

"A FRIEND TO STATE RIGHTS, because A FRIEND TO UNION," thanks Mr. Ritchie for having so far relaxed, in his favor, the rules which he has laid down for himself, as to publish an essay in which the President is freely censured. In asking this courtesy at Mr. Ritchie's hands, the writer laid himself under an obligation to advance nothing as fact that he was not ready to substantiate. Mr. Ritchie doubtless so understands the matter, and would have cause of complaint, if the writer had, without authority for doing so, distinguished between the act of the President in signing, and that of his jackalls in purveying the force bill. He did charge that the act was done deliberately and understandingly by the President, and that with Congress, it was the result of overeager zeal and consequent inadvertence. In saying this he stated as fact, that which, if true, would warrant his censure. He now informs Mr. Ritchie distinctly, that the statement is true. He does not believe that Mr. Ritchie meant to question it. To have done so would have been inconsistent with the respect for the writer implied in the publication of his essay, and which he would be loth to forfeit. To Mr. Ritchie then, who knows whose word he has for the assertion, he again says, that the statement is true. The objections to the bill set forth by the writer, were constantly placed before the President in as clear a light as in the essay published to afford Mr. R. Of this the writer promises to afford Mr. Ritchie, at a proper time, the most decisive proof. As to what passed in Congress, he does not undertake to answer for all that was said in the wordy war of the 2d of March, but he has no reason to believe that the objection was urged there. Who can tell what is said where all talk and none listen? In the little that is heard there is just enough to reconcile us to the loss of the rest. In the changing of hands and partners, which the last session exhibited, in the heterogeneous combinations and "monstrous coalitions" which have taken place; in the clamorous zeal with which men were heard to advocate the practice of principles which they at the same time as clamorously denounced in theory, and in the readiness with which, on every side, they adopted and supported measures and doctrines, when advanced by one set, which they opposed when brought forward by another; --in all this there was a "huge uproar" and confusion, for which there is no parallel but in an old epigram, which I subjoin for the edification of all cameleon politicians:

"As when a BARber and a Colleier fight,  
The Barber beats the luckless Collier white;  
In comes a Dyer of caerulean hue,  
And in his turn he beats the Barber blue:  
Then comes a Brick-dust-man, with rouge  
o'er spread,

And beats the Dyer till he beats him red;  
The rallying Collier whirls his empty sack,  
Knocks down the Brick-dust-man, and beats  
    him black.  
Black, white, blue, red, in rolling clouds are  
    tost,  
And in the dust the combatants are lost."

I can imagine no better description of a state  
of parties in which every man has taken some  
other man's color.

A FRIEND OF STATE RIGHTS, because  
A FRIEND OF UNION