

Bedford Gazette.

VOLUME 57.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

WHOLE NUMBER, 2914.

NEW SERIES.

BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY MORNING, AUGUST 10, 1860.

VOL. 4, NO. 2.

THE BEDFORD GAZETTE

IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING

BY H. F. MEYERS.

At the following terms, to wit:
\$1.50 per annum, cash, in advance.
\$2.00 " " if paid within the year.
\$2.50 " " if not paid within the year.
No subscription taken for less than six months.
No paper is sent until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher. It has been decreed by the United States Courts that the stoppage of a newspaper without the payment of arrearages, is prima facie evidence of fraud and is a criminal offence.
The courts have decided that persons are accountable for the subscription price of newspapers, if they take them from the post office, whether they subscribe for them, or not.

Political.

ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

We, the Democracy of Pennsylvania, in mass Convention assembled, deem it proper that we should clearly and distinctly enunciate the position we at present occupy among the existing political parties, recapitulate the causes and influences which have brought about the alarming crisis in which we are involved, and explain to the voters of the Commonwealth the motives which impel and control our action in the important campaign already inaugurated in the American Union.

We have long been members of the Democratic organization, and our present desire is to act in defence of its established principles, and in conformity with its settled usages, and to support its regular nominees. In now addressing ourselves to our fellow citizens throughout the State, we are actuated by a sincere devotion to the Constitution, under whose protection we dwell, to the time-honored principles of our party, and by the impulse of an elevated patriotism. Regarding the Presidential contest in which we are now engaged as one altogether too sacred for the gratification of partisan prejudice—as one rising far above the atmosphere of the selfish political spoilsman, we desire to act exclusively with a view to the future interests of our heretofore flourishing, but now threatened Republic, and the perpetuity of the time-honored principles of the party to which we belong. Thus actuated, it behooves calmly to reckon our latitude and longitude, carefully to inspect our crew, and fearlessly to set sail upon the political ocean, determined safely to enter port, or if we unfortunately wreck on the rocks of fanaticism and sectionalism, our proud colors shall continue to float at our mast-head, indicative of the future success of our noble vessel.

Now, for the first time in the history of Democracy, we have presented to us the strange anomaly of an organization formed in hostility to the Democratic party, based upon antagonistic principles and advocating candidates for President and Vice President and in many of the States of the Union for local officers, hostile to the Democratic nominations, and yet claiming to be the National Democratic party, and endeavoring to possess and control its organization. Our primary duty, then, is to examine the grounds upon which these remarkable arrogations are founded, and to ascertain what reason there is in these bold assumptions. If they really are the Democratic party—if their candidates are the National Democratic nominees—it is clearly and manifestly our duty as loyal Democrats to support them and no others. Otherwise they are entitled to no more respect or consideration from us than any other opposing and anti-Democratic organization.

We have either but one Democratic nominee for President and one for Vice President, or we have none, because there was but one National Democratic Convention called and invested with power to make nominations, to which we, in any manner, owe our political allegiance. That Convention was duly called, and in accordance therewith, met in the city of Charleston on the 23d day of April last, and then it adopted as its platform of principles, with some slight additions in which all concurred, the series of resolutions adopted at Cincinnati in 1856, advocated during the Presidential campaign of that year by Democrats throughout the entire Union, and maintained triumphantly at the ballot-box by the American people. Upon the occurrence of this result a number of the delegates from the cotton States, under the lead of Wm. L. Yancey, who avows himself not for the Union, claiming the recognition of a doctrine inconsistent with all the past professions of the Democratic party, severed their connection with the Convention and with the party, retired to another portion of the city, and formed themselves into a separate and distinct body—distinct not only in organization, but distinct and diverse in their fundamental principles.

After this disintegration of the Convention, that body proceeded to ballot for a candidate for President of the United States, and so continued for fifty-seven consecutive ballots, during which Stephen A. Douglas received a decided majority of all the votes of a full Convention. The minority should then have yielded; but having due regard for the usages of the party, and desiring as far as consistent with honor to conciliate and satisfy the extreme South, the Convention, after authorizing the Democracy of the States, whose delegates had resigned their commissions and abandoned their seats, to supply the vacancies thus occasioned, adjourned to meet in Baltimore on the 18th day of June. Pursuant to said adjournment, the Convention reassembled, and by virtue of the power inherent in all deliberative bodies, it proceeded to determine, in the usual manner, who of the different claimants were entitled to take seats and act as delegates in the Democratic National Convention. This question being decided (as all questions necessarily are) contrary to the will and wishes of the minority, an additional secession occurred. The state

of the Convention after all secessions, and the manner in which our candidates were nominated, is succinctly stated by the National Democratic Committee, as follows:

After all secessions, as well as the refusal of certain delegates from Georgia and Arkansas, together with the entire delegations from Texas and Mississippi, to occupy their seats, our National Convention at Baltimore yet retained 423 delegates, or 212 electoral votes; being ten more than two-thirds of the electoral votes of the whole Union. But some of these delegates (as in the case of Georgia) refrained from voting, the majority of the delegation having retired; others (as in the case of Arkansas) although full delegations, and authorized, in case of any secession, to cast the whole vote of their State, preferred only to cast that which would be a fair proportion between the seceders and themselves; and yet others (as in the case of Delaware and Missouri) declined to vote, but refused to secede. This accounts for the fact that, upon the second ballot by States, Mr. Douglas received only 181 1/2 votes. Mr. Breckinridge receiving 103, Mr. Guthrie 4 votes, the States of South Carolina (8) and Florida (3) having authorized no delegates to any convention at Baltimore. Here is the ballot as recorded:

State	Breckinridge	Guthrie	Douglas
Maine	0	0	7
New Hampshire	0	0	5
Vermont	0	0	5
Massachusetts	0	0	10
Rhode-Island	0	0	4
Connecticut	0	0	34
New York	0	0	35
New Jersey	0	0	24
Pennsylvania	10	24	19
Maryland	0	0	24
Virginia	0	0	3
North Carolina	0	0	1
Alabama	0	0	9
Louisiana	0	0	6
Arkansas	0	0	14
Missouri	0	0	44
Tennessee	0	0	3
Kentucky	13	3	0
Ohio	0	0	23
Indiana	0	0	13
Illinois	0	0	11
Michigan	0	0	6
Wisconsin	0	0	5
Iowa	0	0	4
Minnesota	0	0	4

On motion of Mr. Clark of Missouri, at the instance of Mr. Hoge, of Virginia, the question was then propounded from the chair whether the nomination of Douglas should or should not be, without further ceremony, the unanimous act of the Convention and of all delegates present, the chairman distinctly requesting that any delegate who objected (whether or not having voted) should signify his dissent. No delegate dissented; and thus, at last, was Stephen A. Douglas unanimously nominated in a Convention representing more than two-thirds of all the electoral votes as the candidate of the Democratic party for the Presidency of the United States.

It may further be added, that so far as the Democratic party of Pennsylvania are concerned, they are honorably bound by the action of their entire delegation to support Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson, because as it appears from the recorded proceedings of the Convention, every delegate from this State was present, and consenting to the passage of the resolution declaring Mr. Douglas to be the unanimous nominee of the Democratic party.—Not one of our delegation notified the Convention of their withdrawal therefrom, or of a suspension of his participation in its deliberations. While a number declined to vote and actually associated with the Seceders, our entire delegation appears, from the record, to have been present when the final resolution was passed without a dissenting voice. Mr. Dawson, who had been a consistent opponent of Douglas for the nomination, with a promptness that did him great credit as chairman of the delegation, pledged the Democracy of the Keystone State to the support of the nominees of that Convention. Under these circumstances, then, Pennsylvania should be the last State in which secession will be permitted to set its feet.

When the Democratic Convention adjourned at Charleston, the Seceders also adjourned, not to meet in conjunction with their late associates, but to meet at Richmond on the 11th day of June. They accordingly did then and there re-assemble, but the Baltimore Seceders refused to join them, and without authority, without call or announcement, came together in an impromptu manner, and after playing the farce of christening themselves the National Democratic party, agreed unanimously that John C. Breckinridge and Joseph Lane should be their candidates for President and Vice President.—The whole number of votes, reported by themselves to have been cast for their candidates, being but one hundred and five, it is apparent that at no time had they a quorum of a National Democratic Convention, and at no time were they competent, (conceding their regularity in all other respects) ever, to organize such a Convention, much less to perform acts binding upon the Democracy. The utmost they can claim for their proceedings is that they were the origination and incipency of a new party, opposed to the American political organizations known to all other people.

To revert to the proceedings of the National Convention, let us inquire in what particular were they irregular? Or what occurred to justify the allegation that the nomination of Douglas was not made in accordance with the usages of the party, and is not therefore binding upon the Democracy? The chief complaint made by the Seceders was that persons were improperly admitted to their seats as delegates.

Now, without inquiring into the merits of the respective delegations contesting—which question was fairly settled by the Convention—we

have simply to ascertain whether the Convention transcended its powers or not, in assuming absolute and final jurisdiction thereof. This can scarcely be alleged, for the Seceders themselves, without disputing the complete jurisdiction of the convention over the question, participated throughout in the very proceedings which resulted in the contingency upon the happening of which they withdrew. Similar questions had been determined in the same way at Charleston without objection, complaint or secession on that account. It is not known that in the entire history of the party any other manner of settling contested seats has ever been resorted to. The rules of the House of Representatives of the United States were adopted, so far as applicable, for the government of the Convention. Section V, Art. I, of the Constitution of the United States, (which is necessarily one of the rules of the House,) says: "Each house shall be the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own members." Then the convention had full power to pass finally upon the credentials of persons claiming to participate as delegates, and every acting delegate was obliged in honor to abide by the decision of the majority upon that as upon all other questions.

Again, it is said that Mr. Douglas was not fairly nominated, because he did not receive the votes of two-thirds of a full Convention. The fallacy of this assumption has already been made apparent by the quotation from the National Committee, but it may be remarked that until the present bold attempt to distract and destroy the Democratic party, the rule was never held to require more than two-thirds of the votes cast for a candidate, provided the votes so cast were a quorum. The convention at which it was first adopted (in 1845) thus construed it, and a similar construction has uniformly been placed upon it, by a common consent, in every convention from that day to this, except the one over which Caleb Cushing unfortunately presided.

Mr. Douglas on the second ballot at Baltimore received all the votes cast but fourteen, and on the final vote declaring him the unanimous nominee more than two-thirds of a full convention gave their assent. So that under either construction of the rule, he is the regular nominee of the National Democratic Convention, according to the usages of the party, and therefore, the nominee of the entire party.—Those who do not support him are outside the party, and it matters not to us where they belong. If they are not for us they are against us.

THE COMPROMISE.

The action of the State executive Committee recommending a compromise and a Union electoral ticket, is already so well known to the people as to render it unnecessary that the resolutions, so insidiously framed and dangerous in their character, should be inserted here. They simply propose that in a certain contingency, the electors appointed by the State Convention at Reading shall vote (in the event of their election) for Breckinridge and Lane—gentlemen unknown as Democratic candidates. They argue most earnestly, and with apparent sincerity, the propriety of consenting to this arrangement, because it will combine the entire strength of the Democratic party in the State, and secure the election of the ticket. Could we believe that any action of those who manage the machinery of politics would bind the incorruptible masses of the Democracy, and lead them like dumb men, whithersoever we would, and had we no more worthy object, no more elevated aim, than mere temporary success and the election of our candidates, we might be induced to consent to this unauthorized, unworthy, and disorganizing suggestion of the Executive Committee.

What are the elements with which we are asked to unite? The seceding organization is composed of the ultra Disunionists and slave-code advocates of the South, and the cohorts of the Federal Administration, moved by a spirit of vindictive personal hostility—such as animated Themistocles in his constant warfare upon the immortal Aristides—bent on the defeat of our candidate, although it may result in the destruction of the Democratic party and the dissolution of the American Union. It is composed of men who withdrew from a regularly called, regular organized, and regularly acting Democratic Convention, and set up for themselves outside of that body and in opposition thereto. Their doctrine, like that of the Republicans, declares the power of Congress over the Territories for their government, and demands that that power shall be exercised for protection of slavery therein—a doctrine which is in direct contravention of all the past professions of the Democracy, and in contradiction of the principles advocated North and South by every Democratic orator four years ago, including John C. Breckinridge, the nominee of the Seceders, and James Buchanan, the President of the United States.

The secession at Charleston occurred, ostensibly, on account of the refusal of the Convention to adopt the very platform which our Executive Committee propose that the Democracy of Pennsylvania shall now support. A union upon an electoral ticket pledged to the support of both candidates would be an amalgamation of principles as antagonistic as the poles. How could we conduct the campaign as the upholders of conflicting theories of government? What principles would our press advocate? What would our public speakers say? What addresses would our committees issue? We denounced the Republican and American parties, in the last Presidential contest, for their sacrifice of principle in forming a combination, and now we are asked to render ourselves obnoxious to similar and more scathing denunciations.

The fact has already been adverted to, that a controlling influence in the new party is personal malignity against our candidate. Can we trust men thus actuated to support him under any circumstances? If we can, then, verily

may we rejoice in the dawning of the millennium, when enemies can in union dwell—when the wolf and the lamb shall lie down together?

Moreover, the course pursued by the new organization since the adjournment at Baltimore, shows conclusively that they have "no part nor lot with us," and we should not have with them—that they are real enemies of Democracy, and that their professed desire for harmony is but the disguise of some ulterior and dangerous purpose. It has been aptly compared to the wooden horse, filled with armed men, ready to rush forth from their seclusion and annihilate its observers and their enemies, once used by the Grecians to attract and deceive the Trojans.—They have persistently continued the business of separating themselves from the organization, have nominated a full State ticket in many of the States of the Union, and in some of the counties of this State have actually seceded from County Conventions, thus carrying disorganization to the very basis of our principles. Their organ in the city of Philadelphia has defiantly proclaimed that the "Federal Administration will not do its duty unless it brings to the block every office-holder who is an outspoken supporter of Douglas.—Nothing but a clean sweep will meet the demand of the times."

In view of such acts and expressions, is it not apparent that their professed compromise is but the Grecian warrior in the uniform of Achilles, and if we are deceived into receiving him, he will spread ruin and destruction throughout our ranks? They are "aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel," and with them we can have no fellowship. The future of our glorious party demands that we shall preserve its organization and its principles pure and unadulterated. Shall we countenance disorganization and anarchy because it becomes formidable? No; now are the times to test men's Democracy. Any person can be a sailor on a well rigged vessel and a smooth sea, but it requires skill, manhood, and heroism to face the terrific storms that shake the ship from stem to stern, bend her proud masts, and threaten destruction. Rebels and mutineers must be watched, and the brave ranks of our true-hearted men protected from demoralization. We must purify the fountain, or the stream with its dark impurities will blind us, while the foes who have corrupted it will lead us to unutterable ruin. The only terms we can consent to make with any of our political opponents (and we make no distinction) are, that when we have formed a pure electoral ticket, pledged to support Douglas and Johnson, and then alone, they may all support it. We intend to comply with the letter and spirit of the Reading resolution pledging the Democracy of the State to the support of the Charleston nominees. We were to unite with our Southern opponents on the basis proposed by our Executive Committee, and by virtue thereof elect our candidates, we would feel more ashamed of the honor than we will of the disgrace of defeat in defence of our party and its principles.

We have fought our battles in defence of the true principles of Democracy, strictly within the Democratic organization—and we have triumphed. We have refused to permit the Democratic party to be sectionalized, and standing to-day as a wall of fire between Northern sectionalism and Southern sectionalism, we have but to maintain the victory already won.—Whatever may be the present result, the firm reliance we entertain in the intelligence and patriotism of the American people inspires confidence that the national and conservative position we occupy will eventually command their support. Acting under a firm conviction of the rectitude of our position and our intentions, we will fearlessly maintain them, and spurn with contempt all propositions, from whatever quarter they may come, calculated to demoralize our organization, and contaminate our principles.

"Oh! for the swords of former time;
Oh! for the men who bore them;
When armed for right, they stood sublime,
And tyrants crouched before them."

Breckinridge's Democracy.
AN UGLY RECORD!
A DISORGANIZER AS A WHIG!—A DISORGANIZER AS A DEMOCRAT!!

In 1848, when Gen. Taylor was a prominent candidate before the people for the Presidency, upon being questioned as to his politics, he replied by saying that he was "a Whig, but not an ultra Whig." Judging Mr. Breckinridge by his record he is in a position to give the same response, in substance, as to his Democracy—"a Democrat, but not an ultra Democrat!" Originally a Whig, he early showed a disposition to bolt and distract the Democratic party. In 1848 he signed a call for a Taylor meeting at Lexington, Kentucky, and took part in it as one of the committee on resolutions. He urged the nomination of Gen. Taylor as an independent candidate, and in the address which he helped to prepare he was very severe upon the Democratic and other old parties. When the election came round Breckinridge refused to vote for Cass, the Democratic candidate. So much for his Democracy then.

In 1855, when Know Nothingism was rampant throughout the country, Major Breckinridge became impregnated with the fatal poison and leaned strongly to that church. On the 7th of April, of that year he made a speech at Cynthiaia, Kentucky, in which he made use of the following sentiments as reported in the Paris State Flag, viz:

"It was natural for a man to prefer those of his own religious faith in voting, and he himself would vote for one of his own way of thinking in religion rather than for another, all other things being equal, just as he would vote for a native in preference to a foreign-born citizen, all other things being equal."

"He (Mr. Breckinridge) here spoke of the difficulty of ascertaining what the distinctive projects of the Know Nothings were. Some prin-

ciples of which they claimed to be the sole advocates he was also in favor of. He was in favor of repelling foreign influence in our affairs. He would not allow any one to have a hand in the direction of our political machinery who had not a community of interest with ourselves."

The ordinary rules of evidence would make him a Know Nothing; and as he has not renounced this doctrine we do not see how Democrats can support him, if this alone stood in the way.

Another Douglas Flag!

The Frederick (Md.) Union, of which Bradley T. Johnson, Esq., the Chief of the bolters at Baltimore, was senior editor, has hoisted the Douglas and Johnson flag. Hear the editor:

"We unfurl our banner this week for DOUGLAS, JOHNSON AND NON-INTERVENTION, and appeal to every Democrat whose attention may be directed to these lines, and who is opposed to the efforts which the Seceders are making to break down the organization of the Democratic party, to stand in defence of Douglas & Johnson, the regular nominees, and assist in administering a proper rebuke to those men who have hitherto made the loudest professions of Democracy, and now refuse to support the regular Democratic nominee for the Presidency. The Democrats who stand to their colors in the coming contest and vote for Douglas and Johnson, will be entitled to praise for all time to come. Like the noble Democracy of the immortal Eighth Ward in the City of Baltimore, who could not be frightened or whipped into the support of error by the Plug Uglies they will achieve an undying reputation for their strict adherence to honor, principle and consistency. We have no fears as to the ultimate result.

The friends of Mr. Breckinridge have no foundation in truth or justice for their superstructure, and it will most assuredly totter, fall, and crumble into dust. All we ask from our friends, is a hearty, active and earnest support in the efforts which we shall put forth to advance the great cause in which we are engaged and a reasonable degree of justice at the hands of those who are unwilling to acknowledge the correctness of our position and the purity of our intention. Rouse! Freeman, Rouse!! and unite with us in the support of DOUGLAS, JOHNSON, and the regular organization of the Democratic party!"

He spits upon it.

Hon. L. D. Campbell, of Ohio, Republican candidate for Speaker of the House of Representatives and Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in the last Congress, sends the following letter to the Hamilton Intelligencer, in opposition to the Chicago platform:

"Sirs—In your last issue you mention the fact that I have been named as a candidate for the Republican nomination for representative in Congress. It is proper therefore, to say that, acknowledging my profound gratitude to the people of this district for their past support, I have not the least desire again to enter that field of strife, and subject myself to a repetition of the calumnious assaults heretofore made upon me. Besides, it is due to candor to add that, according to the 'new tests' of republicanism, adopted by the Chicago Convention, I regard myself as resolved out of that party. I could not accept such a nomination without expressing my unqualified condemnation of the proposition which pledges support to the system which prevails in several States allowing to unaturalized foreigners the right of voting on a residence of six months! This plank is in conflict with much that I have said, and much more than I have thought and still believe on this subject. It proposes, substantially, to obliterate all the wholesome safeguards to the purity of the American ballot-box, and, therefore, to use a familiar and significant expression, 'I spit upon it.'"

LEWIS D. CAMPBELL.

DOUGLAS IN GEORGIA.—The Savannah Republican says:

There are now nine Douglas organs in Georgia. The Hon. A. H. Stephens, who is unquestionably the most intellectual and influential Democrat in that State, leads the Douglas party, and will make speeches throughout the canvas. Douglas himself is to address what will no doubt be a tremendous gathering in Atlanta, and Herschel V. Johnson intends to keep the stump till the election. We shall not be at all surprised to find Douglas stronger than Breckinridge in Georgia on the first Monday of November.

The National Democracy of Monroe County, convened in public meeting at Forsyth, Saturday last, and ratified the nomination of Douglas and Johnson, pledged their support to those gentlemen as the only regular nominees of the Democratic party. Col. Allen Cochran, the head and front of the Democracy of the county, presided at the meeting.

DOUGLAS IN FLORIDA.—We had begun to think, says the Savannah Republican, that the Regular Democratic nomination would get no showing at all in the "Land of Flowers," when the report of a large and enthusiastic Douglas and Johnson ratification meeting at Jacksonville came to hand. It was held on the 9th instant. The Baltimore regular resolutions were affirmed and speeches made by Gen. Peden, W. W. Moore, S. F. Dugget, Esq., and others. The St. John's Mirror says:—The meeting was large and highly respectable, and characterized by much enthusiasm, harmony and good feeling. No sectionalism or party rancour marred its proceedings.

A call for a Douglas State Convention has been made in Mississippi, to be held on the 30th inst., at Holly Springs. The Aberdeen Conservative, and several other Douglas organs in the State have endorsed the call.

Miscellaneous.

LANARTINE'S OPINION OF WOMAN.—Woman, with weaker passions than man, is superior to him in soul. The Gauls attributed to her an additional sense—the divine sense. They were right. Nature has given woman two painful and heavenly gifts, which distinguish them, and often raise them above human nature—compassion and enthusiasm. By compassion they devote themselves; by enthusiasm they exalt themselves. What more does heroism require? They have more heart and imagination than men. Enthusiasm springs from the imagination, and self-sacrifice from the heart. Women are, therefore, more naturally heroic than men. All nations have in their annals some of those miracles of patriotism, of which woman is the instrument in the hand of God. When all is desperate in a national cause, we need not despair while there remains a spark of resistance in a woman's heart, whether she is called Judith, Clelia, Joan of Arc, Victoria Colonna in Italy, or Charlotte Corday, in our own day. God forbid that I compare those that I cite! Judith and Charlotte Corday sacrificed themselves, but their sacrifice did not recoil at crime. Their inspiration was heroic, but their heroism mistook its aim; it took the poignard of the assassin instead of the sword of the hero. Joan of Arc used only the sword of defence; she was not merely inspired by heroism, she was inspired by God.

AFRICA.—Pyrrhus would first conquer Africa, and then Asia, and then live merrily and take his ease; but when Cyneus, the orator, told him he might do that already, he rested satisfied, condemning his own folly. Thou mayst do the like, and be composed in thy fortitude. Thou hast enough; be that is wet in a bath, can be no more wet if he be flung into the ocean itself; and if thou hast all the world, or a solid mass of gold as big as the world, thou canst not have more than enough. Enjoy thyself at length and that which thou hast; the mind is all; be content, though art not poor, but rich. I say then, add no more wealth, but diminish thy desires; if you wish to be wealthy, despise riches; that is true plenty, not to have but to want riches; it is more glory to content than to possess, and to want nothing is divine.—Burton.

In Milwaukee, Wis., a young man of reputed wealth was dead in love with a pretty girl who liked his money, his company and the flirtation, but did not and would not like him. He tried suicide, but was dragged out of the canal and died. Eveline wept for the sake of his spoiled coat, and when, a little later, her father told her he might do that already, he rested satisfied, condemning his own folly. Thou mayst do the like, and be composed in thy fortitude. Thou hast enough; be that is wet in a bath, can be no more wet if he be flung into the ocean itself; and if thou hast all the world, or a solid mass of gold as big as the world, thou canst not have more than enough. Enjoy thyself at length and that which thou hast; the mind is all; be content, though art not poor, but rich. I say then, add no more wealth, but diminish thy desires; if you wish to be wealthy, despise riches; that is true plenty, not to have but to want riches; it is more glory to content than to possess, and to want nothing is divine.—Burton.

A very pretty ghost story is told as having occurred lately near Sandusky, O. A rich old cornucopion of a farmer refused his pretty daughter to a nice young man she loved, insisted she should marry a man old enough to be her grandfather, but who was blessed with money. She said she would die first, but the "uncle parent" insisted, and started off one day to procure a magistrate to complete the marriage at once. In a short time he returned in great fright, went to bed and had a long sickness.—The story he tells is, that the ghost of his departed wife came down upon him out of a tree as he was riding along, took the reins out of his hands, turned the horse and drove home. He took it to be a command to him not to constrain his daughter's affection, and he acts accordingly and the nice young man is to have his daughter and a generous share of the property.

AMERICANS IN KENTUCKY GOING FOR DOUGLAS.—Col. T. L. Jones, of Newport, a prominent member of the American party, who was its candidate for State Treasurer in 1857, recently made an eloquent speech in favor of Douglas and Johnson, and urged upon all national men, whatever may have been their antecedents heretofore, to now support that ticket, as the one best calculated to subserve the end they have in view, of holding the balance of power, and rescuing our country from danger of the selfish designs of demagogues.

REMEMBER.—Let the soldiers of the Mexican war, and the widows of those who were recovered with bloody hands to hospitable graves, remember that Abe Lincoln voted, in Congress, against giving bounty land and supplies to the soldiers who fought upon the field of battle.—Our country has no reward to give to traitors and Tories. Down with the Tory Lincoln, who was the man Friday of Tom Corwin.—Holmes County Farmer.

"Are you an Odd Fellow?"
"No, sir, I have been married more than a week."

"I mean do you belong to the Order of Odd Fellows?"
"No; I belong to the order of married men."
"Mercy, how dull! are you a Mason?"
"No; I'm a carpenter."
"Worse and worse! are you a son of Temperance?"
"No; I'm a son of Mr. John Gosling."

DOUGLAS AND THE UNION.—Dr. Courtney, a prominent Republican of East Des Moines, Iowa, can stand the Helper ticket no longer, and has declared his determination to vote for Douglas. The rail splitter is losing by scores.

"Are there well, and if forever—
Still forever fare thee well."
Mrs. Partington told Bemus the other day, in confidence, that a young man had committed infanticide by blowing his brains up in a state of delirious tremors, and the coroner was holding a conquest over his remnants.