THE BEDFORD GAZETTE.

Bedford, Aug. 10, 1855.

G. W. Bowman, Editor and Proprietor.

Democratic Candidate for Canal Commissioner,

HON. ARNOLD PLUMER,

OF VENANGO COUNTY.

DEMOCRATIC COUNTY MEETING.

☞The Democracy of BEDFORD County will hold a

Grand Mass Meeting

in the Court-House in the Borough of Bedford on MONDAY EVENING of the approaching County Court for the purpose of nominating a Ticket to be supported at the next election, and to adopt such measures as may be deemed necessary to secure its triumphant success at the Polls. As there will be no amalgamation in the formation of this Ticket—no bowing of the knee to any principle not recognized in the creed of JEFFERSON, JACKSON, POLK and PIERCE, it is earnestly hoped that every man who still adheres to these glorious old land-marks will be present to give force and countenance to the proceedings. All who stand opposed to Know Nothingism—who repudiate the abominable acts of the late Legislature—and who desire, honestly, the triumph of DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES—are cordially invited to attend. A number of able speakers will be present to address the meeting.

☞We have been pleased to meet, among the visitors at the Bedford Springs, Hon. Geo. Sharswood, President Judge of the District Court of Philadelphia —Daniel Daugherty, Esq., an eminent Lawyer of the same city—Hon. John C. Kunkel, of Harrisburg —Dr. S. P. Brown, of Greensburg—and Col. David H. Hoffus and Mr. Murray, (Postmaster,) of Hollidaysburg. A large increase of visitors is looked for in a few days.

SOUTH-WESTERN ELECTIONS.

☞The Democrats, it would appear from the returns before us, have swept the State of North Carolina, carrying six out of the eight members of Congress, by large majorities.

The Philadelphia News gives a despatch which says the returns from Tennessee fluctuate considerably, but the chances are in favor of the election of Johnson (Dem.) for Governor. A few days will determine.

SUPREME COURT.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania will meet in the Court House in Bedford on next Monday morning at the ringing of the bell. All the Judges will be present. The Bench consists of Chief Justice Lewis, and Justices Black, Knox, Woodward and Lowrie. Several important cases are to be argued—and opinions given on others argued in Harrisburg at the late sitting—among others the great Erie Railroad Case. It is supposed the Court will continue in session about two weeks.

The First Page.

☞Particular attention is directed to our first page for many interesting articles. The Philadelphia *News*, it will be seen, gives up all hope of harmonious action hereafter between the Old Line Whigs and the Know-Nothings—whilst the Chambersburg Repository and Whig has written the epitaph of the dark lantern Order as follows: "AN UNTIMELY VICTIM OF ITS OWN HEARTLESS VILLAINY!" The latter paper is forced to acknowledge, too, from the signs before it, "that the Democracy of Pennsylvania are morally certain to elect their State Ticket and an overwhelming majority of the next Legislature," an impression which seems to have taken possession of nearly every body. The "*Misgivings*" of the Charlestown Free Press are spicy and to the point —and we think all will acknowledge that John C. Rives' view of the "K. N. Platform" is a head and shoulders taller than any other yet given. The *Globe*, of which he is Editor, is not a political paper, but exclusively devoted to reporting the proceedings of Congress. "A Desperate Indian Fight"—"Tragedy at Long Island"—"Ship Impeded by Locusts" —and "Wholesale attempt at Murder"—are all articles that will repay a careful perusal.

☞The Democrats of Cambria county met in Convention in Ebensburg on the 31st ult., and nominated G. Nelson Smith, Esq., Editor of the Johnstown *Echo*, for Assembly—and James Myers, Esq., for Sheriff.

POWDER MILL EXPLOSION.

Five Men Killed—Five others Wounded—one Mortally.

Wilmington, Aug. 3.

The drying house of Mr. Garesche's powder works on Eden Park, in the vicinity of this city, was blown up shortly before 8 o'clock, this morning. It contained about one and a half tons of powder. The explosion was tremendous, and broke a large quantity of glass in the dwellings in the lower part of the city.

It had been in operation for forty years without accidents, and was considered to be the safest house embraced in the works. All the workmen connected with its operations were killed at once. They were blown to atoms, and fragments of their remains were found at various distances, from 50 to 200 yards.

There were three Frenchmen engaged in the drying house, named Eugene Perene, Joseph Du Peane, and Francis Fisler, and a boy named John Pugh.

The house was entirely blown away, not a vistige remaining. The explosion of the drying house caused a mill, situated about three hundred yards distant, to explode. In this mill there were four persons, none of whom were killed, but two were dangerously hurt, and two others badly wounded.—Peter McGinley was thrown about fifty feet, and it is feared he will not recover. He received a severe contusion on the right side of the head, his scalp is badly cut, and he is otherwise burned and bruised.

Patrick Burke was running from the mill, and was about 30 yards distant, when a lightning rod descended and struck him on the head, fracturing his skull in such a manner as to render his recovery doubtful.

The engineer, William Mitchell, was seated at his post reading a newspaper when the explosion took place. He saw a barrel of powder explode, and started to secure his safety behind the chimney stack, when a second exploded, which blew down a brick over his head.

The trees around the drying house were blown up by the roots, and the fields were literally covered with fragments of wood, cinders, and the remains of the victims.

Mr. Garesche says the explosion must have been caused by one of the Frenchmen, who worked in the packing room, being addicted to smoking a pipe.—Mr. G. had cautioned him two weeks previous, and told him to quit the premises or give up the pipe.—Mr. G. supposed he had abandoned the practice.

ABOLITION OUTRAGE!!

☞The Hon. John H. Wheeler, U. S. Ambassador to Nicaragua, while on board the steamer, at Walnut street wharf, Philadelphia, on Wednesday week, on his way to New York, had three of his slaves seized and taken from him by a mob of colored men, on the ground that, having been voluntarily brought to Philadelphia, they were entitled to their freedom.—Passmore Williamson, a well known member of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Socitey, was charged in the U. S. District Court with heading the mob, and Judge Kane issued a writ, requiring him to produce the slaves. Five of the negroes engaged in the affair have been arrested and committed to prison. The slaves were a mother and her two children, who had requested the privilege of accompanying Mr. Wheeler to Nicaragua.

From the Pennsylvanian.

Opinion of Judge Kane

IN THE WHEELER SLAVE CASE.

United States District Court.—Judge Kane.—The two questions of contempt of Court and perjury in Passmore Williamson, in not obeying the commands of the writ of habeas corpus, and in making an alleged false return thereto, was up for decision yesterday morning. Judge Kane delivered a very learned and exceedingly able opinion in relation to the subject.

The U. S. A. ex-rel. Wheeler vs. Passmore Williamson—Sur Habeas Corpus, 27 July, 1855.—Colonel John H. Wheeler, of North Carolina, the United States Minister to Nicaragua, was on board a steamboat, at one of the Delaware wharves, on his way from Washington, to embark at New York for his post of duty. Three slaves, belonging to him, were sitting at his side on the upper deck.

Just as the last signal bell was ringing, Passmore Williamson came up to the party—declared to the slaves that they were free—and forcibly passing Mr. Wheeler aside, urged them to go ashore. He was followed by some dozen or twenty negroes, who by muscular strength carried the slaves to the adjoining pier; two of the slaves at least, if not all three, struggling to release themselves, and protesting their wish to remain with their master; two of the negro mob in the meantime grasping Col. Wheeler by the collar, and threatening to cut his throat if he made any resistance.

The slaves were borne along to a hackney coach that was in waiting, and were conveyed to some place of concealment; Mr. Williamson following and urging forward the mob, and giving his name and address to Col. Wheeler, with the declaration that he held himself responsible towards him for whatever might be his legal rights; but taking no personally active part in the abduction after he had left the dock.

I allowed a writ of *Habeas Corpus* at the instance of Colonel Wheeler, and subsequently an *alias*; and to this last, Mr. Williamson made return, that the persons named in the writ, "nor either of them, are not now, nor was at the time of issuing of the writ, or the original writ, or at any other time, in the custody, power or possession of the respondent, nor by him confined or restrained: Wherefore he cannot have the bodies," etc.

At the hearing I allowed the relator to traverse this return; and several witnesses, who were asked by him, testified to the facts as I have recited them. The District Attorney upon this state of facts, moved for Williamson's commitment, 1. for contempt in making a false return, 2. to take his trial for perjury.

Mr. Williamson then took the stand to purge himself of contempt. He admitted the facts substantially as in proof before; made it plain that he had been an adviser of the project, and had given it his confederate sanction throughout: He renewed his denial that he had control at any time over the movements of the slaves, or knew their present whereabouts.—Such is the case, as it was before me on the hearing.

I cannot look upon this return otherwise than as illusory—in legal phrase, as evasive, if not false. It sets out that the alleged prisoners are not now, and have not been since the issue of the habeas copus, in the custody, power or possession of the respondent; and in so far, it uses legally appropriate language for such a return. But it goes further, and by added words, gives an interpretation to that language essentially variant from its legal import.

It denies that the prisoners were within his power, custody or possession *at any time whatever*. Now, the evidence of respectable, uncontradicted witnesses, and the admission of the respondent himself, establish the fact beyond controversy, that the prisoners were at one time within his power and control. He was the person by whose counsel the so-called rescue was devised. He gave the directions, and hastened to the pier to stimulate and supervise their execution. He was the spokesman and first actor after arriving there. Of all the parties to the act of violence, he was the only white man, the only citizen, the only individual having recognized political right, the only person whose social training could certainly interpret either her own duties or the rights of others under the Constitution of the land.

It would be futile, and worse, to argue, that he who has organized and guided, and headed a mob, to effect the abduction and imprisonment of others—he in whose presence and by whose active influence the abduction and imprisonment have been brought about —might excuse himself from responsibility by the assertion that it was not his hand that made the unlawful assault, or that he never acted as the goaler. He who unites with others to commit a crime shares with them all the legal liabilities that attend on its commission. He chooses his company, and adopts their acts.

This is the retributive law of all concerted crimes; and its argument applies with peculiar force to those cases in which redress and prevention of wrong are sought through the writ of *habeas corpus*. This, the great remedial process by which liberty is vindicated and restored, tolerates no language in the response which it calls for that can mask a subterfuge. The dearest interests of life, personal safety, domestic peace, social repose, all that man can value, or that is worth living for, are involved in this principle.—The institutions of society would lose more than half their value, and courts of justice become impotent for protection, if the writ of *habeas corpus* could not compel the truth, full, direct, and unequivocal, in answer to its mandate.

It will not do to say to the man, whose wife or whose daughter has been abducted: "I did not abduct her; she is not in my possession; I do not detain her, inasmuchas the assault was made by the hand of my subordinate, and I have forborne to ask where they propose consummating the wrong."

It is clear, then, as it seems to us, that in legal acceptance the parties whom this writ called on Mr. Williamson to produce, were at one time within his power and control; and his answer, so far as it relates to his power over them, makes no distinction between that time and the present. I cannot give a different interpretation to his language from that which he has practically given himself, and cannot regard him as denying his power over the prisoner now, when he does not aver that he has lost the power which he formerly had.

He has thus refused, or at least he has failed, to answer to the command of the law. He has chosen to decide for himself upon the lawfulness as well as the moral propriety of his act, and to withhold the ascertainment and vindication of the rights of others from that same forum of arbitrament on which all his own rights repose. In a word, he has put himself in contempt of the process of this Court and challenges its action.

That action can have no alterative form. It is one too clearly defined by ancient and honorable precedent, too indispensable to the administration of social justice and the protection of human right, and too potentially invoked by the special exigency of the case now before the Court to excuse even a doubt of my duty or an apology for its immediate performance.

The cause was submitted to me by the learned counsel for the respondent, without argument, and I have, therefore, found myself at some loss to understand the grounds on which, if there be any such, they would claim the discharge of the client. Only one has occurred to me as, perhaps, within his view; and on this I think it right to express my opinion.—I will frankly reconsider it however, if any future aspect of the case shall invite the review.

It is this: that the persons named in this writ as detained by the respondent, were not legally slaves, inasmuch as they were within the territory of Pennsylvania when they were abducted.

Waiving the inquiry, whether for the purposes of this question they were within the territorial jurisdiction of Pennsylvania while passing from one State to another upon the navigable waters of the United States—a point on which my first impressions are adverse to the argument—I have to say:

1. I know of no statute, either of the United States, or of Pennsylvania, or of New Jersey, the only other State that has a qualified jurisdiction over this part of the Delaware, that authorises the forcible abduction of any person or thing whatsoever, without claim of property, unless in aid of legal process:

2. That I know of no statute of Pennsylvania, which affects to divest the rights of property of a citizen of North Carolina, acquired and asserted under the laws of that State, because he has found it needful or convenient to pass through the territory of Pennsylvania:

3. That I am not aware that any such statute, if such an one were shown, could be recognized as valid in a Court of the United States.

4. That it seems to me altogether unimportant whether they were slaves or not. It would be the mockery of philanthrophy to assert, that, because men had become free, they might therefore be forcibly abducted.

I have said nothing of the motives by which the respondent has been governed. I have nothing to do with them; they may give him support and comfort before an infinitely high tribunal; I do not impugn them here.

Nor do I allude on the other hand to those special claims upon our hospitable courtesy, which the diplomatic character of Mr. W. might seem to assert for him. I am doubtful, whether the Acts of Congress give to him and his retinue and his property that protection as a representative of the sovereignty of the United States, which they concede to all sovereignties besides. Whether, under the general law of nations, he could not ask a broader privilege than some judicial precedents might seem to admit, is not necessarily involved in the cause before me.

It is enough that I find, as the case stands now, the plain and simple grounds of adjudication, that Mr. Williamson has not returned truthfully and fully to the writ of habeas corpus. He must therefore, stand committed for a contempt of the legal process of the Court.

As to the second motion of the District Attorney, that which looks to a committal for perjury, I withhold an expression of opinion in regard to it. It is unnecessary, because Mr. Williamson being under arrest, he may be charged at any time by the Grand Jury; and I apprehend that there may be doubts whether the affidavit should be regarded as extra-judicial and voluntary.

Let Mr. Williamson, the respondent, be committed to the custody of the Marshal without bail or main prize, as for a contempt of the Court in refusing to answer to the writ of habeas corpus, heretofore awarded against him at the relation of Mr. Wheeler.

U. S. District Attorney Vandyke for Mr. Wheeler, and E. Hopper and C. Gilpin for deft.

District Attorney asked for warrant of commitment under the seal of Court. Granted.

Mr. Gilphin, for the defendant, asked leave to amend the return so as to conform to the views of this Court.

Judge Kane said he would give the defendant a full hearing upon any motion his counsel should choose to present.

The Court then took a recess.

After the decision by the Court, United States Marshal Wynkoop took the prisoner into custody, and conveyed him to Moyamensing Prison, in a carriage, and handed him over to the keepers. A number of Williamson's friends requested the Marshal to put the prisoner into the custody of one of his deputies, and thus avoid sending him to prison, but the Marshal declined, by replying that he would comply strictly with the mandate of the Court.

There was no demonstration of any sort, although the Court room and avenues leading thereto were crowded, nine-tenths of the persons present approving of the action of the Judge.

From the Pennsylvanian, Aug. 2.

☞Important Opinion of Chief Justice Lewis, of Penna.

Chief Justice Lewis of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, yesterday filed the following opinion in the Wheeler Slave Case, in answer to an argument had before him on an application for a writ of *habeas corpus*:

Commonwealth, *ex rel* P. Williamson,

vs.

F. M. Wynkoop, U. S. Marshal, and Charles Hertz, keeper of the Philadelphia County Prison.

Lewis, C. J.—This is an application for a writ of *habeas corpus*. It appears by the copies of the warrants annexed to the petition, that the prisoner is confined for a contempt of the District Court of the United States, "in refusing to answer a writ of *habeas corpus* awarded by that Court against him at the relation of John H. Wheeler."

The council of Mr. Williamson very frankly stated, in answer to an interrogatory on the subject, that they did not desire the useless formality of issuing the writ of *habeas corpus*, if, on view of the cause of detainer exhibited, I should be of opinion that the adjudication of the U. S. District Court was conclusive. The *habeas corpus* act does not require the writ to be granted in all cases whatever. Whenever it appears upon the face of the petition, or, which is the same thing, by the detainer annexed to it and forming part of it, that the prisoner is "detained upon legal process, order or warrant for such matter or offences for which by the law the said prisoner is not bailable," the case is excepted out of the act; see act 18th Feb., 1785, sec. 1. In like manner, where the case has been already heard upon the same evidence by another Court, the Act of Assembly does not oblige the Judges to grant a *habeas corpus* for the purpose of re-hearing it, although, perhaps, they may deem it expedient to do so in some extraordinary instances. Ex. parte Lawrence, 5 Bin. 304.

We come, therefore, at once to the cause of detainer. Is it a "legal process, order or warrant for an offence which by law is not bailable?" Mr. Justice Blackstone, in Brass Crossby's case, 3 Wilson, 188, declared that "all courts are uncontrolled in matters of contempt. The *sole* adjudication of contempts, and the punishment thereof in any manner, belongs *exclusively* and *without interfering*, to *each respective court*. Infinite confusion and disorder would follow if courts could by writ of *habeas corpus* examine and determine the contempts of others.—This power to commit results from the first principles of justice; for if they have the power to decide they ought to have the power to punish." It would occasion the utmost confusion if every court of this State should have power to examine the commitments of the other courts of the State for contempts; so that the judgment and commitment of each respective court, *as to contempts, must be final and without control*." 3 Wilson, 204. This doctrine was fully recognized by the Court of Common Pleas in England, in the case referred to. It has since been approved of in numerous other cases in that country and in this.

In ex-parte Kearney, 7 Wheaton, 38, it was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, in accordance with the decision in Brass Crosby's case, 4 Wilson, 188, that, "when a Court commits a party for contempt, their adjudication is a conviction, and their commitment in consequence is execution." 7 Wheaton, 38, 5 Cond. Rep. 227. In the case last cited, it was also expressly decided, that "a writ of *habeas corpus* was not deemed a proper remedy where a party was committed for a contempt by a court of competent jurisdiction; and that if granted, the Court could not inquire into the sufficiency of the cause of commitment." 7 Wheaton, 38. Many authorities to the same effect are cited by Chief Justice Cranch in Nugent's case, 1 American Law Journal 111.

But it is alleged that the District Court had no jurisdiction. It does not appear that its jurisdiction was questioned on the hearing before it. The Act of Congress of 24th September, 1789, gives it power to issue "writs of *habeas corpus* which may be necessary for its jurisdiction, and agreeably to the principles and usages of law;" and the same act expressly authorizes the Judge of that Court to grant writs of *habeas corpus* "for the purpose of inquiry into the cause of commitment; provided, that writs of *habeas corpus* shall in no case extend to persons in goal, unless where they are in custody under the authority of the United States or committed for trial before some court of the same, or are necessary to be brought into Court to testify. Other acts of Congress give the United States Judges jurisdiction in writs of *habeas corpus* in cases thererein specified.—It does not appear that the writ issued for persons in goal, is in disregard of State process or State authority. It may be that in an action at law, where the judgment of a United States Court is relied on as a justification, the jurisdiction should be affirmatively shown. But in a writ of *Habeas Corpus*, issued by a Judge having no appellate power over the tribunal whose judgment is shown as the cause of detainer, where the jurisdiction of the latter depends upon the existence of certain facts, and no objections to its authority are made on the hearing, the jurisdiction ought to be presumed, as against the party who might have raised the question at the proper time, but failed to do so. It is true that if the jurisdiction be not alledged in the proceedings, the judgments and decrees of the United States Courts are erroneous and may, upon writ of error or appeal be reversed for that cause. But they are not absolute nullities. If other parties who had no opportunity to object to their proceeding, and who would not have writs of error, may disregard them as nullities, it does not follow that the parties themselves may so treat them. Kempe's lessee vs Kennedy, 5 Cr, 185, Skillern's Exe'r, vs May's Exe'r, 6 Cranch, 267, M'Cormick vs Sullivant, 10 Wheat. 192.

It is alledged that the right of property cannot be determined on *habeas corpus*. It is true that the *habeas corpus* act was not intended to decide rights of property; but the writ *at common-law* may be issued to deliver an infant to a parent, or an apprentice to a master. Com. vs. Robinson 1 S. & R. 35 B. On the same principle, I see no reason why the writ at common law may not be used to deliver a slave from illegal restraint, and to restore him to the custody of his master. But granting, for the purpose of the argument, (which I am far from intimating) that the District Judge made an improper use of the writ; that he erred in deciding that the prisoner refused to answer it—that he also erred in the construction of the answer which was given, and that he otherwise violated the rights of the prisoner; it is certainly not in my power to reverse his decision.

If a writ of *habeas corpus* had issued from a State Court to the United States Marshal, and that Court had adjudicated that the Marshal was guilty of a contempt in refusing to answer it, and had committed him to prison, the District Court of the United States would have no power to reverse that decision, or to release the Marshal from imprisonment. No Court would tolerate such an interference with its judgments. The respect which we claim for our own adjudications, we cheerfully extend to those of other Courts within their respective jurisdictions.

For these reasons the writ of *Habeas Corpus* is refused. ELLIS LEWIS.

August 1st, 1855.

Frightful Mining Accident.

The following is taken from the Pottsville *Miner's Journal* of Saturday. The details of one of those frequent accidents by the explosion of fire damp is herewith given:

A fearful accident occurred on Tuesday morning last, about half-past seven o'clock, at Mr. Agard's Belmont Colliery, in this county—the place is better known by the old name of the five points. Four persons, two men and two boys, have been taken out of the slope, dead and dreadfully mangled—one more is not likely to live, and six others are seriously injured. It has been and may be denominated an explosion of gas, but more properly it was a powder explosion: for the latter did the most injury, though the "fire damp," as it is generally called, exploded first and ignited the powder.

The facts of the occurrence are as follows:—The miner boss, Mr. John W. Davis, went into the mine early in the morning as usual, and examined the works carefully before any of the miners were at work. He found "fire" in one of the "breasts" near the face of the gangway. This breast was worked by James Silverthorn and son, and was the only part of mine considered dangerous. Mr. Davis met Silverthorn and told him twice, very emphatically, that his place was full of fire, and that he should not venture in it with a naked lamp until the gas was driven out. Accordingly Silverthorn took the Davy or safety lamp, and commenced to brush fire out of the breast. But unfortunately, several of the miners were seated around the bottom of the breast, in the gangway with their naked lamps, taking their customary "whiff," and that before commencing work, and near them were between two and three kegs of powder, open and unprotected.

The gas being driven down the shuts past the cross-heading, penetrated to the gangway, where the miners were seated, and as might be expected, it took fire from the lamps. But the explosion of gas would have been trifling, in comparison to the amount of damage done, had not the powder, which was in close proximity to the men, also ignited and exploded, crushing and bruising everything in the vicinity, and doing considerable damage to the mines. The effect of the shock was felt at a great distance from the scene, and the mines throughout trembled with the concussion. Coal, rocks and material, were buried with dreadful velocity far out towards the slope. But the damage done to the work, the amount of which cannot be fully ascertained, is nothing in comparison to the dreadful loss of life and limb—the horrid sufferings which the fearful accident occasioned.

The Little Know-Nothing organ having completely dodged every charge preferred against it in our last week's paper, touching the disreputable actions of its Editor and friends in the K. N. Council in this place, it stands self-convicted of a degree of duplicity, dishonor and falsehood, that must bring the blush to the cheek of its blindest apologists. Until it meets in some tangible way the issue its own acknowledged dishonor has raised, we can have no farther controversy with it; but whenever it is prepared to either deny or explain the blistering stains of infamy which now overshadow itself, its masters and its creatures, we shall stand ready to vindicate fully the charges preferred, and to expose, without fear, favor or affection, those who have aided in the consummation of its disgraceful schemes. It is welcome to dodge the issue by attacks upon us—upon our personal, political or moral short-comings, if it can thereby in any degree shield itself from the fruits of its folly. We care for no such assaults, and he who thus prostitutes a controversy raised on district issues, only seeks some plausible method of admitting his total discomfiture.—*Chambersburg Whig.*

Heartrending Calamity.

[From the Morristown (N. J.) Banner, Aug. 1.]

On Wednesday evening last a gentleman living near Communipaw Lane, Hudson county —we have not learned his name—met with a sudden and untimely end, under the following circumstances. It appears that he had in his house a three barrelled pistol, loaded. He told his wife that he believed he would discharge the load. She replied that she would like to fire them off, to which he consented, instructing her to be careful to point the pistol upward.—She did so, and two barrels went off. The third, she told him, missed fire.

He replied that perhaps it might not be loaded, and requested her to hand it to him for examination. But, alas! for all human calculations—she snapped it again; it proved to be loaded, and she holding it in a wrong position; instead of the ball going upward, it entered the heart of her husband, killing him instantly.

This married couple were devotedly attached to each other, and we learn that the unfortunate self-made widow is now frantic with grief and unutterable agony, bordering on insanity, in view of this terrible catastrophe.

Casualty.—Mrs. Roxania Johnson, of New Haven, met with a serious accident on Wednesday morning of this week. It appears that she went to a cistern near the house, for the purpose of drawing water. The cistern was covered with boards, which being very much decayed, broke through, precipitating her into the water. Fortunately, while falling, she caught the edge of the cistern, and hung there for over fifteen minutes, when some one passing by, hearing her groans, relieved her from her perilous position. There was but about four feet of water in the cistern, but exhausted as she was it was sufficient to have drowned her. Her recovery is considered doubtful. She is about seventy years of age.—*Plymouth (O.) Advertiser.*

Frightful Accident on the Delaware.

Providential Escape.—Near ten o'clock, last night, as the steamboat Miantonomi was coming up the Delaware, from an excursion trip to Fort Delaware, and when a short distance below the Navy Yard, she was run into by the steam-tow boat "Spy," and had a large hole knocked in her bow. Fortunately, the steamboat was opposite the flats, and the pilot headed her at once upon the shore, thus, no doubt, saving a large number of lives. The water came in through the aperture in such immense quantities that the boat had begun to settle before she reached the shore. A large number of the excursionists on board being females, some of whom had young children with them, and the excitement on board at the time of the collision may be imagined. All the life preservers were seized upon, in some instances by the males on board, who left the females to take care of themselves.—Several men were seen with life preservers, and which were not inflated, so little knowledge had they of the article. The captain and the other officers on board, by their presence of mind, contributed to allay the excitement. After the boat had been run upon the flats, the passengers were taken off by the steam tug and landed at Mead street wharf. The Miantonomi had the damage temporarily repaired, by means of a bed or two being thrust into the hole and the nailing of boards over all. She lay at Simpson & Neill's wharf all night, and this morning was taken upon the sectional dock at that place. It is expected that she will be able to resume her trips to Salem on Monday next. From all we can learn, we are led to believe that the fault, if any there was, is to be laid to those on board the "Spy." The "Miantonomi" had all her lights up, and the Tug seems to have been attempting to cross her bow. She was struck much in the same place as the Ohio, and had she been a few hundred yards further up the river must have shared the same fate. It is fearful to think of the loss of life that must have ensued if the boat had not been just at a point where she could be run upon the shore, and if there was criminal carelessness in the affair, those guilty should suffer for it.

Distressing Affair in New Haven—Two Lives Lost in a Well.—Two lives were lost on the premises of the New Haven Gas Comlast Saturday afternoon, under distressing circumstances. It seems that the officers had employed a man to clean out the wells belonging to them. The person employed to clean the wells, Mr. James Blakeslee, having finished two, proceeded to the third. He had decended but a few feet, when his father, who was overlooking his work, observed him fall headlong into the water. He called for help, which summoned the hands at work in the factory, and one of them, named Owen Sheriden, immediately descended by means of a ladder placed in the well to the rescue of Blakeslee, who was lying upon the bottom. He had got but a short distance downward when he was observed to lose his hold of the ladder and fall headlong upon his companion below. Another hand in the factory then descended, caught hold of Sheridan, and attempted to raise him, but losing his breath he became unconscious, and was about falling from the ladder when he was seized by the foreman of the shop and raised to the surface, and resuscitated. The bodies of Blakeslee and Sheridan were taken out with the least possible delay, and every exertion made to restore them to consciousness—but in vain. The well in question had been closed for the last six months. An experiment subsequently made by the jury, by dropping a lighted candle into the well, proved it to be so thoroughly impregnated with "well-damp," as to extinguish the light in an instant.—*New Haven Journal, July 30.*

The "Mean Spirits."

Blair County.—The Whig County Convention met in Hollidaysburg on Wednesday. A pledge was exacted by the members that they did not belong to the Know Nothings. A part of the members signed and finally withdrew, with the chairman, and organized in another place, and adjourned to the 28th of August.—The Know Nothings who remained reorganized, and passed a resolution adjourning to the 10th of September. When will this contemptible business of interfering with parties to which they do not belong be discontinued by the Know Nothings? No honest man can approve of such conduct, and none but a mean-spirited man would be guilty of it.—*Philadelphia News.*

Washington County.—The first Convention held by the Whigs having been controlled by the Know Nothings, and the party disbanded without making nominations, for the purpose of benefiting the Know Nothing ticket, a new Whig Convention has been called to meet on the 27th. The call is signed be Wm. McDaniel, Samuel Livingston, R. R. Reed, R. F. Cooper, L. C. Truesdell, David Clarke, and William Lee. The call appears in the *Commonwealth*. The old Whig paper, the *Reporter*, could not find room for it.—*Philadelphia News.*

Too Much of a Pill.—C. Rich, of East Calais, Vermont, says he had taken the Montpelier Watchman for forty years, and been during that period "a federalist, a whig, a federal republican, and a free-soiler," but "know-nothingism is too bitter a pill" for him "at his age," and he therefore stops the Watchman, and subscribes and pays for three copies of the Democratic Patriot.

☞BROAD TOP IMPROVEMENT COMPANY. —At a meeting of the CORPORATORS and STOCKHOLDERS of the BROAD TOP IMPROVEMENT COMPANY, held the 31st of July, to organize said Company under the Charter recently granted by the Legislature, the following gentlemen were elected Directors of the Company:—Henry D. Moore, John B. Myers, John McCanles, Henry K. Strong, J. R. Flanigen, Thos. Allibone, Jesse Godley, Wm. T. Daugherty, Thos. Caldwell.

And at the meeting of the Directors, held on the 1st instant, HENRY D. MOORE, was elected President, and Daniel Haddock, Jr., Treasurer.

On the night of the 27th July, at the house of her sister, Mrs. Rush, of this place, departed this life, Mrs. EMILY C. HAMMONTREE, late of Baltimore. The deceased had just risen but a few days from the bed of sickness, when she left Baltimore to spend some time with her sister at Bedford, the home of her childhood, and the residence of her nearest and dearest friends, as well as the place where her beloved parents had lived and died in the Lord. It was the will of Providence that her visit to her native spot was allowed that she might die in the midst of her pious relatives and acquaintances. Fully conscious that she was not long for this world, she made good use of her few days in preparing herself to meet her God. Reconciliation and union with her Lord were now dearer to her than the whole world. Her death-bed presented a continued scene of edification to her visiting friends, who, each moment of her brief stay here, received such consolation, in witnessing how a true Christian can die. Up to the last instant almost of her lessening life, her lips as well as her heart moved in correspondence with the prayers and Holy rites with which the Catholic Church prepares her children for their departure from this "vale of tears" to their true country. Having now received what she had so much at heart, all the consolations of her Church, as the means of uniting her to her dear Lord, she was disposed and ready to say "Now thou dost dismiss thy servant in Peace, because my eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared." So calmly and so sweetly did her reconciled spirit pass to her Divine Spouse that it seemed rather a gentle sleep than a passage through "the valley of the shadow of death." "*Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his Saints.*"

LIST OF CAUSES

Put down for Trial as September Term (3d day) 1855.

John G Graham	vs.	Simon Cook
Wm S Fluck & wife		Christian Snider et al
James R Smith		Thomas Dugdale's admr
George Troutman		Robert Adams et al
Wm Delany		Jacob Teeter et al
Jesse Sleek		Christian Nawgle
Commonwealth		Abel Findlay et al
Nathan Dicken use		Jesse Dicken et al
Same		Same
Same		Jonathan H. Dicken et al
Same		Same
Christian Stouffer		Thomas Nevit
Pattonsville & Woodbury		T R C vs. James Patton
Same		John & Thomas King
Henry M Brant & wife		David Patterson
Same		Wm Crisman admr
A R Galbraith		Wm Galbraith Exor
A W Schroyer		John Keiser
Baltzer Sheely		Allegheny M & F Seminary
Joseph S Morrison admr		John Folck Jr
James Patton et al		Ezekial Lockard
Daniel Baker		John W. Duncan et al
Mary A Baird et al		Joseph W Tate et al
Jacob Sturby		A J Crisman et al
A W Shroyer		John Moyer
Same		Adam H Huffman
Cath Sands use		Moses Wisegarver
James Blake		John King et al
Joseph W Tate Esq		Joseph O Neal
William Sleek		John Todd
George Troutman		Leonard Bitner

D. WASHABAUGH, Prothy.

August 10, 1855.

Register's Notice!

ALL persons indebted either as heirs creditors or otherwise are hereby notified that the following named persons have filed their accounts in the Register's Office and that they will be presented to the Orphans' Court of Bedford County on FRIDAY the 17th day of September next at the Court House for confirmation at which time and place they may attend if they think proper.

The account of William Smith administrator of the estate of George Smith late of Bedford Township deceased.

The account of Abraham Moses and George F Riddle Executors of the last Will &c of Samuel Moses late of Union township deceased.

The account of Nicholas Whiteline administrator of John Christian Biene late of Juniata township deceased.

The account of John Brown Executor of the last will &c of David Thompson late of Bedford township deceased.

The account of John Sparks one of the Executors of the last will &c of Thomas Morris late of West Providence township deceased.

The account of Jeremiah Bennett administrator cum testamento annexo of George Fryer late of Southampton township deceased.

The account of James Cessna Esq administrator of Joseph Cessna late of Cumberland Valley township deceased.

The account of Hon Joseph B Noble one of the Executors of the last Will &c of William Galbraith late of Napier township deceased.

The account of William Beegle & Emanuel Beegle administrators of the estate of Charles Beegle late of Colerain township deceased.

The account of John Metzger Esq administrator of the Estate of Marcus Metzgar late of Harrison Township deceased.

The account of Wesley Fisher administrator of the estate of Philip Fisher late of East Providence township deceased.

The account of Amos Wertz administrator of the estate of James Boylan late of Bedford County deceased.

The account of Solomon Sparks one of the administrators of the estate of Abraham Sparks late of West Providence township deceased.

The account of Henry Hull and William Hull administrators of the estate of Isaac Hull late of Napier Township deceased.

The account of Emanuel Diehl & John Nycum Exors of the last will &c of Jonathan Nycum late of Colerain township deceased.

The account of George W Figard one of the Executors of the last will &c of James Figard late of Broadtop township deceased.

The account of Wm Adams Executor of the last Will &c of Jacob Adams late of Southampton township deceased.

The account of Thomas King Guardian of the estate of Richard E Bonnett late of Hopewell Township deceased.

The account of George H Spang Esq administrator of the estate of Thomas Keefle deceased who was one of the Executors of John Keefle late of Bedford township deceased.

D. WASHABAUGH, Register.

Aug. 10, 1855.

☞At a meeting of the private class of Dr. Burleigh, held at Woodberry, Aug. 1, 1855, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That Dr. Burleigh's theory of electricity applied to the mind is not only novel and intensely interesting, but is in perfect accordance with the laws of nature, and the acknowledged principles of science.

Resolved, That this wonderful department of human knowledge, showing the relation of MIND to MIND, and of the soul to its Creator, merits the closest investigation and the warmest support of the Philanthropist and the Christian.

Resolved, That we solicit for Dr. Burleigh an impartial hearing from an enlightened public—feeling assured that their experience will accord with our own—prejudice will give place to demonstration—scepticism to proof—and error to truth.

Dr. CHAS. S. OLLEIG, Chairman.

Dr. Jacob Coup, Secretary.

STRAY COW.

Came to the premises of the subscriber living in Bedford township, sometime about the first of June, a Red Cow, black spotted, no particular marks. The owner is requested to come forward, prove property, pay charges, and take her away.

LUCAS SAUPP.

Aug. 10, 1855.

MARRIED:

At Mr. John Cook's, in Londonderry township, on the 2d inst., by D. B. Troutman, Esq. Mr. JOHN BURKET, of Allegheny county, Md. to Miss SARAH BEALS, of Londonderry township.