

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

STATE TICKET.

FOR AUDITOR GENERAL: RICHARDSON L. WRIGHT, OF PHILADELPHIA.

FOR SURVEYOR GENERAL: JOHN ROWE, OF FRANKLIN.

COUNTY TICKET.

FOR ASSOCIATE JUDGE: WM. STATES, OF W. Providence tp.

FOR TREASURER: WM. SCHAFFER, of Bedford Borough.

FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY: GEO. H. SPANG, of Bedford Borough.

FOR COUNTY SURVEYOR: SAM'L KETTERMAN, of Bedford Bor.

FOR COMMISSIONER: WM. M. PEARSON, of M. Woodberry tp.

FOR DIRECTOR OF THE POOR: JOHN KEMERY, of Schellburg Bor.

FOR AUDITOR: DANIEL FLETCHER, of Monroe tp.

Wanted at this office, an apprentice to the printing business.

ARRIVAL OF THE PRESIDENT.

His Excellency, President BUCHANAN, accompanied by Miss LANE, Mrs. Secretary THOMPSON, and Mr. THOMPSON, arrived at Bedford Springs, on Tuesday evening last. The President looks well, and is in good health and spirits. The "best abused" man of the age, "dull care" has failed to set his mark upon his countenance. He is above the reach of the poisoned shafts of envy and malice, and having no other object at heart but the good of his whole country, he cannot be assailed, though enemies be unscrupulous and pretended friends unfaithful. An escort from Bedford met him at the "Half-Way House," where he was received by a large crowd of the sturdy citizens of Cumberland Valley. The President's rooms are the same as those occupied last year by himself and suite.

FR. JORDAN, in his last organ, attempts to reply to our article of week before last, in which we proved that the N. Y. Tribune spoke of the poorer classes of our citizens as "Poor White Trash," and in the course of his argument (1) quotes a passage from the Tribune's article, which in itself contains the substance of what we have said upon the subject. The passage quoted by Mr. JORDAN is as follows:

"A considerable part of the white population were petit blancs, so called, little whites, the 'POOR WHITE TRASH' of our southern States, without education or property."

This language Mr. Jordan acknowledges was used by the Tribune and therefore acknowledged that the Tribune spoke of American citizens as "Poor White Trash." But with characteristic dishonesty, he breaks off this passage at a comma, instead of giving the whole paragraph, as he found it in the Tribune. "Judges and lawyers" might call this "forgery," as it is certainly a fraudulent alteration of the Tribune's article and intended to operate to our injury. Mr. JORDAN blames us for dropping the quotation marks in copying from the Tribune; but how much more is not he to be blamed when he deliberately blots out one half of the Tribune's sentence? Apropos of the "quotation marks," if they really did occur in the Tribune's article (of which we have some doubt) they were dropped unintentionally, but they shall henceforward be used, thus: "Poor White Trash." However, we opine it makes but little difference whether we use them, or not, as the Tribune adopted the language and is responsible for it.

The paragraph from the Tribune's article, when taken as a whole, reads as follows: "A considerable part of the white population were petit blancs, so called, little whites, the same with the 'Poor White Trash' of our Southern States without education or property, but exceedingly tenacious, like our 'Poor White Trash' North and South, of a distinction which enabled them to take rank of the most accomplished and wealthy men of color."

Will Mr. Jordan dare to deny that this is correctly quoted? If so, we dare him to publish the entire article of the Tribune in which it occurs. Nothing short of this, will satisfy the public that his case is not a bad one.

The following is the inscription of a letter lately received at the Post Office in this place: "Go like a bird which always sings, To Bedford, near the Bedford Springs, And if JOHN FLEMING should chance to be In Bedford, or vicinity, Let Mr. Moway quickly say, 'This letter came for him to day.'"

"HONESTY THE BEST POLICY."

About one month ago there appeared on the outside of our paper, a little "quib" of two lines, which read as follows: "Honesty is the best policy, but it keeps a man poor." This sententious little paragraph was selected by one of our compositors, who in our temporary absence, was at a loss for "copy" to "fill out" a column which he was making up. Accordingly the sentence above quoted was placed at the foot of the column, not by our direction, but without our knowledge. To this every hand in our office is ready to make affidavit. Our attention was first called to it, by a friend who informed us that it had been made the subject of a discourse from the pulpit. As might be expected, we were rallied a good deal concerning the matter, our friends and acquaintance considering it "a good joke on us." So far, so good. But unfortunately, (or rather fortunately) for ourselves, in our issue of week before last, we published the proof which establishes the truth of our charge that the N. Y. Tribune spoke of the lower classes of American citizens as "POOR WHITE TRASH." Our signal success in this particular so completely dumb-founded Fr. JORDAN and his retinue of organ-grinders, that they were compelled to fall back and attack us at a new point. So after vainly searching our editorial columns, and finding nothing of our own authorship that was assailable, they were at last forced to go to the first page of our paper, which (as is usual with country newspapers) is generally made up altogether of articles copied from exchanges. Our readers can imagine how eagerly they clutched at the little sentence, at the bottom of the column. "Honesty is the best policy," but it keeps a man poor." Like drawing men, they caught at this unsubstantial straw. And "thereby hangs a tale"—an incident which will serve to show the discerning reader that these godly men believed it not altogether impossible that they themselves might have published the paragraph. One of them (a little red pimple on the body editorial) was in church at the time the discourse concerning the aforesaid paragraph was delivered, and the thought that the offensive sentence might have been in his paper, excited him so much that in defiance of common decency, he talked about it to those near him, whilst the sermon was progressing, and even whilst the congregation were upon their knees in prayer! For full particulars concerning the pious conduct of this model religionist, on the occasion just alluded to, we refer our readers to JOHN H. FULLER, Esq.—Notwithstanding this acknowledgment that they themselves might have published the paragraph in question—notwithstanding the fact that they knew that we were not the author of the expression—notwithstanding the fact that they were well aware of the manner in which it had crept into our columns—these shameless tricksters do not hesitate to denounce and abuse us for publishing it. We have never heard "judges or lawyers" give their opinions concerning a matter like this. "Masters" say that this last attempt of Jordan and his coadjutors to make capital against the Gazette, was a piece of mean and cowardly rascality. In conclusion, we make a few extracts from Jordan's organ which we beg leave to put in as "set-off." Observe the encouragement they give to the poor. Observe the inducements they hold out to the sons of poverty to be honest for the sake of being respectable.

"HONESTY THE BEST POLICY." DOES IT MAKE ABOLITION EDITORS 'POOR'?

Let H. Bucher Swoope answer: [From the Daily News, Sep. 21, 1857.] TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA. Fellow-Citizens:—In a speech recently delivered in Jayne's Hall, in the city of Philadelphia, and on other occasions, in different parts of the State, I promised to publish, with the proof of its genuineness, a certain list of subsidized papers which was furnished by Governor FORD, of Ohio, to a correspondent of the New York Herald. I now redeem that pledge, and present herewith, to the people of Pennsylvania, Gov. FORD's list of expenditures, with the affidavit of Dr. W. W. Woodward, which explains the circumstances under which it came into his possession, and which will be more fully understood after reading the following extract from the New York Herald, of the 18th November 1859, immediately after the late election:—

"Messrs. Fry and Gibbons, in Philadelphia, were the leading managers, and lost the battle by their blunders. Gov. FORD, of Ohio, was furnished with twenty thousand dollars as a subvention for the country papers in Pennsylvania to support Fremont." The affidavit and list are as follows: City of Philadelphia ss. The annexed statement of moneys expended by Lieut. Gov. FORD, of Ohio, in subsidizing the opposition presses of Pennsylvania, was furnished by him, and given to me at the Astor House, in New York. The reason assigned for placing it in my possession was, that with the facts thus enumerated I might be fully prepared to disabuse the mind of the editor of the leading political journal in New York, who by his direction, if not indeed by positive charge, had accused him of the misappropriation of the particular fund entrusted to him for the object above specified.

W. W. WOODWARD, Sworn and subscribed, the 2d day of September, 1857, before me. WILLIAMS OGLE, Alderman. JOHN J. CLYDE, President of the American State Council, and Publisher of the Harrisburg Herald, \$1000 SHIPPENSBURG NEWS, 650 CARLISLE AMERICAN, 520 GETTYSBURG SENTINEL, 500 BEDFORD INQUIRER & CHRONICLE, 500

MERCERSBURG JOURNAL, 450 LOCKHAVEN AMERICAN WATCH-MAN, 425 MCCONNELLSBURG REPUBLICAN, 425 ALTOONA, TRIBUNE, 425 MILTON DEMOCRAT, 350 MUNCY LUMINARY, 350 MIFFLINBURG STAR, 325 PERRY ADVOCATE, 250 LEWISBURG JOURNAL, 150 LEWISTOWN GAZETTE, 75 JOHN J. CLYDE, for travelling expenses, 95 \$490

I desire it to be distinctly understood that the genuineness of the above list rests not simply upon the affidavit of Dr. Woodward, which, however, of itself would be sufficient, but I have other proofs, placing the matter beyond all controversy, ready to be presented whenever the occasion shall require it. I have deemed this sufficient for my present purpose, and have retained other affidavits and correspondence in my possession for future use.

H. B. SWOOPE, Chairman Amer. State Council, Clearfield, Pa., Sept. 15, 1857.

THE NATURALIZATION QUESTION.

So much misapprehension prevails in reference to the views of the Administration on this question, that we embrace the opportunity furnished by a practical case, which has recently arisen in the kingdom of Hanover, to refer to it again. The case is that of a naturalized citizen of the United States, who is a native of Hanover, and who, when he left his native country, was neither in actual service in the Hanoverian army nor had he been drafted to serve in it, but who has yet, upon his return to Hanover, been deprived of his liberty and compelled to do military duty.

The intervention of our Government having thus become necessary, the whole subject of the rights of our naturalized citizens has received the renewed and careful consideration of the President, and his views, as well as those of his entire Cabinet, upon this important subject, will be found in the following extract which we are permitted to make from a despatch transmitted a few days ago from the Department of State to our Minister at Berlin in relation to the case referred to.

It is impossible to add anything to the strength and clearness of this statement; and we are persuaded that it will meet the full concurrence of every reflecting man in the country: Extract of a Despatch from the Department of State, to the Minister of the United States at Berlin, dated July 8, 1859.

The right of expatriation cannot at this day be doubted or denied in the United States. The idea has been repudiated ever since the origin of our Government, that a man is bound to remain forever in the country of his birth, and that he has no right to exercise his free will, and consult his own happiness by selecting a new home. The most eminent writers on public law recognize the right of expatriation. This can only be contested by those who in the nineteenth century are still devoted to the ancient feudal law with all its oppression. The doctrine of perpetual allegiance is a relic of barbarism which has been gradually disappearing from the mind of the people.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes the natural right of expatriation, by conferring upon Congress the power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." Indeed, it was one of the grievances alleged against the British King in the Declaration of Independence, that he had endeavored to prevent the population of these States—for that purpose obstructing the laws of naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass them, or to encourage their migration hither; &c., &c. The Constitution thus clearly recognizes the principle of expatriation in the strongest manner. I would have been inconsistent in itself and unworthy of the character of the authors of this instrument, to hold out inducements to foreigners to abandon their native land, to renounce their allegiance to their native government and to become citizens of the United States, if they had not been convinced of the absolute and unconditional right of expatriation. Congress has uniformly acted upon this principle ever since the commencement of the Federal Government. They established a uniform rule of naturalization," nearly twenty years ago. There has since been no period in our history when laws for this purpose did not exist, though their provisions have undergone successive changes. The alien, in order to become a citizen, must declare on oath of affirmation that he will support the Constitution of the United States; and, at the same time, he is required to absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, State or sovereignty whatever, and particularly, by name, the prince, potentate, State or sovereignty whereof he was before a citizen.

The exercise of the right of naturalization, and the consequent recognition of the principle of expatriation, are not confined to the Government of the United States. There is not a country in Europe, I believe, at the present moment, where the law does not authorize the naturalization of foreigners in one form or other. Indeed, in some of these countries this law is more liberal than our own towards foreigners.

The question then arises, what rights do our laws confer upon a foreigner by granting him naturalization? I answer, all the rights, privileges and immunities which belong to a native-born citizen, in their full extent, with the single qualification that, under the Constitution, "no person except a native-born citizen is eligible to the office of President." With this exception, the naturalized citizen from and after the date of his naturalization, both at home and abroad, is placed upon the very same footing with the native citizen. He is neither in a better nor a worse condition. If a native citizen chooses to take up his residence in a foreign country for the purpose of advancing his fortune or promoting his happiness, he is whilst there bound to obey its municipal laws equally with those who have lived in it all their lives. He goes abroad with his eyes open, and if these laws be arbitrary and unjust, he has chosen to abide by the consequences. If they are administered in an equal spirit towards himself and towards native subjects, this Government has no right to interfere authoritatively in his behalf. To do this would be to violate the right of an independent Nation to legislate within its own Territories. If his

Government were to undertake such a task, we might soon be involved in trouble with nearly the whole world. To protect our citizens against the application of this principle of universal law, in its full extent, we have treaties with several Nations securing exemption to American citizens when residing abroad, from some of the onerous duties required from their own subjects. Where no such treaty exists and an American citizen has committed a crime or incurred a penalty for violating any municipal law whatever of the country of his temporary residence, he is just as liable to be tried and punished for his offence, as though he had resided in it from the day of his birth. If this has not been done before his departure, and he should voluntarily return under the same jurisdiction, he may be tried and punished for the offence upon principles of universal law. Under such circumstances, no person would think of contending that an intermediate residence in his own country for years would deprive the Government whose laws he had violated of the power to enforce their execution. The very same principle, and no other, is applicable to the case of a naturalized citizen, should he choose to return to his native country. In that case, if he had committed an offence against the law before his departure, he is responsible for it in the same manner as the native-American citizen to whom I have referred. In the language of the late Mr. Marcy, in his letter of the 10th January, 1854, to Mr. Jackson, then our charge d'affaires to Vienna, when speaking of Toussig's case, "every nation, whenever its laws are violated by any one owing obedience to them, whether he be a citizen or a stranger, has a right to inflict the penalties incurred upon the transgressors, if found within its jurisdiction." This principle is too well established to admit of serious controversy. If one of our native or naturalized citizens were to expose himself to punishment by the commission of an offence against any of our laws, state or national, and afterwards become a naturalized subject of a foreign country, he would not have the hardihood to contend, upon voluntarily returning within our jurisdiction, that his naturalization relieved him from the punishment due to his crime; much less could he appeal to the government of his adopted country to protect him against his responsibility to the United States or any of the States. This Government would not for a moment listen to such an appeal.

Whilst these principles cannot be contested, great care should be taken in their application, especially to our naturalized citizens. The moment a foreigner becomes naturalized, his allegiance to his native country is severed forever. He experiences a new political birth. A broad and impassable line separates him from his native country. He is no more responsible for anything he may say or do, after assuming his new character, than if he had been born in the United States. Should he return to his native country, he returns as an American citizen, and in no other character. In order to entitle his original government to punish him for an offence, this must have been committed whilst he was a subject and owed allegiance to that government. The offence must have been complete before his expatriation. It must have been of such a character that he might have been tried and punished for it at the moment of his departure. A future liability to serve in the army will not be sufficient; because, before the time can arrive for such service, he has changed his allegiance, and has become a citizen of the United States. It would be quite unjustly to hold him liable to military duty, when but twelve years of age and naturalized here, who should afterwards visit the country of his birth when he had become a man, might then be seized and compelled to perform military service, because, if he had remained there throughout the intervening years and his life been spared, he would have been bound to perform military service. To submit to such a principle would be to make an odious distinction between our naturalized and native citizens. For this reason, in my despatch to Mr. Hofer of the 15th ultimo, I confine the foreign jurisdiction in regard to our naturalized citizens to such of them as "were in the army or actually called into it" at the time they left Prussia. That is, to the case of actual desertion or a refusal to enter the army after having been regularly drafted and called into it by the government to which at the time they owed allegiance. It is presumed that neither of these cases presents any difficulty in point of principle. If a soldier or a sailor were to desert from our army or navy, for which offence he is liable to a severe punishment, and, after having become a naturalized subject of another country, should return to the United States, it would be a singular defence for him to make that he was absolved from his crime, because, after its commission, he had become a subject of another government. It would be still more strange were that government to interpose in his behalf for any such reason. Again, during the last war with Great Britain, in several of the States—I might mention Pennsylvania in particular—the militia-man who was drafted and called into the service was exposed to a severe penalty if he did not obey the draft and muster himself into the service, or, in default thereof, procure a substitute. Suppose such an individual, after having incurred this penalty, had gone to a foreign country and become naturalized there and then return to Pennsylvania, is it possible to imagine that for this reason the arm of the State authorities would be paralyzed, and that they could not exact the penalty? I state these examples to show more clearly both the extent and the limitation of lawful Hanoverian jurisdiction in such cases. It is impossible to foresee all the varying circumstances which may attend cases as they may arise; but it is believed that the principles laid down may generally be sufficient to guide our conduct.

It is to be deeply regretted that the German governments evince so much tenacity on this subject. It would be better, far better, for them, considering the comparatively small number of their native subjects who return to their dominions after being naturalized in this country, not to attempt to exact military service from them. They will prove to be most reluctant soldiers. If they violate any law of their native country during their visit, they are, of course, amenable like other American citizens. It would be a sad misfortune, if for the sake of an advantage so trifling to such governments, they should involve themselves in serious difficulties with a country so desirous as we are, of maintaining with them the most friendly relations. It is fortunate that serious difficulties of this kind are mainly confined to the German States—and especially that the laws of Great Britain do not authorize any compulsory military service whatever.

Government were to undertake such a task, we might soon be involved in trouble with nearly the whole world. To protect our citizens against the application of this principle of universal law, in its full extent, we have treaties with several Nations securing exemption to American citizens when residing abroad, from some of the onerous duties required from their own subjects. Where no such treaty exists and an American citizen has committed a crime or incurred a penalty for violating any municipal law whatever of the country of his temporary residence, he is just as liable to be tried and punished for his offence, as though he had resided in it from the day of his birth. If this has not been done before his departure, and he should voluntarily return under the same jurisdiction, he may be tried and punished for the offence upon principles of universal law. Under such circumstances, no person would think of contending that an intermediate residence in his own country for years would deprive the Government whose laws he had violated of the power to enforce their execution. The very same principle, and no other, is applicable to the case of a naturalized citizen, should he choose to return to his native country. In that case, if he had committed an offence against the law before his departure, he is responsible for it in the same manner as the native-American citizen to whom I have referred. In the language of the late Mr. Marcy, in his letter of the 10th January, 1854, to Mr. Jackson, then our charge d'affaires to Vienna, when speaking of Toussig's case, "every nation, whenever its laws are violated by any one owing obedience to them, whether he be a citizen or a stranger, has a right to inflict the penalties incurred upon the transgressors, if found within its jurisdiction." This principle is too well established to admit of serious controversy. If one of our native or naturalized citizens were to expose himself to punishment by the commission of an offence against any of our laws, state or national, and afterwards become a naturalized subject of a foreign country, he would not have the hardihood to contend, upon voluntarily returning within our jurisdiction, that his naturalization relieved him from the punishment due to his crime; much less could he appeal to the government of his adopted country to protect him against his responsibility to the United States or any of the States. This Government would not for a moment listen to such an appeal.

Whilst these principles cannot be contested, great care should be taken in their application, especially to our naturalized citizens. The moment a foreigner becomes naturalized, his allegiance to his native country is severed forever. He experiences a new political birth. A broad and impassable line separates him from his native country. He is no more responsible for anything he may say or do, after assuming his new character, than if he had been born in the United States. Should he return to his native country, he returns as an American citizen, and in no other character. In order to entitle his original government to punish him for an offence, this must have been committed whilst he was a subject and owed allegiance to that government. The offence must have been complete before his expatriation. It must have been of such a character that he might have been tried and punished for it at the moment of his departure. A future liability to serve in the army will not be sufficient; because, before the time can arrive for such service, he has changed his allegiance, and has become a citizen of the United States. It would be quite unjustly to hold him liable to military duty, when but twelve years of age and naturalized here, who should afterwards visit the country of his birth when he had become a man, might then be seized and compelled to perform military service, because, if he had remained there throughout the intervening years and his life been spared, he would have been bound to perform military service. To submit to such a principle would be to make an odious distinction between our naturalized and native citizens. For this reason, in my despatch to Mr. Hofer of the 15th ultimo, I confine the foreign jurisdiction in regard to our naturalized citizens to such of them as "were in the army or actually called into it" at the time they left Prussia. That is, to the case of actual desertion or a refusal to enter the army after having been regularly drafted and called into it by the government to which at the time they owed allegiance. It is presumed that neither of these cases presents any difficulty in point of principle. If a soldier or a sailor were to desert from our army or navy, for which offence he is liable to a severe punishment, and, after having become a naturalized subject of another country, should return to the United States, it would be a singular defence for him to make that he was absolved from his crime, because, after its commission, he had become a subject of another government. It would be still more strange were that government to interpose in his behalf for any such reason. Again, during the last war with Great Britain, in several of the States—I might mention Pennsylvania in particular—the militia-man who was drafted and called into the service was exposed to a severe penalty if he did not obey the draft and muster himself into the service, or, in default thereof, procure a substitute. Suppose such an individual, after having incurred this penalty, had gone to a foreign country and become naturalized there and then return to Pennsylvania, is it possible to imagine that for this reason the arm of the State authorities would be paralyzed, and that they could not exact the penalty? I state these examples to show more clearly both the extent and the limitation of lawful Hanoverian jurisdiction in such cases. It is impossible to foresee all the varying circumstances which may attend cases as they may arise; but it is believed that the principles laid down may generally be sufficient to guide our conduct.

It is to be deeply regretted that the German governments evince so much tenacity on this subject. It would be better, far better, for them, considering the comparatively small number of their native subjects who return to their dominions after being naturalized in this country, not to attempt to exact military service from them. They will prove to be most reluctant soldiers. If they violate any law of their native country during their visit, they are, of course, amenable like other American citizens. It would be a sad misfortune, if for the sake of an advantage so trifling to such governments, they should involve themselves in serious difficulties with a country so desirous as we are, of maintaining with them the most friendly relations. It is fortunate that serious difficulties of this kind are mainly confined to the German States—and especially that the laws of Great Britain do not authorize any compulsory military service whatever.

Government were to undertake such a task, we might soon be involved in trouble with nearly the whole world. To protect our citizens against the application of this principle of universal law, in its full extent, we have treaties with several Nations securing exemption to American citizens when residing abroad, from some of the onerous duties required from their own subjects. Where no such treaty exists and an American citizen has committed a crime or incurred a penalty for violating any municipal law whatever of the country of his temporary residence, he is just as liable to be tried and punished for his offence, as though he had resided in it from the day of his birth. If this has not been done before his departure, and he should voluntarily return under the same jurisdiction, he may be tried and punished for the offence upon principles of universal law. Under such circumstances, no person would think of contending that an intermediate residence in his own country for years would deprive the Government whose laws he had violated of the power to enforce their execution. The very same principle, and no other, is applicable to the case of a naturalized citizen, should he choose to return to his native country. In that case, if he had committed an offence against the law before his departure, he is responsible for it in the same manner as the native-American citizen to whom I have referred. In the language of the late Mr. Marcy, in his letter of the 10th January, 1854, to Mr. Jackson, then our charge d'affaires to Vienna, when speaking of Toussig's case, "every nation, whenever its laws are violated by any one owing obedience to them, whether he be a citizen or a stranger, has a right to inflict the penalties incurred upon the transgressors, if found within its jurisdiction." This principle is too well established to admit of serious controversy. If one of our native or naturalized citizens were to expose himself to punishment by the commission of an offence against any of our laws, state or national, and afterwards become a naturalized subject of a foreign country, he would not have the hardihood to contend, upon voluntarily returning within our jurisdiction, that his naturalization relieved him from the punishment due to his crime; much less could he appeal to the government of his adopted country to protect him against his responsibility to the United States or any of the States. This Government would not for a moment listen to such an appeal.

Whilst these principles cannot be contested, great care should be taken in their application, especially to our naturalized citizens. The moment a foreigner becomes naturalized, his allegiance to his native country is severed forever. He experiences a new political birth. A broad and impassable line separates him from his native country. He is no more responsible for anything he may say or do, after assuming his new character, than if he had been born in the United States. Should he return to his native country, he returns as an American citizen, and in no other character. In order to entitle his original government to punish him for an offence, this must have been committed whilst he was a subject and owed allegiance to that government. The offence must have been complete before his expatriation. It must have been of such a character that he might have been tried and punished for it at the moment of his departure. A future liability to serve in the army will not be sufficient; because, before the time can arrive for such service, he has changed his allegiance, and has become a citizen of the United States. It would be quite unjustly to hold him liable to military duty, when but twelve years of age and naturalized here, who should afterwards visit the country of his birth when he had become a man, might then be seized and compelled to perform military service, because, if he had remained there throughout the intervening years and his life been spared, he would have been bound to perform military service. To submit to such a principle would be to make an odious distinction between our naturalized and native citizens. For this reason, in my despatch to Mr. Hofer of the 15th ultimo, I confine the foreign jurisdiction in regard to our naturalized citizens to such of them as "were in the army or actually called into it" at the time they left Prussia. That is, to the case of actual desertion or a refusal to enter the army after having been regularly drafted and called into it by the government to which at the time they owed allegiance. It is presumed that neither of these cases presents any difficulty in point of principle. If a soldier or a sailor were to desert from our army or navy, for which offence he is liable to a severe punishment, and, after having become a naturalized subject of another country, should return to the United States, it would be a singular defence for him to make that he was absolved from his crime, because, after its commission, he had become a subject of another government. It would be still more strange were that government to interpose in his behalf for any such reason. Again, during the last war with Great Britain, in several of the States—I might mention Pennsylvania in particular—the militia-man who was drafted and called into the service was exposed to a severe penalty if he did not obey the draft and muster himself into the service, or, in default thereof, procure a substitute. Suppose such an individual, after having incurred this penalty, had gone to a foreign country and become naturalized there and then return to Pennsylvania, is it possible to imagine that for this reason the arm of the State authorities would be paralyzed, and that they could not exact the penalty? I state these examples to show more clearly both the extent and the limitation of lawful Hanoverian jurisdiction in such cases. It is impossible to foresee all the varying circumstances which may attend cases as they may arise; but it is believed that the principles laid down may generally be sufficient to guide our conduct.

It is to be deeply regretted that the German governments evince so much tenacity on this subject. It would be better, far better, for them, considering the comparatively small number of their native subjects who return to their dominions after being naturalized in this country, not to attempt to exact military service from them. They will prove to be most reluctant soldiers. If they violate any law of their native country during their visit, they are, of course, amenable like other American citizens. It would be a sad misfortune, if for the sake of an advantage so trifling to such governments, they should involve themselves in serious difficulties with a country so desirous as we are, of maintaining with them the most friendly relations. It is fortunate that serious difficulties of this kind are mainly confined to the German States—and especially that the laws of Great Britain do not authorize any compulsory military service whatever.

TWO DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

Arrival of the Weser.—A German Army ordered to the Rhine.—Peschiera Surrounded.—Verona Threatened by Garibaldi.—Disturbances in Sicily.—The French Fleet in the Adriatic. The German Diet has agreed to the proposition of Prussia to place a corps of observation on the Rhine. Disturbances have occurred at Messina. A French Division has been sent to join Prince Napoleon.

Despatches from Vienna, dated the 3d inst., state that the Piedmontese troops had surrounded Peschiera. Milan, July 1.—General Garibaldi is maneuvering to close the whole valley of the Adige, in order to isolate Verona, and cut off the Austrian communication with the Tyrol. General Garibaldi is at Tirano, with 5,000 troops. The U. S. steam frigate Wabash has sailed from Trieste for Messina in consequence of the disturbances that have taken place there. A French squadron of six ships of the line, five frigates and as many gun boats were seen off Carola, on the Dalmatian coast, on the 1st inst.

Seven English vessels of war are off Ancona. Prince Windischgratz was expected at Berlin on the 3d, on a special mission from Vienna via Dresden. The French Rentes had advanced on the Paris Bourse closing at 63 3/4. DETAILS OF THE WESER'S NEWS. LATEST DESPATCHES CONCERNING THE WAR. VERONA, June 23.—The Austrians have abandoned the line of the Mincio, and fallen back on Verona, after having burnt the bridges at Monzambano, Vallegio and Goito. The total loss of the second (Austrian) army at Solferino was 230 officers and 9,000 privates killed and wounded. About 4,000 were missing, most of whom have already returned.—The Austrians lost five guns.

VOLTA, June 30.—The Emperor left this morning to establish his headquarters at Vallegio. The sanitary condition of the army is excellent. Prince Napoleon was expected at Vallegio to-day. BERNE, July 1.—The Federal Council has made animadversions to the Sardinian government on the subject of the ill treatment suffered by the Swiss and announces that the Federal Council has also instructed the Swiss diplomatic agents in England to enlighten public opinion as to the nationality of the foreign regiments in the service of the Pope and the King of Naples.

VIENNA, July 3-3 P. M.—The Piedmontese have surrounded Peschiera. A French division has been sent to the south to join the corps of Prince Napoleon. MILAN (via Turin) July 1.—The legion of General Garibaldi and the division of General Cialdini are maneuvering to close up the whole valley of the Adige, in order thus to render themselves masters of the Lago di Gardi, and to isolate Verona from the Tyrol. BERNE, July 2.—The body of Chasseurs des Alpes, 5,000 strong, has arrived at Tirano, under the command it is said, of Gen. Garibaldi himself. TRIESTE, July 3.—A steamer arrived here to-day from Constantinople passed the day before yesterday at Carzolo, on the Dalmatian coast, a French squadron, composed of six ships of the line, five frigates and as many gunboats, coming from Liverpool announces that on the 26th ult., disturbances took place in Messina. Four Sardinian war steamers were at Messina, of which three had left for the Adriatic Sea. Off Ancona were four English ships of the line, with three steamers.

Yesterday Count Rechberg, the Austrian Premier, passed Nabresina. BERLIN, July 3.—According to reliable information, Field Marshal Prince Windischgratz is expected here this evening, on a special mission, coming from Vienna, via Dresden. MEXICO, July 3.—On account of want of money for war purposes an extraordinary Diet has been convoked for the 14th of July, inst. FRANKFORT ON THE MAIN, July 2.—At today's sitting of the Federal Diet, the proposal of Upp-Rhine was almost unanimously agreed to. Several governments were without instructions.

MARLLES, July 2.—Advices have been received from Naples to the 28th ult. M. Grand Colonel of the Order of St. Janarius, has been sent to Naples by France and Sardinia. Letters from Rome, July 2, assert that an inquiry into the 28th ult., assert that been published of the alleged contradiction has criminals at Rome. A report of liberation of the temporal power of the Pope, and an advertisement, have been issued in the confidence in the Emperor of expressing French.

The Slanders of the Opposition. We have recently observed a statement which originated in one of the most seditious of the opposition papers Philadelphia, and has been extensively copied in other papers hostile to the Democratic party. The effect of that Mr. Wendell, of this city, a lawyer in his possession, addressed to him the President, relative to the employ of money set apart for the public printing the purpose of influencing certain papers to support the Administration.

As regards the letter allude we have positive knowledge that not has Mr. Wendell no such letter as that it is said he possesses, but that he has it from the President on any subject relative to public printing, or indeed on any whatever—and never has had any letany kind from the President.

Now that the accusation option and extravagance in the public area with which the opposition so persistently and confidently assailed the President's cabinet has proved to be false and call this new charge is made and circulate faith of anonymous scribblers for sheets, the publishers of this standstill aware that there is not a scintilla of support it, and that it is false from top to bottom. They know also that, owing watchful care and prudent economy resident, the Printing Department of Government, from being a source of extra corrupt-

tion, is now one of the best and most economically managed branches of the public service—that a dollar cannot be drawn from the Treasury for printing except in obedience to, and compliance with, the act of Congress—and unless Congress deliberately annuls the wholesome and radical reforms which the President through the agency of the late Superintendent of Public Printing, caused to be accomplished, and by which an annual saving of at least ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS has been effected, the door is effectively closed against every species of corruption and lavish expenditure of the public money.

In corroboration of this fact, we offer the following plain statement, which is susceptible of the clearest demonstration. By omitting the maps, charts, and useless statistics in the Senate edition of the message and documents, a saving is effected of at least \$30,000 System adopted for making contracts for paper, 15,000 Omitting duplicates of regular annual documents, 37,500 Double composition, 25,000 Reduction of one clerk, 1,800 \$109,300

In addition to the above specific amounts, about fifty per cent. is saved in the execution of the engraving and lithographic printing by giving the work to the lowest responsible bidder, instead of allowing the Superintendent to make contracts upon his own judgment. We make this statement, not because we deem it necessary to vindicate the President against any accusation from the quarter from which it emanates, but because we desire, in thus exposing the reckless falsehoods of this last grand assault, to show the baseness of the means to which his assailants will resort in order to gratify the blind resentment and petty malice of baffled tricksters and unscrupulous factious.

Thrilling Incident—Buried in a Coal Shaft. Mr. Samuel Allen furnished us yesterday, with the particulars of an accident at Wesley City, Thursday, by which a man was buried alive in a coal shaft eighty-four feet in depth. The shaft had sunk on the land of James Whitaker, for the purpose of finding coal. The workmen, after going through ten feet of clay, penetrated through seventy-four feet of quick sand, that required a strong curbing in order to work it. Not finding coal at the depth, the job was given up, but an attempt was made to remove and save the curbing. Scarcely had the man who was engaged in doing it, taken away the first plank, before the entire curbing for fifty feet above him broke loose, and buried him beneath it. The alarm was immediately given, and an excited crowd rushed to the spot. On listening, blows on the timbers could be heard from below, showing the buried man to be alive, and the work of digging him out was at once commenced. The shaft was three and a half feet in diameter, and was entirely blocked up with sand timbers for fifteen feet, and for the balance of the way the curbing was in a shattered and dangerous condition.

Our informant arrived on the ground at one o'clock yesterday afternoon, and found the knocking from below had ceased, and fears were entertained that the man was dead. After a lapse of two or three hours the knocking was resumed, and the work of digging him out was recommenced. Mr. Wm. Smith, a waiting for the repair of the shattered curbing, courageously descended to the top of the rubbish that blocked up the shaft, and lying down, succeeded in communicating with him. In his hour of unwhirl, with the exception of timbers pressing on and pinning his shoulders, that his feet were at liberty, and that he had plenty below giving directions, and allowing none but Smith, in whom he seems to have had perfect confidence, to operate on the excavation.

At 11 o'clock yesterday, after twenty-five hours' incarceration, the poor fellow was reached and rescued, unhurt! It seems that when the curbing gave way, some two or three feet at the bottom held firm, and timbers above, in falling, formed a sort of a roof above him, and thus saved his life. What is most extraordinary of this most wonderful affair, is that while the man was thus immured in a living grave, he fell asleep, and slept for several hours! It was during this sleep that the knocking had ceased, and those who were engaged in the rescue thought him dead.—Pocahontas (Ill.) Transcript.

As Marshal McMahon entered Milan, a little girl of five years of age, dressed in white, presented him with a bouquet nearly as big as herself. He raised her up and placed her standing before him on the saddle. "The child," says a letter, "threw her little arms around the sun-burnt head of the conqueror of Magenta, and kissed him repeatedly amidst the loudest cheers I ever heard. The Marshal seemed delighted with the child, and fondled her most tenderly, looking frequently at her pretty features. And so they both entered Milan amidst a shower of bouquets and applause. I saw many persons affected to tears.

CONRAD & BROTHER, Jobbers & Wholesale Dealers in HOSIERY, NOTIONS, FANCY GOODS, TOYS, &c., 817 NORTH SECOND Street, ABOVE BROWN STREET, PHILADELPHIA. MATCHES AND OIL PASTE SHOE BLACKING.