

GOVERNOR'S BILL.

Our mails leave so early on Wednesday, that we are compelled to defer a notice of the Ball at the Belmont House, on Tuesday night, till next week. Briefly, we may say that the evening was full of enjoyment, and every thing passed off to the satisfaction of the guests.

JEFFERSON CHOICE, ESQ.

It will be seen from Mr. Choice's card that his nomination to the Legislature was unauthorized. We suppose his position to be this: He is not a candidate by his own act. And, while he does not seek the position which his friends would elevate him, in the event of election he would serve the people to the measure of his ability.

SPARTANBURGER IN AUSTRALIA.

In the Melbourne Weekly Age for a glance at which we are indebted to Mr. H. Mitchell, we notice that a complimentary dinner was given to the American consul, J. M. Tarleton, of Alabama, at which Mr. Q. A. Gilkey, formerly of Spartanburg, presided. Mr. Gilkey is associated in a large mercantile house in Melbourne.

THE ELECTIONS.

NORTH CAROLINA.—Bragg, Dem., is elected Governor by a large majority, and the Legislature is Democratic.

KENTUCKY.—In 36 counties the Democratic gain, 5,600.

ARKANSAS.—Yell, American, has been elected Governor.

IOWA.—The returns as far as heard from indicate that Iowa has given the Republicans 5,000 majority.

MISSOURI.—In six counties Ewing, American, has a majority of 1,007 for Governor. In five counties Polk, the Democratic candidate, has a majority of 1,000.

CAVALRY MUSTER.

We were present at Lancaster on Saturday, and witnessed the cavalry muster.

The regiment was composed of—the Glenn Springs Cavalry, Capt. G. A. Smith; Black Rock Troop, Capt. R. Gillman; Union Cavalry, Capt. R. Mcnecht; Brooks Chargers, Capt. Jas. B. Dillard, and Buzzard Road Troop, Capt. Wylie.

When the line was formed by Adjutant Sims Col. Harlan assumed command. The regiment was reviewed in line by Brig. Gen. S. R. Galt, with searching scrutiny and conferences with the Colonel on deficiency in dress and equipments were either pointed out, or the formalities were assumed the functions of Adjutant and Inspector General, (Adjutant and Inspector Gen. Donahoe being detained at home by illness in his family,) and repaired to the headquarters of the Commander-in-Chief. Col. Harlan detailed a squadron of Cavalry as escort to his Excellency, who soon made his appearance surrounded by a brilliant staff, taking position at the flag. Among these we recognized Col. Sontley, Gen. Hunt and Adjutant Sims, of Newberry, Maj. Baker, of Laurens, and other Division and Regimental officers.

After interchanging salutes in military fashion, Col. Harlan put his troops in motion, and with admirable dress went through the evolutions. It is no compliment to say that each movement was executed with precision, and the performances exhibited the possession of rare military ability by Col. Harlan and correct training on the part of the men.

At the close of the exercises the officers were ordered to the front and the troops massed to listen to a speech from the Governor. He commended their discipline, enforced the necessity of military knowledge as the sure reliance of freemen, and exhorted proper pride in all that appertains to the efficiency of the soldier. Adverting to the Kansas question, and the issues likely to grow out of it, he thought this was the time, of all others, to maintain our military system, and be ready to vindicate the interests and integrity of our section. The speech was listened to with great respect, and at its close was hailed with lusty cheers. Gen. Hunt and Col. Harlan were then called out, who addressed a few words to the regiment, which was shortly after dismissed.

We understand the Candidates entertained the people with speeches after the muster, but our inner man plead so earnestly for attention, that we rode off to Glenn Springs to appose the impertinence. We could scarce get a glance at his hospitable face. After much watching and struggling we secured a seat at his well-kept board, and passed a pleasant evening in intercourse with the friends we met there.

In the evening a quiet and enjoyable little "hop" came off, during which we saw the Governor led through the mazes of the dance by a "fayre ladie" of the neighborhood. Long before the "wee hours" the house and its inhabitants were in repose—the latter apparently pleased with the sights and enjoyments of the day. We sought our solitary cabin (thanks to Ben's foresight and recognition of an old acquaintance), and never parted eyelid till the Sabbath morn of myriads birds were warbled forth from many a leafy bower.

SCRAPS ON ABUSE.

There is an old Greek proverb which says: "It does not become poets to abuse each other like crows who seek cakes." And certainly much less does it become legislators of a great Republic.

The Journal of Commerce says in reference to the Summer and Brooks difficulty: "We would be the last to countenance the bitter personalities and wholesale denunciation which Mr. Summer poured forth during two days, disgracing himself and the Senate."

"The wounds inflicted by the tongue on the feelings of an adversary are often more cruel and malignant than the fiercest violence committed on the person."

"A civilized nation will aim at being respectable as well as formidable."

"Few are ignorant of the precept among the Golden Verses of Pythagoras—'But most of all, respect thyself.'"

A European writer says: "I must confess that I can hardly trust the allegations of the man who first, by rancorous invectives, provokes a challenge to a duel; and when the challenge comes, refuses to fight on the ground of religious scruple, or the barbarism or the illegality of the ordeal."

YELLOW FEVER.—Some weeks since our Charleston correspondent stated that several yellow fever cases were reported as having occurred there, and much consequent alarm was being among the people. No official information, however, on the subject was given to the public until the 9th instant, when the Board of Health authorized the City Register to report one case in the Marine Hospital.

The Carolina Times learns "through a private letter that the residents of the city are panic stricken and already large numbers are preparing to flee to the Mountains to avoid the dangers to which they will be subjected by remaining."

TAKEN THEIR SEATS.—Messrs. Brooks and Keitt have re-taken their seats in Congress. Everything was quiet, and we venture the prediction that their personal services will not be called for this session by the Black Republicans.

THE COLLEGE.

The following paragraph is pregnant with meaning: "The Legislature of the State have wisely appropriated seventy thousand dollars annually for the education of the poor, and they have appropriated thirty thousand dollars annually to sustain the South Carolina College, where the sons of the wealthy are principally educated. There is a middle class in South Carolina, by far the most numerous class, who are in defraying these educational expenses of the rich and the poor, and whose sons are deriving very little benefit from either the State College or free school fund. The sons of this middle class are educated at such institutions as the Charleston College, the Furman University, the Wofford College, the Eakins College, &c. These institutions are sustained entirely by private endowment. It is not right and proper that they should, in their hard struggle for existence, receive some aid from the State, when they are doing so much in the cause of education for the sons of the State."

It must be well known that "aid" to the sectarian Colleges from the State will of necessity involve increased taxation. To stop popular clamor against the South Carolina College, and retain the appropriations annually made to it, it is here proposed to doze the private establishments with treasury paper, and thus form a combination among the educational institutions to tax the people still more largely. The adoption of this unwise policy might in the present, aside from the unpopularity of increased taxation, operate no special disadvantage. But we know how dangerous precedents are. A Baptist, Presbyterian, or Methodist college of to-day may secure a State bonus, and no discord mark popular sentiment. But a few years hence—perhaps in less time—one or two Roman Catholic Colleges, arguing equal claim, (and certainly no objection would be valid,) apply for a like gratuity—would it be accorded? We doubt it; and thus would be commenced an agitation dangerous to peace and good government. We hold that no State has the right to adopt any but a popular system of instruction for her children, so that those who would otherwise be deprived of rudimentary education may be benefited, leaving the wealthy to the facilities within themselves to provide education for their offspring.

If the axiom be true that government was instituted to protect the weak against the strong, surely the same rule should apply here—provide education for those who are unable to secure its advantages—not for those who possess means and to spare.

TO THE VOTERS OF SPARTANBURG. FELLOW-CITIZENS: In answering the questions propounded to the Candidates for the Legislature, in the journals of this District, I do not deem it necessary for me to discuss their several bearings. I shall therefore content myself with simply answering them as they appear, and give my views more at large whenever and wherever the people may desire.

1st. Are you in favor of further appropriations (should they be asked) for the Blue Ridge Railroad? Ans. I am not.

2d. Are you in favor of giving the selection of Presidential Electors to the people? Ans. I am, upon the ground that the people have a right to said election.

3d. Are you in favor of increasing the jurisdiction of Magistrates? Ans. By making certain changes in the Magistrate system I think it would be decidedly better to increase their jurisdiction.

4th. Are you in favor of continuing the present large appropriations to the South Carolina College? Ans. With my present convictions I am not.

5th. Are you in favor of any practicable reform of the present Free School System? Ans. I am in favor of every practicable reform in the Free School System.

O. E. EDWARDS.

TO THE VOTERS OF SPARTANBURG DISTRICT. FELLOW-CITIZENS: Recognising the right of the people to know the sentiments of those who seek to represent them in the Legislature upon leading questions of State policy, I readily respond to your interrogatories, with as much directness as their nature will admit of.

1st. Are you in favor of further appropriations (should they be asked) for the Blue Ridge Railroad? Ans. I am not.

2d. Are you in favor of giving the selection of Presidential Electors to the People? Ans. I am.

3d. Are you in favor of increasing the jurisdiction of Magistrates? Ans. With a court organized and restricted as to insure justice to the parties concerned.

4th. Are you in favor of continuing the present large annual appropriations to the South Carolina College? Ans. No.

5th. Are you in favor of any practicable reform of the present Free School system? Ans. I am.

Fellow-citizens, you have my reply to the above interrogatories; and I will here take occasion to remark, that the opinions I now entertain upon the principles involved are founded upon conclusions come to whilst serving you in the Legislature, and are fully sustained by my votes, as they appear on the Journals. Respectfully, J. W. MILLER.

TO THE VOTERS OF SPARTANBURG DISTRICT. As several questions have been propounded to the Candidates through the newspapers, and as I believe in the right of one or "many voters" to require the opinions of those who offer themselves as Candidates to represent them, I now proceed to answer the questions propounded:

1st. In the first place, then, I shall most certainly be opposed to any further appropriations to the Blue Ridge Railroad.

2d. I am fully satisfied that the people have the right of voting directly for Electors of President and Vice President; and as I gave my opinion at length, through the newspapers of the District, two years ago, upon this subject, it is only necessary to add that it remains unaltered.

3d. I am in favor of increasing the jurisdiction of Magistrates, and am fully satisfied that such increased jurisdiction, properly guarded, would be beneficial to the community.

4th. I have, during the period that I have had the honor to represent you in the State Legislature, never voted for "the large annual appropriations to the South Carolina College," believing that they transcended the limits of that prudent economy which, as your representative, I felt it my duty to advocate.

5th. I have always been an advocate of the Free School system, and should most certainly be in favor of any "practical reform" that would render it more efficient. Most respectfully, J. WINSMITH.

CAMP HILL, August 11, 1856.

Some time ago the Greenville Patriot published an account of a horrid murder having been committed in a horrid place, in North Carolina, near the Georgia line, wherein the body was described as presenting a horrid disfigurement when found. It since learns that the supposed dead man wrote the account to throw the Georgia authorities off the scent. It was not so, however, and they have re-arranged him.

Prayer, of the Enquirer, and Ridgeway, of the Whig, Richmond, exchanged shots near Washington, on the 6th inst., but without damage to either. They then resumed amicable relations.

SPARTANBURG, C. H., August 11, 1856. MR. EDITOR: I was much surprised to see in your last number of the Spartan my name announced as a candidate for the Legislature. The announcement was made without my knowledge or consent. I never had a thought of becoming a candidate for that or any other office. Indeed, I have always believed that a seat in the Legislature ought not to be sought or avoided—that it should be left to the people to call one to the seat; that being done, he should accept and fill the place with such ability as he possessed and all the diligence its duties require.

At this time I am overwhelmed with obligations which will not admit of delay, and which put it out of my power to canvass the District, even if I wished to be a candidate. Such being the case, you will do me a favor by stating to the people through your paper that I must respectfully decline being a candidate for a seat in the Legislature.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant, JEFFERSON CHOICE.

RAILROAD MEETING. In pursuance to a card through the Spartan and Express, a meeting was held this day in the village of Spartanburg to appoint delegates to the Railroad Convention to be held at Asheville, N. C., on the 25th instant.

On motion of Maj. J. D. Wright, Gen. J. W. Miller was called to the chair, and J. W. Carline, Esq., requested to act as secretary.

The object of the meeting was briefly stated by the Chairman; when, on motion, the following delegates were appointed, with power to fill vacancies: Maj. Govan Mill, Simpson Bobo, Esq., Wm. Walker, W. H. T. O. Vernon, J. D. Wright, A. Tolson, T. Stobo Farrow, Jason Carson, J. K. Bomar, S. N. Ewins, Gabriel Cannon, H. H. Thomson, W. J. Smith, J. McMain, Gen. B. B. Foster, Dr. J. J. Boyd, A. T. Cavis, J. Bankston Davis, Jefferson Choice, Dr. P. M. Wallace.

On motion, the President of the Spartanburg and Union Railroad, John L. Young, was added to the number of delegates, and requested especially to attend.

On motion of J. D. Wright, the proceedings of the meeting were ordered to be published in the Carolina Spartan and Spartanburg Express.

The meeting then adjourned. J. W. MILLER, Chairman. J. W. CARLINE, Sec. Aug. 12, 1856.

COLUMBIA, August 7th, 1856. GOOD MR. SPARTAN: I promised some time ago to write you a letter occasionally from this seat of Government for the State of South Carolina, and now behold me with a pen in my hand, and a thousand thoughts in my head, as I proceed to fulfil in part this "debt of honor."

Like some great men who have gone before, I discard all parade, and introduce myself and subject at once. The glory of the rising sun is far greater than that of the preceding twilight.

One of our steamers has just arrived at Granby with a valuable cargo for the merchants of the city. A few facts, and a sort of running commentary upon them, may be necessary to place before your readers the subject of these steamboats. For a long time the citizens of Columbia have complained of the high freights imposed on goods from Charleston to this place—ranging from 20 to 100 per cent. over those shipped to Hamburg, but to all these complaints the Charleston Railroad Company have been a deaf ear. Deeming themselves insulted as well as injured, some of the prominent merchants called a meeting on the subject, which was followed by the formation of a Joint Stock Company, and the purchase of steamboats to navigate the waters from this to Charleston; and the above vessel is one of the boats purchased by the company, to which two others will be added by the first of October next. In the meantime, the Directors of the Charleston Railroad, at a late meeting, have made a considerable reduction in their freights, and say they will make a greater reduction as soon as they shall have put more stock ( motive power) on the road; so that it is likely that between the boats and the road a competition will arise that may bring down freights to the lowest point.

Though the amount of cotton sold in Columbia is below what it used to be in years past, the commercial prosperity of the city is not thereby injured. A heavy retail business from the numerous mechanics amongst us, as well as a wholesale business from the country, have more than balanced the loss. Many of our leading merchants sell heavy bills of groceries and dry goods to mercantile houses in the country; and I am informed on good authority, that the sales of our shoe merchants for the past year amount to more than \$150,000, (an hundred and fifty thousand dollars). In addition to all this a new business has been introduced into Columbia, namely the importation of corn, flour, bacon and lard, from Chattanooga and other places; and under the operation of this trade provisions are abundantly cheaper here now than they are in Baltimore.

For a number of years past the Candidates for the Legislature in Richland have disregarded all questions propounded to them in view of their future political conduct; but the silence of the past is virtually condemned, and the Candidates now before the people have spoken out and answered boldly the interrogatories put to them; and whatever may be our opinion of the wisdom or necessity of some of these interrogatories it is gratifying to see men come out fully and fairly on any subject, and not remain dumb like an Egyptian Mummy. Another subject of gratification, too, is so far discernible amongst us—the vote market is unopened. Candidates thus far being unwilling to purchase.

As your readers may wish to know whether or not the subjects of our solicitude be the same as yours, I am happy to be able to gratify them, having your queries and ours now before me, and, will you believe it, they are totally different; so true it is that "every heart knows its own trouble."

We worry not ourselves about the Blue Ridge Railroad—we say nothing on the subject of Presidential Electors. We leave the magistracy as it is; the College in the hands of the Trustees; the Free Schools to the care of the Legislature. Umph! says one, what then have you to complain about? Why, my friend, we are troubled about many things. "We want the river opened from Granby to the old ford near the Columbia bridge; we want the Railroad bridge below Gadsden elevated much higher, so that steamers can pass under it; and finally we wish the Legislative Candidates to say whether they are in favor of law and order or not; as if they were such gumps to declare in favor of rosydium. Ha! ha! a pretty question that! The devil himself preached good doctrine in public.

Yours, truly, NICK BOTTOM.

TEMPERANCE.—The Greenville Temperance Convention assembled, as we learn from the Enterprise, on Wednesday last, Judge O'Neill presiding, and Henry Sumner, Esq., of Newberry, acting as Secretary. Delegates were present from Spartanburg, Union, York, Chester, Newberry, Abbeville, Charleston, Marlboro, Sumter, Greenville, and other Districts.

Col. Sumner, in dispersing the bogus legislature of Kansas transgressed his instructions, and has been called on by the President for explanation. We do not believe Col. Sumner would thus blunder as to orders.

[For the Carolina Spartan.] THE SOUTH VERSUS ABUSE. The publication of the article inserted below demands the following explanation: It is a reading of the public that the New York Observer, which boasts of being the largest newspaper in the world, is a valuable storehouse of knowledge on almost all useful subjects. It is also highly evangelical in its religious sentiments—opposed to the various errors, isms and futilities with which the present age has been afflicted. Of late years, it has been decidedly conservative as regards the subject of chief agitation between the South and the North. For these reasons it has obtained a large circulation in the South, as well as in other parts of the Republic.

To the amusement, however, of its Southern friends, the Editors of said paper—notwithstanding the professed national character of their paper and their experience of over thirty years upon the tripod—allowed themselves, at the outbreak of the Southern difficulties, to be borne wholly away by the sweeping torrent of popular fury which devastated the higher latitudes of our country. Their use of harsh and coarse epithets—the severity of their denunciations of the South en masse—their failure to find anything to censure in all of Mr. Sumner's course—their assumption of the fact, that, instead of our suffering under grievous wrongs and provocations, the South was wholly in fault—their upholding freedom of speech, even to unbounded licentiousness as essential to the existence of our civil institutions—and above all, their call upon the Editors of the South for information respecting Southern sentiment—to let them know, in a word, whether we of the South are all "ruffians," "anti-liberty" of speech men and club-law advocates or not. These several features of their course led me to believe that something in the shape of the following article was called for as a correction of the abuses of such freedom of speech as these men were advocating—putting largely into practice. It was written and forwarded to a friend in New York, who requested its publication in the Observer. The Editors declined. That friend then remained it to me, with the request that I would remodel it—remove from it all that had any reference to that paper—make it a general article—reduce its length, and send it back to the said Editors—adding that he thought they would publish it.

With that request, so far as practicable, I complied—made it general—no reference to the Observer's course remaining in it. And though I could not reduce it much in length without emasculating it, I decided it into two articles, and mailed it directly to them, a respectful letter accompanying it. Since that I have heard nothing from either of them or it. Whether they intend to insert it or not I can't tell. But this, to my amazement, I have learned: that instead of inserting it, those Editors have, in their issue of the 31st ult., taken largely of the thunder of the articles sent them, and woven it into an editorial of their own—thus at once anticipating or precluding the publication of my article, and yet giving no reference whatever to the source whence their new emotions and impulses sprang! Their heavy blows upon Mr. Sumner, and all that "kith and kin," for their insulting abuse of their "privilege" of speech, I cannot but highly approve. I must commend said Editors also for the facility with which they can change both their tone and their whole course of action; for the promptness and vigor with which they have commenced the great work which I had pointed out to them as their incumbent duty—"The return of the morals of public debate"—for in good faith, they have already taken the course which I have indicated! Still, as I cannot but regard it unfair in them thus to "declare 'freedom of speech' to be in their columns, for the sake of using my thunder as their own, I am constrained to lay before the public the original article, accompanied by these statements. Before it is inserted without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" beyond what it had when forwarded first to the Observer, I only say that I have taken the course from no desire to injure that noble paper—one also which I trust will yet return to its former moorings, and ably serve the cause of truth and righteousness. I have acted solely from a sense of justice to myself and the Southern public, which has been so shamefully abused, and yet could get no proper hearing in any of the Northern journals.

WASHINGTON BARD. SPARTANBURG, S. C., August 13, 1856.

[For the New York Observer.] SPEECH—ITS FREEDOM AND ABUSE. MR. EDITOR: Your several articles upon the "Freedom of Speech," and the recent collision between Messrs. Sumner and Brooks, have been read with attention and with respectful regard for yourselves as their authors. From some of those views multitudes of your readers widely dissent, and not a few have they filled with astonishment and pain. And, although I do not claim at your hands the large liberty of speech which you advocate for others, I would most respectfully request a hearing on several of those points, as an act of common justice to a large class of your fellow-citizens whose views I know coincide with mine.

To my mind the inference is irresistible, from reading your articles, that you regard all those who differ from yourselves on that subject as enemies to the "freedom of speech"—plotters of treason against the highest interests of this Republic—yes, of the whole family of man—as "ruffians," also, whose wish is "to substitute club-law for debate." If those were your views, I affirm that few men have ever fallen into a greater mistake, and that the men may be reckoned by millions to whom you have done the greatest injustice. "Freedom of speech" is the elucidated brightness of the American people. You cannot find a son of Adam upon this continent—certainly not one that has an American heart in his breast—who desires to see true liberty of debate—much less done away—and "club law" installed in its room. No! not one. But I will tell you what you may very easily find. You may find millions who dissent from your definition of "Freedom of speech" and your manner of advocating it—millions also who have deeply regretted to learn that the conductors of a religious journal so able and highly conservative as yours—some doing so much also for the promotion of almost every good cause—should have been able to find no dividing line between proper "freedom of speech" and its unwarrantable and ruinous abuse—no opening of the sluices of vituperation and malignity over which they would not throw theegis of legal protection, and around which set up their own strongest moral defences!

You have quoted the Constitution of our country, ransacked history, and—strangest of all—quoted the Bible, to prove that no restraint can, without criminality, be laid upon the "freedom of speech!" I shall not traverse so large a field—nor is it necessary that I should. All the "Fetter instincts of man's moral nature are against" your position. The "book divine" from the "beginning to the end, teaches its very reverse. You have shown what every one knew before, that on a certain occasion Paul was "permitted to speak." But you have failed to present—and you cannot find in all the Book of God—a direct permission given to Paul, or any other man, to abuse his fellow-men, either for his own gratification, or the supposed promotion of his cause, but that cause religious or secular! On the contrary, the "binding of the tongue"—that

is, "the restraining of it from all manner of evil speaking"—is not only strongly enjoined, but commended as one of the highest attainments in civilized life and christian character. As an example, one out of a thousand of like import, I select the following: "Be courteous." Also this: "Let all things be done decently and in order." I maintain also that those injunctions are of universal application. Can any man point out either time, place or state of things in which courteousness is not obligatory, or in which anything uncourteous can be done or said without criminality? The injunction also that "all things be done decently and in order" is equally without limitation.

I hold, moreover, that outside of the pulpit and the great councils of the church, there is no place in which gravity, dignity and decorum should be held in higher requisition than in the Senate of the United States—that place of high honor and fearful responsibility, in which not only the highest interests of our own country, but the destinies of other nations, are the grave subjects for discussion and decision! In reviewing also the recent transgressions within those walls—a part of which you so severely censure—I have thought that if that chaste, lovely and Heavenly minded genius which was born to patronize and preside over the "decorousness of speech" and the "order" of public affairs, had been hovering in her place during the delivery of the speech which caused the indignation, her fine sensibilities would have been deeply wounded—the blush of modesty and decency would have glowed upon her cheek, and in her agony of spirit she would have exclaimed, "at tu Sumner!" Alas, that my efforts in your behalf should have been so ill-requited and so utterly in vain! To say the least of it, that was a very "indecent" speech. There are millions of people in this country, as well as in other parts of the world, who will so regard it. Its abuse also was as much out of "order" as it was irritating and offensive. No man has any right to abuse his fellow man under any circumstances. What then shall we think of a man occupying the highest position of legislative dignity—a member of that noble embodiment of the rights, the interests and the national honor of the several confederated States of this Republic—so far forgetting or wilfully outraging all the proprieties of such official station, and all the established usages of such bodies, as to pile odium upon one of the States of the Union, represented upon that floor on a footing of perfect equality with his own? Nay more—to speak in an exceedingly offensive manner of her oldest and most venerable Senator in his absence, not only from his seat, but from the city! Daniel Webster, the illustrious predecessor of Mr. Sumner, would have had his tongue cut from his head rather than to have been guilty of such outrages! It was also upon South Carolina—the same gallant State which the present Senator so abused—that Mr. Webster, even whilst in the high conflict of debate with one of her villainous sons, bestowed one of his highest eulogies, as the glorious colleague of his own State—fighting "shoulder to shoulder" with Massachusetts in the fearful but eventful struggles of the Revolution!

I mention these things to show how other and greater men—and I might extend the list to scores—may hundreds, of the noblest who have ever borne the public honor upon their shoulders—have always regarded and treated their co-laborers, their fellow-officers, and the several confederated States. It was for Mr. Sumner first—and his is yet the solitary example—in his place upon the Senate floor, and in a deliberately written speech, to attempt to degrade a State—one also of the old "Thirteen" immortal States—to depths of infamy beneath the name of "STATE!" Yes, this was done by a Senator from Massachusetts—the direct successor also of Mr. Webster! And yet, gentlemen, all this pass with you for nothing; nay, it must be "all right" and commendable; for you not only effectually shield it under the panoply of constitutional protection, but you had with severe epithets, and hold up "consequences" in terror, over those who have felt themselves aggrieved at this treatment! In the ancient fable is realized—the vast difference shown between one's own ox and any other man's cattle. A moment's reflection might, however, assure you, that there are a vast many citizens of this Republic—those also of as high respectability as read your paper in any part of the Union—who have viewed the whole matter very differently from what you have done. They would scorn the man of any State who did not feel deeply such dishonor done to his State and her absent Senator. Much more, then, must they despise and scorn the man, who, taking advantage of his supposed immunity as a Senator, could descend to such treatment of either their own State, or of any other member of the confederacy. It is their settled conviction, also, that even if the Sumner speech did not wholly merit the Sumner castigation, it very naturally led to it. In other words, it was just such retaliation as may in any such case be expected. So long as human nature continues human—so long as wrath begets wrath, and severe personal invective calls forth resentment, it were the crowning of absurdity to suppose that the emptying of full vials of doubly-distilled abuse could be done with impunity! Many also of the law-abiding, peace-loving readers of your articles, deprecate your manner of advocating "freedom of speech" as necessarily tending to increase licentiousness—give charters rights to foul tongues, and of course multiply such influences in return, as vast multitudes in all parts of our country, although they abjure the principle of retaliation, fully believe such licentiousness richly merits.

And just here I take occasion to expressly dissent "to a whole" from your exposition of the exceedingly vague clause of the Constitution in which it declares of members of Congress that "for any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place!"

You regard this as a license—nay, a sure guarantee for immunity in the utterance of whatever any fool-mouthed member of the American Congress, however degraded his character may become, shall please to utter! You maintain also that this privilege—this wholly unrestricted license—"is essential to public freedom." Nay, you go further, and class with the most odious "tyrants" and "iniquitous" all those who would in any manner whatever infringe this supposed sacred right!

Let us now examine this matter. The Constitution, like all other great embodiments of fundamental law, was in the estimation of its authors, founded on REASON and JUSTICE. Its supreme respect also was to the "Salus Populi," and the great interests of the confederated sovereignties. "Freedom of speech," then, so far as reason, justice or the public weal demand, they must have intended to guaranty to all the members of the National Legislature. And from the propriety and importance of this right and this guaranty, no man living, so far as I know, dissents. But I deny that either reason or justice or the public weal demands abuse. Nay, I maintain that abuse is always violative of reason and justice, as well as detrimental to the public weal. The intention of the framers of that instrument must then have been, to guaranty to every member of Congress the right, free from molestation, to present, support, or discuss any subject or measure which in his judgment the interests of his constituents or the public weal calls for; also to oppose by legitimate arguments whatever measures, proposed by others, he may believe detrimental. This, and only this, could the framers of that instrument have in-

tended by that clause. Beyond this there can be no freedom of any immunity. It is certain also that the freedom of abuse they never intended to sanction. I maintain then that true constitutional—say, and scriptural—"freedom of speech" has never yet been denied in our country, nor even endangered. The supposition or insinuation that there are, either in the South or any other portion of the Republic, those who desire its abolition, and advocate the employment of force and violence for that purpose, is at once absurd and wicked. There are those who, for their country's honor—for the sake of good morals and the public peace and welfare—have greatly desired to see the abuses of speech corrected—none that its proper freedom should be restricted. And here you will allow me to say, that if you desire to see true scriptural principles established as the rule of both public and private life, the whole moral force of your able journal should be directed primarily and chiefly to that end—against those abuses and in favor of their reformation. Mr. Sumner's speech is before the world. It shows for itself. And it is just such a speech as nineteen twentieths of Adam's family this country over, and the world over, will, when the hour of calm reflection comes, condemn as not only beneath the dignity of a Senator, but as needlessly, if not unnecessarily abusive. So long then as you uphold that kind of public debate, and attempt to throw bulwarks of defence around those who employ it, the results of your efforts will be to multiply cases of violence, relax men's hold upon the principles of the Bible, and install in their stead the code which you have so severely denounced! This is just as certain as that there is a heaven above us. As proof of it I will give you the fact, even that the idea of perfect immunity emboldens even timidity into audacity! It was when the kid had reached an eminence to which the wolf could not climb that it exhausted its vocabulary of abuse upon its otherwise degraded foe. And so of the parrot when swung from the window of a four-story house in the city, and surrounded by the bars of his rich master's cage—his abuse of the old African was unbounded. Cudjoe's sarcasm of: "Craven coward, if you were in the bush where your father lived, you would not talk so to me!" was not only what he knew to be the truth, but it was only a part of the retributive justice which he had for it in store! These fables are true to the life of other natures than the brute creation. Their plain English is, that in ignoble minds abuse naturally, if not necessarily, results from immunity! But I refer to you late articles that, yourselves being judges, congressmen are not all noble minded. Nay, now that you have, it is hoped, ceased your heavy denunciations of the vast multitudes who, in many parts of the country, "squelched" in the retribution visited upon the head of Mr. Sumner for his abusive speech, it is proper that you should know why they did so: it was simply because they believed it "a merited retribution"—not that they sanctioned the principle! These are the declarations of thousands:—"If," say they, "there are no laws to restrain abuse—if neither sense of honor nor regard for the decorum of civilization or the precepts of christianity will restrain the false and foul tongue—if the innocent and the absent are to be thus wantonly assailed and abused—it is the only course that is left us." Thus you see, gentlemen, how your upholding the Sumner conduct—while your denunciations, kept up until doomsday against such assaults, so long as such provocations continue—will be nothing but wasted indignation and labor—tends to the establishment of the very principles which you aim to overthrow! "Freedom of speech," as your article defines it, is synonymous with freedom of abuse. But secure perfect immunity to the freedom of abuse, and you open sluices which must sweep away the foundations. For you may rest assured that so long as such licentiousness of speech was claimed and exercised in that Senator's late speech is the order of the day, so long will the second order of the day be as it then was. In other words, the retribution in some violent shape will follow, and that despite whatever laws may be enacted to prevent the recurrence of such scenes, or whatever limitations certain public presses may utter against them after they have transpired!

But, according to your own showing, this government cannot endure many more such shocks as it has lately received! And yet I wholly dissent from your assertion that the whole criminality rests with those who resent the like gross and intentional insults. The Constitution, in the very article which you have quoted, makes members of both Houses of Congress liable to arrest—say, delivers them over to the hangman's halberd, for plotting against the government. I invite you, then, to review your own picture of the results of Mr. Sumner's speech, and ask yourselves if there be no moral treason in the intentional and unmeasured use of epithets, such as must fill millions of hearts with venom—excite revengeful feelings of demon brood—array State against State—yes, subvert the very foundations of the republic! Such results in part, have already been witnessed from that speech—the remainder you seem to apprehend may soon follow. And yet, not a word of that abuse was called for; nay, both the force of his arguments and the strength of his cause, would have been enhanced by a more courteous manner. I trust, then, gentlemen, that upon a calm review of this whole matter, you will agree with me, that the remedy for the evils which you so deeply deplore—and the only remedy which, in the nature of the case, can ever prove effectual and abiding—is: TO REFORM THE MORALS OF PUBLIC DEBATE! And this, it seems to me, will be best done by elevating and refining public moral sentiment as regards the use of abusive language in debate; and then, removing all other shields and defences from the conduct and the persons of legislators than such as the laws of the land throw around other citizens. Americans want no licensed slanderers—no privileged class of abusers of their fellow men!

Here, then, you have a noble cause, and a glorious field for effort. For that reform also every christian should most devoutly pray; and every conservative and patriotic press should zealously and unremittingly labor. That done, there will be no use for either "body guards" or "cenes" at the capitol! Men's own characters, and the omnipotent support and protection of a strong and united public sentiment, will then afford all the immunity that either the personal independence of the individual man, the honor of the State, or the public interest ever demands! Yours, truly, NO ABUSE.

KANSAS CONTENTED ELECTION.—This case has at last terminated in Congress, by ousting Gen. Whitfield from his seat as Delegate from Kansas. The committee on elections