

# Wilmington Recorder.

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

Vol. XX.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 1840.

No. 1035.

For the Recorder.

The night cometh when no man can work. John ix. 4.

A very gracious intimation. Lord, grant that I may never forget it; and that now, now is the time in which to provide for eternity.

What a wise man, then, when he comes to die, would wish he had done, that he ought to do forthwith; for death is at hand and the consequences of a surprise most dreadful. He will then wish, if he has not done it with all his soul.

First, That he had made a just and christian settlement of his worldly concerns; so as not to be distracted with the cares of this world, when all his thoughts should be upon another.

Secondly, That he had made his peace with God by a timely repentance.

Thirdly, That he had faithfully discharged the duties of his calling.

Fourthly, That he had weaned his affections from things temporal, and loosened the ties which fasten us to the world.

Fifthly, That he had crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts; so that, being weary of this life, he might be more desirous of a better.

Sixthly, That he had got such habits of patience and resignation to the will of God, during his health, as may render death, with all the train of miseries leading to it, less frightful and amazing.

Seventhly, and lastly, That by a constant practice of devotion preparatory for death, he had learned what to pray for, what to hope for, what to depend on in his last sickness.

And this, gracious Lord, is what I wish for, what I pray for, and what I purpose shall be the constant practice of my life. Amen.

Bishop Wilson.

## Letters from Georgia.

A friend has directed our attention to the following interesting letters of the Rev. William Moseley, a worthy and distinguished minister of the Baptist Church in Georgia. They contain matters which deserve the serious consideration of the honest and reflecting of both parties.

From the Georgia Journal.

Henry county, Ga. June 7, 1840.

Fellow Citizens of the State Rights Party, and all others who feel your distress arising from the derangement of the currency, and the consequent embarrassed state of commerce and agriculture—and especially you, who eat your bread by the sweat of your face—you, who have no motive to induce you to support an administration, which is aristocratic in its tendency; and like the rolling of the mighty current, is bearing you and your children to the gulf of vassalage, wretchedness and misery—I entreat you to suffer an humble ploughman to place a few reflections before you, viz:

The time is rapidly approaching when we shall be called upon to exercise the small remains of sovereignty which the encroachments of the Federal Government have left in our hands—in casting our votes for President and Vice President of the United States—which should be a matter of the greatest importance with us, and above every other temporal consideration in this world; for our peace and happiness, as well as that of our children and children's children, depend much on our conduct in casting our votes at this time, and therefore we should retrospect past events, and if we find any thing disastrous growing out of the conduct of the present and past Administration, we should judge of the future by the past, and act upon principles, and not for the sake of party, in casting our votes with an eye to the good of the country.

It is a point now well settled, that one of two men, either Martin Van Buren or Wm. Henry Harrison, will be our next President—and notwithstanding many contend that we should not of two evils take the least, yet I think differently. I admit, if we were left to voluntary choice whether we would take one of two evils, or let both alone, and not partake of evil at all, neither directly or indirectly, I would say, stand aloof. But if it is a matter of necessity, and we must have one or the other, I say—reason, good sense, and wisdom and prudence all say—take the least, which will be exemplified in the following statement, viz: If you were starving, and the chance was a half loaf or no bread, would you say, No bread? I think not. If you must have one eye put out, or both, either of which would be evil, would you not say, one? If you must lose one horse or all, would you not say, one? I am bound to believe all would say, one, every time. Believing, then, that we are destined to have

one of the men to rule over us, we should determine whether the choice of either would be an evil to the country; and, of course, if either, or both, would be an evil, choose the one that would afford a half loaf to a famished Republic. It therefore becomes a duty we owe to ourselves, to our children, and to our forefathers, who purchased our liberty by their blood and lives, to determine whether the choice of Mr. Van Buren would be an evil; or whether the choice of Harrison would be an evil; and if both are evils, of two choose the least. I shall first examine the administration of Mr. Van Buren, and then determine the future by the past, which is the only correct way I know of determining things in futurity, and which is done according to the rule, same cause same effect. I now proceed to examine the first case by saying—

1st. Is there distress in the land such as never has been witnessed, since the Revolutionary War? Your answer must be yes.

2d. What has produced it? Has famine? No. Has the sword? No. What, then, say you? Overtrading, and the fall of produce? Granted. But all this is an effect produced by some cause—and what is that cause? I answer overtrading and the rise of property arose from the country's being flooded with paper money, and that arose from the checks being removed that operated on our local banks, viz:—the United States Bank. And this, together with the highland and unconstitutional interference with the Treasury in the removal of the deposits, deranged the monetary affairs of the country, affected commerce, reduced the price of produce, and left the whole country in debt. And no sooner did the banks discover this, than they, with a few exceptions, changed their operations from that for which they were chartered, to that of Brokers, and thus united with the aristocracy of the country, for the purpose of crushing the poor and laboring part of the community, which is the backbone and sinew of the country, and make them hewers of wood and drawers of water to a proud and profligate aristocracy, which always has and always will support a monarchial head. And yet they raise a mighty shout—"Huzzas for Mr. Van Buren and the Independent Treasury, and hard money currency!"—and I believe this is the reason some of the State Rights party have gone over to Van's support; and in evidence of this, show me one leading man that has gone, that is not wielding a money capital, either directly, or indirectly, privately or in bank, if you can. (I am sure it will not be Mr. Cooper.) They know, fellow-citizens, if there is a change in the Administration, there will be a change in policy, and the hope of their gain is gone. But you say: Mr. Van Buren did not do this. Granted. But his predecessor did, and he stands pledged to follow in his steps; and in evidence of the fulfilling of that pledge, see him pursuing the course, and instead of giving a hard money currency, he is converting the Treasury into a bank, and issuing thousands and millions of Treasury notes, (and God bless you, a Treasury note is not made of gold or silver) and thus, while he promises gold and silver, you get paper! While he professes to divorce the banks from the government, he is converting the whole Treasury into a bank, over which he, if successful, will exercise an entire control, and thus at once snatch, grasp sword and purse, and with his standing army, which he is trying to obtain, with the sword in one hand and the purse in the other, he will carry his points and compel me and you to do his bidding. But you still say his course is calculated to put down the banks. Well, if it is, why has it not done it? We have had three years experience, and I ask you candidly, are there fewer banks now, than there were then? or are there more? If there are more, then the argument is, it is not calculated to put down, but to increase banks.

That Martin Van Buren did give his vote in favor of the Missouri restriction, cannot be denied. That he did vote to allow free negroes to vote, provided they were worth a certain amount of property, thus placing the negro upon an equal footing with the white man, and at the same time favoring aristocracy, cannot be denied. That he does admit the constitutional right of Congress to interfere with the subject of slavery, but says it would be impolitic, will not be denied. That there has been a greater waste of public money under this Administration, than under that of any other President of the United States, will not be denied. I think. That he has been for and against almost every one, and every thing, except retrenchment in the expenses of the government, and that he has always been against, I think cannot be denied. That the distress of the country has been and is worse than under any other Administration, will not be denied. And that these things did not exist under any other Administration, and commenced only with the present policy of the Executive, and his predecessor, I think will be admitted by all.

Now, if cause produce effect, and the effect is visible, we must trace it to the conduct of the Executive of the United States. Then if he stands pledged to pursue that course, and that course is bringing, and has brought, ruin upon you, the case is a plain one, that he stands pledged to ruin you, and has ruined many, and intends to ruin the balance, and one more term will effect it. I ask you then will you suffer him to do it? God forbid!

I now enter upon the examination by which I shall determine whether General Harrison is preferable, like the half loaf, and in doing this, I will first notice the objectionable acts of General Harrison, and compare them with Mr. Van Buren's; secondly, the reports in circulation against him; and thirdly, the evidence in his favor.

1st. Did General Harrison vote for the tariff? He did; and did not Mr. Van Buren? But did he vote for it in 1828, or was it at a previous period? It at a previous period, did not Mr. Crawford and other republicans do the same, for the reason that the government was in debt and required it?

Was he friendly to the Force Bill? He was; and was not Mr. Van Buren and Judge White? Yes.

Was he a member of a Colonization Society? He was; but was that an Abolition Society? No. What then! It was for the purpose of settling the free negroes in Africa, in order to destroy the evil influence which their presence had upon the slave, and to prevent their being a pest to the whites, and to better their condition, with a hope it might be the means of carrying the word of the Lord, and the gospel of the Son of God, to those benighted negroes.

Is he called a Federalist? He is by some. Does that make or prove him to be one? No. Is Mr. Van Buren called by the same name? He is by some. If Harrison's being called a Federalist, proves him to be one, then Mr. Forsyth is a Federalist—for I am told that Mr. Schley beat him once for Major, because Forsyth was a worse Federalist than Schley; and has not Gov. Schley been called a Federalist again? Yes. But did not Mr. Randolph call Harrison a Federalist to his face? He did; but did Harrison own the charge to be true, any further than Adams' Administration related to the French Government? No. And pray what was Mr. Randolph called? Let facts speak. What was the reason that the name of the county of Jasper was altered from Randolph to Jasper? Answer, good fellows! But many good-hearted laboring young men know but little about those by gone days, and make up their verdict from evidence afforded from garbled extracts you raise them, made by designing persons, which they should not do. Then hear an old grey-headed ploughman, and ask your unassuming, plain farming fathers, is it true? But did not the elder Adams' appoint him to that office? He did. Well, does not that prove him a Federalist? No—for Washington done it first, and Madison and others followed suit.

I now come to the 3d proposition. Did Harrison serve his country from the age of eighteen years to the close of the War?—He did. Did he gain more victories according to the number of battles he fought, than any other commander in the United States? I think he did. Did he enjoy the confidence of the army, officers and men? I think he did—for I took the newspapers, then, and I recollect about it—and those chaps that had on their hippons then, and are now spouting about, cannot fool the old ploughman, if they were born to a fortune. Has he proved himself honest? He has. Has he proved himself disinterested and a friend to the South? I think he has, or he would not have voted to receive Missouri without restriction, when he knew and foretold that it would be the cause of his political death. Is he yet poor—the result of sacrifice, honesty and disinterestedness? I am told that he is. Has he told the abolitionists that none but an incarnate devil could view without horror the scene their course was calculated to produce? I think he has, or words to that amount. Has he given evidence that he is a friend to his country and fellow-beings? I say unhesitatingly, he has.

And now, fellow-citizens, let me ask you who is the most likely to sympathize with in your sufferings, and if placed in power, to afford relief—the rich or the poor—the disinterested or designing?—Heaven, doth the rich oppress you, &c. State Rights men! Union men! of Georgia—and poor laboring men all over these United States (of which class I am.) I think you cannot hesitate.—We have a chance for a half loaf—yes, I think a whole one. The power is now in your own hands. I call upon you, therefore, to come to the rescue, and in the power of your might, rally around Wm. Henry Harrison and John Tyler, and proclaim to the world that you intend to remain free. We have not had a real good President, since we had a Virginian. We have not had a good one since we had a poor man, and I fear we will not have till we get another. Then I call upon you to put on strength and let the aristocracy know that you are not prepared to

be tenants, and hewers of wood, and drawers of water to a proud and unfeeling set.

Adieu for the present.

WILLIAM MOSELEY.

From the Georgia Journal.

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON. The brave and skillful general, the wise and firm politician, the prudent farmer, the poor man's friend, and the people's candidate for President of the United States.

MISSOURI. EDITORS:—Since my last I have been ploughing, and thinking about the striking similarity between our condition as a government, and that of ancient Rome in the days of Cincinnatus, and the striking resemblance between the character and conduct of old Cincinnatus and that of Wm. H. Harrison. Ancient Rome was a republic, and through the wisdom, patriotism, and eloquence of Cincinnatus, was prosperous. He, thinking the course of affairs being well directed, and relying upon the wisdom and patriotism of his fellow-citizens, and desiring repose, retired to his farm, no doubt hoping all would go well. But soon through a course of bad policy, the peace of the government was disturbed, and its prosperity blighted. In this state of affairs, the repose of the old man was disturbed, by a committee from the people, who waited upon him, and finding him at his plough, laid their petition before him, who, though fond of retirement and repose, with a deep sigh, influenced by love of country and regard for his fellow-citizens, left his plough and domestic enjoyment, repaired to the post assigned him, and through his wisdom, firmness, and patriotism, peace and prosperity were again restored. So Wm. H. Harrison, when 18 years old, left the delightful home of his patriotic father, took upon himself the hardships and braved the dangers of the tented field, the scalping knife and tomahawk of the northern Indians, until they were humbled, and peace restored to our north-western frontier. He enjoyed the confidence of Washington, Adams, Jefferson and Madison, in evidence of which see the appointments he received, and which he honored by a disinterested and faithful discharge of duty, until the close of the late war with Great Britain, when, in evidence of the people's knowledge of his firmness and ability, he is placed by them in the national council of our republic.—There he commanded respect, until his disinterested and patriotic voice upon the Missouri question, which he fearlessly gave, impelled by the love of country and equal rights, and with a full knowledge as expressed by himself that it would result in his political death. People of the South! Ploughmen! think! O think! He not only fought your battles, but he laid down his political life in defending your interest. Do you, can you want a greater evidence of his regard for you? I think not. Methinks I hear a general response from the ploughmen of Georgia—"No—it is enough." Well, fellow citizens, did he begin now to act like ambitious and aspiring politicians, to cut and come, and change his coat? No. But delighted with the prospect of peace and prosperity attending his beloved country, he breathes his benediction for her future welfare, and retires to his plough.

But, fellow citizens, when Harrison was in the field fighting your battles, where was Mr. Van Buren? By his side! No—not he. When Harrison gave the vote in your favor by which he laid down his political life for you, where was Mr. Van Buren?—by his side, acting a similar part? No—not he. But I will tell you where he was a while before, and what he was doing. He was in the Senate of New York instructing her Senators and Representatives to vote against the reception of Missouri into the Union unless she would strike Slavery from her constitution.

But what has been Mr. Van Buren's general course in a political point of view? He was against and for the war—he was against and for James Madison—he was for and against De Witt Clinton—he was for and against the Tariff—he was against and for Jackson, and now as the nominee of General Jackson, stands pledged to tread in his steps. But has he done it. If yes, why the difference in the condition of the country? What has he promised you? He has promised a sound currency and your pockets filled with gold and silver—and you get paper while he and his office holders get the gold and silver; and such has been the fact, and you know it, that instead of a sound currency, necessity has compelled persons to issue shill-pennies, and to receive them and glad to get them, notwithstanding it is a violation of law. He promised retrenchment and an economical administration of the government, and you have witnessed the extravagance and the creation of public debt, which he says will take five millions of dollars in Treasury notes to pay it. He promised a sound currency, and prosperity as the result, and you have witnessed an entire derangement of our currency, commerce seriously affected, our credit sunk, the people in debt, the price of produce prostrated, the value of property reduced one-half and still going

down—the banks with a few exceptions, turned brokers, and you placed in the power of a few moneyed men, without the means to extricate yourselves. You already hear the sheriff and bailiff crying O yes! O yes! Fellow-citizens poor men, was it so before? If not, it is evident the unwise course of the present Administration has been the first cause; and if a few years has produced such a change, what will four more do? I will tell you—pass two thirds of your real estates under the Sheriff's hammer, and into the hand of a few moneyed men, who will soon discover that a white tenant will be cheaper and more profitable to them than a black servant, and will follow the example of their northern brethren, send them to Texas, or some other country, and increase their capital, and you and your children will become hewers of wood and drawers of water to a few rich men and their haughty descendants—and I have no doubt but those northern members that heretofore voted in favor of the abolition petitions, but turned this session and voted against them, saw this, and therefore changed their course, and have, like Martin Van Buren, become Northern men with Southern principles. Poor men of Georgia, one of your number now addresses you, and entreats you to recollect that on the first Monday in November you will hold the power in your own hands. You are, therefore, in making up your mind, either forging the chain to bind you and your posterity, or nerving your arm to burst it asunder. I pray you, then, in the name of all that is sacred and dear to you, to rouse from your slumber; break the spell; and let your united voice be as the sound of many waters, saying to Old Tippecanoe, in the language of the Romans, leave your plough, and come to the helm of our beloved government; and may he who rides upon the stormy cloud, and manages the seas, grant you good speed, is the sincere prayer of.

WILLIAM MOSELEY.

From the Madisonian.

## ANOTHER NEGRO WITNESS CASE.

It is well known throughout the North and the South that Mr. Van Buren has been from the beginning of his administration feeling for the South, and has relied confidently upon the support of that section of the Union, upon the ground assumed by his friends there, that he is a "Northern man with Southern principles." But we take it for granted that every intelligent and honest man in both extremes of the Union has seen enough, if his eyes have been open, to indicate that no true whatever is to be repented in his professions for either or any particular section, or even for the public interest generally. The Hooe case, the vote for negro suffrage and tariff of '28, however they may be regarded at the North, have been examples most unfavorable and fatal to Mr. Van Buren's pretensions to exclusive partiality for the South, while his vote against the suffrage of poor men, his specie exactions, sub-treasury scheme, involving the admitted reduction of the value of property, farmers prices and laborers wages, and his charge upon the people of his native state of being under bank influence because they presumed to rebuke her recreant son, his war upon canals and rail roads, and the credit system, were arguments equally strong to satisfy the people of the North that he had no honest principles or sympathies in common with them.

It is probably well known every where that the testimony of negroes is not admitted in the courts of the slave states in prosecutions against white persons. The consequences of making such testimony competent in such cases, and where the institution of slavery exists, can be easily imagined by any person of common sense. If the Hooe case was a strong one for the South against Mr. Van Buren, we have now to present one which seems to us still stronger, and which seems to have been attended with other circumstances not at all creditable to Mr. Van Buren's abstract sense of justice.—The letter below detailing the circumstances of the case was transmitted to us by a gentleman well known in the nation, whose name, if published, we are sure would be a sufficient warrant for reposing in the statement entire credit. We do not, as at present advised, feel at liberty to append the name which is signed to the manuscript, although we have no doubt the author would, if necessary, permit his name to be made public, or do whatever else should be required to establish the facts briefly stated in the following letter:

New Castle County, Del. Aug. 3, 1840.

Dear Sir:—That the South may be informed correctly, in regard to Mr. Van Buren, I send you for publication certain facts in relation to his approval of negro testimony, in the trial of an officer in the Revenue service, before the Collector of this District in June, 1839.

At that time charges and specifications of them were preferred by a certain Henry D. Nones, a captain in the Revenue Cutter service, against Josiah Murch, then first Lieutenant in the same service.

The Collector of the District, Henry Whiteley, esq., was ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct the examination. Mr. Murch was defended by counsel, and the prosecution in behalf of the Captain carried on by counsel employed by himself. The character of the testimony, on the part of the complainant, generally, was such, that the counsel for Mr. Murch deemed it unnecessary to enter upon any defence—it was composed entirely of the crew and officers under the immediate command of the complainant, Nones—and of NEGROES, his own servants, employed in the ward-room—five negroes, if I am correctly informed, were brought forward to testify; the moment the first was called to the stand, Mr. Murch and his counsel (protesting against such evidence, it not being competent in the courts of this state for negroes to testify against white persons,) left the room—the Collector proceeded, however, to take the testimony, and after closing the same, forwarded it to Washington; the whole of which I presume you can find in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. A copy of one of the negro depositions I now have before me. Mr. Murch had his commission taken from him; the testimony having been laid before the President and APPROVED by him." So unexpected was this decision to Mr. Murch, and indeed to every one who knew the character of the testimony adduced against him, that Mr. Murch thought it proper to appeal directly to the President for reinstatement; he did so, both personally and by letter. To impress more fully upon the minds of the powers that be at Washington the injustice done to him, Mr. Murch forwarded to the Secretary of the Treasury a deposition of one of the negroes, taken at the negro's own request, after his discharge from the Cutter, by a Magistrate of the town of New Castle—in which he states that what he testified to before Col. Whiteley, the Collector, was false; "that he was compelled, by threats made by Capt. Nones, to give such testimony, &c. &c. Upon the receipt of this deposition, by Mr. Woodbury, the Secretary of the Treasury, he informed Mr. Murch, in substance, by letter, "that his testimony of the negro could not go to rebut his first deposition, but might be made the ground work of new proceedings against Capt. Nones." (I have not the letter before me, and therefore merely give the substance.) To which Mr. Murch, under date of September 10, 1839, made the following reply, after acknowledging the receipt of Mr. Woodbury's letter of the 6th instant; he says: "I have to say that the affidavit of Wm. Murch (the negro) sent to the Department, not for the purpose of commencing new proceedings against Captain Nones, or any other person, but with the object of showing to the Department the character of the evidence on which my dismissal has been founded." Several letters were written to the Department and the President by the friends of Mr. Murch, and I think a formal remonstrance sent by his counsel to the Treasury Department. On the 4th of January, 1840, the Secretary of the Treasury wrote to me, (who had addressed a letter directly to the President in regard to Mr. Murch,) as follows: "Sir, in reply to your letter of the 27th ult., to the United States, which has been referred to this Department, I would inform you that Lieut. Murch was dismissed from the Revenue service, by the President, on satisfactory evidence of improper conduct, which, though the charges and proof have been once or twice re-examined, has never been satisfactorily rebutted or explained."

These proceedings are now matter of record, or ought to be, in the Treasury Department. Copies of most of which I took the precaution at the time to retain. If you think any good can be had by publishing it, please do so, and make whatever remarks you may think proper. I will only add that no officer, however high or honest, is safe for a moment, if the government is to tolerate negroes, under the immediate control of an officer, to give testimony against another whom he has thought proper to prefer charges against.

P. S. You will perceive that Woodbury was willing for Murch to make the deposition of the negro Kork, sufficient ground to commence proceedings upon against Nones.

The administration papers in their impotent attempts to shield the Executive from the abominations of Secretary Pinckney's militia project, affirm that "the measure is the favorite hobby of Gen. Harrison himself." This is unqualifiedly false. Gen. Harrison's plan was free from all the objectionable features in Mr. Van Buren's standing army scheme. It did not require the poor man to find his own musket, cartridge box, ammunition, &c. It did not require him to find his own horse and uniform—it did not require him to march twice a year out of his state, perhaps three, four, or five hundred miles, subject to such rules and regulations as the President might think proper to enforce against him—it did not subject