A. Hoy, Esq

THE DEMOCRATIC WATCHMAN.

VOL. 6. BELLEFONTE, THURSDAY MORNING, JULY 25, 1861. NO. 28.

Select Poetry.

THE MOTHER'S PRAYER.

BY MRS. MAGARET PIGGOT.

God of nations, God of might,
In the stillness of the night
At thy footstool low I bow,
Hear me, hear me, hear me now.

All without is wild and drear,
All without is doubt and fear,
Where can I for refuge flee,
God of hosts, if not to thee?

What fierce scourging, Judge of all,
Must upon my country fall?
Must we o'er this land, so fair,
Witness carnage and despair?
All withdrawn thy favoring light,
All our noonday changed to night.

We have sinned, oh God of might,
Sinned, rebellious, in Thy sight;
Pride and wrath are o'er the land,
But, avenger, stay thy hand!
For our children, smiling here,
For our little ones so dear—
Stay thy judgements, swift and sure,
Say it, God, for these are pure.

By the child whose feeble cry
From the desert rose on high—
Bringing to the mother there,
Angel cheer in her despair,
By the babe that Thou didst save
From the Nile's engulfing wave,
By the children he did press
To his heart in fond caress,
And the loud hosannah song,
Rising from the infant throng—
Save us, save us, spare thine hand,
For the children, save the land.

Dark, still dark, no light I trace,
Hast thou turned away thy face?
Must we take this fiery path,
Scowl'd upon by direful wrath?
Must we to the dust go down,
Blasted by thy hopeless frown?
If so, Father, we obey,
But for these I still would pray.

For the young I make my moan,
Such as this, my own, my own!
These, my boys, in rosy rest,
This my babe upon my breast.
Little dreaming as they sleep
Why their mother wakes to weep,
Oh, let me but feel the rod,
Spare them, spare them, oh my God!

And for all, so passion tossed,
And all this people ruined, lost,
Forgetting now their ancient trust,
Trampling all they loved in dust,
Still, I say, for only Thou
Can'st control and save them now.

By the mercy thou didst show
To thy people long ago,
When, by Thee released, restored,
They, like us, forgot Thee, Lord;
By the prayer of Him who died,
By his love, the crucified,
And the tears he wept o'er them,
Wept o'er doom'd Jerusalem,
Oh, forgive us, forgive us, Lord,
Let thy pity be restored,
Say again, if 'tis Thy will,
To these billows, PEACE, BE STILL.

Miscellaneous.

DOUGLAS' LAST SPEECH.

Delivered in the United States Senate, on the 15th of March, 1861, the last one he delivered in the halls of Congress, and the last official act of his life.

In this state of the case, for the purpose of quieting the apprehension of the country, and demonstrating, first, that the President does not meditate war; and, secondly, that *he has no means for prosecuting a warfare upon the seceding States*, even if he desired, I bring in this resolution. Attempts are made to prevent its consideration. It is suggested that the discussion of it, at this time, would be, if not improper, at least injurious. What bad effect can result from answering the inquiries contained in the resolution? If the policy of the Administration be peace, and if the answer be such as I anticipate it will be, it will quiet the country; it will relieve the apprehensions; it will cause rejoicing throughout the length and breadth of the land. If, on the contrary, the policy be war, it is due to the people of the United States that that fact should be made known, and we be informed whither we are drifting, in order that we may see whether we are wiling to be drawn into war irregularly, without the sanction of Congress or the consent of the country.

I believe that the answer to this resolution will quiet the country, and restore good will and good feelings among the people of the different sections. I repeat the conviction, that Mr. Lincoln does not meditate war. Certain I am, that, under the laws, as they now exist, he cannot, consistent with his oath, do any act that will produce a collission between the seceding States and the Federal Government. In the first place he has no power, under the existing laws, to collect the revenue on ship-board, as suggested by the partisan press. By the laws of the land, the revenue must be collected at the ports of entry, and in the custom-houses designated by law, and cannot be collected anywhere else, except in specific cases provided in the law itself. By reference to the act of the 2d of March, 1799, it will be seen that South Carolina is divided in three collection districts; that three ports of entry are established; one at Georgetown one Charleston, and one at Beaufort; and a collector, surveyor and naval officer, are to be appointed "*to reside at Charleston.*"—The custom house officers are required to reside at the ports of entry designed in the law. So it is with all the collection districts in all the other States. Another section—section eighteen—of the law makes it unlawful to enter goods or collect revenue elsewhere than the "ports of entry" designated in the law. It expressly prohibits the collection of revenue or the entry of goods at any other place. Then a subsequent section—section eighty-five of the same law—makes one exception to this rule; and that is in case a vessel is prevented by ice from approaching the pier or wharf at the port of entry, the captain, on application to the collector, may receive a permit to land the goods, and pay the duties at any place in the district designated in the permit. The only case, then, where revenue can lawfully be collected, or goods lawfully entered, at any other point than the port of entry designated in the law, is where the vessel is obstructed by ice from approaching the wharf at such port.

It has been suggested, and the people of the country, North and South, have been led to believe that it is the purpose of this Administration, without authority of law, to order revenue cutters down to these southern ports, and to collect the revenne on board of them. I wish to call the attention of the Senate, and the country, to the fact that the law *forbids the collection of the revenue on shipboard or anywhere else* except at New Orleans, Charleston, Savannah, and at each of the ports designated in the law. The President of the United States would subject himself justly and *lawfully to impeachment, if he should attempt to collect the revenue on ship-board or in any other manner, or at any other place* than that authorized by law. The law in this respect stands now just as it did when General Jackson, in 1832, called on Congress for additional legislation to enable him to collect revenue at the port of Charleston. Then General Jackson had no power to remove the custom house from the city of Charleston to ship board in the harbor. He had no power to order the collection of the revenue anywhere else than at the place designated by law. Because of the absence of the legal authority to do this, he called on Congress to pass a law, which authorized him to collect the revenue on land or ship board, anywhere within the harbor other than at the place designated at the port of entry. Congress passed the law known to the country now as the "force bill." The force bill was passed March 2, 1833; and the first and fifth section which gave authority to collect the revenue at any place in the harbor, and the power to use military force, expired at the end of the next sesssion of Congress by the express limitation of the act. Hence the law stands now just as it did before the force bill was passed, and there is no more authority to collect the revenue on shipboard now than there was before the passage of the act of 1833. You cannot, under law, collect the revenue anywhere else, either on shipboard or land. what danger is there of any collision between this government and seceding States upon the question of collecting the revenue?—There is none, unless Senators suppose the President of the United States is going to violate his oath of office by using force *to do that which the law forbids him to do.* I do not believe that Mr. Lincoln is going to do any such thing.

But we are told that the country is to be precipitated into civil war by blockading all the southern ports within the United States, blockading our own with our army and navy. Where is the authority for that? What *law* authorizes the President of the United States to blockade federal ports at discretion? He has no more authority to blockade New Orleans or Charleston than he has to blockade New York or Boston; and no more legal right to blockade Mobile than Chicago.—Sir, I cannot consent that the President of the United States may, at his discretion, blockade and close the ports of the United States or any other country. He can do only what the Constitution and laws authorize him to do. *He dare not attempt to obstruct the navigation at the mouth of the Mississippi river*, or at Mobile, or at any other port in the seceded States, or even those that remain loyal to the Constitution and the Union. The intimation that he is to do this implies a want of respect for the integrity of the President, or an ignorance of the laws of the land on the part of those who are disturbing the harmony and quiet of the country by threats of illegal violence.

Mr. King.—Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question in relation to this matter? Is it not the duty of the President to prevent smuggling in all the ports of this Union?

Mr. Douglas.—I am not talking about smuggling. It is his duty to enforce the laws of the land in respect to smuggling.

But, sir, it is not his duty to prevent smuggling in any other mode or by any other means than those provided by law. Will the Senator from New York intimate to the Senate and to the country that, under the pretext of preventing smuggling, the President can close a port created by law, and stop all commerce connected with it? Will he intimate that, under suspicion that if the revenue cutter allows a vessel to enter the port of New Orleans she will not pay any duties, therefore the President will prevent her going there? The law gives him no such power, no such discretion. The suggestion, therefore, of the Senator from New York, that these ports of the United States are to be blockaded by the Navy at the discretion of the President, under pretense of preventing smuggling, only shows how loosely even Senators talk about the powers and duties of the President. It is no use to argue the question. There is no law that authorizes it. To do the act, or attempt it would be one of those *high crimes and usurpations that would subject the President of the United States to impeachment.*

But we are told that the President is going to enforce the laws in the seceded States. How? By calling out the militia and using the Army and Navy! These terms are used as freely and as flippantly as if we were a military government where martail law was the only rule of action, and the will of the monarch was the only law on the subject.—Sir, the President *cannot use the Army or the Navy, or the Malitia for any purpose not authorized by law.* What is that? If there be an insurrection in any State *against laws and authorities thereof*, the President can use military to put it down *only when called upon by the State Legislature, if it be in session, or if it cannot be convened, by the Governer.* He cannot interfere except when requested. If, on the contrary, the insurrection be against the laws of the United States instead of a State, then the President can use the military only as a *posse comitatus* in aid of the marshal in such cases as are so extreme that judicial authority and the powers of the marshal cannot put down the obstruction. The military cannot be used in any case whatever except the aid of civil process to assist the marshal to execute a writ. I shall not quote the laws upon this subject, but if gentlemen will refer to the acts of 1795 and 1807, they will find that by the act of 1795 the militia only could be called out to aid in the enforcement of the laws when resisted to such an extent that the marshal could not overcome the obstruction. By the act of 1808, the President is authorized to use the Army and Navy to aid in enforcing the laws in all cases where it was before lawful to use militia. Hence the military power, no matter whether navy, regulars, volunteers, or militia, can be used only in aid of the civil authorities.

Now, sir, how are you going to create a case in one of those seceded States where the President would be authorized to call out the military? You must first procure a writ from the judge describing the crime; you must place that in the hands of the marshal, and must meet such obstructions as render it impossible for him to execute it; and then, and not till then, can you call upon the military. Where is your judge in the seceded States? Where is your marshal? You have no civil authorities there, and the President, in his inaugural, tells you he does not intend to appoint any. He said he intended to use the power confided to him, to hold, and possess the forts, and collect the revenue; but beyond this he did not intend to go. You are told, therefore, in the inaugural, that he is going to appoint no judges no marshals, no civil officers, in the seceded States, that can execute the law, and hence we are told that he does not intend to use the army, the navy, or the militia, for any such purpose.

Is it your purpose to rush this country blindly into war at a cost of $300,000,000 per annum; to levy $2,000,000 of direct taxes upon the people, and then call upon them to pay it because you have involved us in civil war? Sir, I expect to stand by my country under all circumstances; and hence I will save her if I can, from being plunged into civil war of indefinite duration, that will require a quarter of a million of men and exorbitant taxation, levied on one half the American people to subdue the other half. Remember, this extraordinary amount of revenue, these extraordinary numbers of men are to be called for in eighteen States to fight fifteen; for it is useless to disguise the fact, that whenever you make the question one of peace or war, the slaveholding States will be a unit and will be eighteen against fifteen. Are we prepared for civil war, with all its horrors and calamities?

I repeat, it is time that the line of policy was adopted, and the country knew it. In my opinion, we must choose, and that promptly, between one of the three lines of policy:

1. THE RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION OF THE UNION by such amendments to the Constitution as will insure the domestic tranquility, safety and equality of all the States, and thus restore peace, unity, and fraternity to the whole country.

Or, 2. A PEACEFUL DISSOLUTION of the Union, by recognizing the independence of such States as refuse to remain in the Union without such constitutional amendments, and the establishment of a liberal system of commercial and social intercourse with them by treaties of commerce and amity.

Or, 3. WAR, with a view to the subjugation and military occupation of those States which have seceded or may secede from the Union.

I repeat that, in my opinion, you must adopt and pursue one of these three lines of policy. The sooner you choose between them the better for you, the better for us, the better for every friend of liberty and constitutional government throughout the world. In my opinion, the first proposition is the best, and the last the worst.

I am in favor of such amendments to the Constitution as will take that question out of Congress, and restore peace to the country. That may be done by non intervention —by popular sovereignty, as it is called; or by the Crittenden amendment, making an equitable partition of the territory between the two sections, with a self executing clause prohibiting it on one side and protecting it on the other. It may be done in various ways. I prefer such an amicable settlement to peaceable disunion; and I prefer it a thousand times to civil war. If we can adopt such amendments as will be satisfactory to Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and the border States, the same plan of pacification which will satisfy them will create a Union party in the cotton States which will soon embrace a large majority of the people in those States, and bring them back of their own free will and accord; and thus restore, strengthen, and perpetuate the glorious old Union forever. I repeat, whatever guarantees will satisfy Maryland and the border States (the States now in the Union) will create a Union party in the seceded States that will bring them back by the voluntary action of their own people. You can restore and preserve the Union in that mode. *You can do it in no other.*

War is disunion. War is final, eternal separation. Hence, disguise it as you may, every Union man in America must advocate such amendments to the Constitution as will preserve peace and restore the Union; while every disunionist, whether openly or secretly plotting its destruction, is the advocate of peaceful secession, *or of war, as the surest means of rendering* reunion and reconstruction impossible. I have too much respect for any man that has standing enough to be elected a Senator, to believe that he is for war, as *a means for preserving the Union*, I have too much respect for his intellect to believe for one moment, that there is a man for war who is not a disunionist *per se.*—Hence I do not mean, if I can prevent it, that the enemies of the Union—men plotting to destroy it—*shall drag this country into war under the pretext of protecting the public property*, and enforcing the laws, and collecting the revenue, *when their object is disunion*, and war the means of accomplishing a cherished purpose.

The disunionists, therefor, are divided in two classes; the one open, the other secret disunionists. The one in favor of peaceful session and a recognition of independence; the other is in *favor of war, as the surest means of accomplishing the object, and of making the seperation final, eternal.* I am a Union man, and hence against war. But we are told, and we hear it repeated every where that must we find out if we have got a Government. "Have we a Government?" is the question; and we are told we must test that question by using the military power to put down all disconnected spirits. Sir, this question, "have we a Government?" has been pronounced by every tyrant who has tried to keep his feet on the necks of the people since the world began. When the Barons demanded *Magna Charta* from King John at Runnymede, he exclaimed, "have we a Government?" and called for his army to put down the disconnected barons. When Charles I. attempted to collect the ship money in violation of the constitution of England, and in disregard of the rights of the people, and was resisted by them, he exclaimed, "have we a Government? We cannot treat with rebels; put down the traitors; we must show that we have a Government." When James II. was driven from the throne of England for trampling on the liberties of the people, he called for his army and exclaimed, "let us show that we have a government?" When George III. called upon his army to put down the rebellion in America, Lord North cried lustily, "no compromise with traitors; let us demons rate that we have a government."—When in 1848 the people rose upon their tyrants all over Europe, and demanded guarantees for their rights, every crowned head exclaimed, "have we a government?" and appealed to the army to vindicate their athority and to enforce the law.

Sir, the history of the world does not fail to condemn the folly, weakness and wickedness of that government which drew its sword upon its own people when they demanded guarantees for their rights. This cry that we must have a government, is merely following the example of the besotted Bourbon, who never learned anything by misfortune, never forgave an injury, never forgot an affront. Must we demonstrate that we have got a government, and coerce obedience without reference to the justice or injnstice of the complaints? Sir, whenever ten million of people proclaim to you with one unanimous voice, that they apprehend their rights, their firesides and their family alters are in danger, it becomes a wise government to listen to the appeal and to remove the apprehension. History does not record an example where any human government has been strong enough to crush ten million people into subjection when they believe their rights and liberties were imperiled, without first converting the government itself into a despotism, and destroying the last vestige of freedom.

Let us take warning from the examples of the past. Wherever a government has refused to listen to the complaints of the people, and attempted to put down their murmurs *by the bayonet*, they have paid the penalty. Of all those who listened to the people in 1848, and granted charters of liberty and took an oath to support them, only one has been faithful; and he has been rewarded for his fidelity, the others will pay the penalty of their perfidy. The King of Sardinia granted a constitution, took an oath to support it and to-day he is King of Italy. If George III. had listened to the murmers of our fathers, and granted their just demands the war of the Revolution would have been averted and the blood that was spilled would have been saved.

If we consider this question calmly, and make such amendments as will convince the people of the Southern States that they are safe and secure in their person, in their property, and in their family relations, within the Union, we can restore and preserve it.—If we cannot satisfy the people of the border States that they may remain in the Union with safety, dissolution is inevitable. Then the simple question comes back, what shall be the policy of the Union men of this country? Shall it be peace, or shall it be war? What man in all America, with a heart in his bosom, who knows the facts connected with Fort Sumter, can hesitate in saying that duty, honor, patriotism, humanity, require that Anderson and his gallant band should be instantly withdrawn? Sir, I am not afraid to say so. I would scorn to take a party advantage or manufactnre partisan capital out of an act of patriotism.

Peace is the *only policy* that can save the country. Let peace be proclaimed as the policy, and you will find that a thrill of joy will animate the heart of every patriot in the land; confidence will be restored; business will be revived; joy will gladen every heart bonfires will blaze upon the hill tops and in the valleys, and the church bells will proclaim the glad tidings in every city, town, and village in America, and the applause of a grateful people will greet you everywhere Proclaim the policy of war, and there will be gloom and sadness and despair pictured upon the face of every patriot in the land. A war of kindred, family, and friends; father against son, mother against daghter, brother against brother, to subjugate one-half of this country into obedience to the other half, if you do not mean this, if you mean peace; let this be adopted, and give the President the opportunity, through the Secretary of War to speak the word 'peace;' and thirty million people will bless him with their prayers, and honor him with their shouts of joy.

* * *

IT is confidently stated that Hon. Joseph Holt, of Kentucky, still a resident of Washington, will be offered the post of Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vacated by the death of Justice McLean, of Ohio.

* * *

IT is said that the graziers and farmers of Kentucky who have sold horses and cattle and grain to the traitors, get no money in return only empty promises to pay, which can never be redemed.

* * *

FAITH spans the gulf of Death with the bridge of Hope.

TRUE honor can be purchased only by worthy action

ARCHBISHOP HUGHES ON WAR.

Archbishop Hughes, who some weeks ago made a Union speech in New York, has published his views of civil war in the *Metropolitan Record.* We make a few extracts:

Above all the wars a civil war is the most deplorable and the most destructive in its consequences, both to the victor and vanquished. It progress is marked by ruin and desolation. It gives a loose rein to the worst passions of human nature; rapine and carnage, though horrible to gaze upon, though terrible to witness, cannot be compared to the moral evils which it inflicts upon society. It is not in civil strife that the nobler attributes of our nature are shown; the mind of man becomes hardened and callous amid scenes of blood and devastation. The transition from a peaceful republic to military despotism is more easily effected thr'o such a medium than people generally suppose. Mankind are pretty much the same in every age of the world. Material civilization, it is true, may develop the mind and sharpen the intellect, but it does not purify the aspirations nor elevate the moral nature of the race.

We have heard a proposition made by a prominent speaker at the great demonstration which was lately held at Union Square, that we trust was either not seriously entertained, or had its origin in the excitement of the moment. It was nothing more or less than a recommendation of the policy which England has pursued towards Ireland. The speaker expressed himself in favor of taking away the plantations from the Southern owners and bestowing them as land bounties upon the Northern soldiers. The idea as we have intimated, is not an original one, as it was partially carried into effect against the people of Ireland, and as a means by which that people were to be utterly exterminated. Far our part, we protested against such a wholesale system of spoilation—a system which is calculated to plunge the country irremidably into a war that this generation may never see the end, and to arouse feelings of hatred and revenge that may live through centuries

The proposition to which we have referred is, however, comparatively mild in its character when compared with the suggestion that has been published in one or two of our New York daily papers. It is nothing more or less than a proposal to incite the negroes to insurrection, and, by so doing, to precipitate the Southern portion of our country into all the horrors of servile war. They would be to re-enact on our own soil the fiendish brutalities recorded in the history of St. Domingo. It would be to rouse the savage negroes against our brothers in race and blood: it would be to countenance atrocities and barbarities at the sight of which our whole country would stand appalled; it would be to encourage the whole black population of the South to rise in arms against the whites, to murder women and children, to massacre helpless infancy and age, and to give a license to the excesses and cruelties which characterize all negro insurrections. * ¼

Have we now sunk so low in the scale of humanity, have we so far forgotten our obligations as Christian men, even before we have rightly entered into the heat of the conflict, to calmly tolerate or sanction a proposition as fiendish and as inhuman as that against which the elder Pitt raised his voice?

* * *

MRS. PARTINGTON'S VISIT TO THE TENTED FIELD.—We take the following from the Boston *Post*:—

"Did the guard present arms to you, Mrs. Partington?" asked the commissary of her as she entered the marquee.

"You mean the century," she said, smiling. "I have heard so much about the tainted field that I believe I could deplore an attachment into line myself, and secure them as well as an officer. You asked me if the guard presented arms. He didn't, but a sweet little man with an epilepsy on his shoulder and a smile on his face did, and asked me if I wouldn't go into a tent and smile. I told him that we could both smile outside, when he politely touched his chateau and left me." The commissary presented a hard wooden stool upon which she reposed herself. "This is one of the seats of war, I suppose?" said she. "O what a hard lot a soldier is objecteted to. I don't wonder a mite at the hardened influence of a soldier's life. What is that for?" said she, as the noise of the cannon saluted her ear. "I hope they hain't firing on my account." There was a solicitude in her tone as she spoke, and she was informed it was only the Governor, who had just arrived upon the field. "Dear me" said she, "how cruel it must be to make the old gentlemen come way down here, when he is so feeble that he has to take his staff with him wherever he goes." She was so affected at the idea that she had to take a few drops of white wine to restore her equilibrium, and to counteract the dust from the "tainted field."

* * *

HENRY A. WISE NOT EVEN ATTACKED.—The wheeling *Intelligencer*, of the 15th inst., publishes information received by Mr. Woods, of that city, who arrived in Wheeling on Saturday from Charlotsville, where he was a student at the University. He left Charlotsville about three weeks ago, reaching Charlestown on the 4th and Ripley on the 5th. Henry A. Wise, accompanied by his son O. Jennings Wise, were both at Ripley. On the 8th a report reached Ripley that a thousand Federal troops were marching on that place from the Ohio river. The Wises with their seven hundred followers retreated back upon Charlestown. The report of the killing of Wise and his body guard, reached us on Sunday evening, the 7th, so he could not have been badly injured, as he was knocking around Ripley pretty tolerably spry for an old man. From other circumstances we are induced to believe that the whole story about the attack on Wise's party is a sheer fabrication. It is scarcely possible that he could have been at Sissonville at all.

Mr. Woods was several times arrested, and was detained at Ripley a week, until the Wises had left. The *Intelligencer* says, "Our readers may rest assured that Henry A. Wise still lives, and is, doubtless, this minute "firing the Southern heart" somewhere along the Kanawha salines.

A DEMOCRAT'S COGNOMEN.

To be a Democrat now, is to be a Secessionist—Rebel—Traitor—according to Black Republican logic. Not to endorse all the monstrous usupations of President Lincoln —which a subservient Congress is now required to sanction—is to be a *Rebel*; even to examine into the propriety or constitutionality of the conduct of our public servants, or for daring to ask a representative of the people his opinion upon a great public measure, is a high misdemeanor, and makes a man a *Traitor*; yea, *not to be in all essential particulars, a so called Republican*, and willing in the language of Senator Baker, of Oregon, to "grant almost UNLIMITED POWER to the President," is to be an enemy to the Constitution, the Union, and the Government.

Now, it is an easy matter to call hard names, to make false accusations, to use obscene language, and to act the blackguard generally. No brains are required to do these things, and ony fool can thus make himself conspicuous. But instead of these bold assertions, why are not some attempts made, some arguments used, to show that such men are wrong, and support principles justifying the application of such terms?—*They cannot do it.* The men who are now charged with disloyalty, in nine cases out of every ten, have always been *the real friends* of the Union, and are now ready to sacrifice their last dollar and last drop of blood, in support of any feasible, rational plan for the restoration of the Union. Many of them believe thas this GREAT END could be secured, even now, through peaceable efforts: but never can be by the sword—that the more fighting the more impossible will it be to reunite our now distracted Union.

And who are the men who make these charges? In a great proportion they are the very men who have heretofore acted either as if they *sought* a dissolution of the Union; or else, as if they *thought* a dissolution of the Uniom impossible. "Better dissolve the Union, and send our Constitution to perdition, than live in fellowship with slaveholders," said the Abolitionists. "Let us keep slavery and slave owners out of the common territories," said the free-soiler and the supporter of the Chicago Platform. "The South will scold and threaten, but she can do no more. *You can't kick her out of the Union.*"

Up until six or eight months ago this was th language of the very men who are now charging with disloyalty those who were then, as now, supporting those sound national principles under whose influence alone can this Union be preserved.—*Clearfield Republican.*

FIRST UNDERGROUND RAILROAD.

The following conversation is supposed to have taken place between a slave and his master.

"Hallo, there, Sambo, where are you going?"

"Why, why," says Sambo, scratching his head "I jes going down to de depot."

"What depot?"

"To de U. G. depot, massa."

"Where did you learn anything about U. G. R. R.'s and depots you black rascal?"

"In de Bible, massa, de blessed Bible tell me all about it, massa.'

Feeling anxious to know what new theory Sambo had found in the Bible, he goes on to interrogate him.

"The Bible don't tell anything about R. R.'s neither above or below ground, you poor nigger.'

"Yes, msssa, de Bible tells us were de fust track of de U. G. R. R., was laid.'

"Where was it?'

"In de Red Sea, massa.'

"Who laid it?'

"De Lord Almighty Heself.'

"Well, Sambo,' mellowing down a little, "who were the conductors?'

"Moses and Aaron.'

"Who were the fugitives that run away?'

"De children of Israel, massa.'

"Who were the slaveholders?'

"De Egyptians.'

"Were they white or black?'

"Black, massa, dat time de slave be whit man and de slaveholder de black man, ha! ha! ha! massa.'

"Did they pursue the slaves?'

'Yes, massa.'

"Did they take them back to slavery?'

"No, massa, they couldn't cotch em.'

"Why not?'

"Because they took de track up, ha! ha! good, massa, wasn't it?'

"Sambo, you may go down to your quarters.'

* * *

THE LATE APPORTIONMENT.—The following is the apportionment of Representatives according to the eighth census:

Alabama,	6	South Carolina	4
Arkansas,	3	Tennessee	8
California,	3	Texas,	4
Connecticut,	4	Minnesota,	1
Delaware,	1	Mississippi,	5
Florida,	1	Missouri,	9
Georgia,	7	New Hampshire,	3
Illinois,	13	New Jersey,	5
Indiana,	11	New York	31
Iowa,	5	North Carolina,	7
Kansas,	1	Ohio	18
Kentucky,	8	Oregon,	1
Louisiana,	5	Pennsylvania,	23
Maine,	5	Rhode Island,	1
Maryland,	5	Vermont,	2
Massachusetts,	10	Virginia,	11
Michigan.	6	Wisconsin,	6

The aggregate being two hundred and thirty-three Representatives.

* * *

A runaway slave who made his way to Cairo, where he did good service in the entrenchments, was asked if he did not want to go back and fight. He replied with a grimmace that he would have done no discredit to "Julius;" "Laws no, Massee! dis nigger is not a fightin nigger! — runnin' nigger!"

* * *

Change in temper.—Jeff Davis is anxious for peace, and his Generals seem to be showing a *retiring* disposition.

* * *

Wonder if the Virginians wouldn't like to see "another Richmond in the field,"—a little further South.