THE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOLUME III. LOUISVILLE KY.: SATURDAY AUGUST 11, 1849. WHOLE NUMBER 113.

THE EXAMINER;

Published Weekly, on Jefferson St., next door but one to the Post Office.

TERMS.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE, SIX COPIES FOR TEN DOLLARS.

PAUL SEYMOUR, PUBLISHER.

ADDRESS OF HON. J. R. UNDERWOOD.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: I feel a deep sense of gratitude to the people of Kentucky, and especially to those residing in the Green river section of the State. Raised in the adjoining county of Barren, educated by a charitable uncle, and starting in life with the strongest professional competition, I have been sustained in a most confiding and encouraging manner. I have been advanced from poverty to competency, if not to wealth. During the last thirty-three years I have been almost constantly employed in some high public station; and I now hold an office which, in dignity and importance, approximates the highest known to our constitution and laws. I refer to these things in no spirit of boasting, but to prove that I am not grateful without cause, and that I ought to be strongly attached to the institutions of my country, which have enabled me to rise from a very humble to a highly exalted position—a position from which, I am told, I shall probably be instructed to retire in consequence of opinions I have long entertained and which upon this occasion I mean to express with the utmost candor.

In 1838 the people by an overwhelming majority decided against calling a convention. In 1847 and 1848 they determined in favor of a convention by majorities equally decisive. It is needless to demonstrate that this change was the result of party tactics, seeking advantage over political adversaries. No matter what has brought it about, we are to have a convention; and the great questions now are, what changes shall we make in our present form of Government? what new principles ought we to introduce?

To make a new Government and introduce important changes in the old system, under whose operations we have been long secured in the enjoyment of life, liberty and property, and every civil, religious, and political privilege, involve the highest responsibilities. In the great work, so pregnant with good or evil, every citizen must feel an intense interest. It is not my purpose, however, to enter at large upon the consideration of every subject upon which the convention must act. To do so would be to make a speech tedious beyond endurance. My principal object is to present and defend my opinions on the subject of slavery.

I believe that slavery as it exists among us is a great evil—wrong in its origin—injurious in its continuance to both races, white and black—and that it ought to be terminated.

There are but few who justify the original importation of negroes and making them slaves. But there are many who, regarding the institution as having been forced by the policy of Great Britain upon our colonial ancesters, are now opposed to any change, believing the perpetuation of the institution more advantageous to both master and slave than any new order of things which human wisdom can devise and accomplish. The argument which maintains that slavery is right in its origin, is founded upon the hypothesis that, as ignorant, savage, and unchristian people are made more intelligent, more humane, more moral, and embued with a knowledge of the true God, by being brought under the control and dominion of civilized and christian nations, therefore, to advance the improvement and happiness of the weak, the barbarous, and unchristian men or tribe, the strong, the civilized, and christian community may rightfully reduce the individual or tribe to slavery. Suppose we concede that this argument is well founded, and that intelligence and christianity, combined with power, may of right seize the subjects or citizens of a weak or savage tribe or nation, and carry them off into perpetual bondage; should we not then inquire how the tribunal is to be organized which shall decide what nations of the earth are civilized, intelligent, moral, and christian; and how commissions may be obtained by those justifying them to invade the territories of the feeble, barbarous, and unchristian, and to make slaves of them? Is it not impossible to constitute such a tribunal? What nation or people on earth would submit to its decrees, if it were established and attempted to exercise jurisdiction? In times past, the Popes of Rome have, I believe, arrogated authority to dispose of heathen savage nations and their people, according to the pleasure of *His Holiness*. But the people thus given and granted to a master have never recognized the right of the Pope.—From the impossibility of establishing a tribunal among men and nations clothed with authority to decide who shall be masters and who slaves, and to secure acquiescence and submission to the awards of such tribunal, it is manifest that there can be no harmony, no general understanding by which the people of the earth can be thrown into classes, of masters on the one side and slaves on the other and made to sustain such relations to each other, without violence. A state of slavery is, therefore, nothing short of a state of hostility between opposing phalanxes, where one side has surrendered at discretion, but unceasingly seeks for an opportunity to regain its original position. It is impossible to reconcile the slave and teach him to love his condition.

The constitution and laws of the United States indicate a strong national sentiment against slavery in its origin. Our revolutionary fathers, in framing the Federal Constitution, vested Congress with power to prohibit the importation of slaves from the 1st of January, 1808. This constitutional provision was carried into effect by an act approved 2d March. 1807. This act forfeited to the United States all vessels fitted out for the purpose of engaging in the slave trade, and imposed a fine of $20,000 upon the individual who should engage in fitting out any such vessel. It also imposed a fine of not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000, and imprisonment not less than five nor more than ten years, for taking on board any vessel so fitted out a negro slave on the coast of Africa and transporting and selling him in the United States as a slave. By an act approved —, 1820, Congress made the foreign slave trade piracy, and imposed the punishment of death upon those who might engage in it. Washington signed and approved the Constitution as President of the Convention, and afterwards liberated all his slaves. Jefferson (who, in reference to slavery, said "he trembled for his country when he remembered that God was just,") signed and approved the act prohibiting the further importation of slaves. Monroe signed and approved the act denouncing the slave trade as piracy. Am I to be condemned for entertaining sentiments like those upon which these fathers of the republic have acted?

Our colonial ancestors protested against the conduct of the mother country in forcing the African slave trade upon us. If their sense of justice had tolerated the seizure of unchristian savages and making slaves of them, why did they not attack the Indians and convert every captured squaw and her children into slaves through successive generations? The best title in a slave, in the origin of the institution, is founded on the rights of war; and yet through all our Indian wars, so far as I am informed, at no period of our history has any one seriously proposed to make slaves of Indian captives. Why this difference between the negro and the Indian? As barbarians, as uncivilized, unchristian people, they occupied the same condition of inferiority to the high-toned, civilized, christian Anglo-Saxon! If, for any of the reasons in vindication of slavery, it be just and righteous to make slaves of negroes, will not the same reason have equal force when applied to Indians? True, their skins are not so black as those of Africans; yet, if difference of color be any argument in favor of making slaves of the darker races, the contrast between the Indian and white man is sufficiently striking to justify the experiment. But surely the color of the skin does not favor slavery any more than the color of the eye. What would the world think if all persons with white eyes should congregate and seriously resolve to make slaves of every body who had black eyes?

One of the causes of war against Great Britain in 1812, was the violation of our flag on her part, by invading our ships, impressing our seamen and making them slaves. I say *slaves*, because to make a man fight or work on board a ship against his will is slavery more aggravated than that of forcing him to hoe or plow corn. Was there not as much justice, according to any code of morals, in the British practice of impressing our sailors as there is in enslaving the children of Africa?

But let us admit, for the argument, that it is the will of God, and therefore just, that heathen savages should be enslaved, so that Christian masters may improve their condition. If that be conceded, does it not necessarily follow that it is equally just for the moral and religious part of the same community to enslave the immoral and irreligious citizens in order to improve their condition? Under this new doctrine of making slaves to improve people, may not a religious and Christian majority say to the minority of Jews, Turks and infidels, 'we will improve your faith by making you slaves to an inquisition?' May not a like majority declare that editors and publishers should be enslaved by a board of censors, so that immoral and infidel publications might be suppressed and society thereby improved? What becomes of the right of conscience, the liberty of speech and of the press, or any other great and essential right to which man by nature is entitled, if the doctrine be true, that the intelligent, powerful and virtuous, may rightfully enslave the foolish, the weak, and the vicious for their improvement? In my judgment, the direct tendency of such a doctrine is the subversion of those fundamental principles of human liberty heretofore held sacred as the very basis of our republican institutions. If I could be induced at all to yield to this doctrine of the right to enslave for the purpose of improving, it would be with the qualification that, as soon as the barbarian of the desert had been civilised, and christianised in the school of slavery, and had paid by his labor a reasonable compensation to his benevolent and Christian master for the tuition, then he should be permitted to resume the free exercise of all his improved faculties and regenerated nature. This qualification is no part of the doctrine. On the contrary, if I understand the pro-slavery creed, it is that the benefits conferred upon the race enslaved are so stupendous and magnificent that they are but poorly requited by perpetual servitude, generation after generation!

But I am wasting time and words. In this age of the world and in this country, so enlightened in regard to the natural rights of all mankind, it would be impossible to establish the institution of slavery, were it now for the first time proposed. The question is not, shall we make slaves? But it is, what are we to do with slaves born and raised and accustomed to their degraded condition? These are very different questions.

After years of patient observation and consideration, I have become thoroughly convinced that slavery as it exists among us is prejudicial to the general happiness and interest of the people, injurious to our children, dangerous to our country, and immoral in its tendencies. I look upon it as an evil not beyond remedy; and therefore I am not willing to fold my arms and let it, cancer-like, run its course to consume its victim without a struggle to arrest it.—Hence, as we are to construct a new Government, I think I owe it to my country, to my children, and myself to insist upon some constitutional provision which shall point to its ultimate termination. For doing this I am to be denounced as an agitator, one who embroils society and stirs up strife. The political ocean is already white with foam. My object is to pour oil upon the troubled waters. I believe from this day forth there can be no calm until it is settled that slavery is not to exist forever in Kentucky.

If I am not mistaken in the signs of the times, the advocates for the perpetuation of slavery mean to accomplish their design and give permanency to the institution in the new constitution. So far as I understand the published platform of a portion of the pro-slavery party, they put forth the idea to the people that the constitutional provision on the subject of slavery, which they wished inserted in the new constitution was to be identical with that in the old constitution. Furthermore, that the new constitution was to be subject to amendments proposed by the Legislature and ratified by the people, without the necessity of submitting the entire instrument to the action of another convention. With these provisions in the new constitution, those who desire to take the sense of the people upon the institution of slavery and its continuance forever saw that the door was open to them. But behold the change. I know pro-slavery candidates for the convention who are not now willing to incorporate in the new, precisely the same provision which the old constitution contains on the subject of slavery. I know pro-slavery candidates who are utterly opposed to amending the new constitution by permitting the Legislature to submit particular amendments for the ratification of the people. Look also at the action of the last Legislature. That body modified the law of 1833 prohibiting the importation of slaves in such manner as to make the modification almost equivalent to its repeal. This was done, I believe, without consulting the people upon the subject in the preceding canvass. By the census of the 1840 it was proved for the first time that our free white population had increased by a greater ratio than our slave population. This result was attributable, in a great degree, to the act of 1833. In 1840 our slave population was 182,258.—In 1848, according to the 2d auditor's report, it had reached 192,470, showing an increase of only 10,222 in eight years. In 1840 our voters numbered 108,500, according to the ratio of the apportionment of representation. In 1848 they had increased to 139,612, showing a gain in eight years exceeding 31,000. We have no annual enumeration of free persons as we have of slaves, except of school children between the ages of 5 and 16. In 1844 our free white children between these ages numbered 160,834. In 1848 they reached 183,458, showing a gain of 22,624 in four years. These acts prove that we are destined to follow the States of Delaware and Maryland, where the slave population is fast receding and giving place to freemen. When the advocates of slavery become dissatisfied with their own platform of principles, and when they have destroyed the salutary operations of the act of 1833, when they have commenced the work of agitation by their own instability and the sudden destruction of the law restraining the importation of slaves, it is our duty to speak. Indeed, my friends, those who think as I do are bound to speak in self defence. We are constantly misrepresented. We are charged with designs and opinions to which we are totally opposed. There is, I have no doubt, some intentional misrepresentation with a view to render our positions odious with uninformed and prejudiced persons. But should our adversaries win a triumph by such unworthy means, it would be of short duration. He who is deceived by the trick, is always disgusted with the consequence, and loathes the deceiver. As examples of the misrepresentations of our views, I need only mention the efforts which some persons make to identify us with the abolitionists of the Philips and Garrison, Abby Kelly and Lucretia Mott order; and the not less absurd charge that we intend to deprive owners of their slave property without making compensation.

What is that northern abolition imputed to us? It is, that negro slaves should be forthwith liberated; vested with equal, civil, social, and political rights; and in all respects placed upon the same level with their former masters. This equality of privilege would allow intermarriage between the blacks and the whites, and send black and white voters to the polls together. Now, I do not know a citizen of Kentucky who is willing to organize our society upon any such basis. I have often made speeches to prove the absurdity of attempting, and the impossibility of accomplishing any such project. There are sympathies and antipathies in the social, just as there are attractions and repulsions, in the natural world, which effectually prevent the commingle-ment of two distinct races into the same social and political body. To attempt it, is to destroy all harmony and to war against nature. I am therefore altogether opposed to emancipation, unless it be connected with colonisation.

But we are charged with intending to invade the sanctity of vested rights. There may be, for aught I know, persons in Kentucky, as well as in the Northern States, who deny that there can be any such thing as property in a human being, or vested right in the services of a slave. With all such, if there be any, I widely differ.—What is it that creates a vested right? I answer: It is the act of our Creator which creates and vests us with all our natural rights; and the act of Government which creates and vests us with our civil and legal rights. But there may be a conflict between the rights thus derived. For example, God gives the right to defend ourselves and to redress our wrongs; and if men are thrown together without government, each may exercise this natural right derived from God as his reason and judgment shall require. But as soon as government is formed, whether it be done by arbitrary power or by the assent of the governed, this natural right of self-defence and self-redress may be taken away by the act of the government and legal rights substituted in place of it. The civil codes with which I am acquainted allow the right of self-defence to remain nearly as perfect as it exists by nature. But the natural right of self-redress is almost invariably superseded by a civil remedy. Thus the regulations and institutions of men may, and often do, put down and suppress the rights which God hath given to his creatures. Indeed, it has grown into a maxim that when we enter the social state or submit to a government we surrender a part of our natural rights the better to secure those we retain. Should any individual refuse to make the surrender voluntarily, he is constrained by force to give up, in whole or part, just as many of his natural rights as the laws of the society or government under which he lives requires.—Whether the surrender be voluntary or compulsory, does not effect the power which the government may exercise when it has been established. Can governments, then, in violation of natural justice, create a property in a human being? I answer affirmatively. But what is meant by property in man? Nothing more than the legal authority to control the slave or servant and to appropriate the proceeds of his labor to the use of the master. Now let us look at some familiar cases and we shall see how the law secures the services of one human being to the use of another, and by so doing creates a property in the service, or, which is the same thing, in the man who is to perform the service. And as we examine these cases we shall find that some of them grow out of contracts voluntarily entered into (and these might be denominated voluntary *slavery* but for the odiousness of the term); while others grow out of the action of the government and are forced upon the person subject to such action irrespective of his volition.

The relation between father and child is the first to which I will call your attention. The law gives the father the legal right to control his son until he is twenty-one years old, and to appropriate his labor to the use of the father. Why this, until the child arrives at *twenty-one* and no longer? Natural justice would decide that every child should be free, when by his services he has paid the father for his care, trouble, and expense of raising and educating, and when the child is so mature in judgment as to be capable of acting discreetly for himself. The father's trouble and expense vary according to circumstances. A finished classical education cannot be acquired by the son before he arrives at twenty-one years of age, unless he be endowed with extraordinary abilities. If the youth is kept at college during his minority he pays in services nothing to compensate his father. If he be put to work he may remunerate the father by the time he is nineteen or twenty and may then be sufficiently mature in judgment to act for himself. Yet the law is arbitrary. It makes no allowance for these varying circumstances. The child is free at twenty-one. Fastidious ears might take offence were I to call the child a *slave* until he reached the age when the control of the father ceased according to law. But I defy human ingenuity to distinguish and point out a difference in the nature of the power conferred by law upon the parent to hold his child in service until he is twenty-one and that which is conferred on the master to hold a negro slave for life, and the right in both cases to appropriate the service of the child and of the slave to the use of the parent and master is identical. All of it depends upon positive law, induced by the policy of the government, and the law may co-operate with or run counter to natural justice and right as circumstances vary. In this case the child is the involuntary (I will not say slave) servant of his father and made so by law.

The husband has the legal right to control his wife in many things. The master has no right to control his slave in everything. The husband has the legal right to appropriate the services of the wife to his use. The rights growing out of this relation, the dearest of earth, are vested by law and created by law. The servitude of the woman to the man (if servitude it may be called without offense,) in this case, is commenced voluntarily, by contract, but when begun, the freedom of the woman is lost for life. The contract is indissoluble by the act of the parties. The law can only dissolve it. Here the law, in violation of natural right, which allows contracts to be made and annulled at the pleasure of the contracting parties, regulates the marriage relation, and forces those who enter into it to continue in it and be its servants.

The law causes an orphan to be bound to a master for a term of years, against the will of the orphan, and gives the master the right to control the person and appropriate the services to his own use. The law causes a vagrant to be arrested and sold, and gives the purchaser a right to control the person and appropriate the services to his own use. In the first of these cases, the servitude is involuntary and forced upon the subject of it without crime on his part. In the other case, it is also involuntary, but imposed to cure the disease and crime of idleness.

All governments impose upon their citizens, service, servitude, or slavery, the State being master, just as its wants and necessities require. The work or duty required is enforced by fines, by imprisonment, by stripes, or by death, just as the appropriate and authorised agents of the State determine to be expedient. The citizen is required to work upon a street or highway and put it in good order. He is not seized and marched out at the point of the bayonet, and forced to do the work, but he is fined for the failure. The citizen is required to perform a tour of duty in the army. The lot has fallen upon him by a fair draft. He refuses to join the regiment and obey orders. He may be forced into the ranks and shot for desertion or disobedience of orders. After being forced into the ranks, he may reluctantly obey orders and serve the term prescribed, but should he do it, it is a strong case of involuntary servitude or slavery—not by way of punishment for crime, unless want of patriotism be so regarded and identified with felony. A soldier or sailor voluntarily enlists. He may thereby incur for a term of years or for life, a servitude far more severe and intolerable than that imposed upon the negro slave. It depends upon the law and the contract he makes under it. He may subject himself to loss of wages, to imprisonment, to flogging, and loss of life in case he disobeys orders or fails to discharge the duties required by law. There cannot be a slavery more severe than the military and naval service of some countries, the ranks being often filled by impressment instead of contract. The penitentiaries of all our States are the receptacles of slaves—those who have been made slaves for a term of years or for life as a punishment for crimes. Now the difference is this. Where service, servitude, or slavery, (I care not what term is used to signify the thing) is voluntarily contracted or imposed by way of punishment for crime, or imposed for the manifest advantage of the individual or class, as in the case of the child, the apprentice, the pauper and the lunatic, we feel no repugnance to it—we see no reasons in its favor and we acquiesce in its propriety, but when slavery is imposed for the ease and comfort of the master alone, and when the physical, the moral and intellectual wants of the slave are no further attended to and provided for than the pecuniary interests of the master require, then our sympathies are aroused, our sense of justice violated, and we are, in the heat of enthusiasm, ready to set up the natural rights of mankind as paramount to the constitutions and laws adopted and enacted by men. This is the foundation of the notion that men cannot hold a property in men. It is an enthusiastic error.—Sober, matter-of-fact reasoning finds property whenever and in whatsoever organised governments, capable of executing their mandates, declare it shall exist. Our State and our parent State have declared that there may be and is a property in negroes. The power of government has created that property, in violation of the natural rights of the negro, I admit, but, having done so, it would be a fraudulent act on the part of the government toward its citizens, to deprive them without compensation, of rights which have been enforced for two hundred years. The government has encouraged her citizens to vest their capital in slave property by assurances of protection, given in the constitution under which we now live. To violate the pledge in the Constitution about to be formed, would be an act of bad faith. The British government has paid millions of dollars ($100,000,000, I believe) to compensate the owners of manomitted slaves. Even the Mexican government, in abolishing slavery, promised compensation, to the owners of the slaves. I never could consent to treat our slaveholders worse than England and Mexico treated theirs. As the law tolerates the citizen in vesting his capital in the purchase of slave property, I think the law should, out of fidelity and consistency to itself, guarantee the enjoyment of the property purchased, just as much as if it were a house or tract of land instead of a slave. I would not break up a menagerie of skunks, if created according to law, without making compensation to its owner.

Are we then to incur a debt of some sixty or seventy millions in order to rid the State of slavery? By no means. How, then, is slavery to be exterminated and the black and white races separated? I answer, masters will do it voluntarily or for a compensation which the slaves can pay, and that it can be done and ought to be done by colonising the slaves in Africa.—The advocates of slavery have denounced colonisation as impracticable. The American Colonisation Society has ascertained beyond all controversy that $50 when using their own ships and $60 when chartering vessels is sufficient to transport a man to Africa and maintain him until he can provide for himself. The hire of a healthy negro man and girl of seventeen or eighteen, one year, will take both to Liberia and maintain them until they can provide for themselves. These facts, of undeniable truth, establish the practicability of colonisation beyond controversy. I do not intend to say that it is practicable to send the whole slave population of Kentucky to Africa in a body. I admit they cannot be marched off, as were the Cherokee Indians, to their new home. No such movement has ever entered the mind of any philanthropist. To make the plan successful, emigration must increase with the strength and growth of the settlements in Africa.—Instead of sending out decrepit old age and helpless infancy to burthen the colony, we should only send young men and women. By sending young women as they reached the age of puberty, the sources of increase at home would be gradually dried up. I explained this fully and at large in a speech made nearly twenty years ago before the State Colonisation Society at Frankfort. It is a work that ought not to be accomplished in less time than thirty or forty years. If it be systematically commenced and persevered in, it will put an end to the existence of our black population in Kentucky and transfer the race to Africa. The astonishing progress which Liberia has made; the daily developments of the unlimited capacity of Africa to receive and support the black population of the United States; the example of European colonisation, by which hundreds of thousands of all ranks and conditions are annually thrown upon our shores; and the example of our own migratory population, traversing the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, almost without a dollar, have opened the eyes of the people to the practicability of colonising the slaves, so that it no longer admits of serious question. The opponents of colonisation, however, finding their old objections no longer tenable, now contend that if the negroes were permitted to leave and carry off their earnings the process would drain our specie and impoverish the white population left behind. This argument concedes the ability of the negroes by their own labor to colonise themselves, and thus proves that the only obstacle in the way is our unwillingness. The idea that we should be injured by the drain of our specie is entirely fallacious. The emigrating negroes would require very little money. Implements of husbandry, tools of mechanical trades, clothing and provisions, as experience in colonisation has proved, would constitute the essential outfit. Their wages would be mostly expended for these things before their departure.

But suppose we were injured to some extent in the manner suggested. Is it not a law of trade that the precious metals and coins, like water, seek their level and flow to places where most needed? That law would soon return to us our just share of the currency of the world, and after the removal of the slaves we should be amply compensated for any temporary inconvenience by the advantages of free labor during succeeding ages.

We may speak in favor of slave labor, but the time rapidly approaches when in Kentucky it will be superseded by free labor. I have heard that under the burning sun of the cotton and sugar farms of the South and in the malaria of a rice plantation, the white man could not labor and live; and, therefore, in the Southern States, negro slavery was not only a blessing, but a thing of indispensable necessity. If it be so, let them enjoy it. I have no right to judge for them. If there was not a slave in our State I should rigidly enforce the provisions of the constitution and surrender every fugitive slave who might be found amongst us. In our genial climate, we know that the white man can and does labor, and that *health* is one of the rewards of his toil. We also know that without slaves more of us would be compelled to work for ourselves; and, in doing it, I think we should be greatly benefitted in both health of body and mind, and a large increase of our wealth. Man is prone to idleness when he can live on the labor of others. Idleness is the parent of bodily infirmities and mental sloth. It leads to dissipation and every calamity that "flesh is heir to." The free laborer is stimulated to industry and frugality by many strong motives which the slave never feels. The free man works with energy and good will, stimulated by the wages he is to receive, by the train of thought in regard to the disposal of them according to his own pleasure, and by the interest he has in keeping up a character for fidelity and industry, which will secure employment and good wages thereafter. No such motives operate upon the slave. His reward is just what the master pleases to bestow. He has no selection of food or raiment, quantity or quality. He does not dispose of the proceeds of his labor according to any plans of happiness he may conceive for himself, his wife, or his children. He has no wife nor children in the eyes of the law. But of that I must not, I cannot speak. The slave's strongest incentive to vigilance and industry is the fear of the lash. No wonder that he is careless, idle, and thoughtless in relation to his business or the work assigned him. Nor is it at all surprising under such a state of things that so many slaveholders lose their estates and become bankrupt.

As the free laborer, in the same time, under the influences which operate upon him, does more work and does it better than the slave, and as free labor will become more abundant and more readily procured with the increase of our white population, the time rapidly approaches when employers will find it to their interest to hire free laborers instead of slaves. Indeed I am inclined to think even now that it would be more profitable to the farmer to cultivate his farm by free labor. By consulting the census of 1840 I find, from the best estimate I am capable of making, that there is only about one-fifth part of our slave population able-bodied men between the ages of 17 and 50 years. The other four-fifths are composed of women and children, old men and boys. It is impossible, without more accurate statistical information, to ascertain what portion of those four-fifths are capable of supporting themselves by their labor, and in addition supplying something for the support of the helpless. Certain it is that the 65,244 children under 10 years of age, and 5,117 old men and women over 55 years of age, would require a considerable portion of the labor of the productive and working hands, for their support. Now, when the old and young, the lame and diseased, the helpless of all conditions of our slaves are supported; when the whole flock are fed and clothed; fire and lodging provided; medical bills and taxes paid, out of the labor of the productive classes, I believe there is less clear profit to our farmers upon the labor of their slaves, than there would be if they employed free labor altogether. And while free labor would be cheaper to the farmer, he could afford to pay higher wages to the laborer, because of his greater skill and diligence and the performance of a greater amount of labor in a given time. Indeed the former could dispense with a portion of the free laboring hands a great portion of the year. In case he owns slaves he must keep them and maintain them all the time. Certain it is, that I have known slaves to impoverish instead of enrich their owners. The value placed upon our slaves according to the auditor's report for the year 1848 is $60,820,378. Interest on that sum amounts to $3,645,222 per annum. The census of 1840 shows 55,776 male slaves between 10 and 55 years of age. There are not many more now, as our slave population has increased but little. How many are disabled by disease and accident we cannot tell. But if every one of them were hired by the year, each must bring on an average $65 35 and a fraction to pay the interest. They would not bring it; for, besides those altogether worthless, there are boys between 10 and 17, and old men, between 50 and 55, numbering 17,813, who would bring but little. Slave females capable of laboring cannot more than support themselves and those of both sexes unable to labor. I state these facts to show that our slaves do not by their labor pay legal interest on their value. I leave every one to make his own figures with a view to ascertain how much free labor would be annually procured with $3,645,222, if we had no slaves.

[*Continued on Third Page.*]

Arrival of the Cambria.

ST. JOHN, N. B., Aug. 4.

The Cambria, Capt. Shannon, arrived at Halifax at 3 o'clock, A. M., and will be due at Boston at 4 o'clock on to-morrow. She brings Liverpool dates up to July 21. Parliament is to be prorogued on the 9th. During last week 339 deaths of cholera were reported in London, being more than double of the number of the previous week. Along the whole of the south coast it is raging very malignantly and mortally. At Liverpool the disease is rapidly increasing.

Ireland continues to be exempt from the scourge. On the 12th, a serious riot took place between the Orangemen and Catholics in the county of Down. The Orange party having celebrated the day of Trellymore and being on their march, whilst passing a defile called Dolly's Brae, found their path waylaid, all the passes surrounded, hills occupied by immense number of Roman Catholics, provided with forks and fire-arms, and plainly contemplating a general massacre. The protestants, aided by a small party of police and military, stood upon their defence, and succeeded in forcing their way through the gap after a short struggle, in which 40 or 50 are said to have been killed on both sides, much the greater part being of the Roman Catholic body. 38 Ribbonmen had been taken prisoners. On Friday two medical gentlemen drove through the country round about the scene of contest, with the view of administering relief to those who were found, but they were refused admittance at every house where they called.

FRANCE.—The National announced that Prince Canino, the son of Lucien Bonaparte, and ex-President of the Roman Constituent Assembly, had been arrested at Orleans, by order of the Government, on his road to Versailles. It is said, that having a claim against his cousin, Louis Napoleon, for money lent in aid of his election, the Prince was coming to France to demand it, the conduct of his cousin against Rome having stirred up his ire. It is said that the Prince will not be imprisoned, but that he will be forced to embark for Europe or America.

The Pope has addressed an autograph letter to Oudinot on the occasion of receiving the keys of Rome. His Holiness congratulates the General on the triumph of order in Rome, and expresses his hope that Divine Providence will cease any difficulties that may still exist. He adds that he does not cease to direct his prayers to Heaven for the General, the city, and the French nation.—Cardinal Ricolfi and the Marquis Cuccheti arrived in Rome from Gaeta, on the 8th.

Propositions are making at Rome which leads to the belief that Pius IX is expected to return with a Quirinal. The French are doing all they can in distributing money freely, to get up a cry in his favor, but in vain. Roman troops who had agreed in the first instance to do duty conjointly with the French, are all leaving, and the whole force now remaining amounts to less than 1000 men.

Garribaldi has succeeded in making his escape from the French Division, who were put upon a false scent, and he is now in the mountains of Abruzzi. Previous to his departure from Rome, he had secured ammunition and military stores.—Another account states that Garribaldi is on the Neapolitan frontier, where he has been joined by another body of troops, proving a body of 20,000 men.

Gen. Oudinot has dismissed all persons in office under the Republican Government, and even under Pius IX himself, and put in their place all persons whom he could find that held office under Gregory II.

A report of a victory over the Russians by Bem, is mentioned in the diplomatic circles in Paris.—Also that the Hungarians had obtained further advantages before Comorn.

An agent of Schleswig had arrived at Berlin, to protest against the armistice.

AUSTRIA.—From reports of Gen. Hayman, addressed to the Emperor of Austria, it appears that a very sharp conflict took place on the 11th before Comarn, between the combined armies and the Moggars. The Hungarians fought fierce, but the Austrians claim the victory. Another account states that 180 pieces of cannon were brought into the field by the Hungarians, and nothing could be more complete than the defeat of the united Russians and Austrian armies under Hayman. He was obliged to fall back on Raab, which city is filled with wounded. He has been obliged to send 3000 to Presburg, and but for the timely arrival of Russian troops to cover his retreat, Hayman and his staff would have been captured. The Turkish Ambassador, announced that Bem had completely defeated the Russians at Transylvania, and that the latter had been obliged to take refuge in Wallachia.

GERMANY.—Several principalities and duchies have given in their adhesion to the treaty concluded on the 26th of May, between Prussia, Saxony and Hanover.

BADEN.—A decree of the Grand Duke prorogues the state of siege for a month.

Advices from Vienna to the 13th of July, state that Buda and Presth had surrendered to the Austrian and Russian troops on the 11th, without resistance.

STAGE ACCIDENT.—A stage was driven off a precipice and fell into a deep gully, about five miles from the city, night before last. There were several persons in the vehicle at the time; a young woman, was so seriously injured that her life is despaired of.—*St. Louis Union, 2d.*

AGRICULTURAL.

New Indications in Agriculture.

BY DR. R. T. BALDWIN, OF WINCHESTER, VA.

Messrs. Editors of the Plough, Loom and Anvil:

The indications I have drawn from the practical facts which have passed under my personal observation, since my attention has been directed to the subject of agriculture, differs so materially from the received opinions of the present day, that I have been induced to submit them for your consideration; under the hope and expectation that you or some one equally qualified, will correct them if they should prove to be erroneous. With this view, I shall state them in distinct, substantive propositions.

1st. It is not true that any plant which the farmer is interested in cultivating, derives its principal nutriment from the carbonic acid gas of the atmosphere. Although air is indispensable to vegetable as well as to animal life, it is equally true that no animal can live without food, and no plant exist in an impoverished soil without manure at the root.

2d. That the only food of plants known to the practical farmer is manure, or the residue of putrefaction. Neither water, oil, carbon, phlogiston, nor the sulphates, nitrates, muriates, carbonates, silicates, phosphates of ammonia, lime, magnesia, nor acids, nor alkalies, have ever been proved to be the aliment of plants, unconnected with the putrified substances which may contain them.

3d. It is not true that different vegetable matters, during their growth, extract different fertilizing salts from the earth. For lands exhausted by continued cultivation in one kind of grain will not produce a more remunerative crop of any other kind.

4th. It is not true that lands under cultivation cannot be made to preserve their natural fertility without manure; on the contrary, lands naturally poor, may be made exceedingly fertile without the addition of manure, of any kind whatever.

5th. There is no natural disintegration of the soil in a state of repose, and a formation of alkalies, unless its surface be covered with some substances or other. Exhausted lands, which remain uncovered, never improve in fertility by rest.

6th. The residue of the decomposition of vegetable substances, or the "ash of plants," is not manure. Nor can manure be made of any substance, without the aid of the putrefactive process.

7th. That the analytical investigations of learned chemists, totally disregarding the vital principle of life, have not promoted the interest of agriculture. On the contrary, diverting the attention of agriculturists from careful observations of the operations of nature, and the inductive reasonings drawn therefrom, have been decidedly injurious to its best interests.

8th. That shade is the great fertilizing agent; the putrefactive fermentation cannot be produced without it, and consequently no manures can be made, and no fertility imparted to the earth, in any manner, independent of its influence.

9th. That the earth itself is capable of being converted into the best manure; to effect this, it is only necessary that it should be densely shaded. That is, it should be located favorably for the generation of the putrefactive fermentation.

10th. That the fertility imparted to the soil is more permanent, when produced by shade, than from the application of any manure whatever.

11th. That every particle of earth, as it is naturally constituted, contains a portion of the fertilizing principle. The surface earth, or "mould," is fertilized earth itself caused by shade and not the residue of vegetable decomposition.

12th. The difference in the fertility of the soil, in our native forest lands, arises solely from the circumstance of the surface soil being more or less densely shaded. Pine, which have no leaves, and white and red oak, which part with them so reluctantly, never leave the surface so fertile as those trees which drop their leaves with the first frosts.

13th. Many plants do impart more fertility to the soil than they extract from it during their growth,—not in excrements, but by their shade.

14th. The natural provision of the renovation of worn out lands appears to be this:—That some plants, like some animals, require but little food; these thrive best on the poorest soils. Every practical farmer knows, that if additional fertility be given to the soil, they disappear almost magically.

15th. However industrious and energetic a farmer may be, he cannot continue to cultivate a farm exceeding one hundred acres, and preserve its natural fertility by manures made on the farm. He attempts an impossibility and must fail.

16th. Through the agency of shade, every farmer may fertilize every acre of land which he is able to cultivate. In this, consists the perfection of agriculture.

I most sincerely believe that these propositions may be abundantly sustained by facts, prominently before the observation of every agricultist. Yours, with respect,

R. T. BALDWIN.