lasting and perpetual, and that each return of the glorious anniversary of our national deliverance may find us, grateful to the memories of our gallant progenitors, and vigilant to preserve in its pristine purity, the rich legacy they have bequeathed to us sealed with their best blood. I have extended my letter much further than I desired. If I should not be present with you at the Springs, I shall endeavor to feel a little of that patriotic fervor, which animated the noble souls of '76. I understand that several of our friends in this county contemplate joining you on the occasion. Whether absent or present myself, I wish you a pleasant meeting. With much respect, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

JAMES A. STEWART.

HAGERSTOWN, MD. June 23d, 1840.

GENTLEMEN: It was with pleasure that I received your kind favor of 13th ult. inviting me to attend a general meeting of our political friends, to be held at Barren Creek Springs, Somerset county. I regret to say that owing to the character of my engagements here, it will not be in my power to be with you.

Our prospects here are daily brightning, we will certainly beat them well in this district; their exertions are great, but it is all in vain; the Democracy here are too firm in their principles to be moved by their low schemes. I will send you in a few days the particulars of some frauds that have come to light that will astonish you. I am, gentlemen, with great respect, your obedient servant,

CHAS. MACGILL.

PORT TOBACCO, June 25, 1840.

DEAR SIRS:—Your favor inviting me to attend a meeting of our political friends on the 4th of July, has been received. It would afford me great pleasure to be with you on that occasion, but my engagements will not permit. I have the fullest confidence, that the cause of Democracy will be in good hands when it is gentlemen in your keeping, and I am happy to discover by your letter, that the right spirit is at work in your quarter of the State; supporting as we do those principles by which alone our Republican institutions can be preserved, we can never fear a full and fair discussion of the political topics which now agitate the country; but do you think that is the kind of discussion which our political opponents wish? The doings of their "executive committee" at Washington, tell you a different tale. It becomes us then to be on the alert, "for eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." I am sure that the patriotic county of Somerset will not lag behind in the good work, but that on the day of trial she will be found where the "old Maryland line" was in our revolutionary struggle, in the battles front. With the hearty co operation of our friends, I fear not the result. Our foe is active, powerful, unscrupulous; but contending as we do, for equal laws, and equal rights with truth and principle on our side, we must prevail as in times past, and teach this motley combination of factions that the "mass of mankind are not born with saddles on their backs, and the few booted and spurred to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

I remain, gentlemen with sentiments of high regard, your ob't. serv't.

WALTER MITCHELL.

BALTIMORE, June 28, 1840.

GENTLEMEN:—I find that it will be impossible for me to accept your Invitation to attend at Barren Creek Springs on the 4th of July. There are some cases in the District Court of the United States, in which I am concerned, which have occupied the attention of that Court for 3 weeks past, and are still unfinished. Being cases of great importance, involving some difficult questions of Law and Fact, under the Revenue Laws, I cannot, consistently with my professional duty, be absent from the trial for even a single day, and there is no prospect of their being concluded during the next week. I must therefore pray you to excuse my absence.

In this City we stand steady, with our ranks unbroken and our zeal as ardent as ever.

I am, with the highest respect, yours,

BENJAMIN C. HOWARD.

BALTIMORE, June 29th, 1840.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge your polite note of invitation dated the 13 inst. I am never more happy than while I am advocating the principles of republicanism. Upon these principles (in my opinion) depend in a great measure the happines of all men. Under the influence of this feeling it is scarcely necessary to add, it will give me great pleasure to meet you at Barron Creek Springs, on the approaching anniversary of American liberty. At this time I have some professional engagements which may prevent my visit, but if possible I shall be with you.

Truly sensible of the kindness you have done me, in the very agreeable manner in which you have conveyed the wishes of those whom you represent, I am gentlemen with my best respects,

Your obedient servant,

WM. P. PRESTON.

ROBERT STEWART, WM. T. WOOD, F. BRATTAN, GEORGE HANDY, JAMES POLK, JOS. BARCLAY, JOHN P. GALE, S. D. HANDY, SETH WILKINS. } Committee of invitation, in behalf of the Democratic party of Somerset county, Md

From the Del. Gazette.

GEN HARRISON'S PRINCIPLES.—In 1822, when General Harrison was a candidate for Congress, he avowed the following doctrine in a communication addressed to the Editor of the Inquisitor;

"I have ever believed that every elector has a right to make his call upon those who offer their services to the people, and that the candidates are bound to answer it. I might avail myself of the kind of exception which you make in favor of those who have had an opportunity of showing their political opinions by their conduct."

In 1840, *when* a candidate for the Presidency, he uses the following language on the subject of 1822. See his late Fort Meigs speech:

"I will now, fellow-citizens, give you my reasons for having refused to give pledges and opinions more freely than I have done, since my nomination to the Presidency.—Many of the statements published upon this subject are by no means correct; but *it is true that it is my opinion that no pledges should be made by any individual when in nomination for any office in the gift of the people.*"

Again. When a candidate for Congress, in 1822, he thus spoke of the United States Bank and banking establishments;

"I believe that the charter given to the United States Bank was unconsitutional; being not one of those measures necessary to carry any of those expressly granted powers into effect."

"I declare that it is my firm belief, that the evils produced by the banking establishments in the United States, both as well in relation to the moral, as the pecuniary interests of the country, will be felt for many years to come."

The General happened to hit the truth here, for the evils which he attributed to banking establishments HAVE been felt upon the morals and pecuniary interest of the country for many years; and will be felt for years to come, unless a reform of those establishments—a reform advocated by the Democracy of the country, and opposed by the Harrisonites, shall be speedily effected.—But what does the General now think of the Bank? Hear him, when he was the Bank candidate for the Presidency in 1836. In his letter of that year, to Sherod Williams, he says;

"The question, then, for me to answer, is whether, under the circumstances you state, if elected to the office of President, I would sign an act to charter another Bank, I answer I WOULD."

Again. Abolition has occupied the attention of the General on several occasions.—Some eighteen years ago, when "accused of being friendly to slavery," and desiring to ingratiate himself with the citizens of a free State, Ohio, he made a publication in which he avowed that he "became a member of an abolition society at the early age of eighteen," and that "the obligations which he then came under, he had faithfully performed."—More recently—since his nomination for the Presidency—he has been writing private and confidential letters with a view to make himself acceptable to the modern abolitionists of the North. One of these letters is referred to in the following communication of W. B. Calhoun, a leading whig member from Massachusetts:

OPINION FOR THE NORTH.

"*Washington, Feb.* 4, 1840.

"SIR:—I observe in the doings of the Anti Slavery Convention at Springfield, a resolution denouncing Gen. Harrison. I think this premature, to say the least of it. I have seen a letter from the General in which he pronounces the story circulating in the press, that he while Governor of Indiana, for ten years, done every thing in his power to spread slavery, a foul slander, and speaks of it with great indignation, and says that it would be impossible for him to do any thing of the kind, either privately or publicly, for the reason he says, that while only eighteen years of age in Virginia, HE JOINED AN ABOLITION SOCIETY, and with other members of the same, *pledged himself* to do every thing in his power to *effect the emancipation of slaves*—that he was to inherit a large property in slaves, and subsequently not only emancipated his own, but purchased others, for the purpose of emancipating them. *This is what the General himself* says. I write you this for such use as you may think proper, *except putting it in the newspapers.*

The letter of Gen. Harrison, referred to by me, contains a distinct INJUNCTION, that it should not be published in the newspapers.

W. B. CALHOUN."

Now this will do very well for the North. The Abolitionists cannot but be satisfied that the General *is* with them heart and hand.—All very pretty. But the General wants Southern votes also. He fears to rely upon the abolitionists alone. If he did not, he would not have placed an injunction of secrecy upon the letter to which Mr. Calhoun refers, nor would his particular friend, W. B. Calhoun have written his letter *for any use "except putting it in the newspapers."* Well how are these southern votes to be obtained? Read the following;

OPINION FOR THE SOUTH.

Extracts from Gen. Harrison's letter to James Lyons of Vir., dated June 1, 1840.

"But for these reasons, candor induces me to say, that I could never have brought myself to answer the political part of your letter at all. I am convinced that upon reflection you will yourself think it was totally unnecessary, for I cannot suppose that my personal friends and connections in my native State could think that I was less of a gentleman or an honest man than those ardent politicians farther south, Stanley, Alford, Legare, Dawson, King, &c. They take it for granted that I could not suffer my Vincennes speech and others to be quoted by my friends, to show my opinions on the subject of abolitionism, if I did not hold those opinions at this time; and therefore treated with scorn and contempt, the charge of my being an Abolitionist, and truly assert that I have done and suffered more to support *southern rights* than any other person north of Mason & Dixson's line.

I do not wish what I have said to be published, but I have no objection that the facts should be stated with a reference made to me as having furnished them.

WH. H. HARRISON."

Mark. The General does "not wish" what he says to Mr. Lyons 'to be published.' Why? Because it would give the lie to letters he had written to the North for abolition effect, to one which W. B. Calhoun refers.

Further. The good people North and South appear to have been very troublesome to the General; and inquisitive as to his abolition or anti-abolition sentiments. Governor Owen of North Carolina, in January last, wrote to the General asking him: "Are you now, or have you *ever* been a member of an Abolition society?" To this question, the General replied on the 16th of February last, as appears by his letter which unfortunately for him was "published in the newspapers," as follows: "I answer decisively NO."

On the publication of this strange, and, as every candid man who reads the evidence we have offered must admit, false answer of the General, the Editor of the Philanthropist, the organ of the Ohio Abolitionists, in a recent article, makes this positive declaration.

"In two interviews we had with General Harrison on this subject, (Abolition,) about four months since he WAS AT PAINS TO ASSURE US, that he had himself belonged to an 'Abolition society' in Richmond, Va. HE DID NOT HESITATE ABOUT THE PHRASE; he did not use any other. 'Abolition society' seemed to be the only name which he knew or cared to know."

Readers, we must leave General Harrison with you, for the present. You see what he is—any thing and every thing, or nothing, without regard to principle or consistency, just as he conceives it to be for or against his interest. At one time admitting, and at another, denying the right of the people to inquire of candidates as to their views, &c., and the duty of candidates to answer. At one time, when a candidate for Congress, & anxious for anti bank votes, denouncing a U. S. Bank as unconstitutional, and "banking establishments" generally, as injurious to the morals and pecuniary interests of the country, and at another, when the bank candidate for the Presidency and anxious for bank votes and bank influence, pledging himself if elected to approve an act for chartering an "unconstitutional" institution. At one time when he believed that the accusation of "being friendly to slavery" might injure his political prospects in a free state, he boasts of his having become "a member of an abolition society at the early age of eighteen;" and at another and subsequent time, when he desires proslavery votes, he denies that he is or ever was a member of abolition society. And still worse. In the same year—yea in the same month—he writes a private and confidential abolition letter for the North and an anti-abolition letter for the South! Well may it be asked, what consistent politician—what honest man, who feels solicitude for the honor of his country, can support such a man for the Presidency of the United States?

From the Pennsylvanian.

THE NEW JERSEY CASE.—The minority report of the Committee on elections of the House of Representatives, must be a singular document. We have not yet seen it, but the majority of that committee have published a card in the Washington Globe of Monday, which places the minority gentlemen in rather an unenviable position. It appears that Messrs. Filmore, Truman Smith, Botts, and Randall, the minority, charge the majority with being guilty of great injustice towards Mr. Ayerigg and his associates, (the *great seal* claimants) and have selected *twenty six* cases out of near *six hundred*, thirteen on one side and thirteen on the other, as examples of glaring inconsistency on the part of the majority.

The majority of the committee consisting of Mr. Campbell, chairman, (W.) and Messrs Rives, Medill, Brown and Thomas, in the card referred to, give extracts from the journal of the committee, containing the yeas and nays in thirteen of the cases referred to, which prove that if they were "glaringly inconsistent," the very gentlemen or some of them, voted in committee for the very descisions which they now charge as being "glaringly inconsistent."

We have not room for the entire "card" as published in the Globe, but we give the conclusion of it, which sums up the parts detailed in it:

"We believe that we have now given the ayes and noes upon every vote deducted or alleged to have been improperly withheld from Messrs. Ayerigg and associates, paraded in the minority report as examples of the gross injustice of the majority of the committee to those gentlemen; and we have shown, from the journal of the committee, that in six out of the thirteen selected decisions, Mr. Filmore voted with the majority—that in two of the decisions, Mr. Botts voted with the majority—that in one of them Mr. Randall did the same—that one of these alleged inconsistent and unjust decisions was carried by a majority of six to one—that one of them was carried by a majority of seven to one—that another was carried by the vote of all present, embracing two of the signers of the minority report; and that in six of the examples, the chairman (Mr Campbell) voted with the minority, and against deducting the votes.

Thus it is apparent that three of the gentlemen who have signed the minority report have recorded their own votes in support "of some of the decisions" which they hold forth to the country as examples of the flagrant injustice of the majority of the committee to Messrs. Ayerigg and associates.

We could also show by an extract of the ayes and noes from the journal, that some of 'these same gentlemen' have recorded their votes in favor of "some of the decisions" with which they have contrasted the above cases; but we have done enough for the present to expose the character of that extraordinary document, which, impelled "as they say," by "a high sense of obligation to the cause of justice and truth," Millard Filmere, Truman Smith, John M. Botts and Benjamin Randall, have sanctioned with their names and published to the world!

JOHN CAMPBELL,
FRANCES E. RIVES,
WM. MEDILL,
A. V. BROWN,
PHILLIP F. THOMAS.

The above we think, must settle the question, as to the fairness of the minority report and convince every one of the degree of confidence with which it ought to be received.—When gentlemen, for the sake of making political capitol, do not hesitate to pronounce *their own acts* examples of 'flagrant injustice,' it requires no great stretch of credulity to believe that the entire report, signed by them selves, is also "flagrantly unjust."

A PASSAGE FROM HISTORY.

"The deputies chosen to represent Virginia in the General Congress, were selected with great care, and regard was had not only to their talents and weight of character, but also, it is said, to the diversity of their qualifications. Thus Peyton Randolph was recommended by his personal dignity and acquaintance with the rules of order; George Washington, by his military talents and experience; Richard Henry Lee, by his persuasive oratory; Patrick Henry, by his spirit-stirring eloquence, and because, moreover, he was the man of the people; Richard Bland was deemed the best writer in the Colony; Edmund Pendleton was chosen for his consummate prudence, as well as thorough knowledge of law; and BENJAMIN HARRISON, *as fairly representing the feelings and interests of the wealthy planters*"

The aforegoing extract is from "The Life of Jefferson," by George Tucker, of Virginia, a warm Whig and friend of Gen. Harrison. Should it meet the eye of the General, what curious reflections must it not give rise to in his mind. Benjamin Harrison (his father, elected to Congress of 1773) as fairly representing the feelings and interests of the wealthy planters." Substitute *Bankers* for "*Planters*," and it might form a passage in the General's own history. *Bankers*, quoth the General, is as good a name as "*Planters*," It will do as well, as Cassius said, "to *conjure* with"—*better*, say's the General, with that word "*wealthy*" before it. But alas! says the General, how am I fallen off from him of the "Revolution! Selected though I am, to represent the feelings and interests of the wealthy Bankers, I am made to hoist the flag of the "*Poor* Man's Candidate," am dressed up in *Coon skins*, represented as living in a "*Log Cabin*" and am dosed with "*Hard Cider*." Shade of my honored father! pardon me, that I am meek and gentle with this "Committee!" Though *thou* wouldst have scorned it, *I* must "*stoop*, to conquer."—This mummery will soon be over and let me but reach the Chair of State and I will show the greasy rogues, whom now I am forced to hug, that *I*, too, am worthy to represent the feelings and interests of the wealthy." Bear with thy son, in the moment of his degeneracy! and if thy spirit brooks not *Bankers*, allow something for the change of times: the *Bankers* now are the "*wealthy*."—Rep.

THE MILITIA.—The public are aware that among those who have endeavored to produce a prejudice against the Administration and its friends, on account of the plan proposed by the Secretary of War, for the re-organization of the militia, which has been denounced by the Whigs, as an indication of a design on the part of the President to establish an army of 200,000, to over awe and subdue the people, with the view of creating a prejudice against him, none has been more loud and boisterous than the editor of the Patriot. That our readers may see what degree of consistency and honesty is in the editor of the Patriot, we copy from that paper, of the 31st of December last, the following editorial remarks upon the subject of the proposition of the Secretary of War. It will be found in the same number of the Patriot, which contains the account of the Harrison meeting at Washington Hall, which was addressed by Leslie Coombs. The Whigs have, no doubt, at least some of them, preserved their copies of that number of the paper, and if they doubt the correctness of our statement, we refer them to the paper. When they have done so, let them say what they think of the honesty of their organ.—*Balt. Rep.*

"WAR REPORT.—We publish to day in EXTENSO the report of the Secretary of War. It is quite an interesting document, and while it imparts much information, throws out several suggestions, among which are the re-organization of the militia into departments and to have 200,000 under arms ready for any emergency. This is something of the French system; and what in that country are called the "National Guards." In style and manner, the *report is decidedly good*—and in all respects superior to the message of the President, and the report of Mr. Woodbury.—Better than all, there is not a particle of *locofoco demagogism* in it, and if the reader were kept from a knowledge of the writer, he would infer that it was the *production of some liberal and enlightened Whig*, and that *glorious party* were already in possession of the government."

THE SEA SERPENT CAUGHT.—On Sunday evening about 6 o'clock, as the schooner Wasp, captain Williams, and the schooner Independent Eagle, captain Owens, were coming up the bay, they descried, about three miles below North Point, a strange looking fish or serpent to the leeward. A boat from each schooner was manned, and a chase for the prize took place. A harpoon was driven into the creature, and away it flew, dragging the boat for nearly eight miles, like a chip down a cataract. It was found necessary at length to stop the speed of this marine locomotive, and a couple of balls being shot into it, the death flurry came on, and it soon floated a lifeless carcass. It was borne in triumph to the foot of South street wharf, where it was visited by most of the old cruizers about town, who had been to every part of the globe, and knew every thing that partook of the nature of fish, flesh, or fowl, like a book. They all declared they had never seen such a nondescript. It measures twelve feet in length, and nine feet from fin to fin; it has a head like a seal, with teeth, and its back is covered with a hard shell. It has four fins or flippers, and in its general appearance bears some resemblance of a turtle, or rather a monstrosity of that species of fish, which nature in one of her freaks had created. How it came into the Chesapeake bay is a mystery.—*Baltimore Sun.*

Fire in Hagerstown, Md.—A passenger who arrived in Baltimore last evening reports that a fire was raging in Hagerstown, when the stage passed through, and that the printing offices of the Torch Light and the Herald of Freedom, together with three other houses in Hagers' Row and four or five buildings on the opposite side of the street had been entirely destroyed. We hope and trust this may prove at least an exaggeration, if not wholly untrue.—Ibid.

OFFICE HOLDERS.

DEMOCRATS LOOK HERE!

The officers employed in ALL the Departments at Washington city are politically divided as follows:

Federal whigs, - - -	196
Democrats, - - - -	178
Federal whig majority, - -	18

The amount of salaries paid them is as follows, to wit:

To 196 Federal whigs, -	$269,065
To 178 Democrats, - -	239,149
Excess paid Federalists,	$29,925

Whose hands are deepest in the public crib, even at the very seat of Government? Who secure most of the 'spoils of victory? Which party is composed of 'office holders?' Here are the men who war against the Administration which feeds and clothes them selves and families. Now, if any '*whig*' office holder hater should read this article, tell him to pocket the paper, lest his neighbor may see it.—*Old Dominion.*

MORE CHANGES.

The march of Democratic Reform is onward.—The following persons, in Fayette co., Pennsylvania, have recently renounced the federal hard cider party:

JACOB MEYERS,
JOHN W. MARKLEY,
ANDREW MARKLEY,
DAVID LINCOLN,
JOHN TURNER,
GEORGE JENKS,
WILLIAM HAGER,
ANDREW JENKS.

These gentlemen all declare that they will not support a man who will not trust the people with his political opinions. They cannot countenance their hard cider and log cabin sprees.

From the Ohio Statesman.

I have heretofore supported the whig party and Gen Harrison as their candidate, but I am now convinced that Harrison has never been a supporter of our Democratic administrations or Democratic principles, and that he is now the candidate of the Federal party—therefore, I cannot support him longer. I cannot support a corrupt, vascillating, oppressive paper currency, and therefore I cannot vote with those who do sustain such a currency. I cannot join in the erection of mimic cabins, sing Tippecanoe songs, or raise the shout of hard cider to deceive the people.—Therefore I cannot go with the party that does these things. I wish to know distinctly the principles of the candidate that I support; therefore I cannot vote for him who "is to make no further declaration of principles while occupying his present position." I shall vote for the Dutchman of Kinderhook and the real hero of the Thames.

JOHN J. KELLEY.

Union Co. July 4th.

Renunciation of Whiggery.—It is with pleasure we comply with the request of John B. Sparks of Fallsbury township, and announce that he has renounced Harrisonian federalism, and come out in favor of Van Buren and Democracy. We know of a number of others, who publicly came out from among the federalists on the 4th instant: but there is no necessity for making a parade of names—votes are the thing.

RIDGEVILLE, Ohio, June 20, 1840.

I have in my time cast only three votes for President of the United States, and they were for John Q. Adams, Henry Clay, and Wm. H. Harrison, and should I live to give the fourth, it will be for Martin Van Buren. The log cabins, hard cider, &c., are re-acting upon the whigs in this county. Their majority in 1836, was about 900, and I think by November next we will reduce that majority about one half.

Joseph Crary, Barlow G. Gorsett, Lewis Lawless, Daniel Clark, Jacob M. Molat, Thomas Reeves, and Capt. John Williams, all respectable citizens, together with myself, sent to the Western Star our reasons for leaving the whig party, which was refused publication. You are at liberty to publish this letter, and if the Star denies any of these facts herein stated, the proof will be produced

I instructed Major Purcell to write to you for three copies of the Statesman until after the result of the election is known. If he should do so, please send them to Ridgeville.

Yours, in haste,

From the Ohio Eagle.

HEBRON, (Ohio,) June 18, 1840.

This certifies that I have always voted the Whig ticket up to this time. I have now had a fair view of Gen. Harrison, an old man now in his dotage and second childhood, which entirely disqualifies him for the high office to which he aspires. The arch story told me by the whigs, that he will have a wise cabinet, don't suit me. I want a wise man for President, and he will select a wise cabinet. I now bolt from the whig party and give my vote for Van Buren. My brother, Elias; says the General has converted him in the same way.

JOHN FARMER.

THE DUEL.—The Tuscaloosa (Ala.) Monitor of the 10th inst says:—An affair of honor took place on Monday morning last, 6th inst. in Pickens county, near the Mississippi line, between Ex-Governor RUNNELL and VOLNEY E. HOWARD, Esq. both of Jackson Mississippi. One shot was exchanged by the parties, when Mr. Howard received the ball of his antagonist just below the right lobe, which came out immediately opposite on the other side, burying itself in the fleshy part over the breast bone and perhaps raking the bone itself. Mr. Howard's wound is not likely to terminate mortally, unless it should take an unexpected direction. Gov. Runnell was not touched. They fought at twelve paces.

From the Baltimore Republican.

THE POLE CAT AND THE OPOSSUM;

OR WHIGGERY AND DEMOCRACY.

A pole cat one day to a 'possum's den came,
Quite filled with the idea of changing his name,
Crying hey, brother 'possum, pray how do you do.—
Says the 'possum—I claim no relation with you.

Ri tu di nu, &c.

The pole cat then swore that a 'possum he'd be,
Spite of all that was said to the contrary,
But the 'possum said d—d if such talking would do,
For who ever saw such a 'possum as you!

Ri tu di nu, &c.

The pole cat unwilling his claims to withdraw,
Declared he'd be hang'd if he'd stand such law;
Ah, well! cries the 'possum, as to rest he now sunk,
Though you call yourself 'possum, you smell *like a skunk.*

Ri tu di nu, &c.

Just so with the Whiggies, while thus they endeavor
To steal our emblems, which you know is not clever;
Though they've taken our poles and are rolling our ball,
I'm sure that we'll beat them at election next fall.

Like the pole cat, although they do flounder and swear,
And say how they'll beat us, for that we don't care,
Let them call themselves Democrats, or just what they will,
The odor of *Federalism* clings to them still.

The Lake Hurin Observer has left its neutral position and is out for Van Buren and Johnson.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc6044_1_62-0268.jpg