in acts of spiteful oppression and petty tyranny against the people of one section of our country, and against that very people who fought best and most in the dark and doubtful hours of our first revolution.

I am here to-day, my fellow-citizens, to tell you that when the late Convention assembled at Annapolis, it was to set aside the work of that radical element which got control of the councils of your State during the late revolution in which this country was engaged. I am here to ask that you will stand by me as in days gone by, in defence of the great constitutional rights of the people, and that you will give your united support in behalf of the constitution adopted by the late convention. Will you do your duty in this matter, or will you still adhere to and sustain the damnable heresies of radicalism? Will you accept a constitution, such as your friends have framed for you, or remain under one which was foisted upon you by the Federal bayonet? Will you sustain your party or give aid to the radicals?

It is true, there may be some objectionable features in this constitution, for no work of man can be perfect. But is not the constitution which we now offer you superior to that under which you are now living? Let us compare the two documents and make up our verdict.

Gen. Mitchell here went into a minute examination of the two constitutions and gave very cogent and elaborate reasons why the one now presented should be adopted. He argued that it was a fallacy to hold the late convention responsible for the abolition of slavery, for that work had been virtually accomplished, several years since, through the medium of President Lincoln. Slavery was a thing of the past and did not live in the issue before us. The most vital question involved was that of a free restoration to their full rights of all those who had incurred the displeasure of radicalism and were proscribed by the constitution under which we now live. He believed all who sided with the South in the late struggle did so from a conscientious conviction of duty, and believed they were doing battle for the defence of their constitutional rights. He wished to see all these men—many of whom returned here maimed in the conflict—enjoy all the rights which the proudest among us enjoy; and, to that end, he intended to labor in this contest and in all future contests until this great work shall be accomplished.

Men talk of compensation for slave property. It is right we should have it. But, if it be not attainable, at present, shall we barter away all other rights because this one shall be withheld? Such a theory as this would work a political suicide; and I conjure you, fellow citizens, to pay no attention to men who would excite your prejudices on this question. Regard them, if you please, as your personal friends, but rest assured they are your political enemies. They may mean right, but they hug a vain delusion to their bosoms. The practical tendency of their views is to induce you to give a virtual support to radicalism, by leading you astray upon the great issue now before you.

Many object to negro testimony. So did I when it was first proposed in the convention; I fought against its introduction into the constitution now before you, and would have left it entirely to future legislation. As it is, however, the people control this matter *in toto*. It is simply an experiment forced upon us by Federal legislation, and it cannot survive the next session of the Legislature, unless the people desire its further continuance.

Gen. Mitchell made allusion, also, to the new judiciary system, and argued very ably in support of it. He showed conclusively, if his statistics are correct, that it will not be more expensive than the present system.

He concluded with an eloquent appeal to the people to stand by their old faith and their ancient leaders. As an old man, he said he might never have the pleasure of addressing them hereafter, but he trusted we should all often meet again under the great constitutional banner of our forefathers, and that we would continue to fight, side by side, in defence of the principles of democracy until all our ancient rights shall be restored.

The Chair next introduced the Hon. B. A. Jamison, who spoke as follows:

As a member of the late Constitutional Convention, I deem it my duty to make a few observations on this occasion. It will be admitted, I presume, to be good American doctrine that all men should live under a written constitution. This admitted, and the radical constitution of 1864 being before us, the question necessarily arises to our minds—how shall we rid ourselves of that constitution? The provisions of that constitution are too well known to require comment. They present to us grave political and social barriers, which it becomes us as freemen to remove; and, to that end, the late convention was called by the conservative element in Maryland. The constitution of 1864 was not the work of the people of Maryland, but was foisted upon them by Federal influence, and in contravention of the reserved rights of every State in the American union. It was a military measure, founded on military necessity,—"so-called,"—and has no foundation in justice or law, whether we regard it in its incipiency or its maturity.

But, the question now presented is—whether we shall adhere to the tenets of a party claiming to be based on "military necessity," or fall back upon our ancient legal and constitutional rights? Whether we shall accept the constitution of '64, which all here will admit had its foundation in violence and oppression, or will sustain the action of the uncontrolled wisdom of the democratic party of the State, as had through its members in the late convention. Let the people judge for themselves upon this question and to their honesty and sagacity I submit the grave questions involved.

But there are points likely to be involved in the canvass of this question that may require from me more than a general reference. The question of negro testimony will, it is likely, be held up to the people as a reason why they should vote against the constitution we have framed. I voted against it myself in the late convention, when first proposed, and the only vote I cast for it was on the final adoption of the entire constitution. I can see no harm, however, that can grow out of this measure, for the legislature is given entire control over it. If it proves dangerous to the people, it will be repealed the coming Winter, and will only thereafter be regarded as an experiment which has failed.

Mr. Jamison referred at length to the great advantages which must result to us by the adoption of the constitution. The right given to the legislature to appropriate $500,000 for internal improvements in the lower Western shore counties was a matter not to be overlooked. It could not fail to be of incalculable benefit to our people.

He thought the proposed judiciary system an improvement upon that already existing, and was satisfied that it gave less opportunity for the exercise of fraud, corruption, &c.

He thought there should be no political proscription of the young men from this State who had followed the standards of Lee and Jackson, and he should ever oppose so narrow-minded a policy. Let them stand, as the constitution we offer you proposes they shall, upon terms of the fullest equality with us.

Mr. Jamison closed his remarks with an eloquent appeal to the people, in which he referred to the proud position old Saint Mary's had so long held in politics, which, he trusted, she would not now forfeit by casting any considerable vote against the new constitution.

Upon the conclusion of Mr. Jamison's remarks, the chairman introduced the Hon. B. G. Harris, who made the following remarks in opposition to the adoption of the new constitution:

FELLOW CITIZENS.—In the short time allowed me I shall not be able to make some minor objections to the Constitution which the two gentlemen who have preceded me have so eloquently defended. My remarks, therefore, will principally be directed to the political bearing of that instrument. In the first place, however, let me notice the declaration of the advocates of this Constitution that we should adopt it as a choice of evils. I do not admit that the sovereign people of Maryland are forced to any such alternative. They can if they choose reject this one and order that there shall be one made which shall have no political evil in it at all. I sincerely regret that a body in which, as these gentlemen said, there was not a single republican, should send forth a document so destitute of democratic principles, or rather so full of those principles adopted by the radicals.

I join the gentlemen heartily in denouncing the infamous Constitution of 1864. When it was passed by the Republicans no man denounced it and them who made it more strongly than I did. It contained provisions not only anti-democratic, but if I may say so, anti-American, and it was the wish of my heart that the people would at an early day repudiate them. The test oaths prescribed for the voter and the authority given to the Registrars to hold inquisitions and reject voters even after they had taken the oath, and the test oath for those who held or were to hold office in this State, together with the provisions for the abolition of slavery and forbidding the Legislature to compensate the owners, were features most worthy of denunciation and the most strongly denounced by the democrats of this county and State both in and out of that Convention. Except, however, for the power given to the Registrars to reject voters the test oaths have been to a great extent a dead letter. No one who could go through the mill, as it was called, which the Registrars controlled has been prevented by any concientious scruples from swallowing the iron-clad, and none whom I as yet have heard of have refused to take or hold office because the Constitution of 1864, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, required them to swallow it. It might have been that there were no Southern sympathizers here, but I rather think, that the Southern sympathizers cared not the snap of my finger for this little impediment which the Republicans, thinking we would respect forced oaths more than they ever did voluntary ones, had thrown in their way.—In this they were right. I can never be brought to believe that these forced oaths had any binding effect whatever. The oath that a robber might force me to take that I would not tell who robbed me, I would be bound to break. And if there is any insult to God because of such oaths being taken, he that makes the oath and not he who takes it, is responsible for that insult, and will have to repent for it or—be damned—so that, notwithstanding all the schemes, the democratic party have nearly all the offices as they deserve, and the Republicans will all be damned, as *they deserve*, for trying to concoct their wicked schemes to prevent them from getting them.

But this is not the only opening they left us for thwarting their wicked designs. The poor devils thought they w[illegible] impress the world with the idea [illegible] mense liberality by declaring [illegible] stitution that our *citizenship* [illegible] *stored* by an act of the General Assembly passed by a vote of two thirds of all the members elected to each House, thinking, of course, that that event would not take place for many, many years. But man proposes and God disposes and He pointed out a man in their own ranks who agreed to serve us to a T. They may call him Benedict Arnold and Judas Iscariot, but we have nothing to do with that but we have a great deal to do with the constant accumulation of rewards upon him and which may keep him from having time to follow the example of Judas and—go hang.

However that may be, the necessary vote was obtained in the General Assembly and the law was passed which removed every obstacle to the voter, so that all white men here may now be called *fellow-citizens*.

Then the object of calling the late convention was, so far as these oaths are concerned, rather that it might scrub out the stains, than sweep off the republican filth, for practically that had already been done by the action of the General Assembly. Another object in calling that convention was that it might promptly and emphatically denounce and renounce the provisions of the constitution of 1864, which declared that the Legislature should not compensate the masters for the slaves which they took from them by the article abolishing slavery; in other words, that they would remove the brand of robbery which the Republicans had fixed upon the fair fame of Maryland. Hope had almost ripened into certainty that this would be done when it was ascertained that democrats were in an overwhelming majority in the convention. It is true that the act of the Legislature calling the convention provided that no such compensation should be granted, but surely no one really believed that the convention was any more bound by such a direction from the Legislature than if it had directed them to put in the constitution an article providing there should hereafter be no trial by jury. It was a perfect absurdity. So that we had the strongest reason for believing that the democrats in the convention of 1867 would act in this matter as I have stated. The grounds for these reasons were found in the denunciation by democrats of the infamous measure alluded to and especially by the stirling democrats who were members of the convention of 1864. I will read you the warm and ardent expressions of some of them on this subject.

Mr. Chambers.—"I regard this constitution as a most unwarrantable seizure of property, &c., and I vote against its adoption."

Mr. Jno. W. Mitchell.—"I shall vote against this constitution because it affects my own county by the abolition of slavery in perhaps a greater degree than any other county in the State.—And even had I agreed to the necessity of a provision of that sort, I never could have voted for it when it refused compensation to the holders of that property who have been ruined by this measure. You have not only refused that compensation, but you have put into your organic law a provision prohibiting the Legislature from hereafter making any such compensation."

Mr. Berry of Prince Georges.—"As to the question of compensation I take it for granted that there is not a man within the sound of my voice entitled to a seat upon this floor, who by his vote would take any property of mine or any other citizen of the State without a just compensation, because if he can take my negroes he can take my purse."

These gentlemen no doubt will vote against the adoption of this constitution if they shall find in it the clause so much reprobated by them. I have now, however, to refer to the decided and formal declarations of the gentleman who sits near me and whom I regret to find so warm an advocate for the adoption of the constitution now before us.

Mr. Dent.—"I shall vote against this constitution (of 1864) for the following reasons.—(First and second are on other points.)

Third—Because by this constitution citizens of the State have been unjustly deprived of millions of dollars worth of property by the abolition of slavery and no *compensation* to the owners has been provided; and not only so, but the Legislature is expressly prohibited from providing compensation hereafter."

Now, my fellow democrats, it is to me very mysterious indeed how all this has ceased to be democratic doctrine in three short years. It appears to me, that if it was democratic doctrine in 1864, it ought to be so 1867. Are these things to be almost insultingly denounced when done by Republicans and to be warmly approved and endorsed when done by Democrats? This don't look either consistent or fair. As old a man as I am cannot keep up with these sudden and violent twists and turns. They make me giddy.

Now, if you will refer to the two constitutions and compare them you will find in both, these very same much abused articles. Both declare that slavery shall no longer exist and both declare that the Legislature shall give no compensation for slaves. I advised all who would take my advice to vote against the constitution of 1864, but I suppose I shall be called *"a bad adviser,"* if I should advise any one to vote against this one of 1867. Well! I must suffer the penalty, and I now advise every one of you to cast his vote against this abomination

But, my fellow-citizens, the constitution now under consideration is not as conservative of State Rights as the abominable one of 1864, so far as this subject is concerned. The article in the one of 1864, boldly declared slavery abolished as an act of the State, but the one of 1867, in order to save itself from the charge of frankness, has used expressions which in my opinion have a most dangerous tendency. Let us read it.

Art. 24.—"That slavery shall not be re-established in this State, *but having been abolished under the policy and authority of the United States*, compensation in consideration thereof is due from the United States."

Now, this is a new idea; by reference to the debates of the convention of 1864, some of which I have quoted, the democrats were extremely incensed that that convention had *abolished slavery*, but after reflecting for three years they have discovered, that it has been *abolished* by *authority* of the United States. I deny the correctness of this statement. The United States did *take* from us and kept from us many of our slaves for their own use and for every one they took they owe us a fair compensation, and if the Government of the United States is honest they will pay us for our private property thus taken in accordance with the constitution which they have sworn to support. However, they did not take all and those who were left us were taken from us by the article in the constitution of 1864, *abolishing* slavery, an[illegible] these the State of [illegible] [illegible]ly bound in honor and by honesty to pay us a fair compensation; but unfortunately if this constisution is adopted we may whistle for every dollar we shall ever get from her.—When it is thus declared as in this article, that "slavery is abolished under the *authority* of the United States," we mean by the word, thus used, that the United States have passed some law or amendment of their constitution by which they claimed that slavery was abolished in Maryland. The word authority must have such a technical meaning and will be so construed. All know the Democrats of this State did before the late convention met, declare that the amendment of the constitution of the United States abolishing slavery, had no binding effect in Maryland as law, but now among the many and rapid changes which have in so short a time taken place in our ranks, the abolition of slavery by this amendment of the constitution of the United States has been considered *authoritative* by the members of our late convention and they have so declared in what they wish you to adopt as the organic law of our State. In view of the condition of affairs this in my opinion is a mischievious declaration and admission and will do as much to disarm Maryland in her resistance to the oppressive encroachment of her enemies as almost any scheme they themselves can concoct. Let us read the amendment of the constitution of the United States to which I allude.

Art. 13. Sec. 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Sec. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by *appropriate* legislation.

This last two much unobserved section becomes important in this situaton of affairs. This is the mother of the negro Civil Rights bill passed by Congress. It is under this section that they claim the power of not only passing such a measnre as that, but also any other bill which in *their discretion* Congress may think appropriate legislation for enforcing the first section. The power confered is a political power and in my poor opinion is without any check except the mere discretion of Congress. How far that discretion may carry them you are as capable of forming an opinion as I am, but I don't think they will stop with even the Civil Rights bill as odious as it is to us. It appears to me that the article in the constitution now before us by conceeding, in terms, the authority of the United States, to abolish slavery in our State, concedes every power that flows from both sections of the article of the Constitution of the United States referred to, and certainly gives color by our action to the claims of the Radicals. If this is so, then our noble old platform is demolished by our own act, if this constitution shall be adopted, and by our own concession, may be not intentionally, but most indiscreetly made, we hand over our firm, upright and patriotic Judge Daniel R. Magruder, of Calvert, to the mercy of his and our enemies. Shall such a man be thus deserted and exposed in order that a dangerous quibble may be inserted in our constitution. No! Reject the quibble and put yourselves face to face to your enemies upon your old ground with a frankness becoming the gallant sons of Maryland and stand in defence of your noble Judge. It is a parrallel case to that of the Bishops of England who threw themselves in the breach in order to rescue the liberties of England from the grasp of the fool-tyrant James the Second. Their judges, the tools of the monarch, were willing, if they dared, to hand them over to the power of their merciless tyrant, but the indignant frowns and stern murmurs of the people were seen and heard. I imagine I can almost hear the simple but pregnant song of the hardy sons of Cornwall, as it echoed and re-echoed from the depths and chambers of their mines.

"And shall Trelawney die, and shall Trelawney die?
Then twenty thousand Cornish men will know the reason why."

And shall Magruder, like Bonivard in Chillon, wear away the pavement of a prison? Let the gallant sons of Maryland from the peaks of the Alleghany to the shores of the Chesapeake respond in tones as decisive and threatening as those which fell from the men of Cornwall.

If the Radicals do not vote for the adoption of this constitution it will not be that it is not more radical than the one of 1864, as amended by the action of the Legislature Besides the objections I have heretofore urged, which, if I am correct, sends this, a whole bars length ahead of the one of 1864 towards radicalism, they have made another concession to the enemy by declaring in conformity to the Civil Rights bill "that no person shall be incompetent as a witness on account of race or color, unless hereafter so declared by act of the General Assembly." This, of course, extends the privilege of calling negroes to the stand to testify in all civil and criminal cases, even where white men are involved. Objections to such a proposition I have urged lately in a letter, which has been generally made public, and I shall not now have the time to repeat them. I will only say that these measures place us on an inclined plane which leads directly and irrisistably to the foul slough of Radicalism. The condition attached to this article does not rise even to the respectability of a quibble, but our rights and feelings are sacrified to the desire to save those who may be our judges from the danger that Judge Magruder has gloriously met and which it is so necessary to our independence our public men who receive the confidence of the people should boldly encounter. I have but a few moments left of the time which has been generously allowed to me by my friends on the other side and I will now close. I feel confident from what I have heard from abroad that this constitution will be adopted. There are elements in it which I have not been willing to allude to, which are well calculated to overcome such objections as in the honesty of my heart, I have or shall urge against it. When it is adopted, it will be the decree of the people of the sovereign State of Maryland and I as one of her sons will give it my obedience and submission. In doing so, however, I shall be unable to repress the feeling so beautifully expressed by the poet.

"'Tis something in the dearth of fame,
Though link'd among a fettered race,
To feel at least a patriot's shame
Even as I sing suffused my face;
For what is left the poet here?
For *Greeks* a blush,—for *Greece* a tear.

It is proper to state in this connection, that the speech of Mr. Harris was prepared by himself at our suggestion for publication, whilst the report of the speeches of the preceding speakers constitutes a mere synopsis of each, written out by the secretary from notes taken during the discussion. Full notes were taken of the very able and elaborate speeches made by Col. John F. Dent and Hon. R. Ford, in reply to Mr. Harris, but want of space forbids their publication in this issue. They will appear in our next.

Late Radical Meeting.

In accordance with previous announcement, a meeting was held in the Grove of Hon. H. G. S. Key, within our village limits, on Friday last, at which there were about 1200 colored and 100 white persons present.

The meeting was opened with an address from Revd. John Kimball, of Gen Howard's Staff, who requested the audience to join him in the singing of some hymn familiar to them. The sable portion of the audience joined pretty generally in the singing; and, at the conclusion of this part of the proceedings, the Reverend gentleman delivered a religious and instructive address which was entirely devoid of political allusions.

He stated, in his exordium, "that the main reason for holding meetings of this character was to direct the minds and hearts of the Freedmen in the path of truth and in the light of wisdom. Education is the corner-stone of mental advancement; and, without mental advancement, there can be no radical change, or permanent or well organized improvement." In this connection, he referred "to the generous and manly conduct of Hon. H. G. S. Key in donating land upon which to build a School House for the education of the Freedmen." He thought, "we were a long stride behind other sections of the country, in appreciating the blessings of universal education." He really believed, "the School System in California was even *now* better than that in Washington." He regretted, "that our younger States should give evidences of life and progress, whilst many of the older were still the slaves of prejudice, and were likely to flounder in the quagmire of antiquity." He advised the Freedmen, however, not to "rely too much upon the aid of the Government in this matter, but thought they should first prove themselves worthy of its paternal regard. The Government was willing to furnish the necessary lumber for the building of School Houses, and to send proper teachers to teach the Schools, but the Freedmen must furnish the labor to build these School Houses, or provide the means therefor; and they must, also, take care of the teachers whilst among them.—These Schools are not conducted in the interest, or for the advancement, of any particular religious sect—such is not the object of the Government or its agents." He strongly advocated temperance and recommended that the funds heretofore expended in the purchase of intoxicating drinks be hereafter appropriated to educational purposes. He thought the Freedmen's Bureau was a heavy tax upon the people, and should only have a temporary existence. It was intended, in his judgment, only to give the colored people a chance to show their manhood, and as an experiment to test the great question, whether or not they were able or willing to emerge from ignorance and perform their part in the great drama of life.—The safety of Republican Governments, he thought, depended mainly upon universal education. "It would not be safe to have four millions of ignorant citizens in our midst endowed with the right of suffrage; and, as the political tendency of the age was evidently toward universal suffrage, there could be no question, outside of prejudice, as to the policy of universal education.

REMARKS OF GEN. HOWARD.—Gen. Howard said: "Although he was no longer on the battle field, he still had his harness on and was obeying the laws of the National Government. He came not here to make a speech—no soldier was expected to do so. He came here to advise with and instruct the Freedmen and to advance the cause of universal education. He thought the colored portion of his audience could not do better than follow the advice of the gentleman who had preceded him; and, he admonished them, that if they remained longer in ignorance it was their own fault. Ignorance, he said, begets vice, but vice vanishes with the dawn of education and enlightenment.—Education and usefulness march hand in hand. The Freedmen should not presume too much on their changed condition, if they would profit by it. They should indulge in no presumptive insolence or arrogance toward their old masters, but should legitimately seek their own promotion and advancement. It is true, he said, you are no longer slaves, but a regenerated people! You have been made free, I may add, by an almost supernatural agency! If you would remain free, and become citizens of the Republic, devote yourselves to the good work which has been mapped out for you! You must rely upon yourselves and not upon the Freedman's Bureau! He did not come here to advocate the advancement of the colored above the white race, but his object was to induce the former to advance themselves, that the distinction now existing between the two races might not continue to exist to its present extent. The present ignorance of the colored race prevented them from protecting their plainest interests.—They must not ignore the fact, that their labor is their only capital in trade. They must study and learn how to make that capital available, ere they can become good soldiers in the great battle of life. Again, it is shameful to remain in ignorance, when the means are furnished you to acquire learning and wisdom. Seek the respect of your fellow man, if you would learn to become good and useful citizens. I do not mean to say that you should simply learn to read and write, but that you should seek your moral as well as intellectual advancement. That you should learn to observe your marital rights, and that you should live a chaste, virtuous and Christian life, to the end that God may give his ear to both your temporal and spiritual welfare. A home is not a home unless it be governed and controlled by a Christian spirit; for Providence will not spread the mantle of charity over the wicked wanton, nor shed his comforting influences around the Pagan fireside."

REMARKS OF JUDGE BOND.—His Honor said "he had never, heretofore, visited St. Mary's, and, therefore, had never had a proper conception of the natural beauties of the mother of counties. He confessed himself most agreeably surprised at the fertility of our lands, their improved condition, and their undulating surface." (His Honor appears to have been under the impression that they were flatty, unimproved and unproductive. We rejoice that his eyes have been opened and that he has done us, at least, a *surface* justice.)

He said he regarded this as a great political crisis in the affairs both of the Nation and the State. In the transition from slave to free labor, great changes must necessarily follow. The geographical position of Maryland is such as to make her peculiarly susceptible to political changes. In emerging from the late great struggle for the life of the nation, she still holds her original orbit, and her extremes still rest upon the confines of the late hostile powers. The counter current of winds, which blow from the North and South, still meet upon her soil, and her people are swayed to and fro, by the dread concussions which follow these conflicts. This has produced a dodging element in her midst. Her National representatives are undecided, or are mute. A worthy and striking exception, however, is found, in a late representative from this county and it affords me great pleasure to refer to and remember him. He stands as wide apart as the poles from this dodging element. He boldly proclaims his principles and fearlessly defends them. He is a man—he is a radical—he has a root to him! I am a radical myself and I honor radicalism, whether it be of my own school, or whether it be taught by Hon. Benjamin G. Harris. A brave and honorable competitor will ever gracefully yield to the superior prowess of his antagonist. Such a man may be found in your late representative in Congress; and, I will be pardoned, I trust, if I mention a certain other individual in this connection. I refer to our present worthy Governor, whom I will take the liberty of introducing by a story which was told me in the days of my boyhood. A certain colored individual, it appears, who was a slave, took a notion in his head to steal a pig from his master; and, having bagged the young porker, was going on his way rejoicing. At a sudden turn in the road, however, he met his master, who accosted him familiarly, and politely enquired as to the contents of his bag. It is nothing but a possum massa, was the very ready and prompt rejoinder. Let me see that possum Tom, said the master. Whereupon, the contents of the bag were emptied into the road; and, with something between a grunt and a squeal, the captured porker came to light. That is not a possum Tom said the master. No—no—I see it aint, massa, but, fore de Lord, it was a possum when I put in dere! So it is with Tom Swann—he was put in as a possum but he has turned out to be a pig.

Now, there is a certain class of politicians in this State, including in their number Mr. Montgomery Blair, who suggests that the entire negro population should be sent out of the country. The reply to this suggestion is that we have not now more labor here than we need, and we cannot, therefore, spare any portion of our present population. The only question now is,—will you learn how to labor? I do not think you have learned how to work to advantage during the period of your slavery, and I have come here to advise with and instruct you. It is to the interest of every white man in this county that you should receive instruction.—White labor will not come here, because of the reported stupid and demoralized condition of the negro. White people are not willing to work through the day and have the product of their labor stolen from them at night. It is a great mistake to suppose that there can be an antagonism here between white and black labor. All the labor that can be had will be required in this country for ages to come, and the only question now is—shall the negro learn to make his labor useful to the country and profitable to himself? If he desires to do so, he must be educated. He cannot continue to do the work of a horse and receive the wages of a man for his labor.

Unfortunately for themselves and the country, many colored people have become possessed of the idea, that, now that they are free, they can lay down the shovel and the hoe and subsist upon the mere empty title of freedom. This is a mistake. God's inexorable laws will always prevail, and they must either get their living by the sweat of their faces, or announce themselves as candidates for cells in the Penitentiary.

But, it is claimed by such men as Mr. Montgomery Blair, that I am seeking to make the negro the equal of the white man and that my labors are directed in that particular channel. If universal education will produce such a result, then I am guilty. Otherwise, however, this charge is unjust and I pronounce it a slander. My object here is to talk with the Freedmen and to seek to instil into their minds the great importance of their seeking their own elevation, and to endeavor to prove to them that it is only through the medium of moral and intellectual improvement, that they can ever arise above their present condition. To this end, take the advice of Gen. Howard.—Eschew intoxicating drinks, avoid thieving, get homes for yourselves and families and live hereafter in the true spirit of the Christian.

His Honor next made some pretty harsh allusions to the apprentice law of the State, and said he regarded it as infamous, in its application to the colored people. When it is remembered that this law makes no distinction between the children of white and black, but has a *general* application, we think His Honor shew the cloven foot on this question. Neither can we see the point, or the justice, of his sweeping condemnation of the late State Convention,—unless there be a point in His Honor's *possible* removal from his present position.

In conclusion, he said, he wished to say to the colored portion of the audience, that education had to them become a matter of necessity. Ignorance now was the bane of our country, and universal education is its only curative agent. The day is probably not far distant when the responsibility of administering the affairs of this Government will fall, alike, upon the shoulders of all. In the present condition of things, this would be a fearful experiment. It would be giving to the grossly ignorant and incompetent the power to govern us and to tax us. We all have, therefore, a common interest in the education of the Freedmen, and let universal education be henceforth the watch-word! I am an original emancipationist and I stand fast by my colors. I will never desert a people for whose present condition I am partly responsible, but will assist them with my counsel, my labor and my influence so long as I can be serviceable to them.

Upon the conclusion of Judge Bond's remarks, the Revd. Mr. Kimball delivered a very interesting and instructive lecture on temperance which was listened to with marked attention.

Capt. A. A. Lawrence next made a few appropriate and pertinent remarks, upon the conclusion of which the meeting was dismissed, with singing and prayer, under the direction of Mr. Kimball.

The best order was maintained throughout the entire proceedings, and the addresses delivered were listened to with respectful attention by every one present.

DECLINATIONS.—We are authorized to state that Z. D. Blakistone declines being a candidate for the Orphan's Court.—George Thomas requests us to say that he is not a candidate for the Legislature. P. H. Dorsey and William Mattingley of Wm. decline being candidates for the Commissioners' Court.