

Bedford Gazette.



BY GEO. W. BOWMAN.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

TERMS, \$2 PER YEAR.

NEW SERIES.

BEDFORD, PA. FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 28, 1854.

VOL. XXII, NO. 51.

Select Poetry.



HOME, DEAR HOME.

Where burns the loved hearth brightest,
Cheering the social breast?
Where beats the loud heart lightest,
Its humble hope possessed;
Where is the smile of darkness,
Of meek-eyed patience born,
Worth more than those of gladness,
Which mirth's bright cheek adorn?
Pleasure is marked by fleetness,
To those who never roam;
While grief itself has sweetness
At home! dear home!

There bend the ties that strengthen
Our hearts in hours of grief;
The silver links that lengthen
Joy's visits when most brief;
There eyes in all their splendor,
Are vocal to the heart,
And glances, ray or tender,
Fresh eloquence impart;
Then, dost thou sigh for pleasure,
O! do not widely roam,
But seek that hidden treasure
At home! dear home!

Does pure religion charm thee
Far more than ought below?
Wouldst thou that she should arm thee
Against the hour of woe?
Think not she dwelleth only
In temples of prayer;
For home itself is lonely,
Unless her smiles be there;
The devotee may falter,
The bigot blindly roam,
If worship less her altar
At home! dear home!

Love ever it presideth,
With meek and watchful awe,
Its daily service guideth,
And shows its perfect law!
If there thy faith shall fail thee,
If there no shrine be found,
What can thy prayers avail thee
With kneeling crowds around?
Go! leave thy gift unoffered
Beneath religion's dome,
And be thy first fruits proffer'd
At home! dear home!

ADDRESS

THE STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA:

Fellow Citizens:—The State Central Committee appointed by the Democratic convention which assembled in Harrisburg, in March last, have thought it their duty to address you on the present aspect of political affairs.

The opponents of the Democratic party and of Democratic policy (we scarcely know at this moment by what name to call them) have, for purposes connected with the approaching election, made another of those sudden changes of attitude which have so often heretofore furnished the political character of their leaders, and dissatisfied the people. They have run through their whole list of public measures. One after the other their principles have been condemned by the public voice and abandoned by themselves. A National Bank, about which they once threatened revolution, is an obsolete idea. The Independent Treasury, which they denounced so fiercely, is no longer deemed to be the safest and best mode of keeping and disbursing the public revenues. Their Bankrupt Law is delivered over, with their full consent, to the infamy it deserves. We hear no more from them about expunging the veto power from the constitution. The thunder of alarm against the annexation of Texas are silent. Their execrations of the Mexican War and the barren State of California, are no longer heard. "The tariff of 1842" is erased from their banners and omitted in their speeches. They seem to be ashamed (as certainly they ought to be) of their predictions that the country would be ruined and the treasury made bankrupt by the tariff of 1846. Even the Galphins of the last administration have retired to the quiet shades of obscurity, content to gorge their plunder in silence, without defending the means by which it was acquired.

It might naturally be supposed, from such untoward circumstances, that these politicians would cease their war upon the party of the people, when their formerly avowed principles and measures were thus abandoned. After keeping the country in a commotion for so many years, by contending for measures and views which they now tacitly admit to be either false or hopeless, it would seem that dissolution was the only thing left for them. But the natural enemies of republicanism and equality can never be idle. The interested and ambitious demagogue will never quit his trade. They can at least get local offices by stirring up strife among the people, and this they seem ready to do, as passing events abundantly verify.

We do not deny that the masses of the party opposed to us are honest, sound and true-hearted citizens, who desire nothing but that the honor and interests of their country may be promoted and perpetuated. It is their sincere prejudices against the Democracy, or their long habits of obedience to party discipline which keeps them where they are; but we confidently trust that the time has now come, when they will break the trammels which have heretofore bound them, and join the Democratic party in a cordial support of the laws and the Constitution.

Previous to the last presidential election, the organs, orators and leaders of the party, then calling itself Whig, had exhausted their list of party doctrines. Every issue had been settled against them. But they are seldom at a loss for some temporary subterfuge, and on that occasion they betook themselves to a most disreputable

expedient. They exerted all their power and influence to excite the anger, hatred and jealousy of the Catholics and naturalized voters against the Democratic party and its candidates. Immediately upon Gen. Pierce's nomination, they denounced him as a bigoted Protestant, who, if elected, would use his power to prevent Catholics from having their just rights. A restriction in the Constitution of New Hampshire against this sect of people, was charged on him as a high political offence. Certificates from Catholics in his own neighborhood, declaring that he was hostile to them flooded the country—and the sanctity of the Post office was violated for the purpose of circulating these documents along with the religious papers read by persons of that faith. On the other hand, Gen. Scott was held up as a man for whom Catholics, above all others, ought to vote. If he was not a member of that church himself, it was urged that his family were, and his daughter had, with his consent, gone into a convent. Never before was so bold and shameless an effort made to rouse religious prejudices for political purposes. Sensible men of all parties, sects and classes, were deeply offended at this unblushing system of end-avoring to carry an election by sectarian appeals.

Still more humiliating than this, if possible, was the flattery bestowed upon their adopted fellow citizens. From the aged and distinguished soldier who was their candidate for President, down to the most obscure and inefficient of their speakers and writers, all professed a becoming zeal for the rights of foreigners. According to their statements made then, all persons of foreign birth had been or were about to be greatly misused by the Democracy—and they were urged, exhorted and warned to trust nobody but their true friends, the Whigs. Even the dialect spoken by foreigners was referred to as being superior to the vernacular language which the native born citizen used. The "rich Irish brogue" was music to their ears, and the "sweet German accent" was the subject of extravagant eulogy.

These facts, fellow citizens, are fresh in your recollection. But would you believe it, that the same politicians who were preaching this sectarian crusade against the Democracy, less than two years ago, and who did all that in their lay, to excite the jealousy of adopted citizens against native born Americans, have recently espoused the doctrine of proscription against all citizens not native born of whatever religious faith, and are said to be in close alliance with a secret and oath bound association which proposes to punish men for conscience sake. In Philadelphia the newly elected Mayor has boldly declared this doctrine of proscription. That this is a mere political manoeuvre on the part of the Whig leaders may be confidently affirmed. That it is a heartless attempt to make a political use of religious prejudices, in which they themselves do not participate, no one can doubt. Ascertained facts, past and present, make it perfectly apparent, that these same politicians, if they could secure votes by it, would again flatter the Catholics and be the champions of the rights of our adopted fellow citizens.

It may be asked, how shall the Democracy meet the issues thus presented? We answer, just as they have met all the other false and anti-republican doctrines of the enemies of popular rights, by the power of truth, by the force of reason and argument appealing to the conscience of the people. This mingling of religious and political elements cannot be approved or endorsed by a free and liberal people in this age and in this country. They who think so, must be credulous and short sighted indeed. In 1852, the Democracy asked no more than equal justice for Protestants, and now when the Whigs have changed their ground, we will demand that common and constitutional right for adopted citizens of whatever religious belief they may happen to be. This has ever been the creed of the Democratic party, as it has ever been the policy of this government. They recognize no peculiar rights in any sect or class, but have only sought to maintain the just rights of all, and to bestow distinction and honor as the reward of individual merit. The constitution and the law—the great principles of equality which the people of this country, native born and those of foreign birth, fought and bled for—freedom of conscience, which no American Christian would take from his fellow man—justice to all and special favors to none—this is the platform of the Democracy. From this high elevation, let us look down calmly upon the important struggle of those who come in conflict with these principles. Ours is the cause of our country, of liberty and true religion, which can only flourish in its purity where all are permitted to worship as they think right.

We are fully persuaded that the people of this State are true and will remain true to the principles of civil and religious liberty, which were established by the revolution. Their whole history from the first settlement of this province down to the vote at the last Presidential election, is calculated to inspire every reflecting man with confidence in their good sense and patriotism. How much and why the principles of universal toleration are and ought to be valued, need not be enforced by argument on this point. The history of the world for two centuries is replete with incidents demonstrating the wisdom of this doctrine.

Religious toleration may be looked upon as the fruitful parent of the infant colonies—and the rights of conscience and of worshiping God according to its dictates, may be considered the stone of our republican institutions. The Puritans and Catholics of England and the Huguenots of France fled from the persecutions of religious intolerance at home, to the wilds of this Western world, in order that they might enjoy that liberty here which was denied them in the land of their birth. This land has been the land above all others of religious and political toleration—a toleration of all sects and creeds so much in harmony with our republican institutions. It is true that here and there at the early settlement of the colonies, a contrary spirit

was sometimes manifested, but it gradually subsided and the heaven born principles promulgated by Lord Baltimore in Maryland, Roger Williams in Rhode Island, and William Penn in Pennsylvania, have had their healthful sway in the policy of this country, being engrained in the constitution of the several States. The Quakers and Baptists were once persecuted in New England, and the Puritan preachers and Dissenters from the Established English Church, in Virginia—but who would dare now to avow publicly, sympathy with such intolerance?—Who would have the hardihood now to propose an amendment to the constitution of the Union or of any of the States, that a person born in a foreign land, or professing any particular religious faith, shall be excluded from the rights, privileges and immunities of an American citizen? Thanks to the spirit of the age and an over-ruling and ever wise Providence, the idea of rights of conscience has eventually prevailed and been permanently established, and peace has been introduced among men under the sanction of our government and laws, on subjects which had long led to cruel and bloody wars.

We are not defending the tenets of any particular sect, but the rights of all to enjoy their own peculiar views without molestation, without proscription and persecution. In this lies the safety of all, for the powerful of to-day may be the weak of to-morrow. The same oppressions and cruelties, visited by a dominant religious sect upon their weaker brethren of opposite religious views, may be returned upon themselves with a ten fold fury in the ebbs and flows of party and political feeling, if such questions are to be tolerated at all in political discussions. The poisoned chalice may be returned to the lips of those who would force others to drink the hemlock. We feel right sure, that the adversities of the past in the history of mankind, will not be lost upon the good sense of the American people, and that all religious persuasions may be permitted to carry out the pure and holy mission of propagating the gospel and diffusing a sound morality among men.

Let not then, fellow citizens, the sealed fountains of religious controversy be opened to deluge with bitter waters this happy country. Let not then the unmitigated evils of religious feuds be scattered broadcast over the land, to be more loathsome than the lice and frogs of Egypt. Let us not be divided in political matters, by reason of a diversity of sentiment on religious subjects, where no differences can exist in the eye of the law on such subjects, and where all sects and creeds are alike protected. Let us live together in amity and love, with no sectarian, bigoted or intolerant views upon subjects about which men never could and never will think alike: each conceding to the other the right to consult his own conscience in matters of religion, because such concession secures his own right to do likewise.

Let us also avoid the contracted view of human rights, which denies the privileges of citizens to those who have been born on foreign soil. How few of us, but can trace ancestors, not remote, who first saw the light of day beyond the blue waters of the Atlantic. And how it grates upon the American ear to hear it announced as has recently been done by the new Mayor of Philadelphia, that a distinction marked and manifest is to be made among the people of that city, not by reason of inequality in intelligence or true worth, but by reason of the accident of birth. The adopted citizen is no longer to be considered an equal, but an inferior. He can pay his taxes, enrich by his labor his adopted country, and if need be defend her flag, her honor, her interests, on the field of battle, but he must not enjoy the emoluments of office, must not occupy positions of public trust, or even exercise the right of suffrage except through protracted years and much tribulation. He has cast his lot among us, made his home in our midst, is identified with us in feeling and interest, and by all the ties which love of country can entwine around the human heart, but yet, according to this modern doctrine, he belongs to a proscribed, degraded caste.

We have for long, long years invited the oppressed of every clime to our shores, extended to them the hand of fellowship, offered them the protection of the broad shield of our constitution, to secure them in the rights and immunities of American citizens; but all this is now to be erected outside of and beyond the constitution, and stronger and higher than the fundamental law of the land. The great charter is to be treated as a dead letter, so far as it recognizes the equality before the law of adopted with native born citizens, and a power alien to the constitution and laws of the land is to be hereafter the rule of action.

It was assigned as among the reasons of declaring our independence, and breaking off our allegiance to the British crown that George III. had endeavored to prevent the population of these States, that he had obstructed the laws for the naturalization of foreigners, and that he had refused to pass laws to encourage their migration hither.

If such were considered among the reasons sufficient to risk a doubtful and bloody war, of how much greater magnitude are those now presented for the consideration of all liberal minded men. The offence of Geo. III. was at least an open one. He had refused to pass laws to encourage the emigration of foreigners. But the new policy is a species of deception unworthy of the American character. We leave our constitution as it is, we make no alteration in our naturalization laws, we invite on the faith of these guarantees, to be seen and read of all men, that they should leave their homes, renounce allegiance to their native land, and swear allegiance to our own government, when we mean that the inducements thus held out are mere cunning devices intended to deceive. For it is not proposed by those who adhere to the strange dogma, enunciated by the new Mayor of Philadelphia, to change the settled policy of this nation, by altering the condition on which the people of other countries are to be received and adopted as citizens, but a much

more dangerous and unjust ground is assumed. Its practical workings are to be retrospective.—It proposes to take from citizens the civil rights which they have already acquired under the constitution, by organizing a power to subvert that instrument. It is an attempt to settle a policy not recognized in any law of this country, that hereafter no man born out of the country shall hold a civil office under the government—no matter that he has come here upon the faith of the laws of the land—no matter how good his character; how effective his abilities; how thorough his education; or how numerous his virtues—no matter how devoted his attachments to the constitution; nor how orthodox his religion—no matter though he has suffered and bled for his adopted country. With such we are to have no political communion—we must not listen to their advice nor employ them in the public service. The standard of honesty and capacity is to be overlooked—and the circumstance of birth, and birth alone must decide who shall fill the offices of the government.

Here is a disfranchisement of the most obnoxious character. The alien and sedition laws were passed under the administration of the elder Adams in the height of the insolence of federal domination. But they were laws, while here is a similar policy without the sanction of law, secret in its operations, and tyrannical, unjust and cruel in its results. It is in effect, an administration of the alien law of black cowlade federalism, without the courage to place it on the statute book. Its spirit, essence and design are the same.

The Constitution of the United States authorizes Congress to pass uniform laws of naturalization. It also provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the United States.

The constitution of Pennsylvania is even more emphatic. It declares that all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences—that no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent—that no human authority can, in any case whatsoever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience—that no preference shall ever be given by law, to any religious establishment or modes of worship—and that no person who acknowledges the being of a God and a future state of rewards and punishments, shall, on account of his religious sentiments, be disqualified to hold any office or place of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

Such was the fabric of government erected by the patriots of the revolution, who understood what liberty, true liberty, meant, and who perilled their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, in its maintenance. Are we to do away with this noble feature of our government by indirection, and establish a test not known to our constitution and laws, but antagonistic to both, and which can only lead to political and religious intolerance?

But treating the question as one merely of policy, without regard to constitutional right, has not this liberal feature of our government thus early commenced and sanctioned by time, been attended with the happiest results in the development of the resources and strengthening the arm of the nation? Why should this liberal policy be now rudely and harshly broken up and abandoned?—or why should we be less generous now when liberal and progressive ideas in all other respects are warmly cherished as peculiarly American? We are aware that we may be pointed to the vices and excesses of an ignorant and destitute population, who come into our country unprepared in some respects for the proper enjoyment of its institutions. We are free to admit that individuals abuse the blessings of our government, but this is true of all—native as well as foreign—and surely is no reason for changing the policy of the government, for imposing new conditions upon adopted citizens, or for punishing the just equally with the unjust.

Indeed it is difficult, when examining this subject to say who are the most benefited by an influx of foreign population. Our own history would show that much of our prosperity and rapid advance to national greatness, has been accelerated by the talents, energy and productive industry of those of foreign birth. The debt of gratitude is at least not all on their side. Have we forgotten the distinguished aid of adopted citizens and foreigners, in our revolutionary struggle? Have we forgotten the chivalrous services of La Fayette, Montgomery, DeKalb, Kosciuszko and others like them but of less renown, who perilled life and property in our behalf, and in behalf of the cause of liberty and sound republican ideas? Did they not risk their lives and shed their blood for that cause and for this people? Have not the labors and the toils of the adopted citizens, who have poured into this country in a steady and constant stream, made much of our previously uncultivated lands bloom and blossom as the rose? Have they not felled the forest, subdued the rude and unbroken soil, constructed our railroads and canals, and largely extended our internal commerce and the bounds of culture and civilization? Are there not to be found among them as well as among native born citizens, men of exalted worth, brilliant talents, towering genius, who have given us their valuable services, in all the useful and ennobling pursuits and professions of life, and from among whom the ranks of our artists, statesmen and orators have been adorned. Is it wise, that all these and such as these, shall be disfranchised, proscribed on account of their foreign birth, and persecuted for their religious opinions? Have we nothing to lose by such a policy?

But how is this policy to be administered?—how is this new test to be applied? and by whom? Secretly and without warning, by secret, midnight political associations, bound to-

gether by extra judicial oaths, to do that which can be nothing else in effect, morally, than constructive treason to the government. They thus attempt to do, under the clouds of the night, and by secret political combinations what they would be ashamed to propose in the light of day and before the world.

Secret political societies, fellow citizens, however commendable in design at the outset, must soon degenerate into engines of tyranny and outrage. The Jacobin clubs of the French Revolution, headed by Danton, Marat and Robespierre, made the nation tremble for its existence, while France became drunken with horrid crimes, assassination and murder. What protection can the mass of peaceable citizens have against their secret councils and insidious attacks? Conspiracies and secret combinations against the body politic, or the political rights of large classes of citizens, are as odious in the eye of the moralist, as conspiracies against the private rights of the citizen are odious in the eye of the law. One offence is political and the other penal, but there is little if any difference in the shade of criminality. Both are founded in selfishness and disregard of the rights of others.

We have heard much in days gone by in Pennsylvania, from large bodies of our people, in opposition to secret societies of a purely charitable and benevolent character, having no political policy or purpose in view. How much more should that opposition extend to secret associations formed for political purposes alone, and for political purposes having for their object the disfranchisement on account of the religious views of a portion of our citizens.

Secret societies formed for political purposes, the great and good Washington warned us against it in his farewell address to his countrymen. How well he portrays their evils in the following paragraph.

"However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government, destroying afterwards the very engines which lifted them to the unjust dominion."

The secret political societies of Washington's day, were formed to promote liberty, not to abridge and destroy it; and yet even these were reprobated and condemned. How much more would he dread those of recent organization, which seem intended to destroy the rights of a large portion of our citizens, and to establish an arbitrary, partial and unjust rule of political and governmental action?

How totally must associations of this contracted and illiberal character fail of accomplishing any of the desirable objects of government. The policy of the nation must be abandoned to its fate, to carry out a bigoted and politico-religious frenzy. Forgetting all the great issues involved necessarily in the administration of the affairs of this widely extended country, with diversified interests and wants, in matters of revenue, finance, trade, commerce, peace, and war, external or foreign relations and internal police, they are endeavoring to bring the exalted science of political economy down to an unnecessary and unprofitable scramble about creeds in religion, with which this government has and can have nothing whatever to do, except to let them alone and protect each one in its constitutional rights, and to see that minorities as well as majorities have the free and full exercise of their religious opinions. It is an attempt to introduce a test in political affairs which must be as uncertain as it is unsatisfactory to all sensible and enlightened men, no matter to which of the two great political parties they may belong. It is an effort to stultify the country, and make it forget the history of the past, and render it unmindful of its glorious destiny in the future.

With such allies as these secret associations afford our Whig friends, many of that party will be unwilling to co-operate, and they will turn their faces towards the just, equitable and uniform principles of the Democratic creed as laid down by the wise and philosophic Jefferson. The principles of the Democratic party are benignant, and meets the wants of man in all the diversified interests of life. They teach man's equality with his fellow man, and at the same time they give him humbler views of himself, they dignify, ennoble, exalt him. They apply fitly to him as a rational, intelligent creature, who should be the object and care of all government, and not made to be governed or created for the government. All just government is intended for his good, not to oppress him, but to treat him equally with the subjects or people of the same government. It sheds its blessings alike upon all classes of the community, the high and the low, the rich and the poor. It knows no distinctions and will tolerate none. Like the sun in the heavens, or the dew of the night, or the atmosphere which we breathe, and which constantly surrounds and sustains us, it is alike benignant and bountiful to all.

Such fellow citizens are some of the allies of the whig party. We may have occasion to refer to others during the progress of the present political campaign, little less proscriptive and intolerant in their views; or we may perhaps have the various fanaticalisms of the day to be met and refuted by our Democratic friends, in their own way, in their various localities. But we may venture the general remark, that all collateral organizations outside of the Democratic party, got up as either moral or political movements, are soon thrown by the force of circumstances, by the laws and political affinities of minorities, in opposition to that party, and have for their main object in the end the prostration of its power and its principles. Let no Democrat be led away from his political associations, with the vain hope of accomplishing greater good by other organizations. Let no Democrat desert the standard of the Democratic party—that party which has long guided the destinies of Pennsylvania and of the nation—that

party whose principles have been tried in the fire of persecution in the new and old world until they have become comparatively purified from all dross and imperfections—that party on which the government of this country must ever lean, and in which it must ever confide to meet the just expectations of the people.

The miserable mushroom associations which spring up in a night and perish in a day, cannot withstand the public sentiment of the people of Pennsylvania, or we much mistake their character, and have looked into their history in vain. The people of Pennsylvania are loyal to the principles of the constitution and to the constitution itself, and they will show their loyalty at the approaching election, as they did in 1851 and 1852, by sustaining the Democratic nominees presented for their consideration and approval. It is idle to disguise the fact, that the Whig party of the North has become swallowed up and absorbed by its amalgamation with discordant and anti-republican elements. It is for the people in their sovereign capacity, to decide between such materials and the ever constant and truly liberal Democratic party and policy of the country. It cannot be doubtful how that decision will be made by intelligent freemen.

J. ELLIS BONHAM, Chairman.
George C. Welker, Secretary.

Destruction of Vermin.

Mr. Gordon, the superintendent of the ornamental department of the London horticultural society's garden, has ascertained, it seems, that water heated to a temperature of 140 degrees Fahrenheit, will destroy the "scale insect," with all its young ones, including the eggs; and this too, without the slightest injury to the bark of the tree on which the insect feeds. The method of applying it, is to wet a sponge in the water, and apply it to the parts of the tree on which the scales appear; or with a common syringe.

The following recipe for destroying caterpillars and other similar insects infesting fruit trees, was originally announced by Mr. Tatan, who was rewarded for his discovery, nearly one hundred years ago, by the society of Paris. Take of common black, or "bar soap," of the very best quality, 14 lbs.; flour of sulphur, 12 lbs.; mushrooms of any kind, 2 lbs.; and rain or river water, 15 gallons. Pour one-half of the water into a barrel of convenient size, and stir in the soap till it becomes dissolved, and then add the mushrooms, after they have been crushed. Next tie up the sulphur in a coarse open cloth, with a stone of sufficient weight to cause it to sink, and boil it in the other half of the water, for the space of twenty minutes. While boiling, stir the liquid freely, and squeeze the bag of sulphur thoroughly, before you take it out. As soon as the water is taken off the fire, pour it into the barrel with the other ingredients, with which it must be well mixed. Stir the compound at least once a day till it becomes fetid in the highest degree, for experience has demonstrated that the older and more offensive the liquid is, the more rapid and effectual will be its action. The barrel should be closely covered at all times, except when stirring the liquid, or applying it to the trees. When it is required to use the mixture, it is only necessary to sprinkle it over the plants or trees, which may be done very effectually with a garden engine or a syringe.

The Suicide in East Abington.

In addition to the particulars published in the Journal of yesterday, says the Boston Journal, relative to the suicide of Mr. Nash and Miss Sampson, in East Abington yesterday morning, we learn that the deceased were seen walking together, apparently in a contemplative mood, between the hours of one and two yesterday morning, on the margin of the pond in which they were subsequently found drowned. The following is a copy of the letter left by Miss Sampson in her chamber in Stoughton:

My Dear Friend:—It is with my right mind that I write these lines and also that which I am going to do. I am tired of this world, and so is my own dear friend; so I must say that tomorrow morning I shall be in another world, but, dear friend, I thank you for your kindness toward me which has been very great: call on my spirit.

Our bodies will be found in the East Abington pond, where my own dear companion will accompany me to another world; life may be sweet to you, but I must go where my own love goes. Tell Mr. Morton I thank him also for his kindness. My best wishes I leave to all the children. I did not dream of this, this morning; but please send this to aunt Chloe which I leave, and some of them will come here and get what money I left to get them here. It is with pain that I start from here, but I must say good bye.

My Aunt Chloe and sisters I now leave this world to yourselves, which I hope you will enjoy. Don't think of me only that I have gone with my companion to rest and to meet my Father, I hope. Here are my rings and his in my trunk, but all of you need not think you have led me to this: it is my own self. Mother, I hope you will think of Father and me; so good bye. Aunt Chloe, I have not forgotten your kindness, which I guess none of us will doubt. Don't think of me. Good bye Maddy and Jenny. We sign our names,

ADRIANNA B. SAMPSON,
ISAAC P. NASH.

At a hotel, a short time since, a girl enquired of a gentleman at the table if his cup was out. "No," said he, "but my coffee is." The poor girl was considerably confused, but determined to pay him in his own coin. While at dinner, the stage drove up, and several coming in, the gentleman asked, "Does the stage drive here?" "No, sir," exclaimed the girl, "but the passengers do."