

# Bedford



# Gazette.

BY MYERS & BENFORD.

WHOLE NO. 2757.—VOL. 53.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

FRIDAY MORNING, BEDFORD, PA. AUGUST 14, 1857.

TERMS, \$2 PER YEAR.

NEW SERIES—VOL. 1, NO. 2.

## Address

### of the Democratic State Committee.

To THE CITIZENS OF PENNSYLVANIA:—It has been usual for the State Committee representing the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, to address the people of the State pending important elections. In conformity with this usage, which may be regarded as settled and salutary, we submit the following address:

The Democratic State Convention, upon the second day of March last, and at its re-assembling in June, made nominations for the offices of Governor, Canal Commissioner and Judges of the Supreme Court.

For Governor, Gen. Packer, of Lycoming, was named, after a spirited contest, and his nomination was then unanimously and right-fully confirmed. He has been well known throughout the State; has filled a number of responsible and important positions in the State government, and has established a public character which recommends him to the popular confidence. We conceive it to be a material qualification for this high office, that the incumbent shall be acquainted with the practical workings of the government—with the course and character of legislation—the details of business in the several executive departments—and with the public men of the Commonwealth, who have filled, or may fill the various positions created by the Constitution and laws. The contrast, in this respect, between our candidate and the candidates of the opposition, is too strongly marked to escape general notice, and it is but necessary to allude to it to show the vantage ground held by our party in the present canvass. It may be asserted that the Convention have named "the right man for the right place," and that their nomination deserves popular endorsement if regard is had to qualification and experience.

It is agreeable to add, that our candidate has a solid and reputable character in private life, and that his estimable qualities have endeared him to a large circle of friends who can enter upon his support with feelings of enthusiasm as well as with convictions of duty. We do not desire to draw strongly the contrast which it is possible to draw, between our candidate and his leading opponent. Judge Wilnot has had a career as a public man which has given him notoriety without inspiring confidence. Imperfectly acquainted with the practical action of State government; without experience either in the legislative or executive departments; with but a limited knowledge of public men and State affairs beyond his immediate locality,—he is presented on a comparatively remote national issue, and as the candidate of a bitter sectional party which received a merited defeat at the recent Presidential election. It is not believed that his career in Congress exhibited any high capacity to promote the interests of the people of Pennsylvania, and it is certain that the recent course in the office he now holds, has been calculated to lower the judicial character by connecting it with extreme and violent partisan dispute.

Nimrod Strickland, of Chester county, was named by the Convention for Canal Commissioner. He needs no commendation at our hands, for his integrity, firmness and capacity are not disputed and are widely recognized. It will be a pleasure for those who belong to our party, and for all who desire to consult fitness and merit in bestowing their suffrages to give him their cordial support.

By reason of the declination, by Chief Justice Lewis, of the re-nomination tendered him by the Convention, and the calling of Judge Black to the post of Attorney General in the National Administration, the Convention, upon its re-assembling in June, found the duty devolved upon it of naming two candidates for the Supreme Bench. William Strong, of Berks county, a distinguished member of the Bar, and formerly a member of Congress, and James Thompson, of Erie, also a former member of Congress, once a President Judge of the Common Pleas, an ex-member of the Legislature, and a profound and successful lawyer, were selected by the Convention. Their locations are suitable, giving both to the East and West a representation upon the ticket, and their learning and integrity well qualify them to discharge the arduous and responsible duties of the highest judicial position under our Constitution.

Such is the ticket formed by the delegates representing the Democratic party, and support of it is confidently asked in view of the character of the nominations. But confidence and support is also invited upon the general grounds of policy and principles upon which our party stands. Ours is no new, untried, vindictive, sectional, or suspicious organization. It has been tried; it is bold and open in conduct; it is magnanimous, patriotic and National. Founded more than half a century ago by the author of the Declaration of Independence, it has had a distinguished history, has ordinarily given direction to the administration of public affairs, and planting itself early, and throughout its whole career, upon a strict construction of the Constitution, and a sparing use of the power of Government, has preserved our American system from degeneracy and failure.

The usefulness of organized parties is sometimes denied and often doubted. But in view of historical facts it cannot well be questioned that they are incident to free governments, and arise of necessity under their operation. An inquiry, however, into the nature of political parties and causes which produce them, can scarcely be expected to constitute the subject of a fugitive address. It will be sufficient for the present purposes to assert the necessity of our party to check the evil and dangerous influence to which our political system is liable, and against which it is impossible that written constitutions can sufficiently guard. Doubtless our constitutions exhibit the wisdom of those who framed them, and the amendments to which

they have been subjected have rendered them more complete and perfect than they were at first. But a constitution can only be an outline for the action of government, (beside providing for its establishment,) and by construction it may be made to mean almost anything the political authorities for the time being may choose. It is a chart given to direct the vessel of State, which can have little effect upon the voyage unless those in command choose to faithfully interpret and observe its counsel. A party organization, therefore, founded upon right principles of constitutional construction and powerfully and constantly influencing official action, may be regarded as necessary. It is, in short, absolutely required to give a just and consistent direction to government, both in cases dependent upon construction and in cases where the Constitution is silent. Besides, the instability of political action in republics is a reproach to which they have been often subjected, and is the objection to them which has had greatest weight with profound and independent thinkers in the old world and the new. But this instability, which arises principally from individual ambition, the selfishness of classes, and the fluctuation of opinion is, to a great extent, checked and prevented by the predominance of a party founded upon clear and sound principles of public policy, and acting constantly with reference to them.

Now the Democratic party is simply the representative of a school of opinion, and its creed is given it by those who founded and have subsequently supported it. The great men who have spoken and acted for it, and whose names will remain stamped prominently upon the history of the country, have been men of strong, clear and sound views of our system of government, and of the rules upon which its administration should proceed. Our party is the product of their efforts: the instrument for accomplishing the ends they proposed, and it remains a monument of their sagacity, foresight and patriotism.

They held that over-action in government was a great evil—the most difficult to be guarded against, and, therefore, the most dangerous—and that both within and without the Constitution powerful guards against it were required. Proverbial language conveys the idea in declaring that "the world is governed too much" and that "what government is best which governs least;" and philosophical reasoning attains the same result, in concluding, that government, being the creature of necessity, is limited by the necessities which create it, and is not to be extended beyond them. The Democratic party has therefore held, and holds that Constitutions shall receive a strict construction: that government shall exercise no powers not delegated to it, and that in cases of doubt as to the policy of a particular measure, the conclusion shall not be against it. In short, that public power shall not be exerted except where a clear warrant and manifest utility authorize and justify it.

The powerful (and we think salutary) operation of this doctrine appears throughout the history of the National and State governments, and the occasional departures from its stand as beacons to warn, and not as examples to follow.

To illustrate our remarks, we will refer briefly to a number of measures of public policy heretofore proposed to the general or State government, and upon which division of opinion have existed among public men and parties.—They will afford data for judging the value of the Democratic doctrine on the subject of Government powers and policy on which we have spoken.

1st.—A bank created by the general Government, owned, in part by it, and intended for the regulation of the currency, and to afford facilities to commerce and business. This measure was resisted, and all recent attempts to re-establish such an institution have been put down, upon the very grounds above stated.

2d.—Internal improvements to be constructed at the charge of the National treasury, to facilitate internal trade, and assist in developing the material resources of particular sections. No clear authority for outlays of this description appearing, and the manifest dangers to which they lead being apparent, the action of our Federal government on this subject has been right-fully and wisely arrested.

3d.—Excessive duties upon imports, to the extent of prohibition upon their importation, or to the production of revenue beyond the legitimate wants of government. The federal power of imposing duties being for the express object of Government support and the liquidation of public indebtedness its exercise for an entirely different object would seem unwarranted, and would be unjust to interests or individuals against whom a discrimination is thus produced. Therefore it is, that against such misconception, and the opposition of powerful interests, the doctrine of limited and reasonable duties has been sternly, and, upon the whole, successfully upheld.

4th.—The distribution of moneys from the National treasury among the States, believed to be equally unwarranted with the preceding measures, and inevitably tending to the production of speculation and extravagance in the States, has also been resisted, and except upon a single occasion prevented.

5th.—A bankrupt act, dissolving the relations of debtor and creditor in a manner and to an extent unauthorised by the Constitution, disastrous to private rights, injurious to morals, and to the encouragement, mainly, of one of the least meritorious classes of society—the speculator and spendthrift. With hot haste and under the lash of public opinion, the very authors of such an act in 1842 were coerced into its repeal.

6th.—Appropriations of public moneys or lands, to objects of doubtful constitutionality or utility connected with which, may be mentioned the allowance of claims, insufficiently established or unjust. The Democratic principles strike as decisively at all projects for assailing

the treasury, for an individual, a class or a section, in the absence of clear right to justify the demand, as it does at other unwarranted or doubtful measures.

7th.—The exercise of jurisdiction by the general Government over slavery in Territories, to the exclusion of local decision thereon. Legislation by Congress upon slavery beyond the express requirement as to return of fugitives, is to be doubted, and if regard is had to high judicial decision, expressly denied, as a valid exercise of power. And its inexpediency is yet more plainly manifest, in view of the dangerous disputes which such action inevitably produces. Most clearly, therefore, is it to be deprecated and opposed, upon the general doctrine of non-action by government in doubtful cases.

8th.—The establishment of corporations, either excessive as to number or vested with ordinary powers or privileges; and especially for pursuits or business within the reach of individual means and skill. Under which head is to be particularly noted, the charting of banks beyond the business wants of the community, locating them at points without adequate commerce or exchanges to afford legitimate occupation, and failing to impose upon them such guards against abuse and fraud as are demanded by experience. The recent resolution on this subject by our State Convention, but indicates the well-considered position of our party and its policy for the future.

9th.—The authorizing of municipal subscriptions to railroads and other corporate bodies to the encouragement of speculation, corruption and the accumulation of public debts. The proposition now before the people for the amendment of the Constitution to prevent this in future, is but in affirmance of the principles we have been considering; for the decision of a divided Court in favor of legislative power to authorize such subscriptions has not removed all doubts, and has left the powerful objections to the system, upon grounds of expediency, untouched and irresistible.

10th.—The sale or surrender by Government, in whole or in parts, of any of its constitutional powers confided to it by the people. The attempt to do this in the late act for the sale of the Main Line of Public Works; an attempt which was denounced by the State Convention, and has since been pronounced unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, may be cited under this head, and deserved that reputation which it has generally received.

11th.—Sumptuary laws, by which dress, food, drink, equipage, or other like concern of use, habit or fashion, is coerced. The interference of law in such cases would seem to be unuseful, and is of doubtful authority.

12th.—Finally, measures directed against a class or sect, and intended to degrade them or limit their civil privileges. It is affirmed that neither religious belief nor birth place will furnish grounds for ostracism or a denial of common right.

Such are some of the leading measures upon which political divisions have taken place, and on their careful examination it will be seen that they can all be resolved into the general question whether the powers and action of government shall be extensive or limited. And if we should pursue the subject further, this view of the fundamental ground of difference between public men and parties would be but confirmed and strengthened.

We are left then to choose sides in the struggle between power and liberty—between a government that meddles and one that abstains—between political New Englandism and the Virginia doctrine of 1798. Neutrality is not possible, for almost every public question that arises compels us to a choice between contending parties, and the schools of opinion which they respectively represent.

It has been fashionable for apostates from our party to claim that they retained their principles unchanged, and even opposing parties occasionally advance pretensions to the faith and doctrines of Jefferson. How unfounded such pretensions are, whether advanced by an apostate or party will appear from considering the measures of public policy they propose and support. If we find them favoring new projects of doubtful right or expediency, contending for extensive jurisdiction for government, and scoffing at constitutional scruples as "abstractions," we may be sure they are no disciples of the philanthropist, philosopher and statesman who founded our party, who wrote to Edward Livingston as late as 1824, to endorse the sentiment, that "if we have a doubt relative to any power, we ought not to exercise it." Much more may we deny their discipleship, if we find their measures connected with intolerance in religion, proscription of adopted citizens, or aggressions upon territorial or State rights, which is manifestly a true description, at this moment, of the parties opposed to us.

The (so-called) Republican party makes high pretensions and challenges their examination—but there can be no little difficulty in determining their character and value, and assigning the party which holds them its true position before the public. Especially will it be a work of ease, to explode its pretensions to sound opinions as held by former Republican Presidents, and to bring it within the condemnation which they directed against the heretical movements of the times in which they lived.

The resistance made about 1820, to the admission of Missouri into the Union, was similar to the recent conduct of those who misdescribe themselves as Republicans. In both cases the proposition was, that Congress should prohibit slavery in territories (or cause it to be prohibited) prior to their admission as States. The argument against this was stated by Mr. Madison, in the Walsh letters, under all the high sanctions which his abilities and his position as the leading author of the Constitution could confer upon it. And it is as well established as any political fact can be, that Mr. Jefferson was opposed to the Missouri agitation throughout

and to prohibitions of slavery by Congressional coercion as then proposed. His celebrated letter to John Holmes, dated April 23d, 1820, furnishes conclusive proof of this and confirmation of the fact will be found in other parts of his published correspondence. In his letter to John Adams of December 10, 1819, he says, that "from the battle of Bunker Hill to the treaty of Paris, we never had so ominous a question, it even damps the joy with which I hear of your high health and welcomes to me the want of it. I thank God, I shall not live to witness its issue." In a letter to the same, April 22, 1821, he says—"what does the Holy Alliance in and out of Congress intend to do with us on the Missouri question? And this, by the way, is not the name of the case: It is only the John Doe or Richard Roe of the ejectionment."

The real question, as seen in the States afflicted with this unfortunate population, is "are our slaves to be presented with freedom and a dagger?" He says to Mr. Monroe, March 3, 1820—"the Missouri question is the most portentous one that ever yet threatened our Union. In the gloomiest moment of the Revolutionary war, I never had any apprehension equal to that which I felt from this source." To Mr. Short, April 13, 1820—he writes—"Although I had laid down as law to myself never to write, talk, or even think of politics; to know nothing of public affairs; and had therefore ceased to read newspapers; yet the Missouri question aroused and filled me with alarm. The old schism of Federal and Republican threatened nothing because it existed in every State, and united them together by the fraternity of party. But the coincidence of a marked principle, moral and political, with a geographical line, once conceived I feared would no more be obliterated from the mind; that it would be recurring on every occasion, and receiving irritations, until it would kindle such mutual and mortal hatred as to render separation preferable to eternal discord." He says to Joseph C. Cabell, January 31, 1821—"How many of our youths, she (Harvard College) now has learned the lessons of Anti-Missouriism, I know not; but a gentleman lately from Princeton told me he saw a list of students in that place, and that more than half were Virginians. These will return home deeply impressed with the sacred principles of the Holy Alliance of Restrictionists!" And to Gen. Breckenridge he writes, February 11, 1851. "The line of division between the two parties is not soon, I fear, obliterated, and we are now trusting to those, who are against us in position and principle, to fashion to their own form the minds and affections of our youth. If, as has been estimated, we send three thousand dollars a year to the northern seminaries for the instruction of our own sons; then we must have five hundred of our sons imbibing opinions and principles in discord with those of their own country. This canker is eating on the vitals of our existence, and, if not arrested at once, will be beyond remedy." In a letter to Mr. Madison, in reference to the Missouri question, he declared that Rufus King (a distinguished Federalist) "was ready to risk the Union for any chance of restoring his party to power, and wriggling himself to the head of it." On another occasion, he declared the question to be a mere party trick, "that the leaders of Federalism defeated in their schemes of obtaining power \* \* \* have changed their tact and thrown out another barrel to the whale. They are taking advantage of the virtuous feeling of the people to effect a division of parties by a geographical line, expecting that this will insure them upon local principles the majority they could never obtain on principles of Federalism." And finally, his letter to Gen. La Fayette dated November 3, 1823 contains his judgment of the whole movement, expressed with his usual directness and vigor. He says: "The Hartford Convention, the victory of Orleans, and the peace of Ghent, prostrated the name of Federalism. Its votaries abandoned it through shame and mortification, and now call themselves Republicans. But the name alone is changed; the principles are the same." \* \* \* "On the eclipse of Federalism, with us; though not its extinction, its leaders got up the Missouri question under the false front of lessening the measure of slavery, BUT WITH THE REAL VIEW OF PRODUCING A GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISION OF PARTIES, WHICH MIGHT ENSURE TO THEM THE NEXT PRESIDENCY." The people of the north went bludgeoned into the snare, followed their leaders for a while with a zeal truly moral and laudable, until they became sensible that they were injuring instead of aiding the real interests of the slaves, THAT THEY HAD BEEN USED AS TOOLS FOR ELECTORNEERING PURPOSES, AND THAT TRICK OF HYPOCRISY THEN fell as quickly as it had been gotten up.

This is an admirable description of the Republican party of the present day—of the causes which led to it, and the object of its founders.—The picture is drawn by the hand of a master, and represents the feature of the subject with fidelity and exactness. Republicanism, being but a reproduction of Missouri agitation bears precisely the same description, and is obnoxious to precisely the same censure. And it is to be remarked, that like its predecessor—it invokes the legislation of Congress in a case of rank expediency and doubtful power, and hence falls within the condemnation of the general principles as to limited action by Government, which has been a topic of this address.

But a view of the Modern Republicanism would be incomplete to some particular notice of the features of its career. Without tracing its early movements in the organization of Abolition societies, the circulation of incendiary matter through the mails, agitation by petitions to Congress, clamorous opposition to the annexation of Texas, and to the persecution of the Mexican war, and the acquisition of territory to which it led: It will be sufficient to notice somewhat the Wilmot Proviso which preceded, and the Kansas dispute which accompa-

nied, the organization of the Republican party in its present form.

The Wilmot proviso was offered in Congress in 1846, as an amendment to a war bill, and was (briefly described) a proposition to prohibit slavery in Mexican territory to be acquired.—It created contention which continued some four years. The national harmony was disturbed and the public business impeded by it to unite their utmost efforts to restore peace and secure such legislation as was absolutely necessary for the territory in question. The compromise measures were therefore passed in 1850, and eventually received the general approval of the people. In fact, in 1852, both the great parties of the country endorsed them in their platforms, and their wisdom and propriety are now a subject of general dispute.

The Territory we acquired from Mexico by the treaty of peace—the treaty of Gaudalope Hidalgo—was comprised of nearly the whole now included in the State of California and the Territories of Utah and New Mexico and the Proviso, if it had been adopted, would therefore have had application solely to them. But the Proviso was never adopted or applied by Congress to either. California was admitted into the Union as a State with the Constitution she formed for herself without any decision by Congress on the subject of slavery within her limits. That was adjusted by herself in her constitution, and by her own act therefore she entered the Union as a free State. In the acts for the organization of Utah and New Mexico as territories, there were no provisions prohibiting or authorizing slavery, but it was expressly provided that they should eventually come into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each should decide, in forming Constitutions preparatory to admission. Seven years have elapsed since these territorial acts were passed, and no complaint is heard against them; nor has slavery been established in either Territory. It is, therefore, proved that the Wilmot Proviso was wholly unnecessary to the exclusion of slavery, and that the agitation from 1846 to 1850 to secure its enactment was a thing of arrant folly as well as of real evil.

There stand the facts! no longer to be perverted or denied, and they exhibit the Proviso agitation in its true character. Not adopted, it is seen to have been unnecessary. Productive of great mischief to the country in the contention and alienation it caused, it was a mere abstraction, a thing neither practical nor useful.

A desperate attempt was made last year to carry the Presidential election upon a Kansas agitation, in which the same class of actors appeared that did in the Missouri agitation of 1820—men "ready to risk the Union for any chance" of establishing their party, "and wriggling themselves to the head of it." But a just judgment was pronounced upon these people and their project: in the election of Mr. Buchanan, and they will soon be obliged to select some other topic upon which to disturb the public tranquility, and struggle for the attainment of power. Their spasmodic attempts to keep up excitement without any practical or useful object in view, but simply that they may thrive upon discord and passion, are even now received by the public with a feeling bordering very near upon contempt.

The American people are practical and sagacious.—They will require some practical good to appear in any movement to which they are invited; and when due time has elapsed for reflection, they will try parties and party measures by the standard of principles, and not of professions. The Wilmot Proviso was utterly extinguished by Webster on the 7th of March, 1850, in the demonstration of its inutility, and was therefore delivered over as an imposture; and approval of the Kansas Nebraska act of 1854, has been growing more and more general as its conformity to sound principles has been examined and established. That unnecessary things shall not be done, and that the citizens of each political division of the country shall determine their local institutions, are, in fact, propositions so reasonable and just that it is so surprising they should ever have been questioned.

Three years ago, the Democratic party of this State chose de-lat before-dishonor. It stood up for toleration and equal rights against the passions and prejudices of the time, because constitutional and just principles demanded it. And now, with a new antagonist—the Republican party—still stands in the path of duty, with its past course vindicated, and with the highest claims to public confidence and favor. While it is not insensible to ideas of progress and improvement, and will seek to apply those that are practicable and just, its duty as a great conservative organization to preserve the principles of the government and the institutions of the country from degeneracy, will not be neglected. In brief, if trusted it will be true, and from its administration of public affairs, the people will receive, as heretofore, the "peaceable fruits" of government and honest rule.

C. R. BUCKALEW, Chairman.  
JNO. N. HUTCHINSON, }  
R. J. HALDEMAN. } Secretaries.

THE WILL AND THE WAY.—I learned grammar when I was a private soldier, on the pay of six pence a day. The edge of my berth, or that of my guard bed, was my seat to study in; my knapsack was my book case, and a bit of board lying on my lap was my writing table. I had no money to purchase a candle or oil; in winter, it was rarely that I could get any light but the fire, and only my turn even of that. To buy a pen or piece of paper, I was compelled to forego some portion of my food, though in a state of half starvation: I had not a moment to call my own; and I had to read and write amid the talking, laughing, singing, whistling and howling of at least half a score of the most reckless men—and that too in their hours of freedom from all control. And I say it, under these circumstances could encounter and overcome the task—is there, can there be, in the whole world, a youth who can find an excuse for the non-performance?—Cobbett.

AN ABOLITIONIST QUIZZED.—Under this caption, a Holly Springs, Miss., correspondent of the Memphis *Engle and Inquirer* relates the following anecdote:

The following amusing scene actually occurred last summer between a citizen of our town and a yankee on board one of the Northern steamboats, perhaps upon the Hudson.

Our Southern friend discovered a disposition in a very genteel-looking man on board the boat to open a chat with him, & nothing loth to hear what his friend had to say, he indicated by his manner that he was approachable whereupon the following dialogue ensued:

Yankee—Well, sir, I wish to ask you one question: I hope it will be no offence.

Southerner—Certainly not, I will hear you with pleasure.

Yankee—Well, sir, is it true that they work negroes in the plow at the South?

Southerner—I will answer you in the favorite method of your own countrymen, by asking you a question or two.

Yankee—I admit the right, sir.

Southerner—How many negro men do you suppose it would require to draw a good large one horse plow?

Yankee—Well, I suppose six or seven—say seven.

Southerner—What are they worth per head?

Yankee—Well, I suppose \$800.

Southerner—That would be \$5,600.—Now what would one large, strong horse cost?

Yankee—I guess about \$100.

Upon this the Southerner looked a little quizzical at this neighbor, who, without waiting to hear the conclusion, started and stammered—

Well, I—I—I knew it was a lie!

A CUSTOM WORTHY OF IMITATION.—It is a custom among certain tribes in Siberia, that when a young woman is married, she must prepare the wedding dinner with her own hands. To this feast all the relatives, and friends, both of her own family and that of the groom are invited. If the viands are well cooked, her credit as a good house-wife is established. But if the dishes are badly prepared, she is disgraced in that capacity forever. The result is that a Siberian is generally a good house-keeper, whatever else she may be, and thus competent beyond her sex generally, for the practical duties of life.—*Russian Life*.

DON'T SWEAR.—Profanity is one of the most offensive and disgusting habits to which unredeemed humanity is given. To say nothing of its sinfulness, (which every one of course understands,) profane swearing is a vile, vulgar, low-bred habit, from the indulgence of which a proper self respect should restrain a man, even if he has no regard for the dictates of religion. It is a habit too, which increases with fearful rapidity when once given way to; and we have known instances where men who were once highly respected, but who unfortunately contracted this habit, have sunk so low as to use profane language in their own families, and even to swear at their wives and children.

ORIGINAL PRESCRIPTION.—The best remedy for a slight indisposition is abstinence; for excessive heat, a cool shade; for pinching cold, warm clothes and a comfortable fire; for weariness; rest; for drowsiness, sleep; for hunger, food; for thirst, cold water; for poverty, industry and economy; for discontent, hard work; for loneliness, marriage; and for a troubled spirit, earnest prayer. If any one doubt, let him try it.

Theodore Hook, when surprised one evening in his arm chair, two or three hours after dinner, is reported to have apologized by saying, "When one is alone the bottle dose come around so often." It was Sir Hercules Langrishe, who being asked on a similar occasion, "Have you finished all that port, (three bottles) without assistance?" answered, "No, not that, I had the assistance of a bottle of Madeira."

## GREAT GAME OF BILLIARDS.

The Albany (N.Y.) *Express* states that the greatest Billiard match ever made in this country, will shortly come off between L. J. Higham, the great Albany player, Michael Phelan and Ralph Benjamin. These three gentlemen are said to be the greatest billiard players in the world. The match is to take place either in New York, Philadelphia or in Baltimore.

We have heard a tall story of an Irish knight, who was once disputing with a French courier as to the age and standing of their families when the latter, as finished to the argument, said that his ancestors were in the ark with Noah. "That is nothing," said the Hibernian, "for at the deluge my fore-fathers were cruising about in a boat of their own."

NOT OF THAT FAMILY.—A man whose appearance indicated that he was staggering from the excessive weight of a brick in his hat, being asked if he was a "Son of Temperance," replied, "Hic-no—no relation—not even an hic-acquaintance."

A bevy of little children were telling their father what they got at school. The eldest reading, spelling and definitions. "And what do you get, my little one?" said the father to a rosy-cheeked little fellow, who was at that time shily driving a ten-penny nail into the door panel. "Me! Oh, I gets readin', spellin', and spankin'."

A wag says, it is a folly to expect a girl to love a man whom everybody speaks well of. Get up a persecution, and her affection will cling so fast that a dozen guardians cannot begin to remove them.

A young gentleman having married a young widow worth \$100,000, said it was not his wife's face that attracted him so much as the figure.

Why are good husbands like dough?—Women knead them.