

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY  
H. IRVINE,  
Corner of South Gay and Water Streets.  
GIVE US BUT LIGHT.  
BALTIMORE:  
FRIDAY, SEPT. 29, 1869.

### Republican Assembly Ticket, FOR THE CITY. THEODORICK BLAND, and W. G. D. WORTHINGTON.

#### Second Ward.

The democratic citizens of the Second ward, are earnestly requested to meet THIS EVENING, at 7 o'clock at the Globe Inn, Market-street, to take into consideration matters of public importance.

#### Fourth Ward.

At a meeting of the citizens of the fourth ward, on Tuesday evening at Free-burgh's Tavern,  
JAMES MARTIN was called to the Chair, and  
CHRISTOPHER RABORG, jun. Secretary.

On motion, it was  
Unanimously resolved, to support Abner Neale and Thomas Kell, for representatives in the first branch of the city council, at the ensuing election.

Unanimously resolved, That Messrs. Bland and Worthington, be supported as delegates to the general assembly.

Resolved unanimously, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the different republican papers.  
JAMES MARTIN, Chairman.  
CHRISTOPHER RABORG, jun. Secretary.

#### Fifth Ward.

At a numerous and respectable meeting of the democratic citizens of the 5th ward, held at Myer's Hotel on Tuesday the 26th Sept. 1869, to take into consideration the ensuing election, when  
CUMBERLAND DUGAN, Esq. was called to the Chair, and  
JOSEPH JANSON, appointed Secretary.

Resolved unanimously, That Theodorick Bland and W. G. D. Worthington, Esqs. be recommended to our fellow citizens of the city of Baltimore as proper characters to represent us in our next legislature.

Resolved unanimously, That William Camp and Peter Deffenderfer, Esqs. be recommended as proper characters to represent us in the first branch of the city council.

Resolved, That Samuel Leyth, sen. be recommended as elector of Mayor for the fifth ward.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the democratic papers in this city, signed by the  
JAMES MARTIN, Chairman.  
CHRISTOPHER RABORG, jun. Secretary.

#### Sixth Ward.

At a meeting of the citizens of the 6th ward, held agreeably to public notice, at Campbell's Tavern, on the evening of the 27 inst. for the purpose of nominating two delegates to represent the city of Baltimore, in the ensuing general assembly, the following persons were recommended in the first branch of the city council, when the following resolutions were carried into effect:

Resolved, that Theodorick Bland, and W. G. D. Worthington, be recommended to the citizens of Baltimore as fit persons to represent them in the next general assembly.

Resolved, that William Ross, and William Carman, receive the support of this ward as members in the first branch of the city council.

Resolved, that the proceedings of this meeting, be published in the several democratic papers in the city of Baltimore.

JOHN DEFFENDERFER, Chairman,  
THOMAS ROGERS, Secretary.

#### William Carman,

Returns thanks to the citizens of the 6th Ward for their good will towards him in nominating him in a nomination for a member of the city council—and wishes them to understand that he declines standing as a candidate at the election on Monday next, and hopes they will not vote for him.

September 28, 1869.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The friends of opposing candidates have almost ejected all others from today's paper. Our earnest desire is fair play; but rather than be excluded from our columns, we must engage both parties. We will do so, unless their future articles be of moderate length.

### WHAT'S A PARISH?

An episcopal clergyman exhibits the extraordinary modesty, some years ago, on being on the Rev. Mr. B., of Georgetown, a presbyterian, to solicit his signature to a petition to the Maryland legislature, for permission to tax the parishes, "to promote the cause of virtue and religion."—Mr. B. amazed at the oddity of the application, began to extricate the applicant; what is a parish?—Is it the land, or the stumps, or the stones, or the timber growing in the woods, that constitute this thing you call

What is a parish?—Is it the land, or the stumps, or the stones, or the timber growing in the woods, that constitute this thing you call

### OMINOUS.

One of the Carriers of the Lib's Gazette is by profession a grave-digger; a bad selection for the man must be interested in death. It is thought he will exert all the powers of spade, trowel and mattock, to dig a trench suitable to the size of the dying minister. It ought to be sunk ten fathoms deep, at least, to prevent contagion; though many think the frosty mornings which will succeed the election of Monday next, will greatly narrow the sphere, and controul the action of federal virus.—Indeed, it will grow as mild, say some, as vaccine matter. But I say—bury it—bury it—bury it, as an example to all others in like cases offending.

N. B. Certain Irish labourers would dig a grave gratis; for secret service money being chiefly expended, and no prospect for farther supplies, the funeral must be cheap.

### TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

General Smith, at the urgent solicitation of the most respectable characters in Cecil-visited that county, to confront his enemies, and dissipate their slanders. He addressed a meeting the other day, after the regiment was dismissed, and made a deep impression on all present, to the delight of the democrats, and the mortification of the Tories. Such is the force of truth. Honest federalists confessed the man had been shamefully trifled. The general was to attend another meeting in the upper part of the county.

Truth is every where spreading its splendours.—Cecil, Kent, Prince George, Frederick, Worcester, &c. all feel its divine influence. Toryism prepare thy sables. On Monday next, thine abominations shall meet the stroke of justice, and Maryland be freed for seven years from thy dominion.

### CAUTION.

An infamous hand-bill, printed at Georgetown, and signed "Friend to his country," has been dispersed in abundance over Calvert and Prince George's counties. It contains some solid columns of lies against Gen. Smith, &c. &c.—the people of the lower counties are requested to be on their guard.

### FOR THE WHIG. THIRD COLLOQUY

Between an Episcopalian Minister and a Methodist.

(CONTINUED.)

Cler. Why, I did not expect to meet you so soon. If you have had any conversation on our last subject with your minister, you must have made short work of it. Pray, did he bestow any consideration on the evidences of our lawful mission, as I stated them to you; or had you any conversation with him on the subject?

Par. I had—and he stubbornly maintains his point, that you had better be silent on the business; that the Lambeth consecration, and the evidence produced to establish it, come in the most questionable shape that ever a public act of such importance could be foisted on human credulity; and that he would advise all the Anglo episcopalian ministers, now that the pope is such a steadfast friend to England, to throw themselves at his feet, humbly kiss his slipper, and petition him to reordain them, and commission them to exercise their ministry according to the Anglican liturgy.

Cler. But do you not see clearly the man must be incapable of making any solid reply, when he has recourse to jibes and ridicule in so very serious an affair?

Par. I hinted as much to him—when he replied, My good sir, the great and learned Herbert Thorndike, in his treatise on the rights of the church, gives them a much more harsh and heterodox advice; altho' himself a bishop & a staunch protestant, he says, "the best method I see of restoring the unity of the church, broken by the reformation, would be to remove the bishops who have been ordained contrary to the laws of the church, and whose ordination derives all its validity from the secular power." He desired me moreover to propose to you the following questions:—Was not the document of the Lambeth consecration first given to the world by George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury (not by Camden as you allege); at the instigation of Mason, his chaplain, in the year 1593—that is, 44 years after, it is said, that the consecration of Parker took place?—Did not the whole body of cotemporary Roman catholics immediately protest against the authenticity of the act, and declare it an absolute forgery?—Did not the whole body of protestants declaim against the act of Lambeth Palace, in the year 1593, that is, in the life time of Elizabeth, 26 years after the supposed transaction, and declare their sentiments, in a book entitled a Demonstration of Discipline, which they presented to parliament, and in which they publicly declare that the actual order of protestant bishops, and their consecration, were profane and supposititious,

from the beginning to the end?—Our minister added a great deal more, which I cannot remember—but told me to advise you, for the sake of many tender consciences among your flock, to drop the business; for you will never be able to prove that Parker, your first Anglo protestant bishop, had received episcopal consecration from any apostolical source; consequently, the chain of your apostolical mission is broken; and all your claims and pretensions to a lawful ministry in the church unfounded. He added, moreover, that on other strong grounds, he would prove the invalidity of your ordination and ministry; but would forbear, provided you let the matter lie in peace—otherwise, he pledges himself to prove to the world, that at best the validity of your ordination is extremely dubious; consequently, you will only thrust your head into a hornet's nest, by attempting to disturb the minds of other religious persuasions.

Cler. What strange presumption in an upstart of the other day! I believe you are both incorrigibly obstinate; so I shall spend no more time on you or him.

Par. Do you cast me off in this manner, after raising such doubts in my mind concerning the validity of our own minister's ordination and mission? Do you refuse to give me any satisfaction concerning your own? However, I will not stop until I find out where there is a lawful ministry exercised in Christ's church, suppose it were even to be found among the papists. Have you any thing to say against the validity of their ecclesiastical ministry?

Cler. Sir, my intention was to do you service, but I perceive you are becoming impertinent. Farewell.

### FOR THE WHIG. MR. IRVINE,

I see in your paper of Tuesday morning, two certificates, one from Mr. John Cole, an Englishman; the other from a Mr. Wall, of Howard street, a supporter of the Federal Republican, certifying that L. Frailey had spoken (in a jocular way) liberally of the Irish.—May I enquire, why or for what purpose these certificates are granted? The answer, if founded in truth, might readily be given—for the purpose of defeating the wish of the great mass of the republicans, in their choice of a sheriff.—What is it come to this, that in making choice of a sheriff for Baltimore city and county, the republicans are to fly to English and federal certificates to know who to vote for as sheriff? Would not those certificate gentry give one, that Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, or any other republican, was this, that, or any thing else, that would withdraw the confidence of the people from them?—Conceding Mr. Wall most certainly to be greatly wrapped up in himself, to suppose that any certificate they can give, is to make a republican vote as they think proper. I once knew an Englishman, and a native American, who was a Tory, to give a certificate, that Thomas Jefferson had defrauded his British creditors, had cheated Gabriel Jones, his injured Mr. Walker, &c. Still, republicans did not believe it. They elected Thomas Jefferson president, and thousands are now ready to thank them for it. What true, genuine democrat can reconcile it to himself to form a union with the federalists and Tories, to elect any man sheriff, in opposition to the known will and wish of three-fourths of the republican party?—Watch the Tories, and keep good centinels on the out posts."

### STARK.

### FOR THE WHIG. To the Republican IRISH of Baltimore City and County.

### MY COUNTRYMEN AND FELLOW CITIZENS,

If an election for sheriff or delegates did not happen now and then, you would be seldom addressed by the voice of flattery; but when a hard job, either in fighting, or ditching, or voting, is to be done, then it is fashionable to bestow a soft word on Paddy. Mr. Frailey, however, he may have damned the Irish before, has no notion of doing so again till after the election! He did so—but it was all in jest. There is no joke like a true one. Was not this consistent with Mr. Frailey's general conduct? Then why endeavor to explain it away, by saying it was all a joke? It is too common, and I must say too mean, to put questions to candidates on the eve of an election. I might ask Leonard Frailey, whether he did not last summer object to the appointment of Mr. Duane to the command of a regiment of riflemen? But I disdain mumping—I positively declare he did. The conversation happened near Mr. Finn's, when Mr. Frailey found fault with that appointment, in the same manner the rankest federalists in the country did. What then do you think of censuring such an appointment on the supposition that Mr. Duane was an Irishman? This accusation is belloyed by the federalists all over the country against Gen. Smith, because he voted for Mr. Duane—which I think one of the best votes he ever gave in his life. Who can forget the services and persecutions of the patriotic Editor of the Aurora? Admitting, for argument sake, that he is a foreigner, what native has done more—who has done half so much for America as he has done? His abilities are undisputed; and his military and geo-

graphical knowledge is superior to that of most men in this country; yet Mr. Frailey found fault with his appointment, because report had said he was an Irishman!

For my part, this illiberal argument has determined me to vote against Leonard Frailey. If his way prevails, no Irishman can ever be permitted, in case of war, to distinguish himself as an officer by sea or land in the service of America. We can have no more Montgomeries, or Truins, or Starks. All must trail the musket—none can even carry a pair of colors. What think you of this, my countrymen! May be, Mr. Frailey will say he was only in jest! And let me tell you, it was the more indelicate, as Mr. Frailey made the observations to an Irishman. If you suffer yourselves to be palavered to support this man, I will not.

### AN IRISHMAN.

### FOR THE WHIG. TO THE REPUBLICAN VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF BALTIMORE.

Some days ago, a pretended democratic mechanic addressed some queries to me thro' the medium of the Whig, which were answered on the following morning.

Yesterday, John Cole and George Wall have produced their certificates, with an idea of substantiating the charges. They have, however, varied from the "Democratic Mechanic." He says, in his first queries, that I said, "the Irish were carrying all before them." George Wall states differently—"their influence was truly alarming, and if measures were not taken, they would overrun the country." I have stated before, that a serious declaration of that nature never escaped my lips—and I declare, most solemnly, that the assertion is as base and untrue, as is the heart is malicious which permitted its utterance.

My approbation of the Alien-law, is of the same stamp. During my employment in the Anti-Democrat office, I wrote an essay containing the following sentence; the fact has been substantiated by Mr. C. Clime, of this city, and cannot be controverted:

"The deadly wound inflicted on the constitution thro' the alien-law, which roused the people out of their slumber, has since been healed thro' the healing balm applied by that man, who had secured to himself the admiration of Europe, and who is called the wisest statesman—who is no other, than the wife and good JEFFERSON."

Shortly after, I left that employment and entered as a partner in the American. Mr. W. Pechin has testified to the public, the correctness of my principle; and the whole of my connexion with him, in the following manner:

"An intemperate zeal, on the part of some of the electing party, opposed to Mr. Leonard Frailey, having put in circulation against him, unfair rumors relative to his political character, he has deemed it proper to notice the same, as will be seen in the American of to-day; and it will be further seen, that he has called on me for a public declaration of his political sentiments, during his whole connexion with me in business."

"I will only briefly observe, that when I connected myself in business with Mr. Frailey, I had satisfactory testimony of the correctness of his political character, and from that period to the present, I have ever found him a firm and undeviating republican.—And for my good opinion of that gentleman, in a more extended point of view, I take the liberty of presenting an extract of an article written by me the period of the dissolution of our co-partnership, and which appeared in the American of August 10, 1865:

"The dissolving of a connection with such a man as Mr. Frailey, with whom the Editor had been so long united in the bonds of peace and friendship—most necessarily cause regret, which is alone alleviated by the consideration, that we have both been actuated by mutual views of reciprocal interests—the fair basis of all honest negotiations. In conclusion, the editor seems irresistibly impelled to add, that in Mr. Frailey he has realized the assemblage of every natural and most of the acquired characteristics which can constitute the dignity of man. His candor, honor and sincerity stand unimped—his integrity and truth are equally unsullied. We hope, with fervency, that an auspicious fate may ever attend him."

The Alien-law, it is well known, was not only a violation of our constitution, but obnoxious to every one possessing correct republican principles; but if it had contained a provision clause distinguishing between such foreigners as are desirous of legislating for us according to the British mode, previous to the revolution, and affecting them only, whilst it would give permission to those who are willing to defend our rights, and "the rights of man," to emigrate, then it would have met my most hearty concurrence.

I commiserate Mr. Wall's predicament. In some respects a well-meaning man, he has suffered himself to be duped by one who has declared that no stone should remain unturned, to ruin my election—and who has made himself notorious by declarations as false as the father of lies.

Mr. W. has been repeatedly waited upon to sign certificates, ready cut and dry, by some of my good republican friends, who expect to profit by this manoeuvre, and they even promised to bear him harmless if he would sign them. But even his conscience, from the grossness of their falsity, would not permit him to do it.

The charge brought by John Cole respecting foreigners, "that they should not hold offices, unless they lived in the country previous to the adoption of the federal constitution," will find its answer, by a denial, as above, and the annexed certificates of my officers.—As a man, with whom I had long lived, I regret Mr. Cole's deviation from correctness, particularly as he is so "very little interested in the election." I believe he is no further interested, than as a good partisan to advance the holy cause of federalism.

Mr. Cole says I was opposed to the universal suffrage law. I will barely republish my reply to the querist on that subject:

"I never represented the general suffrage law to be a bad law—but admit I have said that the mode of voting in Pennsylvania is less liable to fraud than the manner of voting in Maryland; as in the former state every citizen pays a tax in proportion to his property, or a small poll. The assessor's book are the documents on which the judges of elections act, and, of course, having documents to go by, fraud is not so easily committed. And I have always maintained this principle: that no man ought to be obliged to perform military duty, who is debarred of the privilege of voting—or be taller than to protect and maintain these rights he himself cannot enjoy."

Mr. C. "believes my antipathy for foreigners still remains." It does, for such as are fostered in this happy country with all the prejudices of British aristocracy—such as leagued with and supported Burr—such as desired a war with France, to gratify Great Britain—such as reprobated the administration for preserving the peace of the country.

Mr. C. says—  
"It is absurd to suppose he held this opinion, because that mode was the best to prevent fraud! for how can any fraud take place, where all are allowed to vote?"

In Pennsylvania, every man is entitled to vote, who has his name registered in the assessor's books. If it is not found there, he cannot vote—consequently he cannot commit a fraud. Here, people vote sometimes (it is said and believed) four or five times at one election, at different wards or districts. Consequently, it is not so absurd to suppose, I liked the Pennsylvania mode best, as less liable to fraud!

There is no man will come forward and say that the laws of Pennsylvania are tyrannical or unjust—the state is the key stone of the Union—the concentration of Democracy—and the pride of Republicanism. Snyder's thirty thousand majority is in itself sufficient to convince any man that the right of suffrage is not improperly shackled in the state of Pennsylvania.

In Maryland the case is materially different—the state, having ample funds, demands no money from the people—the people are willing to pay if the government needed it—the will stands for the good of the people have as good a right to say who shall take care of the money they have, as who shall direct the expenditure of that they may have to pay. I can see no manner of distinction between the two cases.

That this conversation had entire reference to Pennsylvania is indubitable from this fact, that if no man had a right to vote in Maryland but persons "assessed," that I, myself, should have been disfranchised.—To believe that I wished to place myself in that predicament, is too absurd for a moment's belief. "No man hate his own flesh"—He must be a fool indeed, that would vote to deprive himself of the privilege of voting.

I cannot help congratulating my brother "Honest Mechanic," who prides himself so much on his republicanism, in the able advocate he has found in Mr. Cole.—They have both attempted to write down my democratic character—a character which he has sustained, unshaken, the barbed shafts of sham federalism (or Toryism) for a period of eleven years.

The "Honest Mechanic" but a few days ago endeavoured to blast my political character because I worked, as a journeyman, in the office of the Anti-Democrat office.—Now, forsooth, he & the Democratic Mechanic bring forward John Cole, the editor of the Anti-Democrat at the time I worked there, for the same laudable purpose!

The "Honest Mechanic" says—"when he first knew me, he did not consider me as a republican." Speaking of me further, he says—"He was then employed in the Anti-Democrat office—a TOKY paper [edited by John Cole] established here for the express purpose of writing down Democracy, and setting up Harper and other choice spirits upon the ruins of it. It may be answered that Mr. Frailey had no hand in conducting the paper—he was only employed as a journeyman.—But I would ask you, my fellow citizens, would you, at this time, take a man out of the Federal Republican office, to make a Sheriff of? Would you not at least doubt the republicanism of any man who should aid or assist in the publication of a paper so openly at war with every republican principle? Yet you will find if you look back to the files of the Anti-Democrat, edited by this same John Cole that it was as violent and as Englishified—and served his Britannic Majesty as faithfully as the Federal Republican."

A few words more as to the Messrs Cole & Wall. Mr. Cole is an English born subject, and a notorious advocate himself for those things which he is pleased to conjure up as a crime in me. He is, in truth, what is generally called a BRITISH FEDERALIST, a character to men so strongly marked by the Republicans, that know is sufficient to despise them.

Mr. Wall, is, perhaps, one of the most obstinate and illiberal opponents the last and