Bedford Inquirer.

A Weekly Paper, Devoted to Literature, Politics, the Arts, Sciences, Agriculture, &c., &c---Terms: One Dollar and Fifty Cents in Advance.

BY DAVID OVER. BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1859. VOL. 32, NO. 47.

From the Somerset Herald and Whig.

SOME REMARKS ON JUDGE BLACK'S OBSERVATIONS ON SENATOR DOUGLAS'S VIEWS OF POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

The writer of these remarks was born in the native town of Jeremiah S. Black, and is well acquainted with his political and personal history.

We do not profess to be his friend. Judge Black has few personal friends. He is a man of great intellect, but cold as an iceberg — Though a Democrat in name he is an an aristocrat in feeling. No generous emotion ever caused him for a moment to forget himself.— This was his character in youth, and it has strengthened with his advanced years and increased prosperity. He can claim no excuse for error on the ground that he cannot discern the right. His observation nothing escapes. His memory retains everything. His learning is profound, his logic infallible. With these grand qualifications it might be expected that the cause of truth and justice would find in him an irresistible champion. Alas! no. In determining what he shall do or say, he is influenced by only one consideration—a regard for the immediate personal interest of Jeremiah S. Black.

His private life and his career in office afford many illustrations of this fact. The man and the Judge are the same. His decision in the Passmore Williamson case was a bold bid for the Cabinet. His reply to Douglas is a bold bid for the Presidency. Both were addressed to the source whence preferment cometh—the South. Both may be successful.

It is because we look upon him as a Presidential candidate that we have spoken thus freely concerning his personal character; and also because his opinions contained in the anonymous observations on Senator Douglas should have no more weight than belongs to him as a man; yet most of his readers know him only as late Chief Justice of Pennsylvania and the present Attorney General of the United States.

His review is successful in its ostensible subject, for Douglass is completely demolished.— Reasoning from false premises, Judge Douglass tries to establish half a truth. Starting from the same point, Judge Black constructs a symmetrical falsehood.

Douglas has the rudiments of moral sense, and is therefore scrupulous. Black fears no consequences. No conclusion can be too atrocious for him to profess and publish—anonymously. Consciousness furnishes him with no reason why the worst crimes, if profitable, should not be popular.

Judge Black's argument must cause a shudder of horror in the mind of every lover of justice, and every student of Constitutional and the common law. He boldly assumes that the right of property in man is in its origin as respectable, and in its nature as indefeasible and universal, as the right to any other species of property. He places this odious relation, no matter where or how it may arise, on the same footing with the divine institution of matrimony, and demands for it as honorable recognition by Christian communities. If this be Democratic doctrine, we protest against it in the name of decency and humanity, and we also protest against the motive which inspired its publication. There is nowhere in his argument a hint or hope that the policy he advocates may enure to the benefit of freedom, but he addresses himself to the fears of slaveholders, and bends the whole force of his logic to the congenial task of hedging in and protecting their sacred property.

Judge Black says: "the Constitution regards as inviolable all the rights which a citizen may acquire in a State, and if a man acquires slave property in a State, and goes with it into a territory he cannot be stripped of it. * * * A slave being property in Virginia, remains property, and his master has all the rights of a Virginia master wherever he may go, so that he goes not to any place where the local law comes in conflict with his right. It will not be pretended that the Constitution furnishes to the Territories a conflicting law. * * * The right of a master to the services of his slave in a territory is not against law or without law, but in full accordance with law. * * *Has not the emigrant to Nebraska a legal right to the ox team which he bought in Ohio to haul him over the plains?"

Now, we must remark that the Constitution is silent on the subject of slavery. It does not recognize the institution as existing at the time it was framed. It does not recognize the right which one person may have to the labor of another *person*, and takes care that the right shall be protected even in the face of opposing State laws. The *person* owing service or labor, *may be returned to the State from which he fled*. The Constitution does not maintain the relation of debtor and creditor, or master and slave in the place where the fugitive may be found, and none of its duties can be exacted until the parties are again within the jurisdiction of the local laws to which it owes its origin. They constituted it, and they must define it. By them its rights and duties are limited, and offences against it must be tried. Apart from these local laws, there is not and there cannot be property in man.

The relation of master and slave is one thing in Virginia and another thing in Georgia. Indeed it differs in every State in the Union. In some, slaves are regarded as real estate, in others they are personal chattels.— Some give the master almost absolute power over the slave, while others extend to the latter the protection of the law.

By the laws of Georgia a master is prohibited from working his slave on Sunday under a penalty of ten shillings. In Mississippi the penalty is two dollars. In Arkansas the penalty is one dollar. One or two States have different enactments. Others are silent on the subject.

By the negro act of South Carolina, the labor of a slave is limited to fifteen hours in twenty-four, for part of the year, and fourteen hours during the remainder, and for a breach of the law the master may incur a penalty of twenty pounds current money. The act of Louisiana gives the slave half an hour for breakfast and an hour and a half for dinner, or half an hour less for dinner where it is prepared for him.

Some of the States have enactments respecting the food of a slave. In Louisiana the master must give each negro a barrel of Indian corn and a pint of salt per month. In North Carolina, if the master does not give his slave a quart of corn per day, he must answer for what he may steal from a third party. South Carolina provides a remedy for the starving of a slave, by complaint of a third person to the nearest justice, who may order relief and impose a fine. Other States have not legislated upon the subject.

In most of the southern States the wilful, malicious, and premidated killing of a slave is a capital crime. In Missouri the offence of depriving of life or dismembering a slave is punishable as if committed upon a free white person. So in Tennessee. So also in Georgia. These enactments are subject to the exception that when the injury results from *lawful chastisement* of the slave, the Court must direct an acquittal.

The various judicial decisions of these States must be consulted to discover in what lawful chastisement consists.

In South Carolina the murder of a slave is capital, while killing in sudden heat or passion, is punished by a fine of five hundred dollars and imprisonment not exceeding six months.— The penalty for mutilation in the same State is a fine of a hundred pounds current money. In Louisiana the fine may be five hundred dollars. In Mississippi the same. In Alabama it is but one hundred dollars, and it differs in other States, while in one no law for the protection of the life or limb of slaves has as yet been enacted.

In Georgia, if a slave is permitted to hire himself to another for his own benefit, the master may be fined thirty dollars. So also in Kentucky, with a slight difference. In Virginia the fine is not less than ten nor more than thirty dollars. In Maryland the fine is twenty dollars, but twenty days hiring in harvest is permitted. Different regulations may be found in the codes of other States.

In Louisiana a law exists to prevent the violent separation by sale of parents from their children. In the other States there is no such restriction of the power of the master, and this cruelty is daily practiced. In the same State there is also a partial restraint imposed upon the sale of slaves by process of law for the debt of the master.

In most of the States every negro is presumed to be be a slave until he proves that he is free. In North Carolina this presumption is confined to negroes of the whole blood. Those of mixed blood are presumed to be free until the contrary is proved.

In South Carolina any white person found guilty of teaching a slave to read or write may be fined one hundred dollars and imprisoned not more than six months. In Virginia the penalty is the same. So in Georgia, for teaching a slave to read or write, or allowing him to transact business in writing. In North Carolina there is a like penalty, and it is also imposed for selling or giving books or pamphlets to a slave. In Louisiana the offender may be imprisoned for twelve months. In Alabama the penalty is a fine of not less than two hundred and fifty, or more than five hundred dollars. The laws of Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri are, we believe, silent upon the subject. In Virginia *the owners* of slaves may instruct them as carefully as they please. The unhappy slave who is the recipient of illegal education is punished in different ways in the several States, reaching in North Carolina to "thirty-nine lashes on his or *her bare* back."

In Georgia, if a slave shall strike any free white person, for the first offence he may be punished by the justices as they in their discretion think fit, not extending to life or limb, and for the second offence the penalty is *death*. In South Carolina the penalty is death for the third offence. In Maryland the offender is to receive thirty lashes on his or her bare back, well laid on.

The penal codes of the slave states are much more severe on slaves than white persons, slight offences being punished with terrible vindictiveness. In every case the severity is justified by the Legislative and Judiciary power, on the ground that such enactments are needed to restrain the negroes in their servile condition, and are indeed essential to the very existence of the institution of slavery. In the criminal code of Virginia more than sixty offences are enumerated of which the penalty when committed by slaves is death.

Many other enactments might be quoted to illustrate the differences of the slave codes of the several states, defining and limitating the rights of the master and his remedies for any invasion of them. Slavery is one thing in Virginia and in Louisiana it is another.

We have now to ask, what would it be in a Territory of the United States? Judge Black says that the Virginia master who carries his slave into a Territory retains all the rights he possessed under the code of Virginia. He compares him to an emigrant who takes into Nebraska the ox-team which he purchased in Ohio. But the cases are not the same.— Neither the laws of Virginia, nor of any other slave State, give the master the same right of property in a slave that he has in an ox or a horse. His right of property in the latter is absolute. He may sell, use or kill it at his pleasure. He may do anything with it that will not injure the rights of other members of the community. If by the laws of the State where the property was acquired, he could be punished for its abuse, (as in case of cruelty to animals,) or was restrained in certain cases from its alienation, all these restrictions perish when he passes with it into a territory, or in any other way carries it beyong the reach of the state laws. His rights then become absolute and unconditional.

How is it with respect to slave property?— Judge Black says that "the question whether the relation of master and slave exists or not, must be determined according to the law of the state in which it was created, but," he adds, "the respective rights and obligations of the parties must be protected and enforced by the law prevailing at the place where they are supposed to be violated. The master takes with him into the territories his title, but not the judicial *remedies* which were furnished him at the place where his title was acquired &c." Judge Black is adroit. He excepts these judicial remedies, to escape the absurdity of extending state laws beyond their jurisdiction.— We understand by this exception that the Courts of a Territory, where no slave code has been enacted, can do no more than adjudicate the question of title, and re-deliver to the master his slave. They could not punish a third party for teaching the slave to read, for harboring him, or for enticing him away. The master loses the benefit of these enactments, if any such there were in the state from which he came, when he passes the boundary of the state. Nothing like them can be found in the constitution of the United States.

Judge Black must therefore modify his proposition, and say that a slave being property in Virginia, his master retains all the rights of a Virginia master in a Territory where no slave code exists, *except the right to such legislation as will protect his slave property.*

Now can a party have a right, without having a remedy? Judge Black may say that the right originates under the laws of the state from which the slave was brought, and that these are incapable of affording a remedy.— But it matters not where the right originated it would perish when the master passed into the Territory, where it not for Judge Black's construction of the Constitution of the United States. Suppose the master and his slave to go into a foreign Territory or State where no slave code exists, and over which the Constitution of the United States does not extend, what would be the consequence? Certainly they would have equal rights before the law. It is clear then that the right which Judge Black claims for the Virginia master, does not exist by virtue of Virginia laws, but, as he himself says, by virtue of the Constitution of the United States. (He denies that the constitution *'establishes* slavery in the Territories.', Now if the Federal Constitution gave to the master his right, is it not the duty of the Federal Congress to protect it by legislation? That Judge Black will say yes, to this question, when the time comes to answer it, we have no doubt. Southern Democrats have taken that position already. It is the next step in the systematic progress of slavery, another link in the adamantine chain of cruelty and barbarism with which Judge Black is aiding to fetter the free spirit of our democratic institutions. We ask Judge Black to define his position on this question now. His party is looking for Northern dough to work into a Presidential candidate, let him give the proof that he is the right material. Consistency demands it. He has reproached Judge Douglas tampering with the constitutional rights of the slave-holders; we would ask him if these rights are more in danger from "unfriendly legislation," or from venial trespasses on the part of old John Brown and individuals of like sentiments. Perhaps Judge Black thinks that he is safe in remitting the owners of human property to its appropriate means of defence, the bowie knife and revolver. They have no such confidence. Make haste to declare the new Democratic doctrine Judge. We long to meet you on the question of Federal legislation, for or against slavery in the Territories.

We will not stop here to dispute Judge Black's proposition that the constitution recognizes and protects slavery in the territories. Had we time for this, we should argue that the "*status* of a negro under the constitution is that of "*a person*" not "*a chattel*," and that he is entitled to the benefit of that article which provides, that "*no person* shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law." It is possible that after Judge Black and our present Supreme Court have passed away, and are mercifully forgotten, that an upright judiciary may, without "torture," extract from the words we have quoted, something more than the 'semblance of a prohibition.'

Leaving third parties out of the question, Judge Black would say that as between the master and the slave, the rights of the former remain undisturbed, when he goes from a slave state into a Territory. But what becomes of the rights of the slave? May the master scourge maim or kill? May he starve him? May he make him work eighteen hours in the twenty-four, and every day in the week? May he sell him away from his family? If the slave came from Louisiana he was protected in all these particulars. The masters right of property was so far limited. These limitations define the *status* of the slave. They are as much his right as all that falls outside of them is the right of the master. Must the Territorial Court decide that he is his masters property, subject nevertheless to all the restrictions imposed by the laws of Louisiana? Would not such decision be absurd? Would it not be a mockery. The master may appeal to the laws of his state in support of his title, but the slave cannot appeal to the same laws to show its limitations. They are what Judge Black calls 'judicial remedies' and they are left behind with the benignant code of Louisiana. The constitution recognizes and protects the right of one party, but cannot see the rights of the other. The party who most needs protection is, alas! defenceless. It says you are the property of A. B. or C. You are a slave. It does not say that no master shall maim, starve or kill his slave. If he takes it into his head to do so "judicial remedy" can be invoked. The bowie-knife and pistol are in the masters hands, let him use them in right plantation style according to his pleasure.

It will not do for Judge Black to say that the laws for the protection of the slave, which we have alluded to, are of little consequence. Their preambles in every case assert that they are necessary to restrain the lawless passions and the cruelty of the masters. Neither should he say that they are never enforced. That is the worst reproach aimed at the peculiar institution, by such men as Wendell Phillips and W. Lloyd Garrison.

But we have done Judge Black great injustice in supposing that he would trouble himself one moment about the rights of niggers. The scruples of Southern legislators upon this subject can have no place in his mind. Their benevolent enactments he considers the fruit of maudlin philanthropy, and it gives him no concern to see them perish under the blighting influence of the Constitution of the United States. Judge Black uses this great charter, like Circe's cup, to turn men into beasts. Under the worst code of the poorest slave state in the Confederacy, though for many purposes, the negro is a chattel, yet he has some of the essential rights of a human being; but in a Territory of the United States where the Constitution is the supreme law, Judge Black declares that the negro is not a man—but a brute, that he has no more rights than an ox. It is said of the English Parliament that it can do anything but make a man a woman or a woman a man. We had suppose that there was somehow a difference between a human being and a mere animal that legislators and Courts could not fail to distinguish, but Judge Black, does, by mere implication, what has never yet been done by positive law.

We have reached a point where argument becomes impossible. We would appeal to Black's consciousness, but we fear that he has nothing but the color of his skin, to show that he is a man. We will not accuse him of ignorance of the simplest principles of justice. He has been Chief Justice of the free state of Pennsylvania. He is now the highest law officer of the Federal Administration. He is simply doing the dirty work of the South and we are glad that they have chosen such a tool. We wept to see Daniel Webster, who had been the unshorn champion of the Lord.—

"Eyeless in Gaza, at the mill with slaves,"

but we shall shed no tears for Black. He is in his proper place, and is best described in the lines of his favorite author.

"A fellow by the hand of nature mark'd
Quoted and sign'd to do a deed of shame."

GERRIT SMITH AND BROWN.—The Syracuse *Journal* learns from a gentleman who has conversed with Gerrit Smith in regard to the trouble at Harper's Ferry, that he was in no way identified with or privy to Brown's scheme. His explanation of the matter is this:—

Two years ago, Mr. Smith, in order to help the Free State movement in Kansas, gave Brown a note of about $300, against a man then in Kansas; Brown could not collect the note; so he returned it to Mr. Smith, who agreed to give him, at some future time, cash to the amount of the note. After that he lost sight of Brown until about the first of June last, when he received a letter requesting him to send a draft for a certain amount, $100, we think payable to the order of another party.

Mr. Smith, in compliance with the request and his former promise, promptly forwarded the draft, supposing it was a bona fide firm to whom it was addressed.

He probably believed also that the money was to be used, at least indirectly, in assisting fugitive slaves, as that was the last "Kansas work" that he knew anything about. Mr. Smith says distinctly that he had no knowledge or the least suspicion that Brown was engaged in planning an insurrection. This agrees perfectly with Brown's statements, that he alone originated and carried on his scheme.

SENATOR HALE.—Senator Hale publishes a letter, in the Press and Tribune of Chicago, of Monday morning last, with reference to the attempt of the Herald to implicate him in the Harper's Ferry trouble. He says that he shall not undertake the task of vindicating the other gentlemen whose names are mentioned. So far as relates to himself, he can only reply by denying every word and syllable, pronouncing the whole, from beginning to end, as false, challenging the world for a particle of testimony, either written or verbal, that sustains the charge thus made. He never received any knowledge or information from any one that an insurrection or outbreak was contemplated by John Brown or any one else, in Virginia or elsewhere; and pledges himself that if evidence is laid before the grand jury of Maryland or Virginia, and they find a true bill against him, he will go there for trial.

It will most surely have a great effect on the New York election next month, perhaps placing the political power of that State in the hands of the Democracy.—*Charleston Mercury.*

Was it with the hope of carrying the New York and Maryland elections, that Mr. Floyd pocketed the letter, and old Brown (according to the Washington Star,) was placed under the eye of the police in Washington last August? —*Balt Patriot.*

Address of Father Gallagher at the Grave of Senator Broderick at San Francisco, California.

At five o'clock the funeral cortege reached the cemetry. The pall-bearers assisted in removing the body from the hearse, and carried it to the grave, preceded by Rev. H. P. Gallagher and F. Harrington. Father Gallagher then addressed the assemblage as follows:

Beloved and Esteemed Fellow-Citizens:— You are assembled for the purpose of beholding the earthly remains of the Hon. David C. Broderick, deposited in their final resting place —a most melancholy office, and one that wrings the Christian hearts of our people throughout the length and breadth of the land with grief, deep, intense, and unalloyed, over the most pernicious error which created the fictitious, artificial necessity that has cast the eternal silence of death upon this noble young tribune. With what constitutes the character of a good or a bad, an honest or dishonest politician, or with what he was or was not in that respect, I have nothing to do, nor do I intrude any idea that I may have formed of his private piety or otherwise; but whilst I am compelled to regret and condemn unequivocally the grand irreparable fault by which he consented to his own death, I feel a pride, and esteem it a privilege here, in your presence, and in common with you all, to record my high appreciation of the public virtues of the man, who considering the times and circumstances, could say without fear of contradiction, in the hearing of the whole State. "The man is not living or dead who ever saw me at a gambling table, in a brothel, or under the influence of intoxicating drink." This implies no more virtues than a man's duty enjoins; but it is confessedly a refreshing instance to the world, to which I say, all earthly honor to him of whom such things can with truth be said.— Subsequent to his sad mishap he sought and received the consolations of religion. We may and must presume that his repentance was sincere and genuine; that he forgave his enemies; for there is no place in Christian ethics for revenge. He was reconciled, therefore, to the Church, and received her last rites. In her unquestioned right before, as his Holy Mother, would she allowed him to lay him down with honor in the ground which she has consecrated as the temporary resting place for the anointed bodies of her children, but that, unhappily for him, by the accursed duello, the privilege was forfeited.

A Church that has with unabating persistency issued and renewed her anathema from century to century for twelve hundred years against this Pagan code of blood, from the time that Pope Nicholeus I denounced in his letter to King Charles the Bold of France, 820 to the present day, could not be expected to reverse her immutable decrees for human caprice or temporary expediency. He addressed me as father—I, indeed regarded him as my son in Christ; in his repentance, and the grief I feel that his misguided act deprives me of whatever of sorrowful satisfaction there might be in depositing him with solemn honor in his consecrated tomb, is such as oppressed the paternal heart of the noble Brutus, when of the sons of his bosom he said, "*I Lictor collega manus.*" Your thousand sorrowing hearts attest this day that in your solemn and sincere condemnation of this code of blood, you confirm and re-echo the Church's sentiments, but that she, the mother of the faithful, is ever consistent—obnoxious to no vicissitude nor varied phase of feeling—inflicting, indiscriminately, this temporal penalty on all who may set at defiance her maternal mandates. Would to God, beloved and esteemed fellow citizens, that this day, which presents to the horror of the civilized world the bleeding, mangled spectacle of a murdered Senator—(I make no allusion to his antagonist, I say so with emphasis)—we might behold the incipient step inaugurated on this memorable spot that would trample in the dust this last detested relic of Pagan barbarity: Christian men on bended knees, before this melancholy spectacle, with right hands raised to Heaven registering their solemn vows that they would never cease from peaceful, legal constitutional agitation of this question, till every remnant of it is eradicated from our Christian State—a monument more durable than brass or marble and more valuable than the hands of man could erect.

The reverend speaker here, turning to the corpse said with much feeling: "Peace to thy ashes, joy to thy spirit, truest and most unselfish of friends, and most moral of public men."

The coffin having been deposited in the vault and placed by itself in a niche prepared for it, where it will remain until a final resting-place shall have been selected in the grounds of the cemetery, the concourse dispersed, and leaving the body of Senator Broderick to the silence of the tomb, returned to the city. And thus terminated the last act of the melancholy event.

The Richmond Whig was very pathetic over the departure of the "soldier," who departed from that capital for the seat of war.— It says:

"They took leave of their wives and little ones last night amid much weeping and wailing, not expecting ever to see them any more! It was a heart rending scene, to be sure. We endeavored to procure a lock of the hair of several of the 'solders,' as a momento of them, in case they should fight, bleed and die in the service of their country; but they were too much afflicted by the parting scene to pay any attention to our request. We expect to see half of the 'soldeirs' back at least. But good fortune to them all."

From the Boston Herald Oct. 22d.

A Determined Suicide--- Extraordinary Tenacity of Life,

A case of suicide occurred in this city, yesterday, in which a most extraordinary tenacity of life was manifested. The particulars, as we learn them, are as follows: An aged gentleman named Charles Knapp, who has been boarding at No. 1 Bumstead place for some time past, retired to his room yesterday noon and made preparations for committing suicide. He first wrote two letters, addressed to a relative residing in Roxbury, containing directions in regard to the disposal of his property, and then swallowed a large dose of laudanum. Before the opiate had operated, he took a razor and drew it across the right side of his neck, making a ghastly wound but not severing the jugular vein.

Not satisfied with the result of this wound he took a large butcher knife, with which he had provided himself, and cut the left of his neck and throat, from which the blood flowed most copiously. His strength still remaining, and, as it would seem, his reason also, he walked to a table where he had laid a loaded double-barrelled pistol, took up the weapon and fired the contents of one barrel into his head. The contents of the pistol charge entered his forehead, between his eyes, making a hole nearly an inch in diameter and breaking out several pieces of bone, which were found on the floor of his room. After this last effort at self-destruction he crawled to the spot where he laid the butcher knife, seized it and drew the blade across his forehead several times, inflicting terrible gashes.

He now fell on the floor, clasping the butcher knife in his hands, and torrents of blood flowing from his wounds, in which condition he was found by a servant who was sent to call him to dinner. Physicians were instantly summoned, and, notwithstanding the combined effects of poison, knife, and pistol, he survived until late in the evening, and death which seemed reluctant at first, came to his relief.

Mr. Knapp had been a sea captain for many years, in which avocation he had acquired a handsome fortune, and had retired from active life with the intention of spending his remaining years in comfort and quite ease. He was, we understand, a near relative of Chief Justice Shaw's, and has left a maiden sister who resides in this city. It is thought temporary insanity was the cause of this melancholy case of self-destruction.

SENATOR WILSON ON OLD BROWN'S CASE. —Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, made a speech in New York Tuesday evening, in which he said:

It was important that the great State of New York should pronounce her judgment in language not to be mistaken in any section of the country. At the present time, after other States have spoken, and spoken gloriously, an effort was being made—a poor, futile, miserable, abortive effort—to assail the cause of republican liberty in the State of New York, by charging the responsibility of an insane old man's act at Harper's Ferry upon 275,000 liberty, loving, Union saving, patriotic men. The effort was a miserable one, but it had been clutched at by men who have been defeated over and over again by the Republican party. (Cheers.) But who are the parties really to be blamed for the Harper's Ferry disturbance? He had not the slightest hesitation in charging the whole responsibility on the pro-slavery Democracy of the U. States. It was the legitimate fruit of the policy that ruled in this country for the last few years. It was said by Dr. Channing, when speaking of the horrors of the French Revolution, that the monarchy and aristocracy of France that oppessed that people to madness, were ressible for the horrors of the Revolution, and not the insane men who enacted them. This remark was true of the present case, and it has been true in all similar cases in the world.

A Mormon is a living paradox. He says grace before a cotillion, swears in his sermons selects his texts indifferently from the Bible, the books of Mormon, an almanac, or the President's Message, and is perpetually quarreling for the sake of peace. His religion is a joke, and he makes the best story teller a chief of the quorum. He assumes the dignities but has not the slightest respect for them; and the effect of his piety is to put him on a level with the greatest reprobate of the time. In short, he is the Latter Day Saint, or, in other words, the last one you would think of calling a saint. —*Exchange.*

HOW THE SLAVES RECEIVED BROWN'S PROPOSITION.—A negro boy belonging to Mr. Washington, who was taken by the insurgents at the time his master was, when he reached the Ferry was offered a pike, which he refused, when one of the insurgents told him he was free and should fight the whites. The boy replied, "I don't know anything about being free; I was free enough before you took me, and I'm not going until I see Massa Lewis fighting and then I fight for him." This boy was among the prisoners in the engine house.

Parties lately arrived from Pike's Peak state that a fearful mortality had broken out in Mountain City, carrying off as many as fourteen miners per week. At first the disease was supposed to be mountain fever; but a close inspection showed a great number of deaths were caused by drinking highly poisonous or strychnine whiskey.

John Wentworth, of Chicago, puts forth the following as the latest ticket:

Motto, 'Popular Sovereignty—fight it out!' For President, Ossawattamie Brown. For Vice President, Stephen A. Douglas.