Daily Appeal.

MEMPHIS.

FRIDAY, : : : : : : APRIL 13, 1860.

Reading Matter on Every Page

Largest Circulation in the City.

CIRCULATION OF DAILY APPEAL.....1,824
CIRCULATION OF SUNDAY EDITION.....2,200
CIRCULATION OF THE WEEKLY.....[illegible]
CIRCULATION OF WEEKLY.....3,600

SEE FIRST AND FOURTH PAGES.

NOTICE.

The Appeal Counting Room has been removed to No. 3 Howard's Row, up stairs, where all persons having business with the office are hereafter requested to call.

REMEMBER THE CARRIER.

Our carriers will again be morrow call upon their patrons for subscriptions of the present week. We hope they may meet with the proper sort of reception. We have the satisfaction of knowing that our new arrangements with the approbation and approval of nine-ten-twentieths of our subscribers. They get their paper regularly and promptly; they get it in time to read before breakfast; they never miss a number; and, what is more, on wet and inclement mornings their paper is delivered in the house, and not thrown over the palings, as heretofore. We have entered into this arrangement with our carriers, and there is no retreat from it. Therefore, all we have to say is to our subscribers on the subject is, that if you want the APPEAL, and desire it delivered punctually and promptly, lay aside each Saturday two dimes for the carrier, and your paper will never fail you.

NOTICE TO OUR MERCHANTS AND TRADES PEOPLE GENERALLY.

The edition of the WEEKLY APPEAL, JR., which will go to press on Monday, will amount to 4,300 copies. This edition goes to the country with our regular Weekly, of which it is just half the size, and on this account, advertisements inserted in it will more readily catch the eye of the reader. To those of our business men, and all others who desire a sure and safe approach to the notice of our countrymen, we offer this edition of our paper as the very best advertising medium. It is made up exclusively of miscellaneous reading, and is bound to become a great favorite with the ladies.

The number of advertisements admitted into it will be limited to four columns. Price, one dollar per square for each insertion. All advertisements designed for next week's issue, must be handed in on Saturday, all of which will pass through our daily edition of Sunday without extra charge. Which of our enterprising merchants will give us the first start in our new experiment?

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

A sentence in the column of our River Reporter yesterday morning, reads as follows: "Capt. SHIRLEY left for Louisville by rail yesterday evening."

"*Left by rail!*" What would our ancestors have understood by such an expression? Yes, what would we, of the present age and generation, have thought of such an expression twenty-five years ago? Our only idea would have been that which impressed the mind of DAVY CROCKETT, when he first heard mention of a railroad, which was that it was a common dirt road, "fenced all over with fence rails." The idea of CROCKETT was unsophisticated, old-timed and natural under the circumstances, but at that time no of the West never had dreamed of the progress science and commercial wants were making. It has been well and truly observed that SOLOMON, in the hight of his glory and in the plenitude of his wisdom, did not know enough as the juvenile of the present day. Perhaps if a locomotive would have put his smoke to flight, and the approach of a railroad train into Jerusalem would have been regarded as a visitation from the Most High, or at least a messenger from his astatic majesty, who rules in the regions below.

Let all this be as it may, one thing is evident, (because our reporter says so,) that "Capt. SHIRLEY departed for Louisville yesterday evening by rail." We leave all our readers to the cudgelling of their brains, and to guess what it means.

THE GREAT FIRE AT NASHVILLE.

The Nashville *Union and American* of Wednesday contains the particulars of the fire in that city, a meagre account of which we have given by telegraph:

Between one and two o'clock Tuesday morning, the fire was discovered issuing from the rear of the building on the corner of Union street and Printers' alley, between College and Cherry streets, occupied by George Greig as a confectionery and a residence. It required great energy and presence of mind to rescue the family of Mr. Greig, who occupied the upper stories as a residence. The fire when discovered had made such rapid headway as to cut off retreat by the stairway, and the family had to be rescued by means of ladders, leaving to time or opportunity to save any of the valuable furniture with which the Greig family had furnished his establishment. Indeed, with such haste did they have to make their retreat, that they were unable to save any of their wearing apparel.

The flames had got such headway as to render it impossible to prevent them spreading to the adjoining buildings, occupied by Mr. J. Flowers as a jewelry store and residence, and the efforts of those present, not engaged at the engines, were directed to the removal of Mr. Flowers' stock of jewelry, furniture, etc., which was accomplished in a remarkably careful manner. Mr. Flowers himself is absent, having gone New a few days since to purchase additional goods.

The flames still continued their progress up Union street, notwithstanding the unceasing efforts of the firemen, and the building occupied by Barnes & Co., as an eating house, and Mr. John Lock as a music and variety store, were fast crumbling beneath the terrible ordeal of the devouring element. A slight portion of Mr. Lock's stock was removed, though it was greatly damaged.

The buildings on the opposite side of Union street were saved from the flames, and required great efforts to prevent their destruction.

As the fire attacked the building occupied by Mr. Lock, the wind veered somewhat to the north, and it was then feared that the fire would sweep every building from that point up Union and Cherry streets to Bank alley, including the residence of Jacob McGavock, Esq. But by almost superhuman efforts on the part of the firemen, the flames were stayed in their course, and the danger dissipated. That gallant fireman, Capt. Stockell, remarked to us yesterday morning, that he could scarcely realize how the thing had been done, so imminent was the danger. He further remarked that it was the most disheartening and most difficult to manage, that we have had since the great fire of 1856, which burned the Nashville Inn, the Court house, and a number of business houses.

We find it difficult to get at the actual loss sustained from the fire, but hear it variously estimated at from $20,000 to $30,000. Mr. Greig has his stock insured, we learn, in Messrs. Nash & Marr for $3000, and his fixtures for $500, and his furniture was insured in the Commercial Insurance company for $500. His loss will exceed his insurance by perhaps $2000. Mr. Flowers had his stock insured with Messrs. Nash & Marr for $2500 and his show-cases for $500. His loss will probably not exceed $800. Neither Barnes & Co., nor Mr. Lock were insured. We do not know what the loss of the former will be, though it is supposed to be comparatively light. Mr. Lock's loss is estimated at from $1500 to 2000, though it may exceed the highest estimate, from the fact that much of his stock that was saved is materially damaged.

The houses occupied by Mr. Greig and Mr. Flowers belonged to the estate of the late F. N. McCairy, and were insured in the Commercial Insurance Co. for $2900 each; that occupied by Messrs. Barnes & Co. belonged to the estate of the late Dr. John H. Young, and was insured for $1500; and that occupied by Mr. Lock, belonged to Mr. Wessel, of the firm of Wessel & Thompson, and was insured in the Tennessee Mutual and Fire Insurance Co. for $2000. The loss on these houses will exceed the insurance by as much probably as $2000 on each.

Nothing is certainly known as to the origin of the fire, though it is supposed to have been accidental.

Election Returns—Secretary of State.

From the Mississippian, April 10.]

OFFICIAL.

The returns come slowly. The following are all which have yet been received at the office of the secretary of State:

	BROWNLOW. (Dem.)	HARPER. (Opp.)
Adams	99	97
Bledsoe	57	18
Blount	115	56
Carroll	225	176
Coffee	90	40
Claiborne	107	102
Clark	115	104
Cocke	148	113
Franklin	115	71
Harrison	21	4
Independent	27	23
Jefferson	96	85
Lauderdale	200	150
Leake	118	118
Madison	140	107
Rutherford	1111	1111
Warren	202	128
Winston	102	47

Missouri Democratic Convention.

ST. LOUIS, April 9.—The Democratic State convention met at Jefferson City this morning. After a spirited discussion, Judge Rowland said to be in favor of Dickinson for the Presidency, was elected temporary chairman.

At the afternoon session, R. E. Acock, of Polk county, was chosen permanent president, with seven vice-presidents, and eight secretaries.

During the absence of the committee on credentials, several speeches were made in support of the Democratic party.

Adjourned till evening.

THE UNIVERSITY DIFFICULTY AT OXFORD, MISSISSIPPI.

EDITOR APPEAL: We have carefully examined the testimony adduced before the board of trustees, and the whole of Dr. Branham's appeal to the people, in the last *Mercury*. We have hitherto refrained from giving our views on the subject, because we wished to be fully informed as to the facts in the case before forming or expressing an opinion in regard to it. From the record we find these things to be true:

First—That Chancellor Barnard's servant, Jane, was cruelly beaten by a student, in the Chancellor's absence.

Second—That 'tis clearly shown by the testimony of young Falkner, that H—— did it and admitted it after his trial.

Third—That H—— was tried before the faculty for beating said servant, Jane, but as there was not sufficient legal proof against him, he was not expelled.

Fourth—That on the trial, Furniss, the only white person present who saw the deed, refused to testify, and the faculty had no power to compel him so to do.

Fifth—That the accused was altogether undesirable as a student, being a young man of idle and irregular habits.

Sixth—That the accused failed to prove an *alibi*; that Prof. Boynton told the faculty that he knew the accused was guilty, but refused to disclose the name of his informant, and that during the trial Chancellor Barnard stated, as a circumstance corroborative of proof already adduced, what Jane herself had said about it to his wife.

Seventh—That the faculty passed a resolution declaring themselves morally convinced of the guilt of the accused, and that Chancellor Barnard communicated this resolution to the guardian of the accused, at the same time advising his removal; and that at the opening of the next session Chancellor Barnard refused, of his own motion, to re-admit the accused (H——) into college. We agree with Dr. Branham that the trustees erred in saying the charges, *as preferred* by Dr. Branham, were not sustained. For we think the answer of Barnard itself substantially admits them, except as to the chancellor's offering the negro's statement *as testimony*.

But, for argument's sake, granting them all to be strictly proven, they amount to just nothing at all, unless they go to the extent of showing Chancellor Barnard unsound upon the slavery question, and therefore unfit to be president of a southern institution. Barnard challenged investigation on this point, and we think the trustees eminently correct in saving that the proof strengthened rather that diminished their confidence in the president.

There was not only proof of his sound views on this subject since he came to the South, but long anterior thereto, and, more than all, he is a Christian minister and a stockholder. If he were an Abolitionist or even a Pressoiler, this certainly could not be.

Taking it, then, for proven that he is sound on the slavery question, we may then admit more than the proof establishes, and it would not render Barnard unfit to preside over a southern institution. He admits that during the pending of the trial before the faculty he mentioned what he heard said by his wife, Carter and Richardson say this was given as distinct proof. Barnard, Stearn, Whitehurn, Boynton and Moore say it was introduced as a circumstance merely in the case. Evidence is of two kinds—direct and circumstantial. And whether the statement of Jane was introduced as direct or circumstantial evidence, still it was mentioned that it might go for what it was worth, and when there, had to be acted on or rejected.

There was, however, other evidence in the cause, to-wit: Boynton's statement, and Barnard's account of the evasive denial of the young man charged, and his subsequent conduct; and we are somewhat astonished that this did not have more weight with the faculty. The conduct of the accused when charged, is often the best method of detecting guilt.

The testimony was, however, by the faculty deemed insufficient, and he was not expelled. Barnard then proceeded to do what he is charged with, and what, as president, he had a perfect right to do; and Dr. Branham, for reasons best known to himself, preferred these charges. Suppose some young man of Oxford had entered Dr. Branham's kitchen at night, and during his absence had beaten his slave. If there had been legal proof, Dr. Branham would, as every southern gentleman should do, protect his servant by prosecuting the offender before the courts. If there was no legal testimony, he would have called upon the man who was accused by the servant, and demanded of him the truth, and if he admitted the fact or denied it in such an evasive manner as to induce him to believe that he was guilty, the Doctor would have thrashed him soundly, and that, too, only on his negro's statement and the evasive manner of the accused, or he is not the chivalrous southern gentleman that we take him to be.

Barnard's negro was beaten; a student was accused; he denied it evasively when charged; plead not guilty, it is true, when upon trial, but all men know that this plea means, prove the charge if you can. He admitted it afterwards; neither the president nor the faculty had any legal power to swear witnesses or to compel one student to testify against another. What should a southern gentleman do under such circumstances? A minister and a president of a college could not fight a student. But must that student escape altogether for this?

If Dr. Barnard had been a southern born man, and had boldly announced to the faculty that his servant said the man did the deed, that he believed her statement and should act upon it, he would have been applauded as a fearless master, and one well worthy to hold property in slaves. We know Dr. Branham and believe him to be a gentleman, and regret exceedingly to see him placed in such a position. We do not believe that he has been made the dupe of another, or that he has been actuated by improper motives, yet we cannot but feel that he has placed himself in a most ridiculous and indefensible position. The trial before the faculty was not governed by legal rules, and hearsay is fully as good as of the testimony before it, being legal or illegal. College government is parental in its nature, and we presume that there is not a parent in the South, who has not at some time punished his own child upon the statement alone of a faithful slave. Taking the whole affair together, the antecedent reports; the threat of exposure if the trustees did not carry the trial and the proof; it was a complete farce, and we cannot resist a trite quotation—

"*Parturiunt montes et nascitur ridiculus mus.*"

A LOOKER-ON.

XXXVI CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

WASHINGTON, April 8.—*House.*—John Cochrane presented a bill for the protection of the rights of any government recognized by the laws of any government inclusive of those subversive of any such government carrying sight with bullion and specie, and neither passengers, letters or freight for hire, under penalty of seizure.

Mr. Thayer introduced a bill constituting Decotah, a land district, and providing for the admission to the House of a delegate thereto.

Mr. Scott introduced a bill to authorize the President, in conjunction with California, to run and mark the boundary between the Territories of the United States and California.

Mr. Hickman, from the committee on judiciary, made a report on the President's protest refuting the position of the latter. The reply among other things says they cannot refrain from an expression of their deep regret that an officer who prides himself upon the fact that the people have thought proper to invest him with the most responsible and dignified office in the world, and who declares he feels proudly conscious there is no public act of his life which will not bear the strictest scrutiny, and that he defies all investigation, should forget, amidst the surroundings of place and power and flattery, that he is the servant of all some people, and that he should shrink back in anger and terror from a simple request from the representatives of the first time under the Republic, that a Chief Magistrate has left a recorded admission that he has been made cognizance of the origin and schemes and character of his election by the revelers of his enjoyment. To distinguish such conduct by approbation, would be to sanction a kingly irresponsibility, and proclaim the rightful rule cause by the grace of God, and not from the confidence of man. The action, always charitable in the interpretation of acts and motives, is not prepared to overlook such a delinquency. The committee take the ground that the President, under the Constitution, possesses neither a privilege nor an immunity beyond a public citizen, and less favored in this respect than Senators and Representatives in Congress. Unfortunately, they say, for the attempted defense of that officer, that there is no charge made of any shade of offense calling for trial of any kind. It is a mere inquiry that is produced. Mr. Crowdle's resolutions do not contemplate a judgment; therefore, there can be no formal trial under them. So numerous are the proofs that the wise and great man of our earlier history entertained forebodings of the very opposite character from those the President ascribes, that it is difficult to resist a disposition to attribute insincerity to the President in accomplish the purpose of his protest. The world is but a great battle ground for power, and universal history teaches a lesson in this that power is always scrambling from the many to the few—that executive heads of nations absorb popular rights, and that all revolutions are on the part of the people not to establish thrones, but to overthrow that which has been wrung from them by the thrones. The citizens of the United States have occasion to fear that such is the tendency of our Republic, and that every other nation has suffered. The committee entertaining the views therein expressed, recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

That the House dissents from the doctrines in the special message of the President of the United States, of March 26th; that the extent of the power contained in the adoption of the resolutions of inquiry of March 26th, 1860, is necessary to the proper discharge of the Constitutional laws devolved upon Congress; that judicial determinations, opinions of former Presidents, and uniform usage, sanction its exercise, and that to abandon it would leave the Executive department of the Government without suppression or responsibility, would be likely to lead to a concentration of power in the hands of the President dangerous to the rights of free people.

[Here the telegraph failed.]

WASHINGTON, April 10.—*Senate.*—Mr. Sumner presented the memorial of Mr. Sanborn, of Concord, Mass., in regard to gross attempts to kidnap him, by persons claiming to act under the authority of the United States Senate; Mr. Sumner narrated the circumstances attending the capture of Mr. Sanborn, and his subsequent release, and said the act was suspicious, both as regards the man against whom the attack was directed, and the place where it occurred.

M. Sanborn was a quiet gentleman, of excellent fame as a scholar, and of pure life. This was the man who was seized. This attempt was made at Concord, where the attempt was once before made. The Senate owed something to its own character, and should wash its hands of this transaction. He moved the reference of the matter to the judiciary committee

Mr. Mason said this man Sanborn was shown to be either in correspondence with the men who was hung at Harper's Ferry, as a traitor, or murderer, or with some of his friends. He had before been summoned by the committee of the Senate to testify. He replied by refusing to come, on the ground that he feared personal violence. A warrant was then issued against him and the sergeant-at-arms and directly afterwards he did come, but he was rescued by a mob and afterward discharged by Justice Shaw upon a writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. Sanborn's memorial was then read. He claims that he has rightfully resisted the summons of the Senate; complains of his unwarrantable arrest, and asks redress at the hands of the Senate.

Mr. Sumner wished to correct one statement which fell from the Senator from Virginia. Mr. Sanborn was taken from the custody of pretended officers not by a mob but by a writ of habeas corpus enforced by a posse comitatus.

[Here the line East failed.]

HOUSE.—Mr. Taylor, a member of the committee on judiciary, read his argument in support of the President's protest. He denied that the House has the power to investigate or carry out any investigation of any kind, according to its mere will or pleasure. If so, this would be consistent with the Grow principle of law.

Everywhere the rights of individuals are concerned, and, as a consequence, the adoption of the resolution in relation to the President, was in violation of the principle of law. He refers to the powers of the selection as extraordinary and inquisitorial when not a particle of evidence against the President has been placed before the House.

DEMOCRACY AND BLACK-REPUBLICANISM.

THE VIEWS OF A DEMOCRAT OF THE "OLDEN TIME."

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM A FRIEND IN MAINE TO ONE IN ILLINOIS.]

My interest in politics is more intense than ever. Life is valuable to me now in view of the contest pending which this year decides the fate of the Union. The election of a Black-Republican President on the avowed platform of his party is a death-knell of the North American Confederacy. The records of history show no such instances of infatuation as now possesses the North. Spurious ministers of the gospel, women, wives, mothers, misses in their teens, all alike ignorant or regardless of constitutional obligations, urging on our country to perdition, are unrebuked of men, and encouraged by demagogues seeking their own political advancement. My horror of Abolitionism exceeds my horror of hydrophobia! Harsh language, but falling short of my feelings toward the conglomeration of non constituting the Black-Republican party. My wish for life is bounded to the day of its extinction. Fortunately for me that I can distinguish between men and the party with which they associate; otherwise I could not extend to individuals the courtesies of life. I respected the Tories of the Revolution, the Federalists subsequent to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the Whigs of later days, for they had reasons to offer for the faith that was in them, which could be met and confuted by reason; there was then a conflict of mind with mind, eliciting truth; but I have yet to meet with a Black-Republican who can adduce a reason, attaining even the dignity of good nonsense, or which I not an insult to common sense; round assertions destitute of foundation, or distortion of facts pass current with them for arguments.

The Abolitionists proper, headed by Wendell Phillips and meaner ones of that stamp, are monomaniacs, and thus may be honest. They are pitied as men deprived of reason, and therefore not responsible for their words or deeds; they constitute the back-bone of the Black-Republican party; but what can be offered in excuse for the timid minister same their hereditary and inseparable hate of Democracy.

But why disturb your kind feelings with these virulent expressions, simply because my heart and judgment alike dictate what is either spoken or written. With my strong convictions, suppression of the truth would be connivance with treason. It is no time to cry peace! peace! when there is no peace. The bitter feelings now pervade the North and South against each other than pervaded France and England when they implacably each other ravaged the country. The cause is obvious—those nations abused each other in a language unknown to the mass of their people, while the abuse of the North and South of each other is communicated by newspapers, read by all, printed in a common mother tongue, distilling venom. This war of words, of crimination and recrimination between Independent States, reconciling a Federal Government, must cease, or a dissolution of the Confederacy is inevitable. The hope—may more, the confidence felt in the annihilation of sectionalism, the origin of the bad feeling now existing between the North and the South, is the breath of my nostrils; and in this I do but conform to the precepts of the Farewell Address of Washington, now summoning every citizen to the rescue of his country from the perils with which it is surrounded.

The Black-Republican party hypocritically claim to be friends of the Union. Is it not written? "If a man says he loves God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar?" Read these papers! Not one can be found that is not filled with articles inculcating hate to the South. The Democratic party of the North is now the only cement which holds the States together; on its triumph this year depends the transmission to posterity of the noblest government ever inherited by man.

Abolitionism is the direst pest that ever infested the moral or political world. Morally, it weakens, if not destroys, the perception of the true and beautiful; in its withering character it deadens the feeling toward every worthy object to lavish them on one unattainable by man; it encourages pharisaical pride, saying to others, stand off! I am holier than thou! It incites a censorious disposition, diverts the thoughts from the crime and misery around us, which may be remedied, to be wasted on evils at a distance with which we are not familiar, and over which we can exercise no control. It seeks by works of supererogation to atone for the neglect of duties at home duties; it would pluck the mote out of its neighbor's eye, regardless of the beam in its own eye; in the arrogance of its ignorance and pride, it spurns counsel, reviles the poor and down-trodden of its own race, and draws unfavorable comparisons between the freeman and the negro; it sets at defiance divine and human laws, encourages to injury, theft, and murder; sneers at the Bible, ignores the race of Ham, and denounces the Constitution of our country.

Politically it is fast converting the West Indies, the garden of the world, into a wilderness; doubles Cape Horn to transport coolies from China, increasing the length and aggravating the horrors of the middle passage, and reduces a superior race to a state infinitely worse than slavery to supply the place of the emancipated negro, who lives on pumpkins and tasks in the noonday sun. With a reckless-ness characteristic of its madness and folly, it urges the slave to escape from his master, and makes no provision for his maintenance elsewhere; enrobes the Big Bug in her sacred restrictions from most of the States and Territories when in power, exiles him from our country, or leaves him to perish or eke out a miserable existence by filching amid the snows of Canada; there he has now been indicted as a nuisance, and from thence he will be shortly expelled, and compelled to seek refuge in Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire, there to enter in a hopeless competition with the labor of a superior race, or live in idleness and be supported at the public expense.

The days of Abolitionism are numbered; its career is run: It has effected no good and has been the most prolific source of evil! In the course of another year, it will be reduced to a few imbeciles, alike insignificant in number and deeds of talent; abjured by those who stimulated or connived at its frenzy, in the boys, through fear of obtaining political power; disappointed in the expectation, they will spurn the worthless tool of their ambition; Abolitionism will then sink into its grave, to be hereafter resuscitated in history with the other kindred delusions which at times have pervaded and desolated the world.

As I too have? Think of that monomaniac, Wendell Phillips, who leaves his family to tramp after woman's rights conventions; think of him standing on the same platform with the mulatto Remond, who in that memorable George Washington a scoundrel! Think of his saying calmly: "Oh, you should not call George Washington a scoundrel; that word should be reserved for Daniel Webster." But I should blush when the best of Washington is placed among those of the great and good of this world, for he was a slaveholder! Ten years ago I felt a glow of blood on his forehead!"

And this was said to a Boston audience, within sight of Faneuil Hall and Bunker Hill; and he was permitted to proceed! Think, also, of his recommending, in a mixed audience of whites and blacks of both sexes, in the same city, as the only effectual mode to do away with the prejudice of the white against the colored race, free intermarriage between the negro and Caucasian!

The beast! if not monomaniac! In the deduction from his premises he was strictly logical; no one will or can doubt the efficaciousness of the mode proposed; but no white man, however depraved or given to may be, will marry a negress; there will be here no competition between the sexes; it will be left exclusively to delicate white women, to immolate themselves on the altar of this mad philanthropy, and set courtesy to the Italian native, lip implanted in their hearts, to preserve the purity of the Caucasian blood. And this was said by Wendell Phillips, in the self-styled modern Athens, in the metropolis of the pilgrim fathers, and listened to if not applauded by well dressed, but not over refined females. Modern times afford no parallel to the Egyptianess of such meetings; for comparison we must revert to the ancient saturnalia of Rome. Think too of Maria L. Childs, who would sympathize with a wife-stabber, horse-thief and murderer, a white man! who deliberately, and in cold blood, provided himself with pikes to put into the hands of negroes, to terrorize the hearts of the middle passage, and reduces a superior race to a state infinitely worse than slavery to supply the place of the emancipated negro, who lives on pumpkins and tasks in the noonday sun. With a recklessness characteristic of its madness and folly, it urges the slave to escape from his master, and makes no provision for his maintenance elsewhere; enrobes the Big Bug in her sacred restrictions from most of the States and Territories when in power, exiles him from our country, or leaves him to perish or eke out a miserable existence by filching amid the snows of Canada; there he has now been indicted as a nuisance, and from thence he will be shortly expelled, and compelled to seek refuge in Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire, there to enter in a hopeless competition with the labor of a superior race, or live in idleness and be supported at the public expense.

The days of Abolitionism are numbered; its career is run: It has effected no good and has been the most prolific source of evil! In the course of another year, it will be reduced to a few imbeciles, alike insignificant in number and deeds of talent; abjured by those who stimulated or connived at its frenzy, in the boys, through fear of obtaining political power; disappointed in the expectation, they will spurn the worthless tool of their ambition; Abolitionism will then sink into its grave, to be hereafter resuscitated in history with the other kindred delusions which at times have pervaded and desolated the world.

Am I too harsh? Think of that monomaniac, Wendell Phillips, who leaves his family to tramp after woman's rights conventions; think of him standing on the same platform with the mulatto Remond, who in that memorable George Washington a scoundrel! Think of his saying calmly: "Oh, you should not call George Washington a scoundrel; that word should be reserved for Daniel Webster." But I should blush when the best of Washington is placed among those of the great and good of this world, for he was a slaveholder! Ten years ago I felt a glow of blood on his forehead!"

And this was said to a Boston audience, within sight of Faneuil Hall and Bunker Hill; and he was permitted to proceed! Think, also, of his recommending, in a mixed audience of whites and blacks of both sexes, in the same city, as the only effectual mode to do away with the prejudice of the white against the colored race, free intermarriage between the negro and Caucasian!

The beast! if not monomaniac! In the deduction from his premises he was strictly logical; no one will or can doubt the efficaciousness of the mode proposed; but no white man, however depraved or given to may be, will marry a negress; there will be here no competition between the sexes; it will be left exclusively to delicate white women, to immolate themselves on the altar of this mad philanthropy, and set courtesy to the Italian native