



D. W. MOORE,
G. B. GOODLANDER, Editors.

PRINCIPLES, NOT MEN.

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

VOL. XXXIV.—WHOLE NO. 1782.

CLEARFIELD, PA. WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1863.

NEW SERIES—VOL. IV.—NO. 13.

RUSSIAN OUTRAGES IN POLAND.

The history of the rebellion and civil war in Poland, waged against that oppressed people by the Czar of Russia, seems to be nothing but a continued scene of horrors. Below we present the reader with two extracts, which, we think, are enough to satisfy and appease the appetite of the most enthusiastic advocate of civil war.

We are also sorry that the future historian will be compelled to chronicle similar scenes of horror committed in our own country, when he comes to make up the record against us, while detailing the crimes committed during the progress of the civil war among us. The leading feature of the civil war in Poland is, that Russia desires to compel the Poles to accept the religion of the former. The cause of the civil war in our own country, is, the attempt to abolish slavery by force of arms. How similar the cause, and how similar the conduct, and we predict that the result in both instances will be a failure.

MILITARY OUTRAGES IN WARSAW.

An attempt was made on the 6th ult., on the life of Gen. Berg, Military Commandant of Warsaw. A hand grenade was thrown at him, but did no damage. In revenge for this attempt he despatched a thousand men to the house from which he supposed the bomb was thrown. A correspondent of the London Post says: "On their road they arrested in the most brutal manner every person they met, driving all before them with their bayonets. They then entered both the houses of Count Zamoycki, one of which is a strictly private house, occupied by his household exclusively, and the other, perhaps the most magnificent house in Warsaw, fitted up in a most luxurious style, and occupied by nearly 120 opulent and highly respectable families. That the bomb should have been thrown from one of these houses was most improbable; and I have already pointed out that it was impossible to know which was the house whence it was thrown. What were the scenes that were enacted in them, perhaps the most respectable houses in Warsaw, between five in the afternoon and twelve at night, God only knows. The crowd outside saw the windows all smashed, and the furniture, books, pictures, mirrors, pianos, dresses, and cupboards thrown out into the street; and they heard in the midst of the yells of the savage soldiery the noise of the breaking of the furniture, and the despairing cries and groans of women. It is as impossible to describe these heart-rending scenes as it is for one who was not a witness to them to form a brief idea what a soldiery drunk with blood can do to insult all human instincts.

After seven hours of destruction, the soldiery dragged the male inhabitants, upwards of 200 in number, covered with wounds and contortions, to the citadel. These poor people were without hats or coats, and their clothes were nearly torn off their backs. Among them were several old men, whose weary and despairing looks moved the bystanders to tears. In Ludoway street, where there is a church these unfortunate people knelt down to say a silent prayer, but the soldiery rushed upon them with their bayonets, tore them from their kneeling position, and forced them to march on. Meanwhile the women and children, thus deprived of their natural protectors, were exposed to the insults and obscene jokes of the drunken soldiery, without a home—even without warm clothing against the cold. About 11 p. m., a short time before the men were taken to the citadel, a lurid light was seen in the sky above where these scenes occurred. It was thought that this must be a fire, caused either by accident or despair. The three brigades collected from all parts of the town, but the soldiery who were posted in the street would not allow them to enter it, and even threw furniture into the flames as fuel. The fire lasted all night, and this morning three heaps of ashes are all that remain of the residences and homes of nearly 100 families."

PERSECUTION OF THE CHURCH.

Accounts from Poland continue to chronicle the commission of most blood-thirsty atrocities by the Russian soldiers engaged in their attempt to crush the revolution. The war is now, as we have already often stated directed against the Church. Convents, monasteries, churches, all the sacred edifices used by the Church for the advancement of her God-given mission, the inhuman butchers are despoiling and burning by the score; priests and their people are slaughtered together, or exiled in chains to Siberia, to her snow and bitter cold and dismal wastes.

The Polish correspondence of the Paris *Messenger* details some of the facts. The italics are ours; for the correspondent has become so used to these narrations, that he gives them with a gravity in horrible contrast to the facts he furnishes: "On the 14th of August, the Rev. M. Norejka, was shot at 10 a. m., at Pologna, in Lithuania. The authorities had made a parade of his execution, and announced it through the whole town with unusual solemnity. The holy Priest prepared himself for death with the most fervent piety, and went to the place of execution with calm courage. The Rev. Mr. Samochel, his confessor, accompanied him to the stake at which he was attached to receive his death. Before dying the martyr raised his voice and said to those who stood around: 'Brothers continue without flinching the struggle for your country and faith. Be sure that as Poland

existed once, she will exist again, now. This belief makes me joyful in death.' On the 18th, the Rev. M. Juskiewicz, Parish Priest of Zemina, the Rev. M. Koloniewicz, and a landowner named Muklonowicz, were to be shot in the same town. Another Priest, the Rev. M. Gargos, was condemned to be hung. Executions take place twice a week regularly on market days. There are always several Priests among the victims. Bands of exiles are sent daily to Siberia, and Priests, landowners, youths, and even women may be seen chained together and led off to Siberia or the farthest parts of the Russian empire. A Rev. M. Mokoszecki, was condemned to transportation, and had to leave in chains for Zerezyński. On the 15th ult., in the same town, a band of eleven prisoners among whom was the Rev. M. Milewski, was sent off to Siberia. The churches in the neighborhood of Teisz are without Priests. The Bishop of Wonia has had to send a Priest for several parishes so as to baptize the children and attend to the dying. But in many places, and especially at Kroza, Kolliana, Girkoly, &c. the Catholics are altogether deprived of any religious assistance. In the diocese of Sandimir four monasteries have been forcibly cleared of their religious inmates to be turned into barracks."

The Veridico of Rome relates that at Mirasol, the Rev. M. Siemasko, brother of the apostate Bishop of Wilna, who is now the schismatic Metropolitan of Lithuania, has died as a martyr. This venerable Priest, at eighty years of age, after returning from Siberia, where he had been long in exile, was continually exhorted by the Russians to apostatize to the schism. To punish him for his firmness in the Catholic faith, it was resolved to bury him alive. He was thrown into a grave dug for the purpose, and little by little he was covered with earth, while he was told that if he wished to save his life he had to embrace the schism. The courageous confessor announced firmly: 'No, never will I renounce my faith and country. I shall die but as a child of Rome and Poland.' At the moment when the earth covered him completely, he still cried out, 'I die, but Poland shall live!'

The Dziennik Poznanski publishes the names of fifty-seven Priests of the Wilna Government giving the names of their places of abode and of the position they held, who have been either executed or transported to Siberia, and a part of whom are still rotting in the prison cells.

IMPORTANT JUDICIAL DECISION.

The Relation of Master and Apprentice.

In a case in the Quarter Session, which had been heard before Judge Ludlow, who delivered the following opinion: Commonwealth ex. rel. *Co. v. Paul T. Bowen*. Opinion by Ludlow, J. The apprentice, the defendant in this case, has been bound by the assent of his mother, to the firm of Cox, Whitman & Cox, in order "to learn the trade, art and mystery of Stone Moulding," the firm covenant, "at such times as their fortunes shall be in blast," to give him employment, and to pay him \$3 50 per week for the time he shall be at work for the first three months, for the first eleven months thereafter one-half of journeyman's prices by the piece, and for the next fourteen months five-eighths journeyman's prices by the piece, and for the balance of his term he shall receive wages at the rate of three-fourths journeyman's prices by the piece. At a glance it will be observed that this instrument is a very peculiar one, as the firm of Whitman & Cox are not to be responsible "for any acts done or committed by the said apprentice during such times as he is not at work, nor are they to be under any expense for medicine or medical attendance, it being fully understood that the said apprentice is under the guardianship of his mother."

There seems to be in this indenture no express covenant for maintenance, nor do the masters agree to give to the apprentice any education. If it stands the test of a legal investigation, it will introduce a new system of apprenticeship, altogether different from that now in use, and in many respects, in our judgment, very objectionable, especially for three reasons. First, There is no covenant in this instrument for schooling, and it has been long since settled: *Com. vs. Perrot, Brightly's Rep.*, p. 189, that an indenture which does not contain this covenant is void; true, this principle is in a measure to be qualified, if it shall appear to the Court that the apprentice has received sufficient education, before he was bound to serve. See 1 Rawle, 191, *Com. vs. Leeds*. In this case, however, the only evidence produced upon this point consisted of an admission by the defendant "that he had been over a year at school, and had got so far that he was studying geography, when he had to leave to go to work." This Court would not be justified in sanctioning the doctrine that a young man between seventeen and eighteen years of age had received sufficient education, when the evidence conclusively proves that he had had just commenced the study of geography. These masters and their apprentice will hereafter see the necessity which inclines the Court to look with anxious solicitude to the proper education of the rising generation, for upon their intelligence depends the future prosperity not only of the young men, but of the Commonwealth and nation.

Second, There is another objectionable feature in this indenture which has attracted our notice. There is no express covenant for maintenance; the apprentice is to receive so much per week, and then by the piece, and the mother who, "it is understood," shall be his guardian, "must take care of him if he becomes sick, and shall also provide him with medicine. We do not overlook the adjudged case

of *Grear vs. Conrow*, 2 Barre, 402, wherein it was decided that an apprentice might reside at home and not with his master, and that a certain sum per week might be paid in lieu of the common covenants for lodging, &c., but we distinguish this case from that one in many particulars; here employment is to be given "during such times as their fortunes shall be in blast," and certain payments shall be made "for the time he (the apprentice) shall be at work." No such features appeared in the indenture before the Court in the case of *Grear vs. Conrow*. The apprentice in this case, should the furnace go out of blast and he at the same time be afflicted with sickness, may starve or die. Besides all this, in *Leach vs. Agnew*, 7 Barr, 22, the Court declare that "a father is entitled to a child's earnings, and may dispose of them; a mother being held to no such duty is not entitled to its correlative. Neither has a guardian such a right; he may assent to his ward's apprenticeship, but may not hire him out for the guardian's benefit. The impulses of a mother would restrain the donee from turning him out of doors, but in the interpretation of contracts we have to deal with legal obligations. Had she added to the gift an engagement to maintain him, as an equivalent, the contract might have been deemed a beneficial one, but as she did not, it was void."

From what has already been said, enough appears, we think, to justify us in declaring this instrument void; but we have another objection to this paper, which is a radical one, and which ought to be stated. In an indenture of apprenticeship, the master, by the common law and the laws of Pennsylvania, takes the place of a parent, and the apprentice of a child. In some of the old books the apprentice is spoken of as a species of relation; and while in one sense he is a servant, as every child must be, yet he may not be bound as servant but must stand in the relation of a serving child. The obligations which this self-constituted relationship were mutual; the apprentice shall conduct himself respectfully toward his master; shall obey his commands; be faithful in his service, and act as any child should act toward his parent; and the master shall not only teach his apprentice his trade, but shall maintain and protect him; shall watch over his morals; see to it that he is educated; so that at last, when the term shall end, the apprentice may enter the society in which he lives as a good workman, an intelligent and thoroughly trained man, able not only to sustain himself, but also to benefit and not curse the community in which he lives.

Measured by these time-honored principles, what shall be said of the articles of apprenticeship? The master agrees to do nothing but to pay the apprentice a certain sum and to teach him the art and mystery of a certain trade; although the law declares that the master shall be the guardian of the apprentice, yet this indenture declares that it is understood that the mother shall be his guardian, and thus we suppose he will practically be his own guardian. The wages to be paid are to be paid to the apprentice. Now, while the necessities of the present condition of society, especially in large cities, may render it necessary for a master to board his apprentice out of his own house, a course also sanctioned by law, yet it by no means absolves him from his moral and legal obligation to attend to the welfare of the apprentice, and least of all does it sanction the payment of wages to an apprentice. If such a covenant is to be sustained, then the apprentice is to be furnished with the means by which, at a tender age, and when most liable to temptation, he may squander his substance to gratify his passions and lusts, and thus receive an education in idleness and vice.

The old system looked to the mutual benefit of master and apprentice; the new provides most care for the master and with little or no care for the apprentice; the old agreements contained mutual covenants; the new null the services of the minor, and is therefore, a contract of sale of legal value perhaps in one aspect, but of no value as an indenture of apprenticeship.

A question arose in this case as to the form in which it came before the Court, and is decided at the request of all parties concerned in the case. After the transcript of the Alderman had been returned to the Court, a petition was filed by the master, containing a statement of his case, to which an answer was filed by the apprentice. We regard such a petition and answer as altogether useless; an absconding apprentice cannot be permitted to come in and defend his act by declaring that his indenture of apprenticeship is invalid—such a practice leads to insubordination. If the apprentice has suffered a wrong, the acts of Assembly point out the remedy; if the indenture is void, a writ of *habere corpus* will test the question; and, therefore, we will hear cases like the present upon the transcript of the Alderman and at the bar of the Court.

THE FUEL FAMINE.—In Philadelphia Lehigh coal is now selling at eleven dollars and twenty cents per ton of 2,240 pounds, a higher price than it was ever before known to reach in this city. It has been advancing in price at the rate of a dollar a week lately, and the indications are that it will go still higher before the winter closes. No matter if the poor must freeze during the winter, it will be considered a disloyal practice to complain.

If one-half of the political preachers of the present day practice as they preach they are on the wide road to hell.

THE HOUSE OF ROTHSCHILD.

The London *Globe* gives the following account of the rise and present position of the "money kings" of Europe, the famous house of Rothschild:—

"Among all the congresses held this summer of princes, lawyers, musicians, schoolmasters, social science men, political economists, and a hundred others, one very notable meeting has almost escaped public attention. A few days ago our Paris correspondent told us that a congress of the members of the illustrious house of Rothschild had been sitting at Paris. The purpose of the meeting was nothing less than to re-arrange the dominions of the great banking dynasty. In one word, the great object of the Rothschild congress was to reduce the five branches of the house who now rule Europe to four, and following the examples of Garibaldi, to strike another sovereign of Naples from the list of reigning monarchs. Henceforth there are to be but four kings of the house of Rothschild, with secure thrones at London, Paris, Vienna and Frankfurt.

It is not exactly a hundred years since a poor Jew, called Mayer Anselm, made his appearance at the city of Hanover, barefooted, with a sack on his shoulder and a bundle of rags on his back. Successful in trade like most of his coreligionists, he returned to Frankfurt at the end of a few years, and set up a small shop in the Jew Lane, over which hung the sign-board of a red shield, called in German *rottschild*. As a dealer in old and rare coins, he made the acquaintance of the Serene Elector of Hesse-Cassel, who happening to be in want of a confidential agent for various open and secret purposes, appointed the shrewd looking Mayer Anselm to the post. The Serene Elector, being compelled soon after to fly his country, Mayer Anselm took charge of his cash, amounting to several millions of florins. With the instinct of his race, Anselm did not forget to put the money out on good interest, so that before Napoleon was gone to Elba, and the illustrious Elector had returned to Cassel, the capital had more than doubled. The ruler of Hesse-Cassel thought it almost a marvel to get his money safely returned from the Jew Lane of Frankfurt, and at the Congress of Vienna was never tired of singing the praise of his Hebrew agent to all the princes of Europe. The dwellers under the sign of the Red Shield laughed in their sleeves, keeping to themselves the great fact that the electoral's two millions of florins had brought them four millions of their own. Never was honesty a better policy.

Mayer Anselm died in 1812, not without the supreme satisfaction of having his honesty extolled by kings and princes. He left five sons who succeeded him in the banking and money-lending business, and who, conscious of their social value, dropped the name of Anselm, and adopted the higher sounding one of Rothschild, taken from the sign-board over the paternal house. On his deathbed their father had taken a solemn oath from all of them to hold his four millions well together, and they have faithfully kept the injunction. But the old city of Frankfurt was clearly too narrow a realm for the fruitful sowing of four millions, and in consequence, the five were determined after a while to extend their sphere of operations, by establishing branch banks at the chief cities of Europe. The eldest son, Anselm, born in 1773, remained at Frankfurt; the second, Salomon, born in 1774, settled at Vienna; the third, Nathan, born in 1777, went to London; the fourth, Charles, the *enfant terrible* of the family, established himself in the soft climate of Naples, and the fifth and youngest, James, born in 1792, took up his residence at Paris. Strictly united, the wealth and power of the five Rothschilds were vested in the eldest born; nevertheless, the shrewdest of the sons of Mayer Anselm, and the heir of his genius, Nathan, the third son, took the reins of government into his own hands. By his faith in Wellington, and the flesh and muscle of British soldiers, he nearly doubled the fortune of the family, gaining more than a million sterling by the sole battle of Waterloo, the news of which he carried to England, two days earlier than the mail. The weight of the solid millions gradually transferred the ascendancy in the family from Germany to England, making London the metropolis of the reigning dynasty of Rothschild.

Like the royal families of Europe the members of the house of Rothschild only intermarry with each other. James Rothschild married the daughter of his brother Salomon; his son Edmund, heir apparent of the French line, was united to his first cousin, the daughter of Leonel, and grand-daughter of Nathan Rothschild; and Leonel again—M. P. for London—gave his hand in 1837, to his first cousin, Charlotte, the daughter of Charles Rothschild of Naples. It is unnecessary that, though these matrimonial alliances have kept the millions wonderfully together, they have not improved the race of old Mayer Anselm of the Red Shield. A few signs of physical weakness are becoming visible in the great family. So at least hint the French papers in their meagre notices about the Rothschild congress at Paris. From all that can be gathered out of a wilderness of canards, thin faces and thin fiction, it appears that the sovereigns of the Stock Exchange met in conference for the double purpose of centralizing their money and power and winning their matrimonial realm. In other words, the five reigning kings, descendants, according to the law of primogeniture, of the five sons of Mayer Anselm came to the decision to reduce the number to four, by cutting of the Neapolitan branch of Charles Rothschild, while it was likewise decided that permission should be given to the younger members of the family to marry for the benefit of the race beyond the range of first cousinship.

What has led to the exclusion of the Neapolitan line of Rothschild seems to have been the constant exercise of a highly blameable liberality unheard of in the annals of the family. Charles, prodigal son of Mayer Anselm, actually presented, in the year 1846, ten thousand ducats to the Orphan Asylum of St. Carlo, at Naples, and the son and heir of Charles, Gustavus, has given repeated signs of his inclination to follow in the footsteps of his father.—Such conduct, utterly unbecoming of the policy of the house of Rothschild, could not be allowed to pass unnoticed; and accordingly—we quote the rumor of Paris journalism—the charge of the Neapolitan line has been pronounced. However, Baron Gustavus de Rothschild is not to retire into private life, like famous Charles V, with only a casack on his back and a prayer-book in his hand, but is allowed to take with him a small fortune of 15,000,000, or about six millions sterling—a mere crumb from the table of the descendants of poor Mayer Anselm, who wandered shoeless through the electorate of good King George the Third. It is certain that no romance of royalty is equal to the romance of the house of Rothschild."

THE TRUE POLICY.

We have said from the very commencement of this bloody and exhausting civil war that the sword alone could not conquer such a peace as wise and patriotic men desire. Peace without a restored Union and fraternal relations would be but a miserable mockery, transitory and delusive. While armed rebellion exists, the sword is necessary as a means to suppress it; but while alone it may suppress it, alone it cannot restore and hold the government as it was before the contest began. It cannot eradicate the bad feelings, the intense hatred engendered by the strife. For that purpose conciliation must be used, and a just line of policy pursued—a policy, not of exasperation but of reconciliation. Without this, all the blood spilled and treasure expended, all the toil and suffering endured, will have been in vain—for by the sword alone no Republican government can be maintained—that must rest upon the fraternal feelings of the people and a just sense of mutual obligations and mutual forbearance.

On the subject of policy the *World* has the following remarks, which, in the main, we think correct, and worthy alike the attention of our rulers and people: *Pat. & Co.*

There can be no doubt, in any reasonable, instructed mind, that two (or even three or four) free republics within the present limits of the United States would be preferable to one great centralized despotism, if there were fair probability that such republics could co-exist side by side with no more wars than are usual among co-terminous nations. No man whose preference for republican government is intelligent, and founded on principle, would hesitate even to take the chance of such wars in preference to witnessing the failure of the republican experiment on this continent. The United States would have set a glorious and inspiring example to nations struggling against their oppressors, even if we had never made the Louisiana nor the Florida purchase, nor annexed Texas, nor acquired California.—No particular number of States of definite territorial magnitude is essential to our system. Our country was as glorious, and its system of government as nearly perfect when it consisted of thirteen, or eighteen, or twenty-four States as at any subsequent period. Our chief boast has always been of our free institutions as secured by our admirable Constitution. If this should fail, it would be no compensation (scarcely a consolation) to see it replaced by a gigantic despotism, like Russia, holding outlying provinces, like Poland, in unwilling subjection.

The Democratic party would not consent to the continuance of this war for another day, if they did not suppose the reconquest of the South to be compatible with the preservation of our free Constitution. There was no one of the successive enlargements of our territorial limits which the people would have consented to purchase at the peril of the Constitution; nor are any of them, lost, worth reacquiring at that fatal price. The great problem now given the nation to solve is to recover the revolted States without subverting our form of government.

The most important reason why, at any cost short of the Constitution, we must conquer and hold the seceded States, is that two separate republics would never live in peace. Two nations would be a modern rehearsal of Athens and Sparta, whose discords and jealousies drenched Greece in blood, subverted its independence, and overthrew its liberties. The North and the South would as two nations, hate and fear each other like the rival Republics of Rome and Carthage, and we should be afflicted with wars worse than Punic until one or the other was exterminated. We cannot afford to have two rival governments; still less can we afford to lose the Constitution; it is indispensable, therefore, that we adopt a policy toward the South which will save us from the ruinous necessity of holding it by sheer force, when we have conquered it by our arms.

was consistent with war; that he, if anybody, would, in an attempt to blend policy with war, place at least due reliance on the latter. What this incomparable captain would not undertake to accomplish by war alone, it is absurd for this Black Republican administration to think they can drive through by sheer military force. Napoleon, in his conversations at St. Helena, made his projected invasion of England a frequent topic, and both to La Caze and O'Meara explained his plan in detail. As often as he mentioned the subject he gave great prominence to his intended measures of conciliation, as a reason for thinking that he could have succeeded, and should have entered the British capital, "said he to Las Caze, 'not as a conqueror, but as a liberator. I should have been acted with greater candor and disinterestedness. The discipline of my army was perfect. My troops would have behaved in London the same as they would in Paris. No sacrifices, not even contributions, would have been exacted from the English. We should have presented ourselves to them not as conquerors, but as brothers. I would have declared that our only wish was to be able to rejoice in the happiness and prosperity of the English people, and to these professions I would have strictly adhered.' Napoleon took pains to explain that it was only by these conciliatory means that he had only retained any hope of success had he landed in England with an invading army. It was a leading part of his plan to conciliate and gain over the people. 'If, indeed,' said he to O'Meara, 'they supposed that I meant to render England a province of France, then indeed the national spirit would do wonders.' To the clergy and shallow ridicule of the Republicans we oppose the authority of Napoleon; but, in our view, reason and common sense can stand on their own legs, and need not the authority of great names to support them.

For the last ten years, at least, it has not been supposed that Louis Napoleon is quite a simpleton; but in his recent conquest of Mexico he took the most studious pains to conciliate the people. Instead of aggravating their rage, and firing their opposition by threats of wholesale confiscation if they did not submit, his mouth has, from the beginning, been full of conciliatory words and fair promises. People may believe what they please respecting the sincerity of these professions; the fact that they are so assiduously made proves that they are thought an important means of success. Gen. Forey has not allowed his soldiers to pillage the inhabitants; he has levied no military contributions; he and his imperial master have constantly affirmed that the people of Mexico should have a fair opportunity to establish a government of their own choice. Clever despots are too wise to exhibit their chains; but our Abolition rulers seem to think brandishing the yoke a promising mode of securing submission. With minds too narrow to hold two ideas at once, they consider war and conciliation incompatible, and think an enemy is more easily reduced to submission the more you make it his interest to fight.

Of all notions ancient or modern, the most successful in making, holding, or assimilating conquest were the Roman; their far-sighted and able policy, formed on a correct knowledge of human nature, and of the principles of government, gave them the empire of the world. Their treatment of the conquered was the reverse of that of Carthage. Rome pressed on to conquer people their municipal governments, tolerated their religions, and frequently admitted them to the full rights of citizenship in the imperium; Carthage treated those she conquered with great severity; but Rome after their defeat left them to conduct their affairs pretty much as they pleased, provided they differed in the manner of treating the conquered," says a French historian "an important remark, for they explain the power of Rome and the feebleness of Carthage." Thus we see that leaving the restraining authority of the Constitution out of view, and reasoning as if we possessed the South the unlimited rights of a conqueror, even on that supposition a successful policy of conquest requires the blending of magnanimity and forbearance with the vigorous exertion of military power.

A Democratic friend proposes the following question: How much have the planks of the Chicago platform cost per foot? This is a question which interests thirty millions of Americans, but it will never be computed—scarcely the immense debt, to say nothing of the blood, the tears, and lamentations of the widows and orphans. Historians will labor in vain to solve this great and gray question.

Towards the preservation of your Government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext.—GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Barnum has a "five-horned sheep," and at a recent battle show he labeled him "an intemperate sheep, which has taken at least three horns too much."

Gen. Louis Blenker, formerly commander of the German division of the Potomac army, is dead. He died of consumption, in New Jersey.