

freemen and had a right to act. Did this editor make the same remark relative to the meeting to invite A. S. Clayton Esq. to a dinner at this place?—and will the editor dare deny there being but thirty-six men at that meeting including strangers, and that eleven of them opposed the measure? Will the editor please say why thirty men have not as good a right (notwithstanding they exhibit a mongre appearance) to assemble and adopt resolutions and have them published, as for thirty-six to meet, and, though eleven dissented, adopt resolutions, and send them forth as the voice of Bibb county, when in truth and in fact, there were only twenty-five persons who sent out these resolutions? Why did this watchful man of the press not inform the public that that was a mongre assemblage? Will this editor pretend to say that this fact was unknown to him? He dare not do it. This editor makes, in his own strictures, an apology for there not being over twenty or thirty persons attending the Barbour meeting—he says the place was nearly deserted. I will not question the truth or sincerity of his proposition—consequently I will and must draw the conclusion, that had the people been at home and there had not been “such a sudden and unexpected call of the friends of Barbour,” the meeting would have been much larger. This is a point I shall not contest with the editor of the *Advertiser*. “That the South fully appreciates