

of Rome may remonstrate with them for interfering with her institutions; and Rum-sellers may remonstrate against any interference with their rum-institutions. But what then? They must obey God, rather than man; must warn the wicked; must sound the alarm; must preach, and act, not as pleasing men, but God, who trieth their hearts, and who will require the blood of souls at the hands of the unfaithful watchman.

Another gentleman sees a fearful ghost ahead and cries out, *Slavery is a political matter.* This is granted. Political action has made slavery, and by this action slavery is perpetuated. And this is not the only instance, in which iniquity has been established by law. By political action rum-selling has long been sanctioned, and lotteries, and theatres, and idolatry, and wars, and bloody persecutions, and almost every species of oppression. By political action one religion has been proscribed and another established; one denomination banished, or burnt, and another placed under the fostering care of the state. And what has been done may be done again. Is the cry of political matter in all these cases to stop our mouths, and palsy all exertions? I trow not. Slavery is made by political action, and every friend of humanity is bound, by political action, to destroy it; to undo every yoke and let the oppressed go free. And it is somewhat curious, that men, who can see two objects at once, should call for political action in the denunciation cause, and then turn right about, and denounce all such action in the anti-slavery cause! Surely, consistency is not a prominent trait in the conduct of such men. But we hope they will grow wiser, and in time learn to occupy with every talent, even their political talent, and not bury this in a napkin. KIAH BAYLEY.

From the Boston Atlas.

The African Captives.

It appears from the *Hartford Courant*, that on Friday, the grand jury for the district of Connecticut came into the United States Circuit Court, and requested instructions and a charge from the Court as to the African prisoners accused of murder and piracy, which case was before them for consideration.

Judge Thompson informed the jury, that the U. S. Circuit Court had jurisdiction of the crimes of murder and piracy, under certain circumstances; but whether or not the case of the prisoners referred to, was one of which that Court had jurisdiction, he could only tell when the particular facts of that case were laid before him. He could give no opinion unless they would furnish him with a statement of facts. It would be useless for him to address them generally upon the crimes of murder and piracy. If a statement of facts were submitted, it would be the duty of the Court to give an opinion upon that statement as to the jurisdiction of the Court.

The grand jury then retired, and afterwards returned into court, and presented to the court the following statement of facts by them found, viz:

That a Spanish vessel, built in Cuba, called the *Amistad*, duly and legally licensed to carry on the coasting trade, sailed from Havana on the 25th June, 1839, commanded by Rymond Fener, for the Port of Guanaja, in the island of Cuba, having on board a cargo of sundry articles of merchandise, two Spanish citizens as passengers, with 53 negroes purchased by them as *Saxinos*, (that is, not natives of Cuba) in the city of Havana, with regular permits for the Spaniards, negroes and merchandise. That about four days after sailing, when three or four leagues from Cuba, and forty from Havana, the negroes rose upon and killed the master and one of the crew of the vessel, and took the command and charge of the same, and wounded and injured the two Spanish passengers. That on the 26th of Aug. last, the said *Amistad* was found in the waters near the east end of Long Island, within one mile of the shore, in possession of the negroes aforesaid, from whom she was captured by the U. S. brig *Washington* and brought into the port of New London, in the district of Connecticut, where the said negroes were apprehended by the Marshal of this district, in whose custody they now are. That while said vessel was so in possession of said negroes, the boxes and trunks of goods were broken open by them, and some of the goods they appropriated to their own use.

Upon this statement the grand jury prayed the judgment and instruction of the court, whether any offence had been committed whereof this court had jurisdiction.

Judge Thompson said he would take till the afternoon to consider the question. At the opening of the court in the afternoon, he accordingly delivered his opinion, which is reported in the *Hartford Courant* as follows:

Judge Thompson said "The Laws of the United States grew out of the Laws of Nations. The offence charged in this case arose out of two statutes, and would be tried in this district, if triable at all in the United States—but the Courts of the United States have no jurisdiction over offences committed in another country, and if this be an offence, and on that subject I give no opinion whether it be an offence at all, it cannot be tried here. The courts of one country have nothing to do with those of another; and an offence committed in a foreign country cannot be tried in another jurisdiction. A vessel sailing under the papers of another country is to be treated as part of the territorial property of the country to which she belongs, and as this court could not try the alleged offence if it had been perpetrated in Spain or Cuba, or any other Spanish settlement, so neither, for the reason given, could this court try it as having been committed on board a Spanish vessel, which is identical with the soil of the country to which she belongs.—Under the state of the facts, therefore, said his honor, I have no hesitation in telling you that this court has no jurisdiction, nor are there sufficient facts before you to warrant you in finding a bill."

As there was no other business before the court which would require the intervention of either the grand or petit jury, both juries were discharged.

Thus has been settled,—and exactly in the way in which we expected, for in the beginning of the affair we expressed the opinion that the grand jury would never find a bill,—the first great question raised in relation to this matter, the question namely, whether the courts of the United States

have any jurisdiction to try these Africans for the alleged crimes of piracy and murder.

The second great question in the case, the question, namely, whether the President of the United States has any power to deliver up these persons to the Spanish government, as fugitive criminals; we consider that question to be conclusively settled in the negative, by the recent case of *Dr. Holmes*. Any such power claimed and attempted to be exercised by the President of the United States, could not fail, sooner or later, to bring the Federal Executive into dangerous collision with the State authorities.

The third great question, that, namely, whether these captives can be regarded and treated as property, and as such are liable to be delivered up to the persons claiming to own them. This question is raised, though possibly it may not be settled, by the *Habeas Corpus* case in regard to the three children, as to the progress of which case we proceed to give some account.

This case came on for argument on Friday morning. It appeared by the return of the Marshal to the writ, that there had been filed in the District Court, first a libel by Captain Gedney and his crew, claiming salvage upon the *Amistad*, and the property on board, of which property it was set up that these girls were a part, inasmuch as they were slaves; second, a libel on the part of Pedro Montez, claiming these girls as his property, and praying that they might be delivered up to him; and third, a libel by the U. S. Attorney for the District of Connecticut, setting out that these girls were claimed by the Spanish Ambassador, under the treaty with Spain, as Spanish property, and praying that the Court order them to be delivered up under that claim; or, in case the Court should judge the case unfounded, that it order the children to be delivered up to the President of the United States, for the purpose of being sent back to their own country.

Messrs. Staples and Baldwin argued for the children, and Messrs. Ingersoll and the District Attorney, against them.—The argument consumed the whole of Friday, till 7 o'clock, P. M. when it was concluded, and the Court adjourned.

The argument against discharging the children under the writ, seemed to be principally grounded so far as we are informed, upon the point, that the question whether the children are slaves or not, was the very matter which must come up before the District Court, upon the libels filed therein, and that the Circuit Court ought not to anticipate the judgment of the District Court, by deciding that point upon this *Habeas Corpus*. If the decision of that Court should be wrong, the Circuit Court would correct it on appeal. The claimant, Montez, might be able to prove that these girls were his lawful property, if he were allowed time to send to Cuba for the evidence.

On the other hand, the counsel for the children contended, that these children were not, and could not be, under any state of facts, the property of Montez, or any body else; and by way of showing that even under the Spanish law they were not property, they put in evidence certain Spanish decrees, totally abolishing the African Slave trade, and pronounced it to be a criminal offence; also the depositions of two native African interpreters, to the fact that these children could neither speak English nor Spanish, and that, from their language, they, the deponents, judged them to be Mandingos; also the affidavit of Boboo, one of the *Amistad* prisoners, made through an interpreter, that the two girls were born in the same town with himself, and that they were brought from Africa in the same ship with himself.

The argument was closed on Friday evening and the opinion of the judge was expected on Saturday,—but of what was done on that day we have no accounts.

An indication however, seemed to be afforded in the course of the argument, that the Court would have great difficulty in holding these children to be property. It was argued by Staples, —and justly, that if these children were property, and liable as such to the claim of salvage, that then it would follow that they might be sold at auction in the State of Connecticut! For it is the usual way, when salvage is decreed, to decree a certain per cent upon the value of the property, and in order to determine what that value is, to authorize the property to be sold at auction. Judson, the District Judge,—and who, as the author of the celebrated Connecticut Black Act, is not supposed to be favorably inclined towards the prisoners—saw the danger of this argument, and he interrupted the counsel, with the declaration, "that he had already declared in the district Court, that these Africans could not be sold in Connecticut, as slaves, but that salvage might be awarded on the vessel and cargo, and the value of the slaves, if recognized to be lawfully slaves, might be considered in making up the amount to be allowed." But we apprehend the establishment of such a doctrine would overturn the most settled principles by which courts are governed in deciding salvage.

As to the salvage question, we are inclined to think that Capt. Gedney will fail altogether in establishing any claim to salvage.

The question whether any claim of property can be established against any of the *Amistad* prisoners, seems to us extremely clear, and to lie in a very small compass.

1st. Under the Spanish law these prisoners are not slaves. By repeated decrees of the Spanish Government, the African slave trade is abolished, and has become a criminal offence. All Africans imported into the Spanish territories are entitled to their liberty. But then it is said, that the Spaniards have a good *prima facie* title to these slaves, because they possess a permit from the custom house, by which they are authorized to transport these slaves from Havana to Principe, and that our Courts can enquire no further. To deprive a man of his liberty, and to deliver him up to another as property, is the highest power a Court can exercise. It is a power in no respect short of the power of inflicting capital punishment; and it would be just as reasonable to ask a Court to hang a man upon a technical quibble, an official lie, a false certificate, which the Court knew to be false, as to enslave a man upon such grounds. The Courts are fond enough of quibbles and technicalities, but they have never yet gone to this length. If these Africans are to be delivered up, on the ground that by the laws of Spain they are slaves, the proof of that fact must be thoroughly sifted, and satisfactorily established.

2nd. Whatever the condition of these Africans might be under the Spanish law, in Connecticut they are free men, and as such they have all the rights of free men. They are not property, because in Connecticut it is not acknowledged that property can exist in living human bodies. The

State of Connecticut, under the United States Constitution, is bound to deliver up, to be carried out of the State, such slaves as have escaped into her territories, from any of the slave-holding States of the Union. These persons are delivered up, not as property, but under that particular clause of the Constitution, which does not apply to foreign States. This doctrine has been held over and over again in the New England States and is now settled law.

As to the pretended claim under the treaty with Spain, that relates only to property captured from pirates and brought into this country. As the Circuit Court has decided that there is no piracy committed, there is the end of the matter.

The Amistad Prisoners.

Judge Thompson having decided on Friday, in his instructions to the Grand Jury, that no criminal charge existed against any of the *Amistad* prisoners, of which the Court had any jurisdiction, a writ of *habeas corpus* was sued out in behalf of all these prisoners, and on Saturday afternoon they were brought into Court.

It seemed to be taken for granted, after what had dropped from Judge Judson, in the course of the argument on Friday, in the case of the three children, that the claim of Captain Gedney for salvage, so far at least as the Africans were concerned, could not be sustained. With respect to the other two claims, under color of which the Marshal held these Africans as prisoners, viz: the libels of Montez and Ruez, claiming these negroes as their property; and the libel of the District Attorney, setting out—first the claim of the Spanish Minister, and calling upon the Court to decide the validity of it; and secondly, alleging that these Africans are free persons, brought to this country in violation of the laws prohibiting the African slave trade, alleging that they ought to be restored to their own country, and praying the Court to take the necessary steps for enabling the President of the United States to send them back;—with respect to these two libels, and the claim of the Marshal to the custody of the negroes, by virtue of the process issued thereon, Judge Thompson said, "that if the District Court had in fact, jurisdiction over the claims thus brought before it, he would not, upon a writ of *habeas corpus*, forestall or interfere with the decision which the District Court might make upon a question thus legally brought before it. If that decision should be wrong, there was a remedy by way of appeal, first to the Circuit and then to the Supreme Court.—Whatever the opinion of the Court might be as to the ultimate decision of the case, or however abhorrent it might be to the feelings of the Court to keep these persons in prison, or to view them as property, still that question of property was a question to be decided, and if the District Court had jurisdiction of that question, then it was proper that a trial of the question should be had there.

P. S. We have just learned, that on Monday morning, Judge Thompson delivered the opinion of the Circuit Court, on the *habeas corpus* question, deciding that the District Court, under its general admiralty powers, had jurisdiction of the question whether the Africans were property or not, and if property, to whom they belonged. The Circuit Court on that ground declined to interfere, and would have this case to be tried in the first instance by the District Court.

Judge Thompson observed, that if it should turn out, that in point of fact, the seizure was made within the Southern District of New York, then the trial of the questions in dispute must first be had in that District, and the District Court of Connecticut would be ousted of its jurisdiction.

The jurisdiction of the District Court seems to have been sustained entirely on the authority of the case of the *Antelope*. The case of the *Antelope* was this. She was a Spanish slave, & was illegally seized by an American cruiser & brought into the United States, against the will of the persons in possession. It was contended that although the capture was illegal, and the ship must be restored, yet the slaves on board, having been brought into the United States, were free, and could not be given up to their former owners. But the Court decided that they would put matters back into the condition in which they stood, prior to the illegal interference on the part of the American cruiser. Therefore they gave up the slaves.

The facts in the case of the *Amistad* are totally different. That the ship was taken possession of by Capt. Gedney, at the express instance and request of Montez and Ruez, the former owner of the slaves, and was brought into the jurisdiction of the United States, at their desire. The case then, so far as Montez and Ruez are concerned, stands upon the same ground as if the vessel had been brought into New London by the persons on board, in which case there would be no pretence for any interference on the part of the District Court.

If, in the present case, the Court should undertake to act upon this same principle of *status in quo*, which governed the *Antelope* case, it would be much more proper to deliver up Montez and Ruez to the Africans, than the Africans to Montez and Ruez. At the time when the American interference commenced, the Africans were no longer slaves. They had vindicated their liberty, and on the other hand, had reduced Montez and Ruez to a condition of servitude.

The principle, certainly, of restoring things to the state in which they stood, when the American interference commenced, never can justify the delivery of the Africans to the Spanish claimants.

[The hearing before the District Court will come on in November.]

From the Boston courier,

If the slaves recently brought into New London in the Cuba Schooner had been Englishmen instead of Africans, and the master were an Algerine, instead of a Spaniard, how much would the public press echo with their praise! Suppose they had risen upon their oppressor, on their way from one Moorish port to another, had spilled his blood to gain their freedom, and then steered for a free country. They would have been publicly justified, if not hailed as heroes. Now they are arrested as pirates. They will undoubtedly be sent back to the tender mercies of their Algerians, and hang as felons, for doing what nearly every man among us feel it praiseworthy to, were their case his own. They are ignorant and degraded, doubtless, but this gives them a stronger claim to our pity. Yet not a voice of sympathy is raised for them in this nation born in Revolution, and whose foundation principle is the right of resisting tyranny unto blood.

It is painful to look at this transaction impartially, and to consider the agency which our pub-

lic vessels and our government are taking, in stifling the struggles of these poor men for freedom.

Affecting Appeal.

The following is evidently from the pen of Dr. Nelson, now of Quincy, Illinois, formerly a slaveholder. If northern ministers and professors of religion will not hear him, neither would they be persuaded though one should rise from the dead. We wish that by some fair means this letter might find its way into the *Vermont Chronicle*—that it might be pondered by those ministers in the late Convention who turned off the claims of the dying slave under the plea that their testimony against the sin of slavery would do no good.

From the Emancipator.

AUGUST 27TH, 1839.

Brother Leavitt,—During the last few days I have been conversing with some members of the Presbyterian church, who own slaves. I was attending a protracted meeting about thirty miles beyond the Mississippi. I felt a desire to ask certain individuals, on whose veracity and on whose judgment I could rely, concerning the statement that "professors are beginning to feel unwilling to sell men and women." I ascertained that it is so indeed; and that this sensitiveness is on the increase. Four years ago, it did not seem amiss (in the view of the brethren with whom I communed) either to buy or to sell. I look at the present state of affairs with more than astonishment! I am astonished, (not because I did not expect that discussion would be certain victory; but) that debate, so seldom and so faint, should have a result so speedily! Discussion has been suppressed; but even a little agitation has had an effect, blessed—promising—oh, how promising!!! What will the next four years accomplish! The black veil cannot be held between them and the sun always! It is beginning to rot into holes already.

Dear brother, I write you this short, hasty, and imperfect sheet, wishing to make one request of many brethren who read your paper, or who live near to those who do. I make this one request, because I feel compelled to do so. I make it of those with whom I do hope to sing about Calvary thousands of years from now! May I not explain what that favor is, and why I feel so sorely urged to ask it?

I was sitting on a log, under a quiet oak, by the side of one who is well informed, well educated, (and still better) well filled with principles of truth and of integrity! When I asked him what impression the views of the brethren of the East (who differ with the abolitionists,) has upon those who practice slavery—his answer was, "O, our slaveholding brethren here, think that they have their countenance!"! O, dear fellow professor, I know that you will confess that whatever it is which receives most constantly, most zealously, and most urgently our reproof, our admonition, and our deplorable entreaties, has the least of "our countenance." That which we talk most against has the least of our countenance. Those to whom I try to preach, think that you have never (by letter, or in any other way) called to them; that you have never affectionately entreated them to turn against oppression! It is thought that you reprove abolitionists, refuse them your pulpits, and speak and write against them. Oh that slaveholders might either feel or fancy your opposition!—O, dear fellow professing immortal, when I try to preach at the fire-side of the master and mistress, the obstacle which seems to me the most insurmountable, is, when they believe that they have "your countenance." They say that your judgment is impartial, because you own no slaves! O, dear friends, dear brothers and sisters in the Lord, the favor I have to ask is that you will try and tell them that slavery has not your countenance. I have nothing to request, as to the way in which this might be done. (I know that you could do it a hundred fold more plainly, affectionately, and ably, than some have done, who were nevertheless successful.) My request is nothing more than the simple favor, that you will inform them, how little slavery has your countenance. Oh, dear friends, I do believe that the effect would be wonderful, surpassing your highest expectations, a thousand fold. May we act speedily whilst we have time to act. D. N.

[We suppose every body knows who D. N. is; and will understand that his labors and influence extend far into the taboo region.]

BRIGHTON MARKET.

[Reported for the Yankee Farmer.]  
MONDAY, Sept. 23, 1839.  
At market—825 Beef Cattle, 950 Stores, 38 yoke Working Oxen, 19 Cows and Calves, 2950 Sheep and Lambs, 680 Swine.  
Pork—Beef—Still on the decline. First quality was sold at \$7.50 to \$7.75. Poorer quality sales very slow.  
Stores—Sales were not very brisk—prices varied a very little from last week.  
Working Oxen—We notice sales at \$75, 80, 90, 95, 100, 110 and 115.  
Cows and Calves—\$28—\$30—\$32—\$35—\$38—and 40.  
Sheep and Lambs—Qualities rather poor. Sales varied but a very little from last week.  
Swine—At retail, from 6 to 8; wholesale 5 1-2 for Sows 6 1-2 for Barrows. Old Hogs were retailed from 6 to 7.

DEATHS.

In this village, Sept. 24th, Charles R. Cleaves, Esq., aged 42.  
In Williamstown, Sept. 14th, Judith, wife of Mr. John Rood, aged 69.  
In Hampton, N.Y. July 1st, Denison Roggles, 72.  
In westford, Sept. 10th, Moses Ruggles, 68.  
In Westminster, Vt., Sept. 12th, Elisha Hitchcock, aged 86.—After a short illness of four days.

FALL & WINTER GOODS.

BALDWIN & SCOTT, have received a large supply of GOODS, suited to the present and approaching seasons, and offer them for sale on the most favorable terms. Their friends and the public generally are invited to call and examine their goods and prices.  
Montpelier, Sept. 26, 1839. 39:3f

FALL AND WINTER GOODS.

JEWETT, HOWES & CO. are now opening a large assortment of GOODS, adapted to the season.  
Sept. 27, 1839. 39:3wis

RIBBONS.

A FEW pieces of choice Bonnet Ribbons may be found at  
JEWETT, HOWES & CO.'S  
Sept. 27. 39:3wis

USLIN Edgings and Insertion, Cambric do. do. Thread do. do. Plain and fig'd Swiss Muslins just received at  
Sept. 27. JEWETT, HOWES & CO'S. 39:3wis

MERINOS, cheaper than ever, may be found at  
Sept. 27. JEWETT, HOWES & CO'S. 39:3wis

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN consequence of the ill health of the junior partner, and his wish to retire from the printing business, the partnership heretofore existing under the firm of *Allen & Poland*, is this day dissolved by mutual consent.  
E. A. ALLEN.  
JOSEPH POLAND.  
Sept. 26th, 1839

THE business heretofore carried on by *Allen & Poland*, will hereafter be conducted by the undersigned, who will settle all accounts, *pro and con*.  
Sept. 20th, 1839. E. A. ALLEN.

WANTED

IMMEDIATELY, as an apprentice to the Printing Business, a smart, active, intelligent and respectable lad from 15 to 17 years of age, at this office. None other need apply.  
Sept. 21st 1839.

BROADCLOTHS, CASSIMERES & VESTINGS!!!

R. R. RIKER,  
DEALER & TAILOR,  
(State street, opposite the Bank)

HAS received from New York, a prime assortment of Broad Cloths, Cassimeres and Vestings, of superior quality and texture, which he offers to his customers and the public generally, on the most accommodating terms. Gentlemen wishing for clothing are requested to call and examine his stock of Cloths. Garments made up in the latest mode of Fashions. Black satin stocks, shirt bosoms, Collars Rubber Pantalon Straps, Tailors Inch Measures, Drilled Eye Needles, &c., for sale cheap for Cash. Cutting done for others to make at short notice, and warranted to fit. 19:4f

HORSE FOR SALE.

Inquire of C. L. KNAPP.  
Aug. 20.

New Arrangement!

THE Subscriber having taken as partner his son, WILLIAM P. BADGER, in the business heretofore conducted by himself, the business will hereafter be done under the firm of *J. E. BADGER & SON*.  
J. E. BADGER.  
Montpelier, Feb. 7, 1839. 6:4f

HAT, CAP AND FUR STORE,  
STATE ST., MONTPELIER, VT.

J. E. BADGER & SON,  
Dealers in

HATS, CAPS, STOCKS, FURS, SUSPENDERS, Gloves, Hosiery, &c. &c., would return their thanks to the citizens of Montpelier and vicinity for their liberal patronage heretofore extended to their establishment, and solicit a continuance of the same.  
N. B. Merchants supplied with Hats of all kinds at city wholesale prices.  
February 7, 1839. 6:4f

Notice.

THOSE indebted to J. E. BADGER, by note or account, of over six months standing, are requested to call and adjust the same immediately.  
J. E. BADGER.  
February 7, 1839. 6:4f

AT THE CASH STORE OF

STORRS & LANGDONS,

JUST received from Boston and New York, an EXTENSIVE STOCK OF GOODS, among which may be found:—  
From 6 to 7,000 yds. PRINTS, from 6d to 3 6 per yd. From 40 to 50 pieces plain and fig'd dress SILKS—all shades.

BROADCLOTHS & CASSIMERES. BONNETS, from 20 cts. to 15,50. Ribbons, Laces, Linens, Muslin de Laine, Printed Lawns and Muslins, Artificial Flowers, Fancy Hdkcs, Shawls, Flannel Binding, Gloves, Oiled Silks, Neck Stocks.

4,000 yds. Sheetings, from 10 1-4 to 16 cts. 1,400 Shirts, from 7 to 10 cts. Tickling, Cotton Yarn, Wicking, Bating, &c. LOOKING GLASSES, CHINA TEA WARE with Plates to match.

Anvils, Vices, Mill Saws, and Hard Iron in general Nails and Glass, Paints and Oils, Iron Axes, with pipe Boxes fitted. A Large and more general assortment of all kinds of IRON and STEEL, and at lower prices than has been sold before, will be received in a few days.

We invite our friends and the public to examine our stock and prices.  
We are on the principle of SMALL advance for CASH, or SHORT credit.

WANTED—1,000 yds. TOW CLOTH, DRIED APPLE, BUTTER, CHEESE and GRAIN OF ALL KINDS.  
May 15th, 1839. 20:4m

NEW GOODS! CHEAP GOODS!!

LANGDON & WRIGHT

HAVE this day received, at their Cash Store, a large amount of FRESH GOODS, from New York and Boston, comprising a very general assortment which they have recently purchased with cash, and which they offer at prices which cannot fail to please. They respectfully solicit the patronage of their friends and the public generally.

N. B. L. & W. will soon remove their Cash Store to the large white Store one door North of the old Langdon Store, on Main st., where goods will be sold cheap for prompt pay. Call and see.  
Montpelier, May 1, 1839. 19:4f

THE CASH STORE IS  
REMOVED!!!

LANGDON & WRIGHT have removed their CASH STORE to the large White Building, one door north of the *Langdon Store*, on Main street—where they have on hand, and are daily receiving, a great variety of Desirable GOODS, which they offer for sale at great bargains. Call and see.  
Montpelier, May 16, 1839. 20:4f

Attention Artillery Companies!

R. R. RIKER,

(State street, opposite the Bank.)  
HAS this day received from NEW-YORK, Scarlet Broad Cloth, for Military Companies' Uniforms, Artillery Buttons, Yellow Wings for Sergeants, Red Coats, Red Pompons, Red 12 inch Vulture Plumes, Yellow Lace, Yellow Epaullets, Red Sashes &c. for sale cheap for cash.

50 doz. Infantry Hat Plates, White Coats, White Wings for Sergeants, 12 inch White Vulture Plumes, Swords and Belts, Flat Eagle Buttons, Laces, Epaullets, &c. for sale cheap for cash.  
Montpelier, June 10, 1839. 20:4f