

# Willoughby Recorder.

UNION, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE LAWS—THE GUARDIANS OF OUR LIBERTY.

Vol. XVIII.

THURSDAY, JULY 5, 1838.

No. 937.



From the Philadelphia Saturday Courier.

## ATHEISM.

BY W. C. EVERETT, ESQ.

"The fool hath said in his heart there is no God."  
Sceptic! cast thine eyes around thee,  
And o'er Nature look abroad;  
Let her many voices tell thee  
Of thy mighty Maker—God!  
To the spangled vault above thee,  
Now thine eye beclouded raise;  
Read its burning hymn of glory  
To the great Creator's praise.  
Turn thee to the troubled ocean,  
Mark the wonders of the deep;  
See you ought in its commotion,  
In its waves that never sleep!  
View the young Spring's flowery rainbow,  
Mark the zephyr's odorous, bland;  
Let the Sunn's verdant garments,  
Speak they not a Maker's hand?  
Look at Autumn's yellow sheaves;  
View the grain's vines running o'er;  
Bright has reared the Summer leaves,  
And the woods are gay no more.  
Listen now to Winter's murmur;  
See he comes with frost and blight;  
Filling stoutest hearts with tremor,  
Clothed in tempest, storm and night.  
Sceptic! when you mark these dials,  
When you heed stern Reason's nod;  
Tell me, proud one, tell me truly,  
Can you say, "There is no God!"

## SUMMARY JUSTICE OF OLDEN TIME.

In the early settlement of the colony of Connecticut, about the year 1642, under the administration of Edward Hopkins, who for several years was Governor of the Colony, a law was passed by the General Court, as it was then called, prohibiting the killing of deer during those months in the year in which they were poor and of little or no value; and subjecting the offender to the penalty of a fine of forty shillings, "one moiety thereof to be paid to the treasurer of the town wherein the offence should be committed, and the other moiety to him who shall sue for and prosecute the same to effect. And in case the delinquent shall neglect or refuse to pay such fine, he shall be publicly whipped on the naked body, not exceeding 20 stripes."

Some time in the month of April, a month in which the law forbade the killing of deer, one of the Governor's neighbors called on him and stated that a buck, for a length of time, had been in the habit of feeding on a field of wheat near his house, belonging to him, and had become fat—praying his excellency, under the circumstances, to give him permission to kill the deer. The Governor replied, "I possess no authority by which I can dispense with the law—it would be of evil tendency and by no means admissible." The applicant urged his suit by informing the Governor that he was poor, had a family of small children; that although it was out of the season for killing deer, yet the buck had fattened upon his property, and it would be a great favor to have permission to kill it. "I cannot," replied the Governor, firmly, "permit any one, under any circumstances whatever, to violate the law—if you should proceed to kill the deer, have you any reason to suppose any one would feel disposed to prosecute?" "I have one neighbor," replied the applicant, naming him, "who like myself, is poor, and who frequently kills deer himself contrary to the law, though nobody complains of him—this neighbor, I have reason to fear, would prosecute for the benefit of that part of the penalty to which he would be entitled by the statute." "But," said the Governor, "in case you should kill the deer—though remember I give you no permission to do it, would it not be advisable for you to make a present to that neighbor of a quarter of the venison to secure his friendship and silence?" Upon this, the applicant, without pressing his Excellency farther, made his bow and retired.

About three weeks after this, the neighbor who had been named, called upon the Governor, made complaint, and demanded a warrant against one of his neighbors for killing a deer contrary to law. "What evidence," asked the Governor, "have you in support of your complaint?" "Why," replied the complainant, "he told me himself he killed the deer, and more than that, he gave me a quarter of the venison." "Indeed!" said the Governor, "and how did you find it? was it eatable at this time of the year?" "O yes sir," replied the complainant, "it was really fat—we have had an open winter, you know sir, and the deer fed on a field of wheat belonging to the man that killed it, and was as fat as deer usually are in the fall of the year."

Upon this disclosure of facts, the Governor suggested to the complainant whether it would not be better the thing pass off without any prosecution. "You ought to

consider," said he, "we are here in a new country—provisions are scarce—many of us experience great difficulties in sustaining our families—you are not insensible that the reason and object of the law were to prevent the destruction of the deer during the season in which they are poor, and not fit to be eaten—you say this venison was fat, and had become so by feeding on the wheat of the neighbor who killed it. In addition to this, you acknowledge he gave you a quarter of the venison. Now, under all these circumstances, would it not be considered unreasonable and even ungrateful, to insist on prosecuting this neighbor, who by your own account, has been so kind to you?"

But notwithstanding these suggestions this second Shylock continued to press his suit, observing to the Governor, "I know my rights, sir—I know I am entitled to one half of the legal penalty—I also know, sir, you are sworn to maintain and execute the law—you cannot, you dare not disallow my complaint and deny me the benefit of the law!" The complaint was filed, a warrant issued upon it, and the delinquent was arrested and brought before the court, and upon being put to plead the matters charged in the complaint, pleaded "guilty."

As soon as the Governor had pronounced the sentence of the law upon him, the delinquent, in a mild but firm tone of voice, replied, "situated as I am, I cannot undertake to pay the fine of forty shillings—I feel unwilling to starve my wife and children by shutting my back from the lash of the whip—I shall offer it as a satisfaction in lieu of the fine." The Governor accordingly made out and delivered to the constable the warrant of execution. A knowledge of the proceedings among the neighbors against the prosecutor, and had brought them together to attend and hear the trial. The delinquent presented his naked back to the officer, observing to him that it would be unnecessary to tie his hands as he should neither make resistance nor attempt to escape. The constable tied a tight tow string to the end of a short stick and began to perform his duty, by strokes more suitable to brush away flies than to inflict pain upon the back of a criminal. The Governor who stood by with his law book under his arm, counted for the constable; and as soon as ten were numbered, cried out, "stop, sir, let us see how the law reads!" Then opening the book, read "the other moiety to him who shall sue for and prosecute the same to effect."

"This prosecutor is entitled to one half of the penalty—take him and bestow upon him the remaining ten stripes." "O, but stop a little," said he, starting back, "touch me if you dare! Why, I have not been tried—you can't whip me," and made some attempt to escape. But the bystanders, regarding the command of the Governor, more than the moanings of the complainant, instantly laid hands upon him, not in the most tender and delicate manner, and having bared his back, and by the assistance of cords placed him in a posture of hugging a tree, made room for the approach of the officer. The tow string was now exchanged for a good and sufficient horse-whip—Mr. Constable," said the Governor, "you are acquainted with the circumstances attending this case—I hope you will perform your duty faithfully." "Yes, please your Excellency," replied the constable, "I think I know my duty, and I guess I shall discharge it to the satisfaction of all present, with the exception of one only. I have already executed one sentence according to law—this I intend to execute according to law and equity both."

By the time the stripes were all told, the sufferer's back exhibited ample testimony of the indignant feeling of the spectator, and presented a durable *sarcographic* record of the prompt administration of summary justice.

## SEVENTY-SIX.

Wives, whose husbands show but little fondness for home, should examine carefully their general conduct, to see if they are not themselves partly to blame for this alienation. If a wife does all in her power to make her husband fond of home, and carefully avoids any word or exhibition of temper that would tend to make him feel uncomfortable while there, even if he has shown a fondness for one company, she will gradually and surely win him to his own fireside. A drunkard is of course an exception. The wife of a drunkard must suffer without hope in this world; but she should suffer in patient hope of a resurrection to a life of blessedness, after the toil and pain of her mortal existence is over.

The Newport Mercury of Saturday week announces that that number completes eighty years since the said paper was first published by James, elder brother of Dr. Benjamin Franklin.

An excellent Test.—If you want to know whether it is safe to trust a man with goods on credit, see if he is a paying subscriber to some good newspaper.

## Debate in the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

### Speech of Mr. Bond,

(or onto.)

On Mr. Hopkins's Resolution to divorce the Government from the Press.

(Concluded.)

But, Mr. Speaker, no man better knows all the use of office than Mr. Kendall. I have read a political tract, written, I think, by Dean Swift, entitled somewhat in this way: "The convenience of a place at Court, or a sure mode of providing garments for a whole family." Mr. Kendall appears to understand the "modus operandi" of this matter. The printed list of clerks in his Department exhibits his father-in-law and two nephews, with salaries of \$1,000, \$1,200, and \$1,400; and thus we see a family provision of nearly \$10,000 a year, including his own salary. But Mr. Kendall is not the only officer who thus takes care of his own household. If provision of this kind be evidence of "faith," few of them will be found "infidels." The President's son has an office, which I have already mentioned, of \$1,500 a year. The Secretary of State's son, until very lately, held the place of District Attorney in Alabama. A near relation by marriage of the Secretary of the Treasury has a comfortable annuity of \$1,400 in the Navy Department; another holds the appointment of naval officer in Boston, with a salary of 3,000 per year, besides being President of the Lafayette Bank of that city; and a third is the Cashier of the Franklin Bank of that city, which became a special pet under the pet bank system. These gentlemen would all make excellent sub-Treasurers!

Mr. Bond said, when the proposition for retrenchment was under consideration here in 1828, the friends of Mr. Adams, by way of proving that he and they desired every just economy and reform, pointed to his Message recommending it. How were they answered? Why, sir, Mr. Ingham, who soon afterwards was made Secretary of the Treasury, said it was indeed true that the Message did recommend it, but he wanted to see more practice and less profession in this matter. There were no specified reforms found in the Message; he could only find there one of those formal recommendations, which were as unmeaning, he said, as the words "your humble servant" at the foot of a letter. Mr. Randolph, in the same debate, used this language, on the subject of retrenchment and reform:

"The President did recommend them in one of those lofty generalities with which all sermons, political or religious, abound; which might be printed in blank, like law process, and filled as occasions might require. But, sir, (said he,) I am for looking at the practices, and not at the precepts of the parson, political or religious."

Mr. Bond said this rule of Mr. Randolph was perfectly just; it was thus shown, too, to be avowed by this Administration, and he was willing to judge them by their own rule, and thought to this they ought not to object. He would leave it to the House and to the People to say whether the "practices" of this Administration "had conformed to their precepts."

Was the recommendation in General Jackson's inaugural address one of those "lofty generalities" just spoken of, and defined by Mr. Randolph? The "Unit Cabinet" must have lost the art of reading, otherwise "reform" was not quite so "legibly inscribed" as the General imagined. That patronage of the Federal Government which was said to be brought into conflict with the freedom of state elections has greatly increased, and is still unrestrained in the same conflict.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Bell) has for years labored to bring this House to the consideration of a bill to secure the freedom of elections, and thus carry into effect the recommendation of General Jackson's inaugural address. Able as that gentleman is, and untiring as he has been in his efforts, the measure proposed by him has received the frowns instead of the favor of the Administration. He and the venerable Senator from the same state (Mr. White) were the early and devoted friends of General Jackson, and they still desire to carry into practical effect the principles which they, with General Jackson, profess to be governed by. They feel and know the imminent danger which threatens the country, in the increased strength of the patronage of office. They see, and we all see, that the office holders are "abroad in the land." For a description of this growing phylax and its powerful incentive to action, I will draw on high authority. A member of the Senate (Mr. Grundy), a zealous friend of General Jackson, the evidence of which has been already given in his own words, held this language, when aiming to pull down the old Administration: "When I see (said he) an office holder interfering in elections, it has occurred to me that he was thinking of his salary, and is, therefore, an unfit adviser of the People."

Mr. Speaker, that which occurred to

Mr. Grundy no doubt often occurred to you at the same period. The proposition is a very natural one, and I think that recent events have strengthened rather than impaired its truth. But I beg the future indulgence of the House while I read what another distinguished friend of General Jackson said, when debating the subject of retrenchment and reform on this floor. I allude to Mr. Buchanan, now a Senator from Pennsylvania, and, with his continued and growing devotion to the party, what he said will certainly be considered "orthodox." I find, by that debate, that he said it was well known

"That when a man is once appointed to office, all the selfish passions of his nature are enlisted for the purpose of retaining it. The office-holders (said he) are the enlisted soldiers of that Administration by which they are all sustained. Their comfortable existence often depends upon the re-election of their patron. Nor does disappointment long rankle in the hearts of the disappointed. Hope is still left to them; and bearing disappointment with patience they know will present a new claim to office at a future time."

This passage of Mr. Buchanan's speech proves him to have been an observer of men and things, and familiar with the leading principles of human action. He dreaded the consequences of the selfish spirit of the office-holder, and induced the country to believe that Gen. Jackson and his friends would provide a suitable restraint upon it. But I fear, sir, the People will be left to conclude that this gentleman is one of those "political parsons" described by Mr. Randolph, whose "practices" do not correspond with his "precepts." It is certain that, under the favorite Administration of the gentleman and his friends, the office-holders have received new life instead of a check. But I must yet point out another discrepancy between Mr. Buchanan's profession and practice. In the same debate, he reviewed, with censure, several of the foreign missions, that to Russia included; and particularly condemned any practice allowing a minister to "return after one year's absence." His language is: "If such a practice should prevail, our ministers, in violation of the spirit of the existing law, will receive, by adding the outfit to the salary, \$18,000, instead of \$9,000, for one year's service." "I am," said he, "against the practice." This, Mr. Speaker, was his precept. But, sir, in a brief space of time after condemning and saying "I am against the practice," we see him take the bounty and become one of the "enlisted soldiers" whom he had described, and go on a foreign mission to Russia, where, after staying "a twelve-month and a day," he pockets the "18,000, instead of \$9,000, for a year's service," and comes home!

This seems to be an appropriate time to compare the precepts and practice of Mr. Randolph, too, who said he "was for looking at the practice, and not the precepts, of the parson political or religious." In that same debate, Mr. Randolph said he "could not permit any motion connected with the division of the spoil, to mingle with" his exertions. He would not, he said, give up his constituents and the pleasure of his home, "for a clerkship in the War Office, or a foreign mission; or even for a Department of State." He said, "there had been an improvement in the plan of sending ministers abroad, and bringing them back, when they have finished their business; for," said he, "they are now sent abroad on *sleeveless errands*, that they may come back *re-infected*, to pocket their emoluments." Mr. Speaker, the Greeks and Romans both held it to be a highly useful, but exceedingly difficult matter to know one's self. Modern history, and our own times, add new force to the truth of that position. I do not at all question the perfect sincerity of Mr. Randolph, when he uttered the sentiments; but great as he may have been, and skillful as he professed to be, and no doubt, was, in the motive of human action, after events proved how little he knew of himself. Sir, we soon found Mr. Randolph given up his constituents, and leaving all the boasted emoluments of his district, for a foreign mission to Russia, where, so far as any public advantage resulted from it, he emphatically went on a "*sleeveless errand*," and "*came back re-infected*, to pocket his emoluments!" Indeed, this mission to Russia seems to have been specially dedicated by "the party" to short terms of six and twelve months, for the advantage of some of the "enlisted soldiers" described by Mr. Buchanan. In this way, the cost of that mission has been inordinately increased; and it is high time that this drain on the public Treasury for private benefit should be checked.

Mr. Bond said it was not to be disguised that many of the politicians who engaged in the debate and strife of the times to which he had alluded, had been surprised, if not disappointed, by events which soon followed. A singular exchange of position has taken place between two of these gentlemen. When the retrenchment resolution was discussed, a friend of the then Administration,

Mr. Pearce of Rhode Island, took ground, not in terms, but somewhat similar to that now avowed and practised by the dominant party, "that the spoils belong to the victors." Mr. Wickliffe, a Jackson reformer, denied and condemned such a right. He was appointed a member of the retrenchment and reform committee, and, after General Jackson came into power, Mr. Wickliffe zealously endeavored to carry out the promised reform; but not finding the co-operation he had expected, he abandoned the "party." About this time, it happened that the reformers avowed the doctrine "that the spoils belong to the victors," and Mr. Pearce enlisted under their banner.

Sir, has not the country been disappointed and altered by specious and vain promises? Has not the Federal Executive patronage inordinately increased, and is it not still unrestrained? Is not the power over it abused and perverted? Do not the expenses of our General Government far transcend in amount all our past history? Why are these things so, and why has not this "plague been stayed," Mr. Speaker, according to your pledged faith? I will tell you why, sir, but I prefer doing so in the language and illustration of one of your own friends, Mr. Buchanan, of the Senate, to whom I have before referred. In his speech here, to which I have already alluded, and when he was assailing the (then) administration, he thus exclaimed: "The very possession of power has a strong, a natural tendency to corrupt the heart. The lust of dominion grows with its possession; and the man who, in humble life, was pure and innocent and just, has often been transformed, by long possession of power, into a monster. In the sacred Book, which contains lessons of wisdom for the politician as well as for the Christian, we find a happy illustration of the corrupting influence of power upon the human heart. When Hazeal came to consult Elisha whether his master, the King of Syria, would recover from a dangerous illness; the prophet, looking through the vista of futurity, saw the crimes of which the messenger, who stood before him, would be guilty, and he wept. Hazeal asked 'why weepeth my lord?' The prophet then recounted to him the murders and the cruelties of which he should be guilty towards the children of Israel. Hazeal, in the spirit of virtuous indignation, replied: 'Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?' And Elisha answered: 'The Lord hath shown me that thou shalt be King over Syria.' This man afterwards became King, by the murder of his master, and was guilty of enormities, the bare recital of which makes us shudder."

How true, and, alas! how applicable is this sacred illustration to those who invoked its use in elevating themselves to power!

Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that some inspired Elisha had been present when you and Mr. Buchanan, with others engaged in the debate which has been referred to, and moved by the sympathetic tear of the prophet, you had asked, "Why weepeth my lord?" how would you have been astonished in being then told what the People of this country have since realized!

Imagine, sir, the inspired one looking through the vista of a few brief years, and saying: "You will be placed in power, but will greatly increase the amount of all public expenditures. You will use the offices and patronage of the country for private and not for public good. You will create offices for favorites. You will enlarge all Executive power. You will deny the right to call for reasons on a removal from office, and in a few years will remove more than 1500 persons from office for opinion's sake! You will derange and corrupt the Post Office Department, which you now admit to be sound, and you will not reform any of your designated abuses in the other Departments. You will appoint more members of Congress to office in four years than has been done in all the past history of the Government. Your bill for the abolition of the power and patronage over the Press will sleep the sleep of death. You will retain the press, the post office, the armed force, and the appointing power in the hands of the President, and will not suffer them to change position and take post on the side of the People." You now censure a small appropriation to purchase some additional furniture for the President's house, but you will furnish that house in luxurious style for General Jackson, who will be succeeded by Mr. Van Buren; and he, not content with the second-hand furniture of his predecessor, will cast it off and make his entry into that edifice, with one appropriation of \$7,300 for alterations of the house and superintendence of the grounds, and another appropriation of \$20,000 for new furniture; and this, too, in the very year when your public treasury will be bankrupt. You will increase the expenses of foreign missions and suffer your Ministers to return home on such brief service as will show their appointments to have been made for individual gain rather than public good. You will increase the contingent expen-

ses of this House from \$80,000, the present annual amount to 210,000. You will add to the like expenses of the Senate and to all other public expenditures in the same ratio; and the sum total for the whole total civil list and ordinary appropriations of the Government, which is now \$12,163,438, will be increased from time to time under your boasted reform, until it shall exceed thirty millions per year!

You now question the right of a Department to purchase a print or likeness of the immortal Washington; but will decorate every room in all the Departments with portraits of Martin Van Buren. You will by means of the "office holders," the "enlisted soldiers," as you have just called them, bring the patronage of the General Government into conflict with the freedom of elections, and you will resist the bill that shall be brought in to secure the freedom of those elections. You, Mr. Randolph, will go upon what you call a "*sleeveless errand*," and, after saluting the Emperor of Russia, will make a pleasant sojourn in "old England," and return to your estate in Virginia. You, Mr. Buchanan, will become an "office-holder," go on your mission to Russia which you are now censuring, and will pocket the \$18,000 for "a twelve-month and a day's" service. You, (to the gentleman from New York,) Mr. Cambreleng, will oppose a vote against the very measure which you now report and recommend, for reducing the pay of members, as a means of shortening the session of Congress. You, Mr. Stevenson, will be made Speaker of this House, and appoint its committees, and dispense its rules, with the promise of a foreign mission in your pocket. You, Mr. Benton, will vote to lay on the table the bill which you now report, to take the patronage of the press from the Government, and your report on Executive patronage with its six accompanying bills so imposingly introduced, will prove to have been but as "*sounding brass and tinkling cymbals*!" You, Mr. Van Buren, who now, as a member of the committee on Executive patronage, report a bill requiring reasons to be assigned for removing an incumbent from office, will be made Secretary of State, and in due time President, but from the moment you obtain power, you will forget your bill, and not only violate but refuse to be governed by its principles. You, Mr. Dickerson, also a member of that committee, will be made Secretary of the Navy; but the Department will be so mismanaged under your direction, that it will be truly said of you on the floor of Congress, "there is none so poor as to do him reverence." You, Mr. Woodbury, will take first the Navy and then the Treasury Department, and, under your supervision, an attempt to humbug the People with the promise of an exclusive hard-money currency will result in the banishment of all specie, a bankrupt treasury, and a circulation of shill-pasters and treasury notes.

Imagine, then, Mr. Speaker, such a response to have been made at the period of time which I have suggested. What would have been your reply, and what would Mr. Buchanan, who made the scriptural allusion, have said? Methinks I almost see and hear him exclaim, "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?" We are told that, notwithstanding the indignation of Hazeal, he reached the throne of Syria by murdering the King his master, and soon committed all the enormities foretold by the prophet!

Sir, I fear that, in despite of the protestations of Amos Kendall, the promised "reform" was "an empty sound," intended to apply merely to a change of men." But I leave it for this House and for the People of this country to judge whether their confidence has not been betrayed and their hopes disappointed.

Interesting Pension Case.—Among the large number of Pension bills that were passed in the House of Representatives last Saturday, was one in which the Pension was claimed under peculiar circumstances. It was that of Benjamin Gennet, who claimed a pension in right of his wife, Deborah Shurtleff, who enlisted in April 1781, in one of the Massachusetts regiments, and served two years in the war of the revolution, after which she was honorably discharged, having been seriously wounded at Tarrytown, in 1783. She married, received a pension, and died, and her husband now claimed her pension, as in the case of widows of revolutionary soldiers. The bill passed without any opposition.

A two story brick building, nearly finished, at the corner of Monument and Forrest streets, Baltimore, was crushed to a heap of utter ruins a few days since merely by the weight of its slate roof. It belonged to Mr. Azolle, and was to be occupied by his family in two weeks.

A new treaty has been made by the French with Achmet, by which the latter, after two years, is to pay a tribute, until when the French are to hold possession of Constantine and Stora—the French to monopolize the trade of the province.