willing to reduce the currency down to three dollars a head; and, as a necessary consequence, *to reduce, by operation of law*, ahe wages of labor, the price of produce, tnd the value of property, to corresponding low prices; and thus sacrifice all the laborious industry of the country? Those who would propose or adopt such a diminution of currency, and scarcity of money, may prepare to encounter the fierce frowns and fiery indignation of an injured and ruined people.

MONOPOLY.

This hard money monopoly would be attended with disastrous and distressing effects upon all branches of business. If this scheme shall ever be carried into full operation, the man who works now for a dollar a day, will not receive more than twenty-five cents; he who gets fifty cents, would receive twelve and a half cents per day; so that honest industry could not support itself and live by labor. Wheat, worth $1 a bushel, would sell at twenty-five cents; corn, worth fifty cents, would go at twelve and a half; one bushel of wheat, (or i day's work in harvest,) will now pay a debt of one dollar; carry this Sub-treasury into practice, and then it will require four bushels of wheat, or four day's labor to pay the same debt of one dollar. Cotton, negroes, land, every species of property, must fall in the same proportion. The price of every article of trade, made by the planter, farmer, mechanic, and workingman, would be diminished, sacrificed, and crushed before golden images and silver idols. But observe the difference and inequality of this measure—it will reduce all the wages, prices, and property *in our own country*, while it leaves all articles imported here from foreign countries at the present high prices!! So that, by the operation of this Sub-treasury law, we shall be compelled to sell low and buy high. This is a losing *lefthanded* game to that large and meritorious class of society, *whose labor* constitutes their capital, and currency. But still "it is a bad wind that blows no body any good." The President, members of Congress, and all federal officers and agents, will make money by it. Their specie salaries will be increased just in proportion to the reduction of prices for labor and property. This is the game of "heads, the officers wins; tails, the people loose." This is a simple, but safe game; the process, I am informed, is this: a federal creditor, or member of Congress, draws his pay in new coined gold and silver, and then takes and carries it away to a broker, and sells it, at *a premium* of from five to fifteen or twenty per cent, for bank rags and shinplasters. He pockets the premium, and pays his debts with the *unconstitutional* currency. I do not think officers of Governmnet and guardians of the people should become money changers, brokers, shavers, or speculators in currency. I do not think the iron arm of power should use its federal fingers to seize and tear *silver* shillings and sixpences from the necks of *little* children, or rob the *little till* of the big chest of some honest frugal farmer to get silver and gold to pay public men and agents, that they may engage in speculation, and enjoy the profitable privilege of shaving, skimming, and having a large per cent, from the fruits of honest industry, or from the common currency of our common country. This making flesh of one, and fish of another, is very unequal and unjust, but proof positive that the practical operation of this measure is to make invidious distinctions, and furnish two kinds of currency of different value—the better sort for the Government, and the baser sort for the community—gold and silver for the President and office holders, bank bills and depreciated paper for the people and tax payers. This is very *aristocratic* Democracy!! The Sub-treasury policy makes it the direct interest of the federal officers to derange and depreciate the common currency as much as possible—because gold and silver will always be appreciated just in proportion as bank notes are depreciated. And thus specie will be banished from circulation as money, and become an article of merchandise, bought and sold in the market, like salt and sugar. Yes, sir, the President's better dollar may buy two bushels of salt, while the farmer's baser dollar may purchase but one. Now, if the farmer's paper dollar be debased and depreciated still more, then the President may buy four bushels of salt for his silver dollar while the farmer cannot purchase one with his depreciated bank note. This is not even handed justice. The farmer pays his tax to Government, among other things, for a good sound equal currency—and it is the duty of the President and Congress, not only to make and keep the constitutional standard of money in gold and silver coin, but if there be a deficiency and scarcity of the precious metals, to see that Government and the people are provided and furnished with a sufficient uniform currency of equal value, and exercise their limited powers to prevent the circulation of any currency that is depreciated and sunk under specie par value. Then a paper dollar would be equal in value to a silver dollar. Then the farmer would not be obliged to give the tithe of his crop, or ten per cent. of his currency, to make the residue of his means available. Then the honest, hardworking man would enjoy the fruits of his own labor, without being shaved with Shilock's razor, between the fingers of a broker; or hewed by a Sub-treasury broad axe, in the hands of a public officer.

Mr. Speaker, I represent planters, farmers, mechanics, and laboring men chiefly—living far in the interior, a great distance from the sea-board, and I do not like to see my consituents drained and *deprived of their own native precious metals* to satisfy the specie exactions of the Government: for the inevitable character and direct tendency of this *monopolising* scheme, are to abstract and withdraw the gold and silver from the possession and circulation of the people in the back country, and concentrate and accumulate it in *a few* large cities where the Federal Government collects its demands. To withdraw our coin from our use and trade, not only deprives us of so much money, but of *all the credit* it would nourish. This policy will uproot and unsettle the solid specie foundation on which our circulating medium properly rests, and depreciate the credit and confidence of the currency in the interior of the country. It will impoverish the country to enrich the city, and rob the people to pay the President.

My objection to this bill is, not to the precious metal money, but *to the precious metal monopoly*. The money is good, but the measure is bad: because, no man, nor set of men, are entitled to exclusive privileges, or separate profits. Yes, sir, the money is good, and *too good*, to be monopolized and enjoyed by *one* class, or privileged order, to the great disadvantage and injury of the States and the community.

Why should we not extend justice and the right of fellowship to our fellow citizens? Equality is equity—and since we cannot have specie enough for all, let us share, and share alike; let Representatives and constituents fare, and fare alike. Then we shall administer "the *Golden Rule*," and not monopolise the golden money by taking the lion's share, because we happen to have the power.

Some of the supporters of this project, seem to *imagine* if they destroy the credit system, (which consists of about four hundred millions of bank notes in use,) that then, the same amount of specie will directly flow into circulation, and take its place. That is a vain hope, and strange delusion. We may call spirits (or ghosts) from the vasty deep—but will they come? Just as soon as four hundred millions of gold and silver which lie *vasty deep* in some undiscovered "country, from whose bourn no traveller returns."

"He must have optics sharp, I wean,
Who sees what *is not* to be seen."

Mr. Speaker, I am decidedly in favor of gold and silver as a standard of money, and as a currency, as far as it is practicable to bring it into circulation; but after exerting and *exhausting* my mental resources, still there is a great deficiency and general scarcity. Whenever Providence is against us upon any question, we may as well submit, and surrender our frail judgment—because the giver of every good and perfect gift knows exactly what is right, and suitable to our condition and wants, much better than we do. This high authority appears to have decieed against the Sub-treasury, because *our Creator* has made the precious metals so very scarce and hard to find, that *it is impossible* to procure and command a sufficent abundance of gold and silver for general use and common circulation. Some of my constituents know, "all that glitters is not gold," and he that *digs* for gold, gives hard work for hard money. In all the gold region, I have never met with *one single practical gold miner* who advocated *an exclusive* hard money currency. Now that is a remarkable fact worth remembering, and hope those gentlemen who live in States and represent districts where not one penny weight *of native gold* has ever been found, will bear it in mind, and communicate it to their constituents. "Distance lends enchantments to the view," but "golden dreams are seldom realised." In my district, when a man is *too zealous* and *gives too much* for a gold mine, we say, he has the *yellow* fever. That disease is as dangerous to the pocket in the up country, as it is to life in the low country—very few survive it. Now, sir, *this administration has taken the yellow fever* and I tell those who are infected with that disease, to beware that they are not "carried off," to their political death by it; and beware, that history does not record this brief epitaph on some slab at Kinderhook,

"Here lies,
Martin Van Buren, late President of the United States—his administration, *died of Yellow Fever*, on the 4th day of March, 1841."

SPECIE.

Mr. Speaker, the advocates of this bill have *discovered* that all our illustrious statesmen and Presidents (from the first day of Gen. Washington's administration, down to the last of Gen. Jackson's) were mistaken and *ignorant* of the true reading and meaning of the constitution of the United States. We are now told, by Mr. Van Buren and his party, that although a paper currency and bank notes have been in use and circulation, as money, for fifty or sixty years still, it was all wrong and unconstitutional: that nothing but gold or silver coin is constitutional currency. This is a new reading, and strange provision, of the original intention and *practical* meaning of the constitution. That honored instrument declares, "Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

To coin money means, *to fix the standard and stamp* of legal value upon the precious metals, just as it is required to fix the standard of weights and measures. The whole intention and object was, *certainty, unifomity*, and a *common standard*; whereby all currency, which purported to pass as money, or its equivalent, might be tried, compared, and adjusted. Under this very power, Congress has authorized *standard half-bushels* and *yards, to be cast and manufactured out of brass*. That metal is durable, and very little liable to expansion or contraction. One standard half-bushel and yard are sent by congress to each of the Custom houses, to each of the States and Territories, there to remain as the legal model, and the *right standard*. The brass half-bushel weighs *thirty-five pounds*. The cast brass yard, with the matrix, which is a part of it, weighs *twenty-four pounds*. They are weighty and costly.

These metal measures are too heavy for common use, and never were *designed* for any thing but standards. Nine hundred and ninety-nine half-bushels out of a thousand, in every day use, are made of wood, notwithstanding the great liability to expansion and contraction. The want of durability in the material, is made up in convenience, lightness, and cheapness. To a plain man, like myself, a half bushel of salt is worth as much, measured in a wooden as in a brass half-bushel, provided the quantity conform to the legal standard. A yard of cloth, sold and measured by a wooden yardstick, is worth just as much as though it had been measured by one made of brass, provided the length be one and the same; because things that are equal to the same, are equal to one another. Still, if the purchaser doubts the correctness and fairness of the instrument of measure, it is his right to refer, under the stamp and seal of the law, to the standard fixed by the constitution. We are searching after practical truth, which must be tried by common sense and applied to every day business. Now, suppose all the wooden half-bushels and yardstick measures in every house in the United States were suddenly converted into metal, and made of gold and silver, but still kept in the same use and retaining the same shape, quantity, and capacity; would the articles sold and measured by them be any more valuable than if measured by the wooden instruments now in common use? I presume not. The salt would not taste of silver, and the cloth would not smell of gold. The value of the grain sold, and the goods purchased, would be precisely the same. If there were no half-bushels and yard-measures in this country, but those cast and manufactured by the General Government, out of brass, there would be a great inconvenience and scarcity among the people; and very few poor people could afford to purchase and own those useful and necessary instruments now in common use.

In like manner, this coining clause in the constitution, when rightly understood and *practically* interpreted, means, Congress shall have power to declare the quantity or number of grains and pennyweights there shall be in a gold eagle or silver dollar, stamp them with certain official seals, and finally *fix the standard of money*, whereby the value of all currency may be measured, tested, regulated, and ascertained. In other words, Congress shall be the national standard, keeper, and regulator of value; and gold and silver shall be the only true national standard of money and currency; just as the brass yard is the standard measure of length and breadth whereby all wooden or other yardsticks may be measured, tested, and compared. Gold and silver coin is the yardstick of value in money matters; and all currency and circulation should be made and kept equal to it in value. We want a *uniform standard* of value for currency as well as for weights and measures.

In short, a bank paper dollar is to a silver dollar, just what a wooden yardstick is to a brass yard.

[*Concluded next week.*]

[From the Nashville Banner.]

CHANGES, HO!

Gov. Runnels, who is said to possess greater personal popularity than any man in Mississippi, and who has been for years the Ajax Talemon of the Administration party in that State, in a letter dated Jackson, July 17th, 1840, and addressed to a Whig Committee of Natchez, announces his "deliberate determination" of supporting Gen. Harrison at the ensuing election. He says:

"I am, and ever shall be a democrat, and when those who profess the doctrines of democracy carry them out in good faith, I will be found acting with them, and not till then. I have no political views to subserve, but will, regardless of the source from which they eminate, continue to oppose those measures that I think are calculated to injure my country, and to advocate such as I conceive are calculated to sustain our free institutions, and spread peace, prosperity, and happiness through the land.

"The financial concerns of the country are in so deplorable a condition that a change cannot be for the worst. I am clearly of opinion that the doctrines of an exclusive gold and silver currency are calculated to produce a scene of bankruptcy and ruin, never before witnessed in our devoted country.

"I have heretofore been an advocate of the "exclusive State Bank system," but I am now fully convinced that in consequence of local influences and local causes, that neither the government nor the people can prosper without the aid of a National Bank—such a Bank can and will, as it has done heretofore, give a currency preferable to a metallic currency alone. I am not an advocate for inconvertable bank paper, but for such a one as will better subserve all commercial purposes, and which can at the will of the holders be converted into gold or silver.

"In voting for Gen. Harrison let it not be said that I am sustaining a man who is unworthy of public confidence. He is the son of one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, the friend and supporter of Thomas Jefferson, of Jas. Madison, and of James Monroe. He has always been found ready and willing to enter the ranks in his country's defence, and I see nothing charged against him which has been sustained by proof calculated, in my opinion, to render him obnoxious to the charge of being a Federalist.

"It is true that Gen. Harrison after having devoted a large portion of his life to the service of his country, has retired from public life and sought his ease and comfort by his own fireside, but when the tocsin of war was sounded, or his country's liberties endangered, he has ever been found among the first to gird on his armor in defence of his home and country's cause.

"I am, gentlemen, very respectfully, your friend and obedient servant,

H. G. RUNNELS.

MR. VAN BUREN'S ARMY BILL!—There is one feature in the Army bill so strongly recommended by the President, which seems to have escaped the notice of most persons. Every man between the ages of 20 and 45 is to supply himself with equipments which will cost at least $12,50 or perhaps $15, except THE OFFICE HOLDERS who are excluded! Each poor man is to bear a heavy DIRECT TAX but the fat officeholders are to pay NOTHING! Each private citizen is also to be marched hundreds of miles at the will of the President, whilst the OFFICE HOLDER is sitting comfortably by his fire side! In other words, the People are to pay the taxes and fight the battles, while their SERVANTS, the OFFICE HOLDERS, are fattening from the Public Crib!. What say you to this Farmers?—*Raleigh Register.*

The Pennsylvania Democrat asks whether we would have the office holders, that is, the leg-treasurers "work for nothing and find themselves." We would certainly have them find themselves, for in many cases it would be very difficult for any body else to find them—this side of Texas.

AMERICAN ENTERPRISE.—Under this caption the Harrisburg "Keystone" of the 26th states "that the Emperor of Russia, by his agent, closed a contract with Mr. Norris, of Philadelphia, for two hundred Locomotive Engines, forty of which are to be delivered each year; for which the Emperor is to pay 1,400,000 dollars. These engines are principally to run upon the great railroad now in construction between St. Petersburg and Moscow."


# THE MESSENGER.

D. R. M'ANALLY & J. ROBERTS, EDITORS.

ASHEVILLE, N. C.

Friday Morning, October 2, 1840.


## WHIG ELECTORAL TICKET.

1. Col. CHARLES MCDOWELL, of Burke,
2. Gen. JAMES WELBORN, of Wilkes,
3. DAVID RAMSOUR, of Lincoln,
4. DAVID F. CALDWELL, of Rowan,
5. JAMES MEBANE, of Caswell,
6. Hon. ABRA'M RENCHER, of Chatham,
7. JOHN B. KELLY, of Moore,
8. Dr. JAMES S. SMITH, of Orange,
9. CHARLES MANLY, of Wake,
10. Col. WM. L. LONG, of Halifax,
11. WILLIAM W. CHERRY, of Bertie,
12. THOMAS F. JONES, of Perquimons,
13. JOSIAH COLLINS, of Washington,
14. JAMES W. BRYAN, of Cartaret,
15. DANIEL B. BAKER, of New Hanover.

## THE ELECTION

For Electors for President and Vice President takes place in North Carolina the SECOND THURSDAY IN NOVEMBER NEXT;—REMEMBER, *the Second Thursday in November*, (the twelfth day of the month,) THEN LET EVERY MAN DO HIS DUTY. Each voter will vote the whole ticket.

## An Examination

*Of certain anti-Republican and anti-Christian doctrines, as held by a number of the leading politicians of the day, and particularly set forth in a late number of the Boston Quarterly Review:*

[CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST.]

We come now, as proposed in our last, to consider the views of Mr. Brownson in reference to Christianity in general, and the organized Christian church in particular. On the subject of Christianity it is difficult to tell from his article what he thinks. At one time he professes for it the most profound reverence, and then again he is coming out in an indirect manner with the most sweeping denunciations against it. There is here a goodly spice of what is to be found among almost all infidel writers, a strange inconclusiveness, where reasoning is attempted, and for the most part a skimming along over the surface, studiously avoiding close investigation, content with mere bold assertions.—Such, indeed, is the article in question.—Assertion after assertion comes in the most unqualified manner—denunciation follows denunciation in quick succession—and after all the blustering and prating there is nothing proved. The same bitter invectives which we find here have been hurled against the church in every age, and still impregnable and imperishable as the pillars of Heaven she stands, while all such missiles either fall harmlessly at her feet or recoil with tenfold force upon the heads of those by whom they were thrown.

We have long since known that the most untiring efforts have long been making in Boston, New York, and elsewhere, to spread infidelity, and make inroads upon the church organizations of the country—that they have their regularly established lecture rooms—and have tried to flood the whole country with their various productions; but while these were kept disconnected from the leading political questions of the day, we, in common with most others, deemed them entirely unworthy of notice. Now, their design avowedly is, to wedge their infidelity into the political creed of the present dominant party, and thus to make the questions at issue present themselves under different circumstances and with entirely different relations. This we confess, attaches an importance to their views which they otherwise could not have had, and lays a corresponding obligation upon all the friends of religion and morality to seek some opportunity to bear their testimony against them. But mark the policy. These odious doctrines are to be brought before the country by *politicians—in political journals, and under the specious cloak of partizan politics.* With these ministers of the gospel must have nothing to do—they are denounced from Maine to Florida if they presume to think, much less speak on these subjects, and if denunciations can keep them silent then infidelity can be spread over the country, and the haters of God and Holiness reek their vengeance upon the church.

We will venture to say that the world has not known a more deep-laid and fiend-like scheme, and a more deadly blow has never been aimed at the religious institutions of our country. We repeat it, and among the candid there can be no reasonable doubt of its truth, that the policy is first to silence the ministers of the church by reiterating the hackneyed cry of clerical interference in party politics, and then under the garb of these professedly political views, impose their infidelity upon the country. Something of this kind must be resorted to in order to success. Infidelity cannot bear the light of investigation—the more it is examined in the calm sunshine of reason and common sense the more odious its peculiarities appear, and its advocates, whatever they may say to the contrary, know well that they never can succeed without some such connexion as above. The editors of this paper are no more favorable to clerical interference in partizan politics than any one else, and hitherto they have looked with mingled feelings of pity and contempt upon those hypocritical ranters, who, in affected sympathy for the church, have endeavored to prejudice the public mind against this paper from the fact that one of its editors is a clergyman. We have not progressed this far in our work ignorant of the fact that a number of *would-be* political leaders in this country affect to be in holy horror at the idea of our devoting a paper to the joint interests of Religion, morality, and politics, and are ready to shed a flood of crocodile tears over the prophetic downfall of a church they care no more for than they care for the fabled man in the moon. We have let such pass for *nothing*, knowing that to be precisely their *worth*, and precisely the estimate the public in the end would place upon them. With them to connect religious and political matters in the proper sense of that word, in the same paper, though under different men, each responsible only for the matter belonging to his department, is a crying sin. But for political champions to throw around them the speckled cloak of modern Democracy, and make the most bitter and deadly thrusts at the institutions of christianity, is all perfectly right. On such a course as this we offer no comment. Its inconsistency is too apparent to need a serious attention, and its authors too lately set loose from the long incarceration of their native insignificance, to have their names or characters before the reading public.

But to return to Mr. Brownson. He professes not to stand opposed to religion—religious teachers—or religious assemblages—but he is opposed to "every thing like an outward, visible church; to every thing that in the remotest degree partakes of the priest." It is an easy matter for every believer in the divine original of the Bible to see that "an outward, visible church" is one of the institutions inseparably connected with the christian system; and it is equally easy for every sensible man whose mind has not been darkened by the clouds of infidelity, to see the beneficial results that flow out from this organization, as well as its absolute necessity in order to the perpetuation of christianity. The truth is, the whole article in question, from first to last, is made up of the most downright agrarianism and infidelity. The doctrines are not new, as intimated by the New York Post, they are the doctrines of infidelity in every age; they have been reiterated again and again, and though a thousand times exploded they are still urged with as much apparent confidence as though nothing had ever been said or written on the subject.

That it is right and proper to worship the Supreme Being, Mr. Brownson admits, but if this be done properly it must be done orderly, there are certain rites belonging to christianity which cannot be dispensed with without destroying the distinctive characteristics of the system—all rites pre-suppose *order*, all order *direction and control*, and these necessarily pre-suppose a *directing and controlling power*. All laws are nugatory without enforcement, in the present mixed and imperfect state of society, and all enforcement supposes an *executive*. If, for instance, baptism be an institution of christianity some must judge of the fitness of the candidate and proper administrators must be appointed. If the sacrament is to be partaken of, the times and mode are to be determined, the qualifications of the communicants judged of and the administration placed in suitable hands; and how can this be done without church organization? Not at all.

Again, if the continuance of the privilege of partaking of the ordinances of the christian system be conditional upon the good conduct of the individual, so that the purity of the system itself be guarded, then the power of enforcing discipline must be lodged somewhere, and thus *government* flows out of the very *nature* of that system. There can be no government without organization, and the very moment there ceases to be "an outward, visible church" that moment the whole system of christianity becomes a perfectly dead letter. This, indeed, is what Brownson and his coadjutors know, and this is, without doubt, what they desire. They labor to excite the prejudices of the uninformed against the church, her ministers and institutions, under an affected reverence for christianity, knowing at the same time that if the church go down the christian religion, as a system, will perish with it, and men at once be loosed from all religious and moral restraint. This was the scheme of the leaders of the memorable revolution in France, and there is good reason to believe that the ultimate design of the advocates of these doctrines in this country is to fasten upon us the prominent features of the French politics of that day, and of course flood us with all the horrors of that revolution.

But suppose the mighty work accomplished, the church disorganized—her ministry abolished—and her institutions set aside; or, (what is the true aim) christianity proscribed, and the religion of nature, if any such religion there be, made the religion of our country. What would we have gained by the exchange? We know that the answer will be that "the labouring classes will be elevated, and our country freed from the hypocrisy of the priests and the tyranny of superstitution." But not the religion taught in the Bible and in the church is the only religion the world ever knew that really benefitted the poor man. Every other system of religion that has ever been published oppresses the poor man, gives the rich a decided advantage over him, and depends for its success on pandering to one or more of the prevailing dispositions of the human heart. Christianity knows no difference among men save that of character alone, it requires unconditional submission in all—flatters neither our pride nor vanity, and places all its votaries on the same common level.

Again, the history of the world in every age shows beyond the reach of successful contradiction, what a perfect nullity civil institutions are without a connexion with, and dependence upon some system of religion. Without such connexion and dependence, human laws are mere cobwebs. This truth has been felt and directly or indirectly acted upon by all the great Legislators of ancient or modern date. In all religions there must of necessity be a priesthood, or teachers, the idea of there being "no class of men set apart and authorised, either by law or fashion, to speak to us in the name of God, or to be interpreters of the word of God," is perfectly preposterous upon the supposition that some system of religion is necessary to the conducting the affairs of civil society. In any other system that could be introduced there would be necessarily as much hypocrisy and tyranny, in its teachers, as there can be in the teachers of christianity, even if the system itself be untrue. In the proscription of christianity and the organization of the church, then, our country could possibly gain nothing, but would loose all abhorence of vice, all powerful incentives to virtue, the depravity morality of Paganism would be brought back, mankind would be robbed of the firm assurance of another life, and therefore despoiled of their patience, their humanity, of their charity, and of their chastity in a word, of all those virtues which ameliorate and sublime our nature; virtues that natural religion never knew—that belong only to christianity, and without which the present life would be nothing but infamous degradation and licentious wretchedness, and the future more vicious and miserable than this.

Such are the consequences inseparably connected with a doctrine held by a prominent political party of our country—a party which claims the Chief Magistrate of this nation as its friend and fellow laborer; and a party that will no doubt make every possible effort to bring practically to bear those "grand legislative measures" to which they look forward." We do not wish to be considered as charging the belief in these destructive doctrines upon all the members of the present Administration party, hundreds and thousands of them are men possessed of high patriotic and christian feelings, men to whom these principles are as revolting as any men on earth, but who, we fear, have too confidently followed their party leaders, and have looked too little to the ultimate tendencies of the doctrines which they have been led to espouse.

One thing in this matter we consider as mysterious, not to say inexplicable, that is, though these startling disclosures were made in the Boston Review last April, and though, as we showed in our last, they have been directly or indirectly sanctioned by a number of the leading men of the same party, no administration paper that we have seen has said one condemnatory word on the subject. Why is this? That they do not all subscribe to these views we are satisfied. Are they afraid to speak out?—Or do they think that there is nothing in all this calculated to make fearful inroads upon our civil and religious liberties? Do they think it best to conceal these things from the mass of the people, and vainly hope they will pass with the moment, or do they fear the implication of the President, together with many of his most particular political friends? We repeat, to us their silence is inexplicable.

In reference to the prohibiting the transfer of property from father to son, and the abolition of the rite of matrimony, we have only to say that these are but the legitimate fruits of the anti-christian principles noticed above. These they do not hope to effect while the christian system and the christian church are in existence. Mr. Brownson tells us plainly that the "destruction of the church and the priesthood