

Clearfield Republican.

D. W. MOORE.
G. S. GOODLANDER. Editors.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS—\$1 25 per Annum, if paid in advance

VOL. XXXII.—WHOLE NO 1673.

CLEARFIELD, PA. WEDNESDAY, OCT. 2, 1861.

NEW SERIES—VOL. II.—NO 11.

HON. SAMUEL LINN'S Charge to the Grand Jury.

SEPTEMBER TERM, 1861.

GENTLEMEN OF THE GRAND JURY:

We enter upon the discharge of our official duties to-day under very solemn and impressive circumstances. Since the last term of this Court, events have occurred in the history of our national government of the most serious and startling character. I need not refer to these events in detail as they form a conspicuous part of the history of the rebellion against which this nation is now struggling, with which every intelligent citizen is presumed to be familiar. We have fallen upon strange Amer, and are experiencing a state of national trial which would seem not to have been apprehended by the fathers and founders of this confederacy. In that admirable constitution, by which the union and compact of these States were formed, and under which they have, until recently, remained linked together by a strong and peaceful bond of union, there are no provisions which contemplate either an amicable separation or an attempt on the part of any one or more of the States to forcibly withdraw from the Union, and consequently those public functionaries whose duty it is to provide for the public safety and protection have been occasionally embarrassed by constitutional restrictions, apparent or real, or a want of constitutional authority to meet fully and promptly the exigencies of the times.

When we consider the magnitude of the rebellion, the years which have been occupied in diligent and systematic preparation for this attempt to overthrow the government—the number and character of the individuals concerned in it—the object and purposes which, as we have reason to believe, have long been secretly meditated and are now openly and defiantly avowed—the acts which they have already done in furtherance of their plans, and the further outrages and atrocities which they would seem to have in immediate contemplation, we cannot but consider it the most alarming event that has ever occurred in our history. There is enough in this to fill the stoutest heart with dismay and terror.

When our country is in the midst of such perils, every citizen has duties which flow from the allegiance that he owes to the government and which as a loyal freeman he is bound to perform. The sum of these duties is that he shall do all that in him lies to aid in protecting and defending the existence and the honor of the nation. This is a demand to which a patriot is always ready to yield a cheerful obedience. Next to his Maker he acknowledges that his country has the highest claims upon him.

We, as a constituent branch of the State government, have duties devolving on us, which relate to the present condition of public affairs—duties which we should perform, promptly, faithfully and without fear, favor or affection, but we should at the same time give to them a temperate and impartial consideration. Of these I shall come presently to speak.

I am compelled, though with deep regret, to believe that there is not at the present time amongst the inhabitants of the loyal States, an entire, unanimous and hearty co-operation with the national government in the attempt now making to suppress the rebellion; nay, more, I am credibly informed that there are amongst us not only persons who secretly sympathize with the rebellion, but those also who boldly and publicly avow sentiments which are in opposition to the authority of the government. Such persons, whilst they merit the contempt of the people of this, and every other civilized nation on earth, and are bringing disgrace upon themselves and their posterity, should nevertheless receive the punishment which the law assigns to them.

This leads us to consider and define the offences which may be committed directly against the government. Although some of those belong to the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts, it may not be out of place to notice them here in order that you and the people of the county who happen to be present may be made to understand something of the nature and extent of the obligations which they owe as citizens. The present generation of Americans know but little experimentally of a state of war, and it therefore should not surprise us that their attention has never been particularly directed to the duties which at such a time are incident to the relation that exists between a government and its citizens or subjects. I am therefore led to take a charitable view of the conduct of those who may have seemed to forget or depart from their allegiance, and to attribute most, if not all, such cases of delinquency, not so much to a disposition openly to violate the law or oppose the known authority of the government, as to entire ignorance of the law's demands and of the nature and design of the rebellion. I am led to more than suspect that artful and wicked men are making it their business to deceive the people by leading them into the erroneous belief that the war is waged for the supremacy of a party, instead of being a struggle purely for the life of the nation. True that kind of loyalty, is not very praiseworthy or reliable which is not the spontaneous outgrowth of a patriotic heart, but needs the unyielding lash of penal sanction to keep it in shape. Still it is better than open rebellion.

The offences which directly affect or are injurious to the government are Treason, Misprision of Treason, and certain positive misprisions or contempt of its authority or supremacy.

By the law of England there were various acts defined by statute which would render the perpetrator guilty of treason,

but by our National Constitution it is directed that treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. That the inhabitants of those States of this Union which have assumed to withdraw therefrom, and form a new and independent government, have levied war upon the United States within the meaning of the constitution will not admit of a doubt. Giving aid and comfort to such persons, by such overt acts as giving them intelligence, sending them provisions, furnishing them with supplies, or arms, or the like, would be treason, and would render the offender liable to punishment of death.

Misprision of Treason is the concealment of treason, by being merely passive, for any assistance given to the traitor makes the party a principal, as there are no accessories in treason, this misprision is of a negative character, but as has already been stated, there are other misprisions affecting the government of a positive nature, which we shall notice hereafter.

Treason may be committed against either the government of a State, or of the United States. When the offence is against the sovereign authority of a single State, it falls within the jurisdiction of the Court of the State wherein it was committed, but where, as in the present instance, war is waged against the federal government, the federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction. This Court cannot, therefore, take cognizance of any act of treason, or misprision of treason growing out of this rebellion inasmuch as the war levied by the Confederate States, as they are called, is against the federal government, and not against the State of Pennsylvania.

But as has already been intimated, there are misprisions of a positive nature, some of which are grave misdemeanors and may be like treason, or misprision of treason, as the case may be. I have heretofore neglected to explain to you that the term "misprision" is of French derivation, and means in legal parlance contempt or neglect. Thus, misprision of treason, consists in the neglect to give information of the commission of an act of treason and is what is termed a negative misprision.

The positive misprisions which concern our present inquiry and of which we shall now proceed to speak, are such as involve an attempt to weaken the strong arm of civil power, or a contempt of lawful authority. Thus, for example, to dissuade a witness from giving evidence, or from obeying the process of subpoena, to persuade or assist a prisoner in custody to escape; to refuse obedience to the call of a police officer for assistance to quell a riot or apprehend an offender or endeavor to persuade others to disobey such call, are all misdemeanors of this sort, based upon the principle that it is unlawful to offer resistance to lawfully constituted authority. It is safe to assert as a general principle, that any wilful attempt to resist the authority of the government, or to prevent or hinder the success of its plans or designs in the prosecutions of a war offensive or defensive, or to induce or persuade others to do the like, is unlawful and punishable as a high misdemeanor. Now, apply this general principle to the present condition of our national affairs. A state of war actually exists. The President of the United States by virtue of the power reposed in him, has issued his proclamation calling upon the Governors of the several States to furnish their quotas of troops for the organization of a military force sufficient to protect the government and suppress a formidable rebellion. The Government of Pennsylvania in response to this demand has issued a proclamation calling upon all able bodied citizens within the Commonwealth subject to military duty, to form themselves into military companies and regiments to be called and mustered into the public service. Now it must be perfectly apparent that any attempt to prevent the carrying out of this design would be a gross insult to the government and a daring contempt of the authority vested in it and therefore a high misdemeanor. For if the designs and plans of the government can with impunity be thwarted and rendered abortive, then all our high sounding theories respecting the supremacy of the government, and allegiance and sovereignty are but beautiful figments of the imagination. Such toleration could spring from no principle other than would assert that the citizen is only bound by his allegiance to the government so long as its measures may be in accordance with his own views, and is obliged to obey only such laws as meet his entire approval.

Suppose a riot to occur in one of our streets. It is the duty of the officers of the law to suppress it, and the duty of all good citizens to aid and assist, for without such regulation the public peace could not be maintained, and we would constantly be in the midst of disgraceful scenes of tumult and disorder. Now, suppose that on such an occasion some individual would take it upon himself to address the assembled multitude, denouncing the riot act and the administration under which it was passed, and assailing and condemning the political views of the officers who are endeavoring to preserve the peace and advising and persuading the bystanders to withhold any assistance for a court and jury deal with such an offender? The question need only be asked, And is not that man a thousand times more culpable who, by words or actions, persuasions or threats, would attempt to prevent or dissuade our citizens from responding to the call of the chief magistrate of the nation for aid to put down a rebellion that aims at the total subversion and overthrow of the government?

There is great misapprehension abroad

on this subject. Many persons erroneously suppose that so long as individuals will refrain from an overt act of treason, they may speak and act as they please against the government, with perfect impunity. It is time that such dangerous misapprehensions should be corrected, and in our remarks on this occasion we are doing what we can to accomplish that purpose. There are other offences besides treason and misprision of treason, which affect the government and its claims to allegiance, as has already been explained. The late Judge Kane, in his charge delivered in the District Court of the United States a few years ago, in referring to the case of United States vs. Hanway, a case which produced no little excitement, uses the following language:

"There has been, I fear, an erroneous impression on this subject among a portion of our people. It has been thought safe to counsel and instigate others to acts of forcible opposition to the provision of a statute—to inflame the minds of the ignorant by appeals to passion and denunciations of the law as oppressive, unjust, revolting to the conscience and not binding on the actions of men—to represent the constitution of the land as a compact of iniquity, which it were meritorious to violate or subvert, the mistake has been a previous one; and they who have fallen into it may rejoice if peradventure their appeals and their counsels have been hitherto without effect. He whose conscience, or whose theories of political or individual right forbid him to support and maintain it in its fullest integrity, may relieve himself from the duties of citizenship by divesting himself of his rights; but while he remains within our borders, he is to remember that successfully to instigate treason is to commit it."

The views that we have just expressed, do not, in our opinion, conflict in the least, with the freedom of speech or of the press. By the Constitution of the United States, Congress is forbidden to make any law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, and the constitution of this State provides that the printing presses shall be free to every person who undertakes to examine the proceedings of the legislature or any branch of the government; and no law shall ever be made to restrain the right thereof. The free communication of thought and opinion is one of the invaluable rights of man; and every citizen may fully speak, write and print any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty. What are we to understand from the words "freedom of speech or of the press" as used in the Constitution? The framers of that instrument evidently recognized it as a well defined, pre-existing right, for they declare they shall not be abridged. Certainly men of learning and experience, would not in so important a paper, forbid the abridgment of a right which was without any certain measure or extent; for it would involve one of the most cherished rights of the citizen in a maze of confusion and obscurity. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, in 1787, when the freedom of the press was spoken of, the people understood exactly what it meant—its boundaries were well marked, and have continued so to this day. Justice Blackstone in his commentaries, vol. 4 p. 156, says, "Where blasphemous, immoral, treasonable, schismatical, seditious or scandalous libels are punished, the liberty of the press, properly understood, is by no means infringed or violated. The liberty of the press is indeed essential to a free State; but this consists in laying no previous restraints upon publications, and not in freedom from censure for criminal matter when published. Every freeman has an undoubted right to lay what sentiments he pleases before the public; to forbid this is to destroy the freedom of the press; but if he publishes what is improper, mischievous or illegal, he must take the consequences of his own temerity. To subject the press to the restrictive power of a license, as was formerly done, is to subject all freedom of sentiment to the prejudice of one man and make him the arbitrary and infallible judge of all controverted points in learning, religion and government. But to punish any dangerous or offensive writings, which, when published, shall, on a fair and impartial trial be adjudged of a pernicious tendency, is necessary for the preservation of peace and good order, of government and religion, the only solid foundations of civil liberty. Thus the will of individuals is still left free; the abuse only of that free will is the object of legal punishment. Neither is any restraint hereby laid upon freedom of thought or inquiry; liberty of private sentiment is still left; the disseminating or making public of bad sentiments, destructive to the ends of society is the crime which society corrects. A man may be allowed to keep poisons in his closet, but not publicly to vend them as cordials, and the only plausible argument heretofore used for the restraining the just freedom of the press, that it was necessary to prevent the daily abuse of it, will entirely lose its force, when it is shown (by a reasonable execution of the laws) that the press cannot be abused to any bad purpose, without incurring a suitable punishment; whereas it never can be used to any good one, when under the control of an inspector. So true will it be found that to censure the licentious, is to maintain the liberty of the press."

Judge Addison, in his charge delivered to the grand juries of the 5th Judicial District of Pennsylvania, in 1798, makes use of the following language: "Freedom of the press consists in this, that any man may, without the consent of any other, print any book or writing whatever, being in this, as in all other freedom of action, liable to punishment, if we injure an individual or the public. Such is the liberty of the press, which the people of the United States of America, for its greater security, have made part of their funda-

mental law. In their State Constitutions, they provide that their legislature should not make any law restraining the liberty of the press, that it should lay no previous restraints on the liberty of the press; or, as the Pennsylvania Constitution expresses it, That every citizen may freely speak, write or print on any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty." The same principle was afterwards adopted in the Federal Constitution, and the section establishing it there is to be construed in the same manner. So that the liberty of the press is precisely as stated by Justice Blackstone, it being free from all previous restraint, as all other rights or liberties are, subject to correction for its abuse."

On this subject I shall refer to but one more authority, which may serve to mark out the distinction between those publications respecting the government, which are authorized by law and such as are unauthorized and unlawful. The case of the Commonwealth vs. Dentle, reported in 4th Yeates, 267, was an indictment for libel tried in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 1805. I quote here so much of the opinion of the Court in that case as is applicable:

"The legislative acts, or the acts of any branch of the government, are open to the public discussion, and every citizen may freely speak, write or print on any subject, but is amenable for the abuse of that privilege. No alteration is made in the law as to private men affected by injurious publications, unless the discussion be proper for public information. It is no infringement of law to publish temperate investigations of the nature and forms of government. The enlightened advocates of representative government pride themselves in the reflection, that the more deeply their system is examined, the more fully will the judgment of honest men be satisfied that it is the most conducive to the safety and happiness of a free people. But there is a marked and evident distinction between such publications and those which are plainly accompanied with a criminal intent, deliberately designed to loosen the social bonds of action, totally to unhinge the minds of the citizens, and to produce popular discontent with the exercise of power by the constituted authorities. Such writings are subversive of all order and government. The liberty of the press consists in publishing the truth from good motives and justifiable ends, though it reflects on governments and magistrates. *Crawwell's Trial*, pp. 63, 64. Such publications add to the common stock of freedom, while the latter insidiously infects the public mind with a subtle poison, and produce the most mischievous and alarming consequences, by their tendency to unsharply, sedition and civil war. Such conduct is punishable by the Constitution. It may be difficult to draw the line of demarcation in every instance, but the jury are to judge for themselves on the plain import of every word without any forced or strained construction of the meaning of the author or editor, and determine on the correctness of the innuendoes. To every word they will assign its sense, and collect the true intention from the context."

It is evident from these quotations, which are from highly respectable authority, and should be accepted as a sound interpretation of the law, that the government, by holding its citizens criminally responsible for every wilful design to interfere with its authority or its plans, in no respect infringes upon any personal right. Much excitement prevails in many parts of the country because of the apparent sympathy manifested by certain newspapers and public journals with the rebels, and in some places printing presses and the contents of printing offices have been destroyed by a resort to violence and mob rule. This is much to be deplored on account of the encouragement it affords to that spirit of riot and insubordination which is exceedingly dangerous in its tendencies, and never can be justified by any pretence whatever. Such proceedings deserve the condemnation of all good citizens, and we trust there may be no repetition of them in future. It is sincerely to be hoped that those who have control of the public press will conduct it so prudently as not to excite angry feelings at a time when the public mind is extremely disloyal or indignant to the government; and moreover, that if there should be any abuse of the liberty of the press, resort will be had to legal authority, and not to the power of an excited mob. There is no necessity for a resort to violence; the government has ample power to correct such evils, and in such times as these has never scrupled to exert it when occasion required. The right of self preservation by all the means within reach in times of imminent peril, belongs to the government as fully as to an individual, and it is a great mistake to suppose that in time of war a government may not remove every obstruction which tends to embarrass or hinder the success of its military defenses, or to weaken its power, moral or physical. Neglect or hesitation on the part of those who administer the government to resort to such measures whenever exigencies arise that in their opinion require it, would expose them to the just indignation of their constituents, and would prove them to be unworthy of their high trust. During the revolution, an act was passed in this State, on the 11th February, 1779, the 4th section whereof is in these words:

"If any person or persons within this State shall attempt to convey intelligence to the enemies of this State or the United States of America, or by publicly or deliberately speaking or writing against our public defence, or shall maliciously and advisedly endeavor to excite the people to resist the government of this Commonwealth, or persuade them to return to dependence upon the crown of Great Britain, or shall maliciously and advisedly terrify or discourage the people from enlisting in the service of

the Commonwealth, or shall stir up, excite or raise tumults, disorders or insurrections in the State, or dispose them to favor the enemy, or oppose and endeavor to prevent the measures carrying on in support of the freedom and independence of the said United States; every such person being thereof legally convicted by the evidence of two or more credible witnesses, in any Court of General Quarter Sessions, shall be adjudged guilty of misprision of treason, and shall suffer imprisonment during the present war, and forfeit to the Commonwealth one half of his or her lands and tenements, goods and chattels."

This act having been passed for a temporary purpose, expired by its own limitation at the end of the war.

We notice that several of the newspapers published in New York and elsewhere, which have rendered themselves obnoxious to the people because of their alleged secession proclivities, have been brought to the notice of proper courts, and we may therefore expect before long, we shall be favored with an opinion on this subject from the Circuit Court of the United States. And the newspapers report that the press, type and fixtures of a printing office in Philadelphia, which was alleged to be advocating the right of secession, was seized by the Marshal a day or two ago. This too—as though the government had determined to trifle no longer with those who disregard its rights or bid defiance to its authority. We should rejoice at every indication of vigor and strength in our government proceeding from a proper and prudent exercise of its power in the suppression of the rebellion and of any thing that affords it aid.

We have hitherto been speaking of a class of offences which lie beyond our jurisdiction. Each State possesses the right, however, to pass laws regulating the conduct of its own citizens. The legislature of Pennsylvania, at its last regular session, passed an act to which it is our duty to direct your attention. The first section provides, "that if any person or persons belonging to or residing within this State, and under the protection of its laws, shall take a commission or commissions from any person, State or States, or other the enemies of this State or of the United States of America, or who shall levy war against this State or Government thereof, or knowingly or willingly shall aid or assist any enemies in open war against this State or the United States, by joining their armies, or by enlisting or procuring others to enlist for that purpose, or by furnishing such enemies with arms or ammunition, or any other articles for their aid and comfort, or by enlisting or a traitorous correspondence with them, or shall form, or be in anywise concerned in forming any combination or plot or conspiracy, for betraying this State or the United States of America into the hands or power of any foreign enemy, or any organized or pretended government engaged in resisting the laws of the United States, or shall give or send any intelligence to the enemies of this State or of the United States of America, or shall, with intent to oppose, prevent or subvert the government of this State or the United States, endeavor to persuade any person or persons from entering the service of this State or of the United States, or from joining any volunteer company or association of this State about being mustered into service, or shall use any threats or persuasions or offer any bribe, or hold out any hope of reward, with like intent to induce any person or persons to abandon said service, or withdraw from any volunteer company or association already organized under the laws of this Commonwealth, for that purpose; every person so offending and being legally convicted thereof, shall be guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall be sentenced to undergo solitary imprisonment in the penitentiary at hard labor, for a term not exceeding ten years, and be fined in amount not exceeding five thousand dollars, or both, at the discretion of the court. *Provided*, That this act shall not prohibit any citizen from taking or receiving civil commissions for the acknowledgment of deeds and other instruments of writing."

This law is free from obscurity, and its meaning and intention cannot be misunderstood. We have brought it to your notice so that if any of you know of any of the offences therein mentioned having been committed within this county, the offender may be dealt with as the law directs. If any of you know of the commission of such offence, it will be your duty to make it known to your fellows so that the matter may be duly and formally presented to the Court. It is your duty to present allegations of this act, as well as all other known offences against the criminal law, but we should be careful that no act that is done in this behalf should spring merely from political differences, from any selfish, sinister, or other unworthy motive, but that every such discharge of duty is always an unpleasant duty, should be solely in vindication of the honor and authority of the State and the nation.

"Every man has in his own life follies enough—in his own mind troubles enough—in the performance of his duties deficiency enough—in his fortunes evils enough—without minding other people's business."

"An Irish girl being inquired of respecting her mistress, who had gone to a water cure establishment, replied that she had 'gone to soak.'"

"A writer remarks with great truth that 'the great characteristic of modern life is worry.' That is true. Some people are so prone to it that they worry because they have no real griefs to worry them."

"Some a lover, vainly trying to explain some scientific theory to his fair innamorata said, 'The question is difficult, and I don't see what I can do to make it clear.' 'Pop it!' said the lady."

THE WAR NEWS!

THE WAR IN MISSOURI.

Further Particulars of the Battle of Lexington.

The St. Louis papers of Saturday the 21st contain further particulars of the commencement of the battle at Lexington, Mo., which town, according to the dispatches published, has surrendered to the State forces under Gen. Price. The St. Louis Democrat has the following version of the state of affairs up to Wednesday evening, two days before the town was surrendered by Col. Mulligan:

The gentleman who arrived at headquarters in this city yesterday morning via the North Missouri railroad, brings news from Lexington, or, to be strictly correct, from the point on the river opposite Lexington, up to ten o'clock on Wednesday night last. The rebel forces under Price, Rains, Reed and others, had possession of the city of Lexington, and had surrounded Colonel Mulligan, who, with a force of about 2,700 men, was strongly posted in the fortifications on College Hill, a point on the river bluff, just below the city, and between that and what is called Old Lexington. On Tuesday the rebels made an attempt to capture one small steamer and two ferry boats, which were lying at the water's edge, just under the fortification walls. A desperate fight ensued, the rebels attacking the boats from up and down the river, and Col. Mulligan defending as well as he could from the river side of his fortifications. The rebels captured his boats. One of the spectators who witnessed the struggle from the opposite side of the river, says he saw the rebels carry off twelve wagon loads of dead and wounded. Colonel Mulligan's loss of course could not be ascertained. The report that these boats were steamed loaded with government stores, ammunition, &c., is incorrect.

On Wednesday, a large number of the citizens of Ray county witnessed the fight from the river bank. The rebels assaulted the fortifications in great force four or five times during the day, and were each time repulsed, as it seemed, with great slaughter. The fighting it was expected, would continue on Thursday. It was feared that Mulligan's ammunition would give out, and that in consequence he would be compelled to surrender. His fortifications are admirable, and his men are fighting with but little exposure and great advantage. The messenger states that the Federal reinforcements of three or four thousand men were sent on their way, and expected to reach the river opposite Lexington on Wednesday night or Thursday morning.

On Thursday of last week an attack was made on the fortifications by a force of rebels from the position of Old Lexington. They were beaten back with a heavy loss. On the next day, Friday, Col. Mulligan shelled Old Lexington, and burned the houses in and behind which the rebels in their attack on the day previous had taken shelter.

The forces under Gen. Price are variously estimated from 16,000 to 20,000 men. In another article the Democrat says: "Our Federal force there is about 3,500 men."

The St. Louis Republican has the following account of the progress of the fight: "The first attack of Gen. Price upon the fortifications at Lexington was made on the Thursday of last week, at five o'clock in the evening, with a force of about eight thousand men. The engagement lasted two hours, and resulted in the repulse and withdrawal of the Confederates with a loss of one hundred killed and between three and four hundred wounded. The Federal loss was from three to five killed and several wounded."

On Wednesday morning last, Gen. Price, having collected a force of from sixteen to twenty thousand, began a desperate and most determined assault upon the fortifications. The engagement commenced at nine o'clock, and raged with great fury during the whole day. Five or six resolute charges were made by the Confederates, but each time they were forced back with considerable slaughter. They succeeded, however, in the capture of three government steamers and a ferry boat that were lying under the bluff and within range of the Federal cannon. As they encountered fearful loss, as it is reported that ten or twelve wagon loads of dead bodies were removed from the bluff.

The Position of Lexington.
We find in the Cincinnati Commercial, the following description of the city of Lexington: "The painful suspense attending the anxiety for news from Lexington, Mo., is greatly enhanced by a consideration of the size and wealth of the place, and its importance as a strategic point. The population of Lexington and vicinity was made up of the best class of the early emigrants from Kentucky to Missouri, is generally wealthy, and probably more refined than that of any other section of the State, excepting St. Louis. The early settlers in that region were attracted by the similarity of much of the country to that Eden of Kentuckians about Lexington, Ky., and they not only made their selections of land according to the standard of old Fayette, but carried the analogy to the naming of the county and principal town of their location in Missouri."

The city, containing now probably 12,000 inhabitants, is situated on a high rocky bluff, which there has its course on the south side of the Missouri river, and whose slopes almost precipitously directly down to the bed of the river, making a very steep ascent from the landing up into the city.

"The sweetest flowers ever scattered in an old bachelor's pathway, are the lips of a pretty girl."