

# HILLSBOROUGH RECORDER.

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

VOL. XXXII.

HILLSBOROUGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1851.

No. 1499.



## RURAL ECONOMY.

"May your rich soil,  
Ere dawn, a star's better blessings pour  
O'er every land."

### Thiring out Vegetables.

There is a greater loss in suffering vegetables to stand too thick, than most cultivators are aware of. It does require considerable nerve to commit indiscriminate slaughter upon fine growing plants. For instance here are ten beautiful melon vines, just beginning to run, with fruit beginning to form. Now, who has the bold hardihood to draw them all to the ground, and throw them wilting away? Who can take the berries just as they give evidence of roots below, and separate them to ten inches? It is a hard matter, we must confess, and is not properly done one time in twenty; but to have bulbs, top-roots, melons, cucumbers or squashes, it must now be done, and the increased vigor of the remaining plants will well repay the trouble. Then fall to and spare not, no top-rooted plant or bulb, should stand so thick that the hoe will not pass freely between them. No vine should have more than four or five plants left to a hill.

Snap beans look so pretty growing thick that we have to disturb them; but if you would have the bushes yield their pendant treasures, thin out to ten inches. We know of nothing that bears as thick planting as English peas; in place of thinning them, shake the ground around them; now that they are in bloom and in pod, they will continue in fruit much longer; the shade enriches the land and saves culture. It is not always those that make the earliest and best start in the garden, that succeed best; but those who thin judiciously and cultivate understandingly. Most gardeners plant seeds too thick, trusting to thinning out in their growing state, but alas! they look so inviting, and plead so eloquently for life, that degenerate inferior plants are the rewards of our false philosophy. Gardeners, now is your time to thin; strike in with a bold hand, and your reward is certain.

Soil of the South.

### Grow your own Potatoes.

A friend of ours received a day or two since a barrel of Irish Potatoes from the plantation of that enterprising farmer and hospitable gentleman, Dr. A. Averit, Esq., of Richland, Onslow County, which were equal in appearance, and, he assures us, fully equal in quality to any of the Northern growth. We are confident that our market could be supplied by our own farmers with this vegetable, at much lower prices than it ordinarily bears. Yet thousands of dollars are annually sent North to purchase this article alone. So it is. With the blessings of Providence showered upon us in every kind and degree, and the means of independence entirely within our control, we prefer to pay tribute to the abolitionists for everything, and content ourselves with the contemptible satisfaction of abusing them. Southern friends, let us preach you a short sermon.

Work out your own independence. Cease quarreling among yourselves about abstractions. Grow your own potatoes, make your own woolsen pails, forge your own iron, build up your own cities, foster your own commerce, marry your wives at home, educate your children at home, spend your money at home; and then we shall indeed enjoy our Southern Rights. So mote it be. *Wilmington Herald.*

### GATHERING AND PREPARING MANURE.

Without manure, no farmer can farm to advantage. With manure, his land will yield fruitfully, improve in quality, and he grow rich. Now, what is the use of expending your horses' and hands' time, in trying to grow corn on land that only yields 2 and 3 barrels to the acre? There is no use in it—you wear out your plows and other implements, exhaust the powers of your team and plowmen, and, make no money. Whereas, had you taken a couple of good hands, and a team or two, you might have collected manure enough to fertilize that very land, so as to grow 8 or 10 barrels to the acre; we have, in an experiment, grown more than twice the largest quantity, and so can you if you try. The fact is, that land, by being fed, and properly cultivated, can be made to produce one hundred bushels to the acre—and no man should rest contented until his whole crop averages 12 barrels to the acre. *Repository and Wigs.*

ENORMOUS YIELD.—Mr. John Q. Hewlett, residing about three miles from Baltimore, on the Frederick Turnpike road, raised this season seven hundred and eighty bushels of prime white wheat on a field containing 18 acres, 2 rods, and 6

perches—being a very small fraction under forty-two bushels per acre. The grain was sold for ninety-five cents per bushel.

CLOSE AND LIBERAL FEEDING.—A. Todd, of Smithfield, R. I., states in the N. E. Farmer, that he had five cows pastured on a piece of land, but none seeming satisfied with the amount of feed they obtained, he sold one at the end of the year. He consequently found that the four yielded a greater net profit than the five had done. "Concluding in my mind," says he, "that if four cows were more profitable than five, on the same principle, three might be still better, (although I find no rule in 'Adams' or 'Smith' that supports this doctrine,) I accordingly disposed of another, and by taking a little extra pains with the three left, I churned more butter from the three than I had in any preceding year from four or five."

EXPERIMENTAL CULTURE.—Last year an intelligent farmer in Murray county, made an experiment in corn culture which is worthy of note. Four rows were selected, some two hundred yards long; from two, the fodder at the usual time was gathered; upon the other two, it was suffered to remain unstripped. The corn upon the four rows weighed the same per bushel, but upon the two rows upon which the blades were suffered to remain, two bushels more were gathered than upon the stripped rows. *Home Courier.*

### THE WIDOW'S DREAM, OR AN OASIS IN THE DESERT OF A POOR SEAMSTRESS'S LIFE.

The cold piercing wind of a December whistled and moaned around the old frame tenement of a poor widow, who resided in a narrow dark street of a populous city. The widow in vain stuffed the few surplus pieces of her spare wardrobe into the fissures of the broken and shattered door and windows to exclude the nipping breath of "Jack Frost," as it oozed into her humble apartments; for the fierce wintry king and his snowy train drove furiously through the deserted streets, and in boisterous glee mocked the dying embers of the poor woman's fire-side. Upon a small deal table before her, as she crouched in a low chair beside the expiring fire, dimly burned a lamp, while the benumbed fingers of the widow, guided by her weary eyes, were playing over a half-finished garment of a cheap tailoring establishment. Ever and anon the poor woman would cast her eyes towards a large and ill-accoutred bed in a corner of the room, and as she did so, she would renew her wasted energies to complete her task. That humble couch contained all on earth that was dear to her; her two children slept, nothing the less sound because of their wretched poverty, but slept that sweet and refreshing sleep that knits up the ravelled sleeve of care, and falls as gently upon the beggar in his shed as the millionaire in his palace. A sobbing moan escapes the poor widow, tears suffused her hollow cheeks.

"I can work no more, my light is nearly gone. I'm chilled to the bone. But O, what will my children do for bread to-morrow! They almost broke my heart when I put them to bed hungry and cold to-night. To-morrow they'll have nothing—no food, no fire. Great God, they must not perish, while I've an ear or a hand." And the poor woman again plied her needle, nodded, sobbed, sighed and worked on, until the last ember of her fire was gone. The light of the lamp flickered in the socket for a moment; and the last stitch in the garment was completed as the faint streaks of day broke through the interstices of the windows.

Pale and wan as if death had already claimed his demand, almost as rigid with cold, too, the widow arose from her seat, crossed to the bed, gazed upon her still quietly sleeping children and falling upon her knees beside them, she prayed—prayed that God would call them home, as nothing but despair and misery seemed before them. But the sun began to spread his broad rays over the frozen earth, and the hum and roar of a busy city resounded again in the streets. The poor woman donned her plain habiliments, kissed her waking children, and bidding them sleep until she returned with food and fire, she rolled up the finished garment and started through the deep snow and keen morning air, to the tailoring establishment.

It was one of those large depots, where ready made clothing holds out such great allurements to the economical wearers of such goods; a long established and tolerable species of the latter day *Buxite* for the torture of those poor females who fight to the last, against most overwhelming odds and

chances of a wretched existence, in defence of their honest poverty, and a purity of purpose, which, when preserved, scarce attracts a passing commendation; yet, if lost, all the world, the law of the land, and *pulpit* malevolence, fall not to scathe to the heart's core the misery-goaded wretch. She stood beside the proprietor's counter, while he, arrayed in his flashy wardrobe, and ornamented with seals, keys and chains, fumbled over the garment, examined the seams, testified the strength of sewing, found fault with this, and objected to that; and with all the vulgar coarseness and tyrannical stupidity peculiar to the *order* of a "shop," or the debauched manager of a second-rate theater. Shears, the proprietor, dealt out his ill humor to the half-finished, pale woman before him. At length he consented to take the garment in, half finished as he proclaimed it to be, and sulkily threw the wretched seamstress a quarter of a dollar upon the counter. She grasped it; it was the link between her and dissolution. She stood for a moment, waiting for more work.

"You may go," said the proprietor. "Have you no more work, sir?" "No; you don't deserve any more. If I intended to give you more work, I should have made you work the button holes of that coat over again."

"But, sir, how can I afford to do more work on such coarse garments, at such a price?"

"Price? Why, I can get better work done, hundreds will be glad of the chance to make one of them coats for three *fipenny* bits?"

"Ah, sir, I have two small children to provide bread and fire for! I work incessantly on one of those cats from day break until midnight. I am—"

"Well, well—no matter. I've no more work for you at present, anyhow, so you may go along."

And the arbiter of the fate of this woman, and many others in the same miserable situation, stood off to enjoy his cigar, while the seamstress retraced her steps back to her home of forlorn wretchedness. As she paced along, in a frame of mind bordering on frantic despair, she passed an apothecary's. A strange, mad motion flashed upon her brain! As if propelled by some invisible spirit of destruction, she entered the medicine shop and called for an ounce of *lanthanum*! The shopman, of course, hesitated not, as wild and desperate as his customer looked, to sell her the deadly draught, and extracted his pay from the poor woman's last hard-earned coin; he threw her the change, and she again bent her steps towards her dwelling. The few pennies remaining sufficed to buy a small loaf at a neighboring grocery. This, and some drops of tea warmed over the blize of a handful of shavings on the hearth, provided for the meagre repast of the widow's children.

After their meal, on some pretence or other the widow sent her children to a neighbor's house, and then drawing the vial from her bosom, she prayed God to be the protector to her offspring while she sought refuge from her unbearable burden of poverty and woe, in self-destruction.

"She's not dead! she's warm yet, and breathes," said one.

"Poor dear soul," sighed another. "She has looked like death for a long time, and her little girl says her mother never went to bed last night at all; the poor dear creature's worn out, a good long sleep will do her good."

"Ay," says the first speaker, an old woman, "and she'll sleep a sleep that knows no waking; run quick some one of you get the doctor, the woman's taken poison; look, I've found the bottle under her head!"

"Nor is this inattention induced by any want of appreciation on the part of the ladies. I never saw gratitude more gracefully expressed than when a venerable Philadelphia, with genuine Yankee promptness, extricated a lady, with a pretty little 'responsibility,' from a crowd at a railroad station. When he had procured a cab for her, he held her little one until she was seated. She thanked him in French—not a word of which, however, he would have understood, but for her eyes. They were perfectly intelligible. In reply to her thanks, the kind-hearted old gentleman said, 'It's all right, my girl; and just what any gentleman would have done.' 'Anglais?' inquired the little French woman. 'Not by a long shot; I'm a Yankee all over.'"

A pretty young lady, residing not a thousand miles from our village, who returned not long since from a boarding school, was asked by a friend what countrymen inhabited Portugal.

"Portugese," was her answer.

"And the singular of Portugese?" quoth her friend.

"Portugose," was her reply.

He only is independent who can maintain himself by his own exertions.

leaves out flattered a \$100 bank note! "My dream! My dream is true! We're saved, my children, we're saved!"

The woman looked the exhausted seamstress to her bed. A few days suffered to recover her from the effects of the well-advised drug—too weak to kill. The \$100 note, placed in the family Bible by her late husband, and revealed to her by her opium slumber, proved one of those mysteries and rare asses in the weary desert of a "lone woman," who essays by her daily toil to rear her little ones in a populous city.

### LITERATURE OF THE BIBLE.

The following extract, on the literary attractions of the Bible, is from an eloquent tract by the Rev. James Hamilton, Minister of a Scotch Church in London, which was sent by Mr. Lawrence, our Minister in England, for reprint and circulation in the United States. The tract has been published by the American Tract Society in New York.

"But in giving that Bible, its divine author had regard to the mind of man. He knew that man has more curiosity than piety, more taste than sanctity; and that more persons are anxious to hear some new, or read some beautiful thing, than to read or hear about God and the great salvation. I've known that few would ever ask, What must I do to be saved? till they came in contact with the Bible itself; and therefore I've made the Bible not only an instructive book, but an attractive one—not only true, but enticing. He filled it with marvellous incident and engaging history—with sunny pictures from old-world scenery, and affecting anecdotes from the patriarchs. He replenished it with stately argument and thrilling verse, and sprinkled it over with sententious wisdom and proverbial purgery. He made it a book of lofty thoughts and noble images—a book of heavenly doctrine, but withal of earthly adaptation. In preparing a guide to immortality, infinite wisdom gave not a dictionary or a grammar, but a Bible—a book which, in trying to catch the heart of man, should captivate his taste; and which, in transforming his affections, should also expand his intellect. The pearl is of great price; but even the cabinet is of exquisite beauty. The sword is of ethereal temper, and nothing cuts so keen as its double edge; but there are jewels on the hill, and fine tracery on the scabbard. The shekels are of the purest ore; but even the scrip which contains them is of a texture more curious than the artists of earth could fashion it. The apples are gold; but even the basket is silver."

"Price? Why, I can get better work done, hundreds will be glad of the chance to make one of them coats for three *fipenny* bits?"

"Ah, sir, I have two small children to provide bread and fire for! I work incessantly on one of those cats from day break until midnight. I am—"

"Well, well—no matter. I've no more work for you at present, anyhow, so you may go along."

And the arbiter of the fate of this woman, and many others in the same miserable situation, stood off to enjoy his cigar, while the seamstress retraced her steps back to her home of forlorn wretchedness. As she paced along, in a frame of mind bordering on frantic despair, she passed an apothecary's. A strange, mad motion flashed upon her brain! As if propelled by some invisible spirit of destruction, she entered the medicine shop and called for an ounce of *lanthanum*! The shopman, of course, hesitated not, as wild and desperate as his customer looked, to sell her the deadly draught, and extracted his pay from the poor woman's last hard-earned coin; he threw her the change, and she again bent her steps towards her dwelling. The few pennies remaining sufficed to buy a small loaf at a neighboring grocery. This, and some drops of tea warmed over the blize of a handful of shavings on the hearth, provided for the meagre repast of the widow's children.

### MANNERS AND CUSTOMS ABROAD.

The letters of Mr. Dawson, of the *Albany Evening Journal*, while traveling through England, France, &c., are fresh and racy, and by no means so barren of useful information as most of the foreign correspondence of American newspapers. Here is an extract from his last Paris letter:

"I have seen ladies roughly jostled from the sidewalks on the Boulevards—where, if anywhere, you might look for politeness—and, in crossing from Dover to Ostend, and from Boulogne to Folkestone, I have seen Frenchmen stretched out at full length upon the sofas, while ladies could find no place to sit down. But I never saw a Frenchman discommoded himself to oblige a lady. All this may seem apocryphal. And so I would have deemed it but for the evidence of my own senses. Americans may be ignorant of many of the higher branches of politeness; but if one of the 'Universal Nation' should treat women as cavaliers as Frenchmen treat them, there is not a backwoodsman east of the Rocky mountains who would not volunteer to pitch him into the Mississippi."

"Nor is this inattention induced by any want of appreciation on the part of the ladies. I never saw gratitude more gracefully expressed than when a venerable Philadelphia, with genuine Yankee promptness, extricated a lady, with a pretty little 'responsibility,' from a crowd at a railroad station. When he had procured a cab for her, he held her little one until she was seated. She thanked him in French—not a word of which, however, he would have understood, but for her eyes. They were perfectly intelligible. In reply to her thanks, the kind-hearted old gentleman said, 'It's all right, my girl; and just what any gentleman would have done.' 'Anglais?' inquired the little French woman. 'Not by a long shot; I'm a Yankee all over.'"

A pretty young lady, residing not a thousand miles from our village, who returned not long since from a boarding school, was asked by a friend what countrymen inhabited Portugal.

"Portugese," was her answer.

"And the singular of Portugese?" quoth her friend.

"Portugose," was her reply.

He only is independent who can maintain himself by his own exertions.

Gossiping and lying go together.

### Mr. Cobb's Reply to the Macon Committee.

Athens, August 12, 1851.

GENTLEMEN: I did not receive your letter until my return from the lower part of the State, about the first of the present month, and have not, therefore, replied to it at an earlier day.

As I have received communications from other parts of the State on the same and kindred subjects, I have determined in this reply to consider the questions involved at some length, as I desire that it may be considered as responsive to the various communications to which I have referred.

Your letter propounds the two following interrogatories:

1st. "Do you believe that a State, by virtue of her sovereignty, has the right peaceably to secede from the Union? or is it your opinion that the general government has the constitutional authority to coerce her to remain in the Union?"

2d. "Do you believe that the late acts of Congress, termed the 'Compromise,' were constitutional, just, and equitable?"

I shall consider these questions in the inverse order in which you have proposed them.

In order that I may be distinctly understood in reference to the late acts of Congress termed the "Compromise," I consider it proper to make a brief reference to each of the six bills which composed that Compromise, and shall, in that way, be enabled to give the most satisfactory answer to your second interrogatory.

The bills establishing territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico rest upon a great constitutional principle, which has always received the warm and cordial support of southern men, and by none advocated with more zeal than those now politically associated with yourselves. That principle is, "the right of the people to determine for themselves whether or not slavery shall constitute a part of their social system."

In these bills on the slavery question is found this provision: "And said Territories shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission." If this important principle, so long contended for by the South, and so long resisted by the North, be now repudiated by the South, then these bills are obnoxious to the objections urged against them by the disunionists; but if the South be content to abide the operation of her own cherished doctrines on this subject, then these bills are in strict conformity with the requirements of the South, and should be entirely satisfactory to us. It is too late to talk about the repeal of the Mexican laws, after the almost unanimous support by the representatives of the South of the Clayton compromise bill, which no more repeals those laws than the bills we are now considering; nor were our representatives in their advocacy of the Clayton compromise bill more united than were their constituents in their approval of the votes of these representatives. The eight southern representatives who voted against that bill, on the ground that they required the repeal of the Mexican laws, were denounced as traitors to the South for making the demand, by those who are now most noisy in their complaints against southern representatives for not requiring the repeal of the Mexican laws. I voted for the Clayton-compromise bill, and I was universally sustained in Georgia in that vote. Why is it that I am now condemned for my support of those bills by the men who then approved of my course?

The Clayton-compromise bill contained no express guarantee for the admission of slave States, if the people desired it; whilst these bills pledge the faith of the government to admit these territories as States, with or without slavery, as the people may determine when they come to organize their State constitution. These bills received the support of a majority of the representatives of the South. Your own representatives from Georgia were unanimous upon the subject. The only violent and decided opposition made to them proceeded from the abolitionists and free soilers, who saw, in the provisions to which I have referred, the repudiation of their favorite doctrine of congressional interdiction of slavery in the territories, and the recognition of our own favorite doctrine of leaving to the people the decision of the question whether or not they would have slavery among them.

The bill to settle the disputed boundary between the United States and Texas rests upon equally sound and constitutional principles. Its provisions simply contain a proposition from the general government to the State of Texas to settle the boundary between the territory of the United States and the State of Texas by adopting a certain line as that boundary; and, in consideration that Texas will yield the claim which she had made to the ceded territory, the United States agrees to pay her the sum of ten millions of dollars. There was no threat, no coercion,

on the part of Congress to compel acquiescence in their proposition. It was a matter for the calm and patriotic judgment of the people of Texas to determine; and the terms were agreed to by her with unparalleled unanimity. It is equally untrue and unjust to the brave and patriotic people of Texas to impute their action on this subject to the fear of federal power, or the equally offensive consideration of bribery and corruption. As I would not tolerate such an imputation upon the citizens of our own State under similar circumstances, I will not indulge in the ungenerous and untoward reflection upon the honesty and integrity of our young and prosperous sister.

This disputed boundary was thus settled between the United States and Texas in the only mode, in my judgment, in which such an issue could be determined between the government and a sovereign State of this Union. I am aware that the charge is sometimes made that this bill seized on the slave territory of Texas, and appropriated it to free soil. Nothing could be further from the truth. The only direct effect resulting from this measure upon the slavery question was to remove the prohibition upon slavery in that portion of the ceded territory being above 36 deg. 30 min., which was put upon it in the articles of annexation, when Texas was admitted into the Union. This bill removes that prohibition, and submits to the decision of the people of the territory, when they come to organize their State government, the question whether or not slavery shall constitute a part of their social system. This bill, like the others which I have considered, received the warm and cordial support of a majority of southern representatives, and encountered its bitterest opposition from the free-soil representatives of the North.

The only remaining bill affecting our territorial acquisition was the one for the admission of California as a State into the Union. This measure was objectionable to southern men, though it finally received the support of nearly one-third of the representatives of the South. In common with a majority of the South, I entertained objections to this bill; I preferred that a territorial government should have been provided for California, as was done for Utah and New Mexico. It would have been a more regular and appropriate mode of disposing of that portion of the territory; but the failure to do so I do not regard as a violation of the constitution or the rights of the South. In the admission of California, Congress exercised a power expressly conferred upon it by the constitution, "to admit new States into the Union;" and though our judgments do not wholly approve of the exercise of that discretionary power in this instance, it constitutes no such cause of complaint against the government as would justify the resistance which has been indicated by the enemies of the Compromise and the advocates of disunion.

The principle upon which California was admitted into the Union, with her constitution prohibiting slavery, has ever received the sanction of southern statesmen. The principle denies to Congress the right to look into the constitution of a State asking for admission into the Union, further than to see that it is republican in its form of government. Whether slavery shall exist there is a question not for the consideration of Congress, but to be determined by the people when they frame their State constitution.

This doctrine was clearly expressed in the following resolution introduced by Mr. Calhoun into the Senate of the United States in 1847. It was the annunciation of a sound constitutional principle, and I am prepared to maintain its correctness:

"Resolved, That, as a fundamental principle in our political creed, a people, in forming a constitution, have the unconditional right to form and adopt the government which they may think best calculated to secure liberty, prosperity, and happiness; and that, in conformity thereto, no other condition is imposed by the federal constitution on a State, in order to her admission into this Union, except that its constitution be republican; and that the imposition of any other by Congress would not only be in violation of the constitution, but in direct conflict with the principle on which our political system rests."

The bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of

the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was objected to by southern men principally on the ground of the penalty which it provides. That feature is taken from the laws of Maryland, and it will be remembered that all that now remains of the District was originally a part of the State of Maryland. In 1816 the State of Georgia prohibited the introduction of slaves within this State for sale, under a penalty of a fine of five hundred dollars, and imprisonment in the penitentiary for four years, for each slave brought into the State for sale. This law was repealed in 1842 and re-enacted in 1843, and again repealed at the session of 1849. The penalty for the violation of the District law is the liberation of the slave, which, as I have said, the same penalty provided by the Maryland law for a violation of