The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, EDITOR. "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS." ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 14.---NO. 51. SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1859. WHOLE NO. 721.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT SALEM, OHIO, by the Executive Committee of the Western Anti-Slavery Society.

TERMS.—$1,50 per annum payable in advance.

☞Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to BENJAMIN S. JONES, Editor.

Orders for the paper and letters containing money in payment for the same, should be addressed to ANN PEARSON, Publishing Agent, Salem, Columbiana County, Ohio.

☞Money carefully enveloped and directed as above, may be sent by mail at our risk.

☞We occasionally send numbers to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of Anti-Slavery truth, with the hope that they will either subscribe themselves or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

One Square (16 lines) three weeks,	$1,00
" " Each additional insertion,	,25
" " Six months,	4,00
" " One year,	6,00
Two Squares six months,	5,00
" " One year,	8,00
One Fourth Column one year, with privilege of changing monthly,	12,00
Half Column, changing monthly,	20,00

☞Cards not exceeding eight lines will be inserted one year for $3,00; six months, $2,00.

J. HUDSON, PRINTER.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

From the Washington Republic.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE!

There are some men in the Republican ranks who hold that it is the right and duty of the State courts to interpose and prevent the execution of the fugitive slave act, by the courts of the United States. Our readers are aware that the refusal of the Supeme Court of Ohio, in a recent application for that purpose, to set at liberty certain prisoners who were undergoing the sentence of the United States District Court, on a conviction for forcibly resisting the execution of that act, has been violently assailed by certain politicians of that State, some of whom go so far as to declare that hey "do not recognise as Republicans" men who will sustain that decision.

It would seem that these men are determined to make a direct issue with their brethren on this point. Well, if it is an issue that must be met, it behooves us to look at both sides of it. It behooves even those who think that a fugitive slave never ought to be delivered up, under any circumstances, nor by any process, to look at both sides of the issue, and see what there is in this new doctrine to commend it to their favor.

In the opinions of the judges, in the Ohio *habeas corpus* case, we have the two conflicting doctrines clearly laid down. The court consisted of five judges, all Republicans. Three of the five held that they had no right to interpose, and arrest the execution of the sentence of the Federal court, on the ground that the act under which the prisoners were convicted was unconstitutional, especially after it had been decided to be constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States—whatever their private opinions on that subject might be.

The other two judges held, not only that the fugitive act of 1850 is unconstitutional, but that Congress has no constitutional power to pass any act whatever for the surreender of fugitive slaves. They held, also, that the State courts have a right to interpose and prevent the execution of any act of Congress which they may deem unconstitutional, and that it was their duty to interpose and prevent the execution of the act under consideration.

Those who would read out of the Republican party all who sustain the decision of the majority of the court, accept the dissenting opinion of the minority, as laying down the orthodox Republican doctrine. This doctrine will be found very clearly stated in the dissenting opinion of Judge Brinkerhoff, which we printed in our paper on the 8th of June.

Now, does Judge Brinkerhoff assert that fugitive slaves ought not to be surrendered, on claim, to their owners? By no means. He acknowledges the constitutional right of the owner to recapture his fugitive slave, and the constitutional obligation and duty to deliver him up, on claim, quite as distinctly as the majority of the Judges do. But he thinks the *States* are bound to pass laws to carry into effect that provision of the Constitution which declares that "fugitives from service or labor shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor shall be due," and that Congress has no right to legislate on the subject. The following is the concluding paragraph of his opinion on this point:

"I conclude, therefore, that the States are bound, in fulfilment of their plighted faith, and through the medium of *their* laws, legislation and functionaries, to deliver up the fugitive from service or labor, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due under the laws of another State from which the fugitive has fled. But the Federal Government has nothing to do with the subject, and its interference is sheer usurpation of a power not granted, but reserved."

Now we respectfully ask those who are conscientiously opposed to the surrender of a fugitive slave, under any circumstances, what *they* expect to gain by adopting this doctrine? The fugitive is to be surrendered, at all events. Congress says, and the Supreme Court of the United States says, he must be delivered up in accordance with a law of the United States, to be enforced in the Federal courts, and executed by Federal officers. But Judge Brinkerhoff says, he must be delivered up in pursuance of laws which "*the states are bound in fulfilment of their plighted faith*," to pass for that purpose. Where is the difference, so far as the interests of the fugitive are concerned? Of course, those who hold, with Judge Brinkerhoff, that the States are *bound by their plighted* faith to pass laws providing for the delivering up of fugitive slaves, would have those laws *executed* when passed.

The question, then, upon which certain men would divide the Republican party, is not whether fugitive slaves are to be delivered up to their masters, but *how* are they to be delivered up?

We admit that there is much force in the argument by which it is attempted to prove that the true construction of that clause of the Constitution relating to the surrender of fugitive slaves imposes upon the State, rather than Congress, the obligation to pass laws to carry it into execution. Mr. Webster held that such a construction ought originally to have been given to this clause of the Constitution, and that the South *had just cause to complain* that it had not been given. It is however, a question upon which much may be said on both sides, and inasmuch as Congress has exercised the power of legislating on the subject for two-thirds of a century, with the express sanction of the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as of the Supreme Courts of numerous individual States, and without the dissent of any, we agree with Mr. Webster, and the Ohio court, that this long unbroken line of precedents ought to settle a question of construction, which, in the beginning, was a doubtful one. We certainly think the free States have no cause to complain that such a construction has been given, in preference to that now contended for by the minority of the Ohio court.

If fugitive slaves are to be hunted down and recaptured on the soil of the free States, we prefer that the General Government shall pass the laws under which it is to be done, and execute them, too; and that the State Governments shall not be required to perform so odious a service. The prevailing construction permits the State Governments to remain entirely *passive* in the business of slave hunting and slave catching. Judge Brinkerhoff's construction would compel them to become *active agents* in the business. And this is the sum and substance of the difference between the conflicting doctrines, upon which a few rash men are endeavoring to get up a schism in the Republican party.

Those who are conscientiously opposed to the surrender of fugitive slaves, by any process, are invited to nul'ify not only the fugitive slave act of 1850, but *any* fugitive slave act that Congress may pass. They are invited to do this, however, not for the purpose of putting an end to slave-hunting in the free States, but that the State Governments may take upon themselves the delightful task of prosecuting the business. Do they see anything in this new doctrine that they are invited to espouse, which will induce them to make its acceptance a *sine qua non* of political fellowship? Being eminently conscientious men, they will of course act in *good faith* in the matter, and not nullify the acts of Congress, under *pretence* that the State is *bound by its plighted faith* to pass laws securing the same object, and then turn round and *refuse* to pass such laws, or to execute them when passed.

TWO NEGROES HUNG AND ANOTHER BURNT AT THE STAKE.

MARSHALL, SALINE CO., MO., July 20, 1859.

Some time ago, you will recollect, a negro murdered a gentleman named Hinton, near Waverly, in this county. He was caught after a long search and put in jail. Yesterday he was tried at this place and convicted of the crime, and sentenced to be hung. While the Sheriff was conveying him to prison he was set upon by the crowd, and taken from that officer. The mob then proceeded to the jail and took from thence two other negroes. One of them had attempted the life of a citizen of this place, and the other had just committed an outrage upon a white girl. After the mob got the negroes together, they proceeded to the outskirts of the town, and selecting a proper place, chained the negro who killed Hinton to a stake, got a quantity of dry wood, piled it around him and set it on fire! Then commenced a scene which for sickening horrors has never been witnessed before in this, or perhaps any other place.

The negro was stripped to his waist, and barefooted. He look the picture of despair—but there was no sympathy felt for him at the moment. Presently the fire began to surge up in flames around him, and its effects were soon made visible in the futile attempts of the poor wretch to move his feet. As the flames gathered around his limbs and body, he commenced the most frantic shrieks and appeals for mercy—for death—for water! He seized his chains—they were hot, and burnt the flesh off his hands. He would drop them and catch at them again and again. Then he would repeat his cries, but all to no purpose. In a few moments he was a charred mass—bones and flesh alike burnt into a powder. Many, very many of the spectators, who did not realize the full horrors of the scene until it was too late to change it, retired disgusted and sick at the sight. May Marshall never witness such another spectacle.

The ends of justice are surely as fully accomplished by the ordinary process of law as by the violence of an excited populace.

If the horrors of the day had ended here it would have been well, but the other negroes were taken and hung—justly, perhaps—but in violation of law and good order. They exhibited no remorse. —*St. Louis Democrat.*

BURNING AT THE STAKE.

Our telegraphic dispatches have again conveyed to the reader information that a human being had been burnt to death at the stake. Where did this occur? In New England? Did any one ever hear of their doing such things in the land of steady habits? Perhaps it may have been in the Middle States? What? Would the land of William Penn, or Calvert, or Carteret, or the descendants of the Knickerbockers, be guilty of acts of that description! Ah! no. Wherever it might have been, it was not here. Was it in the free northwest, with its heterogeneous masses of settlers from everywhere under the sun, and all wild and rough on the frontiers, however calm and peaceful it may be in the settled districts? Tell us not of such a supposition. The free west has many sins to answer for, but not this—oh! not this. It never burnt a human being at the stake. Where, then, was this awful deed perpetrated if not anywhere within the regions named, which contain two thirds of the population, wealth and intelligence of the whole Republic?

It was in that section of the Union where alone horrors like this are possible—it was in a region where we people of the north are always accused of fanaticism, abolitionism, and every other freak of human frezy possible to minds at sea on any one subject; where the press and the politicians are forever gibbering about the constitution and the laws, and obedience to lawful authority, and trying to convey the impression that while they are the special friends of law and order, we are anarchists, rebels, outlaws, and the like. It was—where else could it have been?—in the slaveholding section of the confederacy.

Were this an isolated case we should hesitate to refer to it in these terms, for the south is full of noble and generous people, and has high qualities which command our respect and esteem, and we should make due allowance for the occurrence. But it has become so common at the south as to take its position among the permanent customs and recognized habits of the southern people, and unless they can free themselves of it, they must take the consequences. Within the last ten years very many cases like this have been chronicled in the newspapers of the south, to which alone we are indebted for the information in every case. The accounts are usually made up, too, by editors so lost to all sense of right and propriety as to defend or apologize for the infamous deed, and hold it up to the negroes of the neighborhood as a warning. Why so? does the reader ask. The The reason is plain. It is a warning that it will be repeated on other offenders.

The avowed object is to appal the negroes, and deter them from the commission of similar crimes; but like all severe punishments, this utterly fails of its object, as is clear from the frequent happening of these mob executions. They do not prevent the recurrence of the crime so punished; and hence, knowing this, those who go on repeating the punishment in defiance of law, do so merely to glut their revenge and gratify base passions. And what crime is it that causes men at the south to get so completely beside themselves? Sometimes it is murder, sometimes rebellion; sometimes rape. There are laws for the punishment of all these crimes, and there need be no fear of the negro escaping, if public sentiment is so unanimously against him. His death being needful, the law is sufficient for that. But it seems that death is not sufficient. It must be death by torture, with a miserable wretch burning slowly, yelling in agony as the flames curl about his naked limbs. Perhaps the same principle which justified this might induce pinching to death with red hot irons, pouring molted lead down the throat and some other of the great inventions of the Inquisition. And as the usual justification given is, that it would not be so were it not for the interference of the abolitionists, and as that interference unfortunately increases a hundred fold with these outrages, who can say that a few years shall not see all the horrors of the inquisition established at the south?—*Phil. N. American.*

NEGRO CONSPIRACY.—A negro woman belonging to Mr. M. J. Nixon, of Harrison county, says the Clarksburgh Register, gave information on Wednesday last, that there was a combination among the negroes of the neighborhood of Shinnstown, for the purpose of running off, and defending themselves in so doing. She states that some of the negroes about Clarksburg are engaged with them; that they are well supplied with fire arms, &c.—Ten of the negroes suspected, were arrested on Wednesday, and are now in jail; the negro woman giving the information is also in jail. She further states that these negroes were supplied with poison, which was distributed among them at a convention of them held at Shinntown, not long since, and that their intention was to poison their masters' families. Whether any confidence should be placed in this report, we do not know, but the matter will, we presume, be judicially investigated. There were about sixteen negroes implicated in the affair.—*Wheeling Int.*

From the New York Commercial Advertiser.

SUDDEN CLOSE OF THE WAR IN ITALY.

A very general surprise has been created by the news from Europe brought by the North Briton to Quebec and telegraphed thence to this city. Its most startling features is that a treaty of peace has been signed between the two belligerent powers, in a personal interview between the Emperors of France and Austria.

It is beyond denial that on the part of the friends, both European and American, of the Italian cause, the basis of this treaty is not regarded with satisfaction. As briefly stated in the Emperor's despatch to the Empress, that basis embraces the following particulars: the Italian States are to be formed into a confederacy, under the "honorary presidency" of the Pope; Austria is to cede Lombardy to France, with the understanding that it is to be transferred to the King of Sardinia, and become part of his Kingdom; while Venice is to be retained by Austria, but only with a qualified possession, it having a place in the Italian Confederation. Napoleon III. redeems his pledge given to European powers that France would acquire no territory by the war. As a compliment to the real victor, and as the course least humiliating to the vanquished, Lombardy is assigned to France, and Sardinia receives it from her and not from Austria. So that Napoleon's promise is fulfilled, and as far as possible the feelings of Francis Joseph are spared. Those who have repeatedly and persistently doubted Napoleon's good faith in this respect are rebuked and silenced by the first provision of the treaty.

But when we come to the other provisions of this treaty of peace, their satisfactory character is less general. The letter of Louis Napoleon in relation to the liberation of Italy is apparently violated. We use the word "apparently" because in our judgment very much depends in this relation upon the exact meaning to be given to the expression "honorary Presidency" of the Pope. Leaving that expression for the present out of consideration, we repeat that the Emperor of France does not seem to have achieved all he promised when he entered upon the war. Venice is as much a part of Italy as Lombardy is; and is further the stronghold of Austria in Italy, for there are her fortified places. These she retains, and by means of these can maintain a firm hold and exercise her despotic will over Venice. This is the broader, general view of the terms of treaty, and if there were no qualifications or restrictions, the power of Austria over this portion of Italy would be even more absolute than before.

But this cession of Venice to Francis Joseph is not unqualified. It does not become a part of his Empire. He is to be not Emperor, but King of Venice, and that not absolutely, but with limitation. Venice is to be a member of the Confederacy of Italy, and Francis Joseph, as its owner and ruler, is but to have a voice in the confederated councils with other Italian rulers, Princes or Kings. If all this is done in good faith the Emperor of Austria's tenure of Venice is little more than nominal, for doubtless guarantees will be taken for his adhesion, as King of Venice, to the Italian Confederation, and his continued assent that it shares fully in whatever advantages accrue from a confederated government.

And now as to th nature and value of the promised boon to the Italian States. They are to be formed into a Confederacy "under the Pope as honorary President," what are known as the "States of the Church" included. The anomalous position thus assigned to the Pope is probably a compromise, the Emperor of France being desirous to denude him of temporal power, and the Emperor of Austria pleading for the abandonment of such a purpose, and the meaning of the language (the word 'honorary' being tautological) is that the Pope shall stand at the head of the confederacy, but that the actual government—the power of making and enforcing laws—shall rest with the representatives of the States in congress or council assembled. We do not see any other natural or reasonable interpretation of the language of the despatch announcing the basis of the treaty of peace.

Supposing this view of the matter to be correct, Louis Napoleon has probably redeemed his promises on behalf of Italy, so far as it was in his power, and perhaps further knowledge of events may show that he has done this wisely and well. Austria's co-operation was needed to establish this new order of things. Probably she only could influence the Pope to be a party to it, and without his assent even such a step toward the amelioration of Italy's condition could probably never have been taken. Nor is it improbable that this will ultimately prove the surest and most permanent regeneration of Italy. The measure strikes at and destroys the absoluteism of the most absolute of temporal sovereignties—that of the Pope. It gives the Italians an opportunity of trying, upon a limited scale, the experiment of solidarity and nationalization, for although we apprehend that the rulers or princes of the Italian states, and not popular representatives, will for the present form the Congress or legislative and administrative Council, yet a great point is gained by this confederation, as many of those rulers will be a check upon those excesses of despotism by which some of the Italian states have been oppressed.

One great boon, at least, will be conferred upon the world if the provisions of the treaty accord with its declared basis and are faithfully carried out, viz: that the *supremacy of the temporal power of the Pope is practically brought to an end.* It requires no great faith to regard this as the entering wedge—the sure forerunner of civil freedom throughout Italy.

THE BRITISH GOLD IS COMING.

The prints which are friendly to a protective tariff, often warn us of the evils likely to spring out of our large exports of precious metals. We have many times shown, on scientific principles that their apprehensions were groundless; but we mean to show that they are groundless for another reason. The high authority, the official organ of the federal government, assures us in the most positive manner, that the "British" mean to send back all the gold they have had from us, and perhaps more.

This result has been brought about by the instrumentality of Senator Seward, who was lately in London. He went abroad, ostensibly, for his health and in order to observe the various objects of interest in foreign countries, but in reality, it seems, to enter into a fearful combination for the overthrow of the government of the United States. Mr. Buchanan's organ, the *Constitution*, fastens the treachery upon him beyond all peradventure, and by the most overwhelming proofs. They are these; When Mr. Seward arrived in London the Daily *News* of that city remarked upon his arrival, spoke of his high position as an American Statesman, and moreover said that he was a candidate for nomination to the Presidency, with good chances of success.

"Now," says the *Constitution*, "mark that! The London Daily *News* is the organ of the Exeter Hall Abolitionists, and the faithful chronicler of the proceedings of anti-slavery tea parties in the provincial towns of England, and Mr. Wm. H. Seward is formally nominated by the aforesaid British Abolitionists as their candidate for the next Presidency of the United States!"

The *Constitution* proceeds;

"No American who has a single spark of patriotism can read the article without feelings of indignation at its arrogant interference in American affairs, and the manifest concord that it manifests as existing between the Abolitionists of this country and those of Great Britain to bring about a severance of the Union, for the profit of British capitalists. Mr. Seward has certainly sold himself to this infamous combination. Until now we were at a loss to explain Mr. Seward's sudden visit to England. It is now apparent, that we may confidently expect the free use of British gold in the next presidential election, for the purpose of compassing the villainous purpose which he and the British abolitionists have in view."

How dreadful it is to think that Mr. Seward and the naughty British abolitionists will not let the precious Union alone; but then, again, how delightful to know that we are to get plenty of British gold for it! When the Nullifiers and those Southern Democrats with which the Constitution sympathizes, threaten us with eruption, they do not propose to pay for the ugly process. The British are more generous, and gild the pill they poison. They are so compassionate as not to ruin without an equivalent. While they knock us on the head with their clubs, they fill our pockets with their guineas. There is compensation in this, and if we are to be extinguished, it is pleasing to feel that we shall die rich.

We hardly think, however, the *Constitution* was prudent in disclosing the scheme in the way it has. With the known avidity of its partisans for all sorts of plunder, we are afraid that when it is once shown that the Republicans will have the distribution of the British gold, there will be no keeping them together. Like the congregation of Scotch wreckers, which rushed out of church when a cry was raised, that a richly freighted vessel had been stranded, they will desert to a man, and President Buchanan, like the minister on the same occasion, will have to say, "Gentlemen, let us all start fair." It is to be hoped that the gold will not be so abundant as to produce a result so much to be deprecated on all sides.

Besides the *Constitution* ought not to frighten Wall street in this sudden and shameless manner. What are we to do with all the gold when it comes? Chevalier and Cobden have told us already that the enormous yield of the mines is about to plunge us in a gold bath, that it is going to produce a most uncomfortable plethora; that the prices of everything will be so high that it will take a ladder to reach them, and that inflation, disorder and distress must be the consequences wherever commerce is known. Now, was it not enough to be threatened with drowning, suffocation, and a general cataclasm, all through gold, without having the British coffers remorselessly opened upon us? Mr. Buchanan's organ is indiscreet. It should have broken news of this awful calamity in prospect by degrees, and not overwhelmed us at once.—*N. Y. Post.*

NEWS FOR THE VERDANT. *via.* THE NEW YORK HERALD.

The New York Herald, in an article on the revival of the slave trade, charges that Thurlow Weed, of the Albany Journal, is engaged in it. It says the facts are these:

A number of anti-slavery republican leaders in the North entered into a secret confederacy to embark in the slave-trade, the object being two-fold: first, a mercantile speculation, by which plenty of money might be realized, while at the same time it would injure the hated slaveholders of the south by glutting the market, and thus reducing the price of negroes: second, a political scheme to overthrow the democratic party in the next presidential election, by bring the slave traffic to light, and charging our government with connivance at it, while the conspirators took good care to cover up their own tracks. This plan of operation is this: The managers buy up fast sailing, beautiful yachts in New York, which from their small size, their snow white sails, their rig and appearance as pleasure boats are never suspected. These can go into the shallowest waters, where they cannot be pursued by ships of war, even if they do become objects of suspicion, and should one of them be caught, the value is comparatively small, and the escape of so many others will amply compensate for the loss. Thus the northern abolitionists have been doing a thriving business, and when it is broken up at last, it will be turned to excellent account for the presidential campaign. The democratic government will be denounced through all the moods and tenses for winking at the inhuman traffic in flesh and blood', and the foremost and fiercest among the denouncers will be Thurlow Weed. The cat, however is now out of the bag, and we trust that government cruisers will keep a sharp look-out for his slavers, both on the African coast and among the reefs of Florida, and that the "whited sepulchres" will be turned inside ont, and the prophet at Albany, who delivered his oracular responses in the Journal be stripped of his veil, and his true lineaments exhibited to his followers and the whole community.

VERY SATISFACTORY.

Corwin's Xenia speech appears to have given entire satisfaction to his constitutients. The *Xenia News* says,

To any who may have been in doubt as to Gov. Corwin's positions, we commend a careful perusal of the speech itself. The silly assertion that our Representative was not a Republican, there receives its final quietus. This assertion, first made by a few indiscreet persons in our own ranks, has been taken up, and magnified, and distorted by the Democratic press, until many believed that Gov. Corwin was really leading away a large wing of the party from the "purity of the faith." After reading this speech, they will be at a loss to see how such an opinion could ever have been entertained. He has only manifested, all along, independence of thought and action which becomes a statesman; but the Democracy are so unused to anything of this kind that they actually have believed that, because he had opinions of his own, he could not belong to the party!

We also extract from the *Torch Light's* comments upon the speech:

"Those who invited Mr. Corwin to speak had intimated to him, as we have been informed, that his party position was not fully understood by at least a portion of his constituents in this region; and hence he availed himself of the occasion to announce his "proclivities." He opened with the emphatic declaration that he was a Republican—had voted with that party since its organization, and indorsed freely its principles and policy so far as it had proclaimed any distinctive features of the kind. As the Philadelphia Platform, so far as it involves principles, is recognized as the "written law" of the party, Mr. Corwin, of course intended by his declaration to be understood as indorsing that. We so understood him. In the past, immediate and remote, he has been written down by reporters as taking an entire independent position outside of all parties; but his declaration, made on Friday evening, led his hearers to the conclusion that he had, in this particular, probably, been unfairly dealt with by that class of journalists.

"With the general tone of the speech all Republicans were satisfied, and they will now take, as against all reporters for the press, his own assertion that he is a member of the Republican party and indorses its platform of principles.

In the report of the speech we published last week, it seems there was a trifling inaccuracy, which our readers will please to correct. The following paragraph from the Cincinnatti Commercial indicates the mistake the reporter made:

MR. CORWIN'S SPEECH—CORRECTION.—In the point our telegraphic report misrepresented Mr. Corwin. It was reported that he "*would not vote* for the admission of a State with a slave Constitution." He said he "*would* vote for a State" under such considerations; "that if his constituents should instruct him otherwise he should disobey them, or he would resign. He would have them remember that he was sworn to support the Constitution and laws to the best of his own abilities, not to the best of the abilities of his constituents."

SWAN AND GHOLSON.

The Springfield (Clark Co.,) *News*, a staunch Republican paper thus discourseth:

"If the issue had been the approval or disapproval of Judge Swan's decision, there would have been a majority in its favor. We do not claim that the approval would have been unanimous, but, if there had been an opportunity for expressing it, it would have prevailed triumphantly. In reality, the action of the Convention, in nominating Judge Gholson, sustained Judge Swan, for it is well known, in all portions of Ohio, outside of 'benighted Ashtabula,' and the 'skull' of Joshua R. Giddings, that Judge Gholson is just another such a man in sentiment, in talent, and in high moral worth, as Judge Swan."

DEATH OF THE KING OF SWEDEN AND NORWAY.—A telegram from Stockholm announces the death of Oscar, King of Sweden and Norway. The event occurred on the 8th of July, after an illness which had incapaciated the King from taking any active part in the Government since Sept., 1857. King Oscar was the son of Bernadotte, whom he succeeded on the Swedish throne in 1844. His Government was marked by liberality and justice. In 1845, the year following his accession, he presented to the Diet several projects of reform,—a proposition for the right of primogenture in noble families, and another for the revision of the criminal code; and in the succeding year, named a Commission for the revision of the Constitution. His measures have redounded to the welfare of his people, and his reign was pacific. He is succeeded by his eldest son, Prince Charles, who was appointed Regent by royal ordinance, in 1857, when the King's illness became so severe as to unfit him for the conduct of affairs. The present King (Charles XV.) was born in 1826, and married in 1850 the Princess Louise, daughter of Prince William of the Netherlands.

"Republicans have been busy ever since the nomination of Judge Gholson, trying to convince the uninitiated of their party of the *falsity* of the charge made by the Democratic press, viz: that Judge Swan was cast off because he recognized the constitutionality of the fugitive slave law."

So says the last Canfield *Sentinel*, and we acknowledge its truth; though we hardly expected that we should be aided in our labor by the editor of the Sentinel. We labor continually to convince the public of the *falsity* of various charges made by the Democratic press, and it gives us great pleasure to say that the election results show that the Republican press is very successful in that labor.—*Mahoning Register.*

RESCUE OF DR. DOY.

The St. Louis *Democrat* has the following in relation to the excitement at St. Joseph, regarding the escape of Doy:

"On Sunday morning, between one and two o'clock, during the severe storm, a party of eight men, all disguised, presented themselves at the jail building in St. Joseph, and after arousing the jailer, demanded admission, saying they were from Missouri with a horse-thief whom they desired to put in jail. The jailer seeing the horse-thief in their midst secured with ropes, suspected nothing, and at once unlocked his doors, and admitted the whole party. As soon as they were inside, they at once told the jailer that their real design was the liberation of Dr. John Doy, who had been convicted of negro-stealing, and was confined in jail.—The jailer remonstrated in vain. The party drew their revolvers and demanded the keys, which having possessed themselves of, Doy was immediately taken out of his cell, placed on a horse, and accompanied across the river by a portion of the rescuers, while the others remained with the jailor to prevent any alarm being given until the fugitives were well across the river, when they also made a precipitate retreat.—By daylight the whole city was greatly excited about the matter. In the evening, great fears were entertained that the excited populace would mob the office of the Free Democrat, and visit the lawyer who defended Doy, with vengeance."

CURRENT NOTES AND OMENS.—In the June number of DeBow's Review, Mr. E. Ruffin, a distinguished citizen of Virginia, estimates the number of slaves sold to the South, from that State, at 20,000 a year. He also estimates their average value at $800 apiece, making a gross amount of *sixteen millions of dollars.* We should like to know what proportion of these 20,000 slaves per year, were sold by members of the M. E. Church in that region. That very many of them are, is as certain as that they are sold at all. And yet our chief denominational paper at New York does not even condemn this domestic Methodist slave trade, and has not, since it came under its present editorial management.—*Northern Independent.*