Adam Hoy, Esq

The Democratic Watchman.

VOL. 8. BELLEFONTE, FRIDAY MORNING, AUGUST 7, 1863. NO. 29

Miscellaneous.

THE CONSCRIPTION.

How it was viewed by eminent men in 1814.

Extracts from the speeches of Jeremiah Mason, the greatest lawyer of N. H., and from Chief Justice Dagget, the greatest lawyer of Connecticut, delivered in the U. S. Senate in 1841.

REMARKS OF MR. MASON.

The honorable gentleman says the Government has the constitutional power to be exercised at discretion, as occasion may require, of placing our citizens by force, and for an unlimited time in the ranks of the regular army,

Till lately such an opinion was entertained by few, expressed by none. Great and sudden changes in opinion on important political subjects are the usual forerunners of revolutions in States. This is emphatically the case where the force of Government rests on the common sentiment. Sincerely believing the doctrine contended for to be unwarranted by the Constitution, and pregnant with consequences dangerous to the rights and liberties of the country, I cannot permit it to pass with out attempting its refutation. The most monstrous opinions, when announced by high authority, and supported by plausibility, will, if permitted without contradiction to become familiar to the mind, in time lose much of their original deformity.

In return I take the liberty of admonishing the friends of the Administration, to be cautious how they overstep the limits of the Constitution. Of all our dangers I see none more alarming than the apparent disposition to exercise arbitrary power. Revolutionary measures can never, with safety, be resorted to by a regular Government. They place the magistrate and private citizen on the same level, and none can foresee into whose hands, during the boisterous commotion of the political elements, the tyrant's power will fall.

A Government which should require such expedients would not be worth preserving. If sufficient powers are not granted by the people, apply to the people for their enlargement. In periods of alarm and terror, when present danger hushes all fear of that which is more remote and less obvious, inroads on the rights of the people are chiefly to be apprehended. In a case so deeply affecting the personal liberty of the whole body of the nation as the present, no extremity of danger would justify the exercise of illegal authority. The inquiry is, whether the Constitution gives to this Government the power contended for?

The authority given to Congress "to raise and support armies," comprises their whole power on this subject. This, and the authority for calling forth the Militia upon certain circumstances, are the means by which the common defense is to be provided for. Can the Legislature, by virtue of this grant of power, adopt the proposed plan of Conscription, and place by force such part of the population of the United States, and for such periods as shall be deemed expedient, in the ranks of the regular army? A power so transcendant and dangerous must, to justify the exercise of it, be derived from plain principles, and depend on no doubtful construction or subtle reasoning.

The power to raise and support armies must be construed according to the intentions and understanding of the people of the United States, who made the Constitution consistently with all the known and established rights of the States and of the people, and consistently with all the general principles of civil liberty.

In three specific cases only, and for a service within the limits of the United States and under the command of their own State officers, and as I think for short periods of service, can this Government call on the States for their militia. From these restrictions it is apparent the power of the United States has a very limited nature, and that the States still retain by far the greatest portion of authority over their own militia. Over the regular army the Government of the United States have an unlimited power. They may use it in all cases where military force is needed, in any part of the world, under such periods as they please. There always have been in this country important distinctions between the militia and regular army. These distinctions were always kept up, and in various instances exemplified in the war of our Revolution, and were well understood by the people of the United States at the time of forming the Constitution.

If any such power as that contended for could have been conceived to be granted by the Constitution, it would have been detected and pointed out by those so much alarmed; yet it is believed that such construction was not even suggested, in any of the Conventions, although the subject was there most ably discussed.

The power claimed is doubtless vastly greater and more dangerous, than any other possessed by the Government. It subjects the personal freedom of every citizen, in comparison with which the rights of property are insignificant, to arbitrary discretion. All the recruits wanted for the army might, if the Government should so please, be taken from one section of the Union.

Were the Government at liberty to raise armies by forcibly taking men at their discretion, it might, by a similar construction of the Constitution, support them by taking property in a like manner. The armies when raised, might live at free quarters on the people. In a similar way a navy might be provided, by seizing the ships of individuals. The right in both cases would be the same; the injury and distress in taking property the least.

The States still retaining the principal power over the militia, as has been shown, the power given this government to raise armies must not be construed as to destroy that power of the States. This surely annihilates all State power over the militia. The whole or in part may, at the pleasure of this Government, be converted into a regular army, and the provision of the Constitution in this particular, together with the rights of the states be destroyed.

To that part of the Secretary's plan which recommends a tax to be levied on all property within the precinct of the class in order to raise the bounty for the recruits, objections occur which in ordinary times would seem insurmountable. The tax proposed is a violation of the Constitution, too plain and obvious to require any reason to demonstrate. It is however, in my opinion of less importance than the other which affects the rights of personal liberty, as this does the rights of property. Reduce the people to slavery, and you may take their property when and as you please. All within the prescribed ages, whatever may be their pursuits or condition in life, must submit to the iron yoke. Priests must be taken from the altar, and Judges from the bench.

The highest officers, both civil and military, must be ignominiously forced into the ranks of the army. The seminaries of learning are to be robbed of their professors and scholars. Neither literature or science, except what is subservient to the military art, will be held in estimation.

Such a measure cannot, it ought not, to be submitted to. If it could in no other way be averted, I not only believe, but I hope it would be resisted. The most odious and cruel slavery, would be the inevitable consequences of submission. On a former day, when this measure was mentioned by an hon. public member, I called it weak, wicked and silly. On mature reflection, I see no reason to alter my opinion of its character. It is weak for it is all calculated to effect its object; wicked for it attempts to use force without right; and wicked for if successful, it will destroy the Constitution and liberties of the country. It is difficult to ascertain with certainty the motives of statesmen; and it matters little to the country whether its rights and liberties are lost through the weakness or wickedness of its rulers. Public men are to be judged by their measures.

Already too much blood and treasure have been wasted in the pursuit of an object which, were it desirable, cannot be obtained.

For the necessary and proper defence of the country, neither men nor pecuniary means are, in my opinion to be withheld. Ever to the present Administration, so long as they continue to be clothed with Constitutional authority, and shall not have given the most unequivocal and decisive evidence of having abandoned that defence, I will, for that purpose, and restricted to that object, grant all that could be necessary under a wise and prudent Administration. Such grants, however, must be within the limits, and in all respects according to the provisions of the Constitution. Beyond these limits, and in all respects according to the provisions of the Constitution. Beyond these limits, under no pressure of circumstances, will I consent to go. Should the National defense be abandoned by the General Government, I trust the people, if still retaining a good portion of their resources, may rally under the State Governments against Foreign invasion, and rely with confidence on their own courage and virtue.

REMARKS OF MR. DAGGETT.

MR. PRESIDENT: By this bill (the Bill then November 1814, before the Senate,) the President is authorized to call upon the several States and Territories for their respective quotas of 80,430 militia, to serve for two years, unless sooner discharged. They are to constitute part of the Regular Army of the United States, and to be treated in every respect as such, with the exception that they cannot be compelled to serve beyond the limits of the State or Territory furnishing them, and the limits of an adjoining State or Territory, and that the officers are to be appointed by the State or Territorial authorities. The object of this force is declared to be "the defence of the frontiers, of the United States.

The principle is assumed that Congress may by law, order the militia of the several States into the service of the United States, to defend their frontiers and garrison their fortresses for two years, or for any other definite period, or during the war, provided the country is invaded, or in imminent danger of invasion. This country while engaged in war with any nation which can send either fleets or armies against it will always be in such condition, and consequently the militia are subject to the control of Congress. There is no limit say the advocates of this law to the power of Congress, over the militia in time of war, except that they must be officered by the States. A CONSCRIPTION IS THUS JUSTIFIED. *It is openly avowed by the same gentlemen as proper, just and legal.* I think these conclusions are fairly deduced from the premises. If the power of this Government over the militia is in time of war unlimited it does indeed follow that the freemen of this country, who are subject to the duties of militiamen may be converted into soldiers of the army of the United States during the war, or for any definite period. The exception that they shall not be obliged to go from the State, or an adjoining State, is a matter of form, and not of right. They may be ordered to Canada, or any other remote region. But sir, this whole doctrine is unconstitutional; it is an *on race*, upon its face and its principles and provisions, upon the endoubted rights of freemen, and upon the character of our liberties.

That the powers of this Government are limited—that those not granted are reserved—are positions sanctioned by an amendment to the Constitution, and universally admitted. The entire control over the militia, previous to the adoption of the Constitution, was in the States. All that control except what has been delegated to the United States remains. There is no article in the Constitution delegating a single power. Every word employed on the subject shows that it is limited. "Congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repeal invasions." Why give power to call forth the militia in those exigencies if the entire authority over them was elsewhere given? The absurdity is too apparent to admit of argument or illustration. Again:

"Congress shall have power to provide for arming, organizing and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of training the militia, according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

In other language, may provide for arranging them into companies, battalions, regiments, brigades and divisions. It may provide that they shall be armed, and the manner in which it shall be done; prescribe the discipline to be pursued, and make laws for governing them while in the service of the United States to which they might be called forth in the cases before specified. All this Congress may do to establish that uniformity and order which are so essential to a well regulated militia. This is the obvious and just meaning of the clause, again:

"The President shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States."

In these articles of the Constitution, Congress and the President are everywhere limited, and everywhere the power of the States is apparent. The militia cannot be called forth as a regular army at all—they may be called as a militia. They cannot be trained and officered in any case, except under the authority of the States, nor commanded even by the President, except when called forth in the exigencies specified, who can discover in these provisions a pretence for asserting that the militia are constitutionally subjected to the general control of Congress.

But Sir, to prove the Constitutionality of this bill, its friends rely on those clauses which give to Congress the right "to raise and support armies," and to provide for calling forth the militia in the cases mentioned. These are distinct and independent powers and are always so considered. In the first, gave to Congress any power over the militia as such, it gave a general authority, and if so the subsequent provisions regarding them, are worse than useless. They tend only to perplex and bewilder. The truth is, this clause has no reference to the militia and more than to physicians, lawyers or merchants. It authorizes Congress to raise and support armies in a manner and by means consistent with the great principles of civil liberty known to the people of this country, and adopted, and deemed sacred in a free Government. But it is utterly inconsistent with those principles to compel any man to become a soldier for life, during the war, or for any fixed time. In Great Britain, a warlike nation, a nation often the reproach here for the tyranny of its Government, no such practice is or can be resorted to: the people would revolt at it; they would shake a throne which should attempt it. It is alike odious here and I hope will remain so.

It is said, however, that our country is in great peril; men must be had, the army must be filled. What then? Are these reasons for resorting to unconstitutional and oppressive measures? The plea of necessity is to old, to well understood to be admitted. This people have seen times of imminent danger. In the war of the Revolution where destruction assailed us on all sides when did we, for a moment, admit these doctrines?

☞ Counterfeit $3,000 bills on the Troy City bank are in circulation in different parts of this State. They are said to be well executed with some degree of skill, and the signatures are quite good.

GEN. LEE AND "RETALIATION IN PENNSYLVANIA."

From the Mobile Evening News:

"It was said that 'no blade of grass ever grew where the horse of Attila had one set his foot.' Let the Confederate army imitate the leader of the Huns in this particular." So holdeth forth the Richmond Dispatch, and all the people say Amen!

Robert E. Lee, the rival of Attila!

Robert E. Lee laying aside the mantle he hath won so fittingly; the mantle of him whose grandson he is worthy to be:

"The first, the last, the best,
Whom envy dare not hate,"

of him to whom was

"Bequeathed the name of WASHINGTON,
To make man blush there was but *One*."

Laying aside that unsullied mantle for the barbaric *role* of Attila, the 'Scourge of Mankind!" Robert E. Lee whose name is a synonym for honor, truth, modesty, dignity, piety—all, *all* that constitutes moral as well as military grandeur—carrying arson, rape, murder, destruction and desolation among unarmed men, and unprotected women and children!

The army of Northern Virginia—with what pride we write the sentence—the army of Northern Virginia! How have these our boys, to whom life had been but a bright play-day, bared their breasts to the storms of wind, and hail, and snow, and sleet, and grape, and ball, becoming suddenly, under the mighty responsibility resting upon them: veterans; an invincible host; a nation's safeguard? Now, when victors on every battle-field; now, when they spread an unstained banner before high heaven; now, when all earth is amazed at the reserve, strength and honor of the Southern character as shown by these, our exponents: now, now shall the army of Northern Virginia, our pride, our boast, our glory, with their young laurels around them become a Hunnic band—a band of marauders—burning defenceless farm houses, tearing down fences, robbing henroosts? Stonewall Jackson conquered all his foes, moral and spiritual, ere he had reached his full prime, became "the greatest general this country hath produced" (London Times) the highest embodiment of the Christian virtues, the purest illustration of the Christian warrior. Now, when all the nations are rejoicing and honoring him as a humble and mighty man of valor, fallen, nay rather risen to his fitting place amid the hosts of the Lord God omnipotent, now shall the corps, so long animated by his great soul, with his holy name for a battle cry, his guardian spirit for a guide, that corps to whom the taking of defended cities is but as child's play, shall *that* corps smash mirrors, tear up libraries, cut family portraits, break open drawers, and steal *women's garments*? Yet this is the retaliation in kind—who wishes it—who, *who* so fallen? The Generals of the Northern army have become a "contempt, a hissing and a by-word" wherever civilization has a foothold. Shall our Generals become so? Is the "rebellion at the last gasp"; must it resort to petty revenge because too powerless to do like unto those we so detest and despise? Said Wood in New York, "We cannot compare Lincoln, and Butler and Burnside with Davis and Lee and Jackson," and thirty thousand of our enemies applauded. Would you make it possible to compare them?

The question is not WHAT DO OUR FOES DESERVE, (they deserve annihilation) BUT WHAT IS WORTHY OF US? Because a cur has bitten me, MUST I BITE THE CUR? The nations had been taught to hate and despise us, that we were semi civilized, cut-throats and assassins PAR EXCELLENCE: but our very foes have been forced to acknowledge that we have taught them lessons worthy of imitation—lessons of magnanimity in the hour of victory. Now, when we have compelled this tribute—compelled if not the nominal, the real recognition and admiration of the world; when we have laid the charge of *barbarous braggarts* and fixed it upon the foe—*now* shall we yield all this moral dignity and grandeur, YIELD IT FOR ALL TIME AND ALL HISTORY, for the poor pleasure of devastating a few acres of Pennsylvania, or gutting a few Dutch stores?

No, a thousand times NO; thanks be to God we have no need to aught contemptible. Let us then cease this shout so unworthy of us. Let us strive to visit a STERN AND MAJESTIC VENGEANCE. Let their country be dismembered, bankrupted; their once great name a by-word; let them be compelled to sit at the foot as they have at the head of nations; as great as hath been their pride, so great let their degradation be!

This would, indeed, avenge our mourners and our exiles—avenge them as is deserved of our foes, AS IS WORTHY OF US. But let us never dream of accomplishing this great vengeance, if we have succeeded by our insane cry, in debasing, demoralizing and disgracing our noble boys, our glorious army.

Great God of Heaven! in this breathless hour make Thou Davis and Lee deaf to the too thoughtless voice of a people exasperated by long suffering; keep them worthy to be a nation's saviors, worthy to be Thy honored sons!

The Luzerne *Union* says it sees nothing to prevent the election of Judge Woodward by at least one hundred thousand majority.

An Irishman says he can see no earthly reason why women should not be allowed to become medical men.

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

In pursuance of a previous announcement the Democratic Club of the borough of Unionville, met at the school-house, on Saturday evening, the 25th of July. Although the weather was inclement, the sturdy democracy turned out in their might and at an early hour the house was crowded. The ladies, God bless them, have caught up the spirit of patriotism, and came to cheer with their presence, those engaged in the good cause of restoring the democracy to power. They, although disfranchised by the laws of the land, understand the issues involved in the coming campaign, and have determined to throw the weight of their influence on the side of the democracy. The President of the Club called the meeting to order, and after the usual preliminary business was finished, a motion was made that C. T. Alexander, Esq., of Bellefonte, address the meeting. Mr. Alexander responded to the call in an able and eloquent address of over an hour's duration, his argument being mild and temperate, and entirely devoid of the cant phrases so common to politicians. He treated the republican party in a respectful manner, and attributed the many errors they had committed and the evils they have brought upon the country, to a mistaken idea in regard to our form of government, and to their prejudices against the democratic party. He believed the masses of that party were honest men who loved their country, but who had been misled into support of the republican party by the false teachings of abolition demagogues. He dwelt elaborately upon the cause of the war, charging it, where it justly belongs, upon the abolition and republican parties, and by conclusive proofs established the fact, that the disregard of the plain teachings of the Constitution, the violations of the law, the denial of the authority of the decisions of the Supreme Court by the abolition and republican parties, under the plea of a "higher law," was the beginning of the civil war. That the recent riots in New York and elsewhere, were but the legitimate offspring of the disregard for law as taught and practiced by the administration itself. He recounted the many errors and crimes committed by the administration in its conduct of the war, showing that the many lives that have been lost, the millions of treasure that have been squandered and stolen by corrupt officials, were chargeable to the imbecility and corruption of the President himself—that its whole policy, as shown by proclamations and orders, was to the end that slavery should perish though the Constitution and the Union should fall with it and be buried in one common grave. He closed his address amid rounds of applause, calling upon the honest masses to rally around the standard of democracy for Woodward, Lowrie and Liberty, and then, although the Union, under the present misrule may go to pieces before another presidential election, (which he hoped Providence would prevent) the independence, the dignity and Government of the country would, at least, be saved from the general wreck, and the liberties of our people remain intact.

Upon the conclusion of Mr. Alexander's remarks, the ladies sang the song of "The Repentant Wide-Awake" in eloquent strains. This song, wherever it is sung, must make "Wide Awakes" feel like asking Providence to forgive them for ever having worn a cap and a cape and for carrying a lamp.

At the conclusion of this beautiful and impressive song, J. H. Orvis, Esq., was called out amid the cheers of the audience. Mr. Orvis is one of those cool, calculating thinkers and logical reasoners, who always carries conviction with his argument. He spoke in an impressive and feeling manner of the troublesome times upon which we have fallen—traced the rebellion to its legitimate source and sustained his argument with proofs from history. He recounted the warnings of Democratic statesmen and of the press against the dogmas of sectional parties in years past, and showed conclusively that the present war is nothing but the legitimate consequence of the triumph of a sectional party. The people had been warned that war, bloody and ruinous, would follow the triumph of the "irrepressible conflict" of President Lincoln, yet they had not heeded it, but had ridiculed the idea and stigmatized those who had uttered the warnings as "Union shrickers," "Union savers," &c. Their warnings had proved alas, too true. Sectionalism triumphed and war, terrible and devastating, had followed. He showed the efforts that were made by the democracy to compromise the difficulty by the adoption of the Crittenden Compromise. He showed that the proposition was a fair one, and gave the South no advantage that the Constitution did not warrant. The Compromise was spurned by the republican party, while the democracy both North and South were willing and anxious to pass it, if the republicans would agree to vote. He reflected severely upon them for refusing to settle the difficulty and avoid the war.—He spoke of the inability of the administration to run the machinery of so great a government as this—proved it by their many blunders, and cited their violations of the Constitution as evidence that they did not intend that the Union should be restored. His arguments on all these and many more kindred points, were powerful and logical and could not fail to carry conviction to the heart of any *honest* man that ever wore a cape or carried a lamp.

The meeting was a great success, and showed that the spirit of democracy is not and cannot be crushed out in the borough and township of Union.

A vote of thanks was tendered to the ladies for their song, and to the speakers for their eloquent and instructive speeches, whereupon the meeting adjourned to meet again in four weeks. JAMESON

CASE IN JUDGE PONTIUS PILATE'S COURT.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

1. And the whole multitude of them arose, and led him unto Pilate.

2. And they began to accuse him, saying we found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that himself is Christ a King.

3. And Pilate asked him, saying art thou the King of Jews? And he answered him, and said, thou sayest it.

4. Then said Pilate to the Chief Priests and to the People, I find no fault in this man.

5. And they were the more fierce, saying He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout Jewry, beginning from Galilee, to this place.

6. When Pilate heard of Galilee he asked whether the man were a Galilean.

7. And as soon as he knew that he belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod who himself also was at Jerusalem at that time.

8. And when Herod saw Jesus he was exceedingly glad; for he was desirous to see him for a long season, because he had heard many things of him; and he hoped to have seen some miracle done by him.

9. Then he questioned him in many words; for it he answered him nothing.

10. And the Chief Priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused him.

11. And Herod and his men of war set him at nought, and mocked him and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, and sent him again to Pilate.

12. And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together, for before they were at enmity between themselves.

13. And Pilate, when he had called together the chief priests and rulers, and all the people,

14. Said unto them. Ye have brought this man unto me as one that perverteth the people, and behold I having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man, touching these things whereof ye accused him.

15. No, nor yet Herod for I sent you to him, and lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him.

16. I will therefore, chastise him and release him.

17. (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)

18. And they cried out all at once, saying away with the man and release unto us Barrabas.

19. Who for a certain sedition made in the city, and for murder was cast unto prison.)

20. Pilate therefore willing to release Jesus, spake again to them.

21. But they cried, saying crucify him, crucify *him*.

22. And he said unto them the third time why what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him. I will therefore chastise him and let *him* go.

23. And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified. And the voices of them and the Chief priests prevailed.

24. And Pilate gave sentence that should be as they required.

25. And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified.—And the voices of them and the chief priests prevailed.

26. And as they led him away they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him they laid the cross that he might bear it after Jesus.

27. And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him.

28. But Jesus turning unto them, said, daughters of Jerusalem weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children.

29. For behold the days are coming in which they shall say blessed are the barren and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck.

☞ Charles Sumner, we believe, is the President of the "American Peace Society." Why does he not call it together? Neal Dow, now Colonel Neal Dow, was also one of the shining lights of that society. In 1863, just ten years ago, he wrote as follows:

"War as an arbiter of national disputes, is an absurd and wicked relic of a barbarous age; and its abrogation is demanded as well by the true interests of every people on the globe, as by the light of Christianity and a higher and purer civilization. That the time will come when war shall be no more known among men I have no doubt; and I hold it to be the duty of every one who loves and fears God, to hasten this time to the utmost of his power.

☞ Always look up. Every good thing cometh from above.

JOHN WINTERBOTTOM'S SUBSTITUTE.

Mr. Pilkinson, a small farmer in Pennsylvania, was some time ago drafted for the service of his country. His wife, tho' she possessed general information, is one of the best conjugal partners, and she was much troubled at the thought of parting with her husband. As she was engaged in scrubbing off her doorsteps, a rough looking stranger came up and addressed her:

"I hear ma'am, that your husband has been drafted."

"Yes sir, he has," answered Mrs. Pilkinson "though dear knows there is a few which thatcoulun't better be spared from their families."

"Well ma'am, I have come to offer my self as a substitute for him."

"A what?" asked Mrs. Pilkinson with some excitement.

"I am willing to take his place," said the stranger.

"You take the place of my husband, you wretch! I'll teach you to insult a distressed woman, you vagabond!" cried Mrs Pilkinson, as she discharged the dirty soapsuds in the face of the discomfited and astonished substitute, who took to his heels just in time to escape having his head broken by the bucket.

☞ As marriage was not designed for infants, children should not be allowed to pop the question before they are weaned.

It is wrong to mete out justice according to the wealth or poverty of the offender.

Man's worth consists in his virtue and not in his dollars and cents.

Beauty adorned in the flowers of virtue is more lovely than that arrayed in the jewels of Golconda.

The bad mechanic will always condemn his material.

There are some professors so spiritually minded that they scarcely ever draw a sober breath.

We should pen our injuries in the snow, but our benefits in brass.

He that pours in his rum pours out his reason.

The man that provides not in summer, must want in winter.

We should never mourn for that we cannot have.

A dollar in hand is generally worth two in the ledger.

None of us should be idle; the hen with one chicken is as busy as the one with twelve.

☞ Mr. Lincoln never spoke truer words than when he said, in his Fourth of July speech, that he was not prepared to make a speech worthy of the occasion. Unfortunately, he never is prepared to make a speech worthy of the occasion, and it is a fact becoming the settled conviction that he never will be. It is a very bad comment on the capacity of a Chief Magistrate that cannot get upon his feet and say a few words to the people without blundering through his part as a stripping lawyer would be ashamed to blunder. From the time he enunciated the "nobody hurt" joke to the present, he has placed himself and the country in a mortifying position at every public appearance. We can survive his anecdotes but his speeches are too much for equanimity. There is probably but one other peculiarity that can rival them, and that is his vein of letter writing. Considering that the nation allows him to do the governing, the least he can do to show his gratitude is to make no more speeches and write no more letters.

☞ A young man in California, whose friends at home had neglected to write to him for a long time, adopted the expedient of sending letters to various business men in the neighborhood, inquiring the prices of land and stock, intimating that he had large sums to invest. By return mail he received no less than seven letters all anxiously inquiring after his health, when he was coming home &c., including some warm ones from an old and very cold sweetheart.

☞ The *Tribune* was once a vegetarian and anti-war. Its New Orleans correspondent having related that in a battle at Port Hudson, "one negro was observed with a rebel soldier in his grasp, tearing the flesh from his face with his teeth." "Thus," exclaims the *Tribune*, "passes one regiment blacks to everlasting fame." In two years Greeley will advocate cannibalism.

☞ If the Democratic papers are full of treason, and of enmity to the soldiers, why don't the Black Republican authorities let the soldiers see them?

Among the drafted men in Boston are two Catholic Clergymen, six editors, the United States District Attorney, the Provost Marshall General, an artillery armorer, and three John Smiths.

A young doctor on being asked to contribute toward enclosing and ornamenting a cemetery, very cooly replied that in filling it he should do his part.

☞ "Dear me, how fluidly he talks!" said Mrs. Partington recently at a temperance meeting. "I am always rejoiced when he mounts the rostrum for his eloquence warms me in every cartridge of my body."

☞ Subscribe for the WATCHMAN.