



D. W. MOORE, Editor and Proprietor.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS:—\$2 00 Per Annum, if paid in advance

VOL. XXXVI.—WHOLE NO. 1860.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1865.

NEW SERIES—VOL. V.—NO. 46.

LETTER FROM Capt. McKiernan

Smith's Mills, May 20, 1865.
D. W. Moore, Esq.

Sir:—With one fell swoop the Journal thinks to annihilate me. But this "individual" "still lives," and has yet to learn that the epithets "fool" and "liar" constitute argument; and then they come with ill grace from one whose chief stock in trade is falsehood and vituperation.

If I have "acquired some reputation as a brave soldier," it is more than my manager has ever done.

The Journal publishes a number of what purports to be my letters. They are nearly all garbled extracts, and yet I think they fail to prove more than I admitted in my letter to you.

You will perceive that I gave reports—nothing more; and that I did not put such faith in them you would have learned had they published the whole of each letter. Under date of July 1st, 1863, I find published, "I have been informed to-day that a party of sixty persons have been organized to resist the enrolling" in Knox—Why did they not publish the remainder, which says, "To-morrow I am going up to see them, and in my next you will hear of their being enrolled." No call for troops there, Mr. Journal.

"Poor fool" though I be, I did not forget to keep a copy of every letter I ever wrote to Col. Campbell, and they are free for the inspection of all; and I will forfeit whatever "reputation as a brave soldier" I may have acquired, if every letter quoted that would make out a case against me is not published, and in several instances words, nay, whole sentences, added to what I did say.

Whilst at Waterford the Pro. Marshal and I, at different times, conversed about the state of feeling in Clearfield, and at one time he talked of sending a Company of Invalid Corps to this county. It was partly in allusion to a conversation of this kind that the letter of July 9th, 1863, was written. But I did not say, "I find that twenty or twenty-five cavalry will be necessary for my posse." I said, "Since I have been around through the county I find that twenty or twenty-five cavalry will be quite sufficient."

A material difference, as you will perceive.

After I had been around through the county I found that the people were not half so bad as represented. Instead of that letter being a call for troops, it was virtually asking for a reduction of the number contemplated being sent.

July 27, 1863, I wrote for a small force to assist me in arresting deserters—not citizens. This I admitted in my letter to you. Then where the necessity of proving what was not denied? But it was almost two years before the soldiers came.

August 5, 1863, after detailing the various stories in circulation, I close by saying "Notwithstanding these reports all treat me kindly."

The next letter is such a miserable abortion, as quoted, that none but a scoldator could have been father to it. What I wrote was as follows, and you can compare the two:

CLEARFIELD, Aug. 11, 1863.
Col. H. S. Campbell:
SIR:—Several persons have been asking me why there are no notices given in our county papers of what is expected of drafted men, and those dependent upon them. I wish it could be possible for you to visit this county before the draft; you could then appreciate better the difficulties attending it here. Mr. Row, the editor of the *Register*, told me that in Knox township the people think that I am to serve the notices, and expect it soon to be done. That they now have parcels on all the different roads, who he, (Mr. Row) says will shoot me the first time I show myself there. He tells me there is no doubt, in his mind, but that is a fact. A pleasing one to me, is it not? I expect to serve the notices myself, and if I had twenty mounted men I would not fear the worst of them. But without them I will go where ordered or duty calls. Respectfully,

J. S. McKiernan.

The difficulties were felt by all, not in resistance to, but a want of understanding the draft. That I did not fear these "sixty men" was evident from my asking for only "twenty" to oppose them, and my readiness to go without them.

But why was not this letter published entire? Surely it gives as straightforward an account of what was to be done as any other; and more, it gave the author of the report. Strange that so important information should be passed without notice! These reports were generally given to me by those whose wish was father to the thought.

This pseudo reviewer blows hot and cold in the same breath. He "overlooked my shortcomings!" Generous man! And "bore with my incompetency!" Charitable soul! yet, "as a faithful officer he [] could make no other report."

But why pursue this farther? My letter remains uncontradicted, save in the one item of the Reed case. Mr. Reed was a prisoner, and as such was not privy to conversation between the District Attorney and myself; and that it was as stated every one who knows me will believe, notwithstanding R. B. Carnahan's "it is only necessary to say that no such interview took place." Amazing impudence!

I will close by quoting, *a la Journal*, a few passages of Scripture for the Preacher to contemplate: *Matt. xxvii, 5th*, "And Judas went and hanged himself." "Go thou and do likewise." "That which thy hands find to do, do quickly."

Respectfully yours, &c.
JOHN S. McKIERNAN.

SPEECH OF ANDREW JOHNSON

OF TENNESSEE.

In the United States Senate, Dec. 12, 1859, on the resolution, asking for the appointment of a committee to investigate the facts attending the attack upon Harper's Ferry, in the fall of 1859—commonly known as the "Johns B.ova Raid."

[Continued.]
Mr. Trumbull. If the Senator from Tennessee will allow me, as he has done on that point, I will restate my position in regard to that. I do insist that all men are created equal, by which I do not mean that all persons are equal in organized society. The fact is an abstract truth; but when we come to form government and organize society, all persons do not have equal rights. If the Senator from Tennessee denies that proposition, I would ask him, in the absence of all government, and when men are created without a society, who is superior? And how is it that a white man is superior to a black man, or a man to a woman? I take it that women are created with the same natural rights that men have; but they do not have the same political rights in society. I understand that declaration which has been quoted from the Declaration of Independence, and the same language in the Illinois constitution, to mean simply an assertion of the great natural truth that all men are created equal, to hold that up before the people of this country that everybody may see it. Now, when we organize our society, we will infringe as little on that great natural right as possible; but no government is perfect, and therefore we do in Illinois make a distinction between whites and blacks; and we make a distinction between the political rights of men and women. While we do that, we admit the great God-given truth that all are created equal.

Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee. That is the precise point at which we come to ascertain those rights; it is when government and societies are to be formed. Then we raise the question at once whether this description of individuals is equal to another description of individuals. The constitution of the Senator's own State assumes that all members of the white race, the race for whom they were making and forming government, were equal, and created equal. An African may be equal to his fellows in his own country, surrounded by his own kind of people, who are inferior to the white race; but, because he is transferred here, or happens to be born on this continent, he is not invested with the same rights with one of our race; he is not created equal in the very beginning. The distinction begins with the very germ itself. It depends entirely upon where he is born.

But I wish to ask the Senator a question. Assuming equality to be the rule in a natural state where there is no law, he assumes, then, that the black man is created with the same rights that the white man is. You assume that the power of the Federal Government is sovereign over a Territory. You now go into a community where there are no whites established. Will you, under this general idea of liberty, and this declaration that all men are created equal, in the organization of your territorial government under your sovereign power, make the negro equal to the white man? Will the Senator answer that?

Mr. Trumbull. Does the Senator desire that I should answer him now?

Mr. Johnson. Certainly, if you think proper.

Mr. Trumbull. I should be governed by the circumstances of the people. I would not give to the negro population the same political rights that I would to the white population in every case. I do not know that I would in any case. When we come to form our political rights of the persons who are to compose it, I am not prepared to say that I would give the same political rights either to females or to negroes that I would to the white male population. Under ordinary circumstances certainly I should not be in favor of such a proposition.

Mr. Johnson. Mr. President, all that I want is, to get at the truth, and I want no fog or mystification about the subject. Do not understand me as assuming that the Senator is intentionally throwing fog about it. The fog may be on my part, not on his. But perhaps I can make my proposition understood by asking another question. If, for instance, the Territory of Arizona was colonized and filled up with a free colored population altogether, would the Senator be willing to admit it into the Union as a State on an equal footing with the other States of this Confederacy?

Mr. Trumbull. My idea about the admission of new States is this: I would not admit any community applying to become one of the members of this Union, by the admission of which I suppose I was endangering the peace of the Union itself. In my judgment, as I said the other day

when discussing this question, there is a distinction between the white and the black races, made by Omnipotence himself. I do not believe these two races can live happily and pleasantly together, or enjoy equal rights without one dominating over the other, and therefore I advocate the policy of separating these races by a system which shall rid the country of the black race, as it becomes free. I say I should not be prepared, in the existing state of things, to admit, as a sovereign State of the Union, a community of or of Indians either.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the Senator for the admission he has made, and I wish to press the matter a little further: I think we shall get together directly; I think we are traveling in converging lines, and we are traveling pretty much to the same conclusion. Suppose the four million slaves in the slave States were all emancipated, and were to fill up one of our Territories and apply for admission here, it seems to me the Senator's answer would apply to them as well as to the question I have put. If I am wrong in construing it so, let me correct me; but, in his last remarks, he has admitted that I set out to prove, which was opposed to the whole tendency of his argument and the doctrine he laid down a few days since, and what, it seems to me, according to my understanding, the honorable Senator has been denying. He admits to-day, in his explanation, that the Creator himself has made a difference between the white and the black race.

Mr. Trumbull. Not in their natural rights.

Mr. Johnson. He says the difference begins with the very origin of man. If the Deity himself, according to the Senator's own admission, has made a difference between the races, how can they have been created with precisely the same equal rights and privileges? The difference began with the Deity. The Senator, in his last explanation, has conceded the whole ground; and all this clamor and claptrap about liberty, and the construction which should be put on the Declaration of Independence is clear and unobscured.

In speaking about the latter part of the second resolution of the platform of his party, which puts slavery and polygamy together as "twin relics of barbarism," the Senator in reply to a suggestion of the Senator from Alabama, [Mr. Clay] said:

"Mr. President, I will not cavil about the word 'crime.' I do not call it a crime in citizens of the South to hold slaves at all."

"Mr. Clay. Is not polygamy a crime?"

"Mr. Trumbull. Polygamy is a crime under some circumstances, but not always a crime. I take it that polygamy is no crime in Turkey."

The Senator makes use of the word 'crime,' and says polygamy is not a crime under all circumstances; he says in two parts of his speech, Mr. President, I am one of the last who should begin to discuss a question of ethics; but for myself, in early life—and I have practiced upon it since—I tried to lay down in my own mind certain great rules of right and wrong, truth and falsehood, vice and virtue. According to my judgment, and the teaching I have received, these things exist; and, in my view, a thing cannot be a crime in one place, and not a crime in another, according to circumstances. I do not believe that right and wrong are conventional. We know what the practice of the world is; in some nations one thing is practiced and tolerated by law and custom, and in another precisely the opposite. But does that disprove the great fundamental truth of the proposition upon which all religion, upon which all sound morals should rest, that there is a great principle of right which lies at the foundation of all things, and that the practices of this or that nation cannot change or vary it? What sort of a teaching is the Senator's to a nation? Nations must have morals, as well as individuals. Nations must have a high appreciation of the right, as well as individuals. If right and wrong, if truth and falsehood, if vice and virtue, are to be mere conventional terms, as morality, or immorality may prevail in particular localities, where will this country and every other country go? Each individual will be a law unto himself, according to that system of ethics; and to one man polygamy will be right, and according to some other individual it will be wrong.

Are these the doctrines that are to be inculcated in this country? Are the pulpits and moralists to inculcate the idea that each man is to have his own system of morals; that each man must judge of right and wrong; and that there is no rule, no fundamental rule, by which this great principle shall be determined? I repeat, that I hold that, according to my teachings, there is a great moral principle of right which lies at the foundation of all things; that it exists from eternity; that it began with the Deity himself, and will continue until the termination of His reign; that it reigns throughout all time as deep and as pervasive as nature itself. Now, we are told in the Senate of the United States in the presence of this intelligence, that polygamy may be right under some circumstances, and wrong under others.

The next question comes up, under what circumstances is it right? It is said to be right in Turkey; which is given as an illustration, and to be wrong here. If my memory serves me right, I read the teachings or the doctrines of a professor called Hoffman, who, I think, wrote about the year, 1838, just two hundred years before the Virginia resolutions were passed. I like to remember epigrams, epas, and great events. He laid down the doctrine that truth was susceptible of division into two parts; and all that was true in philosophy was false in theology, and all that was true in theology was false in philosophy. This is a sort of paradox; and yet he founded a sect, and many looked to his standard, and inculcated the doctrines that he taught. It seems to me that system of ethics would suit the doctrines which have been recently inculcated, and which proclaim that, under the circumstances of Turkey, polygamy is precisely right; while under the circumstances of the United States, it is precisely wrong. I suppose, according to that system, all that would be right in Turkey, would be wrong in the United States, and what would be right there would be wrong here. It seems to me, you might make another application of it, and say that all that is right in Republicanism is wrong in Democracy, and all that is right in Democracy is wrong in Republicanism—I mean modern Republicanism. I think we shall have to fall back on the teachings of Professor Hoffman, if the system of ethics recently inculcated is to be fastened on the country; but I trust and hope it will not.

[To be continued.]

THE TRIAL OF THE CONSPIRATORS.

Even that portion of the testimony in the trial of the conspirators, before the Court Martial at Washington, which is allowed by the Court and the War Department to be published, is too voluminous for the limited space of our columns. We therefore, have endeavored to meet a public want by preparing a brief abstract of the testimony, so far as already rendered.—*Patriot & Union*.

A. W. Lee, a Government Detective.

This witness testified that he had examined room No. 126, at the Kirkwood House, occupied by A. G. Atzeroth, and to find a coat hanging upon the wall, in the pockets of which he found a handkerchief marked Mary R. Booth, another supplied to be marked P. E. Nelson, another marked M. H., a pair of spurs, a pair of socks, three boxes of Colt's cartridges, and a bank book with the following inscription in it: "Mr. J. Wilkes Booth, in account with the Bank of Ontario, four hundred and fifty dollars." Under the pillow or bolster he found a brass-bound revolver, loaded. Under the sheets and mattress he found several boxes. The witness was asked to describe the location of the room with respect to that occupied by Vice President Johnson, but failed to make himself intelligible to either court, lawyers or reporters.

Lewis J. Weickman.

This witness stated that he made the acquaintance of James H. Surratt in Charles County, Maryland, in the fall of 1859, which was continued until 1862, and renewed in January, 1863. Commenced boarding at Mrs. Surratt's Nov. 1st, 1864, on H. street, 511. Met Dr. Mudd and Booth by Surratt. The party went to the National, where Booth ordered wine and cigars. Mudd went into the passage and called Booth out into the passage. Surratt was then called out. Conversation outside lasted eight or ten minutes. Mudd apologized to witness by saying that Booth wanted to buy his farm but would not give him his price. Conversation between the three resumed in the room at a centre table, unintelligible to witness; Booth made marks on a piece of an envelope; did not see the marks nor hear the conversation. Booth frequently called upon Mrs. Surratt, and had short private interviews; also with John H. Surratt, with whom he had interviews upstairs of two or three hours duration. Atzeroth came to Mrs. Surratt about three weeks after witness became acquainted with Booth; called for John H. Surratt ten or fifteen times. Went by the name of Port Tobacco among the young ladies. Was with Booth, Surratt, Atzeroth, and Harold at the theatre when Booth played "Pizarro"; had liquor and oysters afterwards. Surratt told him he had two horses which he kept at Howard's stable on G street, between 5th and 7th. Saw Atzeroth at the stable on the 14th of April, about half past 2 o'clock attempting to hire a horse but failed. Witness went to hire a buggy for Mrs. Surratt. On Tuesday previous witness had sent to the National by Mrs. Surratt to borrow Booth's horses and buggy. Booth said he had sold his buggy but gave ten dollars to hire a buggy for Mrs. Surratt. Said the horses at the stable were his. On that occasion (Sunday 11th) witness drove Mrs. Surratt to Surrattville, ten miles from Washington. Returned same day—stayed only half an hour. Mrs. Surratt said her business was to collect some money due her from Mr. Northy. On Friday the 14th, witness drove Mrs. Surratt to Surrattville; arrived there at half-past four; stopped at Lloyd's; returned half-past six. Identified Payne as a man who called at Surratt's in March and gave the name of Wood. He stopped over night and left for Baltimore in the morning. About three weeks afterwards he returned giving the name of Payne; stayed three days and said he desired to become a good loyal citizen, having taken the oath of allegiance, and I reconverted him as a Baptist preacher. Miss Surratt remarked that he was a queer looking Baptist preacher. Had a linen coat and two linen shirts. Witness found a false moustache, which Payne afterwards called for but did not get—afterwards found in witness's baggage. Witness, says day Payne arrived, found him and Surratt sitting on a bed on the third floor playing with bow-knives; they had two revolvers and four sets of spurs. Identified spurs that was found in Atzeroth's room at the Kirkwood. Showed knife found in the same room, but did not recognize it as one seen on that occasion. Went with Surratt to hire a room for some one at the Herndon

House. Afterwards learned that Payne was stopping there. Saw Harold at Surratt's once in 1863, on the occasion of a man named Slader arrived from Richmond, Surratt drove her into the country, and witness understood they had gone to Richmond. Surratt returned on April 3d; had nine or eleven 20-dollar gold pieces and greenbacks. Took oysters with him and that evening he left for Montreal, and witness has not seen him since. Saw a letter from him to his mother, dated Montreal, April 12th, which was received on the 14th. Surratt told witness he had seen Davis and Benjamin, and they said Richmond would not be evacuated. Witness went to Canada on the 18th of April in search of Surratt; learned that he had arrived at Montreal on the 6th, returned to the States on the 12th; returned to his rooms at the St. Lawrence on the 18th, and disappeared the same night—saw some one leave the house of a man named Butterfield in a wagon, named "Burratt" at half-past two, as witness was about to drive Mrs. Surratt into the country, found Booth and Mrs. Surratt in the parlor. The interview lasted only three or four minutes. In December, 1864, Surratt rented her farm and removed to the city. Witness had boarded with her since then. Made her acquaintance through her son—who was a schoolmate of witness. Always was kindly and courteously treated by her. Her house had six large rooms and two small rooms; rented rooms; furnished board. Young Surratt was in the habit of staying away three or four weeks at a time. Witness never heard any purpose expressed to assassinate the President. Heard Surratt say he was going to Europe on a cotton speculation—that he had three thousand dollars advanced to him; that he would go to Liverpool, thence to Nassau, thence to Matamoras, to find his brother, who was with Magruder. Occupied same room with Surratt. Was well educated, and a student of divinity; said once he was going with Booth to be an actor. Was a student with him; character at College excellent. First drove Mrs. Surratt into the country on the 11th of April and again on the 14th; returned about 9 or 10 o'clock on the 14th. Her visits were to collect money from Northy, she said. No one called about 10 o'clock same night, but stopped only a few minutes; witness was at supper. Had many callers; was very hospitable; acquaintances could get rooms as long as they chose. First heard of the assassination at 3 o'clock next morning. Atzeroth stayed only one night; he said he wanted to see John; John was away but returned next day, and Atzeroth left; he had been drinking in his room that night; had heard them say that they did not care to have Atzeroth brought to the house; Mrs. Surratt said she did not care to have such sticks brought to the house; they were a false moustache; witness therefore did not give it to him when asked for; afterwards exhibited it to some clerks in the office—put it on with spurs and made fun with it. Surratt described as six feet high; prominent forehead; large nose; eyes sunk; goatee; and long black hair. Letter to Mrs. Surratt from Montreal, said he was much pleased with the Catholic Church; and had bought a French pea jacket; would go to a private house. Mrs. Surratt's character exemplary and ladylike; member of the Catholic Church; went to church every Sunday; went to her duties every two weeks—sometimes in the morning, sometimes in the evening. Does not know the exact date of introduction to Dr. Mudd; after the Congressional holidays; never saw him at Surratt's only heard his name mentioned in the house once. Witness wrote a letter for Mrs. Surratt to North about money due, and figured the interest on \$430 for thirteen years. Booth's interviews with Mrs. Surratt lasted only five or eight minutes, but Atzeroth on 4th of April, said he was going to get a horse for Payne.

Robert R. Jones Clerk of the Kirkwood House.

Identified page of hotel register, of the 14th of April, containing name of Atzeroth. Thought he recognized one of the prisoners as the man who took room No. 126. Gave a card of Booth's that day to Col. Browning, Vice President Johnson's secretary. Would not know Booth. Did not know whether Atzeroth was out the night of the assassination; saw him only between 12 and 1 o'clock; he asked if any body had called for him; he paid for one day in advance for his room. Witness went off duty at 12 o'clock that day; did not see him register; on Friday, between 12 and 1 o'clock, the man called him to the counter, and pointing to the name, asked if any one had called. The room was locked—the chambermaid could not get in; went with detective Lee to the room identified some of the articles found therein, when exhibited to him.

Mr. Lloyd.

This witness kept a tavern at Surrattville. Became acquainted with John H. Surratt Dec. 1, 1864. Knew Harold and Atzeroth. Five or six weeks before the assassination all three were at his house. Atzeroth came first—went on to T. B.; was gone about half an hour, and then returned with Surratt and Harold. Surratt called witness into the parlor, where he had two carbines, some ammunition and a rope about sixteen or twenty feet long. Surratt told witness he wanted him to keep those things for a joint, where they had a place under a joint, where they could be concealed; witness put them away as directed. On the Monday previous to the assassination met Mrs. Surratt who referred to or hinted about the

shooting irons in such a manner as not to be at first understood by witness, but finally became more plain, and said they would be wanted soon. On the day of assassination Mrs. Surratt came to his house. She was there when he came home—about five o'clock—he met her at the wood-pile; she told him to have the shooting irons ready that night; that there would be some parties call for them; she gave him something in a paper to keep for her, which he found to be a field-glass, she asked him to have two bottles of whiskey ready, saying they would be called for that night. About a quarter after 12 o'clock that night Booth and Harold came and took the whiskey out of the bottles;—Booth was a stranger to the witness; Harold came in and took the whiskey, and told witness to get him those things. Witness went and got the carbines, the field-glass and a monkey-wrench. They remained at the house not over five minutes. Only one carbine was taken; Booth said he could not take his because his leg was broken. Booth drank while sitting on the porch; Harold carried the bottle to him. As they were leaving Booth said—"I will tell you some news; I am pretty certain we have assassinated the President and Secretary Seward." Witness became so excited, he does not know if it was in Harold's presence. Witness received the news of the assassination afterwards about 9 o'clock next morning. Thinks Booth's name was mentioned as the news spread. Did not have any conversation with the soldiers next day; did not tell them that Booth and Harold were at his house on the previous night—regrets now that he did not. Never had any conversation with Mrs. Surratt about a conspiracy. After the last conversation with Mrs. Surratt on the evening of the 14th, witness took the carbines into the bedroom. Gave Booth and Harold the carbines after they took the road to T. B.; Booth rode almost a white horse; Harold's horse was a bay. Witness did not give the soldiers any aid when his premises were searched; told them he did not know anything about it; should have been perfectly free if he had given them the information they asked for. Witness has a wife; no son; employs a couple of colored men. Court adjourned until Monday morning. [To be continued.]

How Bodies are Embalmed.—By embalming people generally are sent to im-agine that the modern process consists of saturating, filling and surrounding the dead body with spices, gums and other indestructible and preservative substances, as is understood to have been the process practiced by the ancients. Such however is not the case. The modern process is not as follows: The blood is drawn off through the jugular vein. An incision is then made upon the inside of the thigh, through which a chemical liquid is injected by mechanical means. This liquid permeates all the veins and arteries, taking the place before occupied by the blood, and in a short time renders the body as hard as stone, and as rigid as a statue. A portion of the scalp is removed and the brain scooped out: The chest is opened and the heart, lungs and viscera are abstracted. When the process is completed, the body is reduced to a mere empty shell, having only the outward semblance of the departed individual. How long a body thus prepared will remain unchanged we cannot say. The process has only been employed for a few years—since the war commenced, we believe—so that time sufficient has not elapsed to test the indestructibility of bodies thus prepared.—*Patriot & Union*.

REPLY TO THE CORRECTOR.—A correspondent of a Cincinnati paper gives the following statement in reference to the destruction of this intolerable pest to fruit which we here produce for the benefit of our readers:

In the spring of 1860, I noticed some of my plans punctured. Having succeeded in catching the striped bug that is so injurious to melon vines—by placing wool on the hills around the young plants—I concluded to try it around my plum trees. I removed the grass about a foot around the tree, placed trash wool on the cleared ground, and wrapped around the forks of the tree. On looking the next day, I found my trap had caught a number of the enemy; they having become entangled in the wool. This tree produced a beautiful crop, while the fruit on the others, within twenty feet of it, "came to naught." In 1861 I treated part of the others the same way, with like result. Also in 1862. In 1863 I treated all my trees the same way. A most healthy and abundant crop of plums I never saw. I have eight varieties; I have a freestone daimson that deserves a place in every fruit yard and very prolific—a superior fruit for canning or drying."

TO START A BALKY HORSE.—Fill his mouth with dirt or gravel from the road and he'll go. Now don't laugh at this, but try it. The plain philosophy of the thing is, it gives him something else to think of. We have seen it tried a hundred times, and it has never failed.—*Exchange paper*.

"I suppose," said the quack, "you think me a fool?" "Yes," said the patient, "but I did not think you could ascertain my thoughts by feeling my pulse."

"It is not a single sudden blow that crushes permanently, but the long endurance of heavy burdens, or an accumulation of smaller ones.

"There is nothing that so awakens the divinity within us as lofty music. In the labyrinth of the ear, as in those of Egypt, gods lie buried."

"If you don't want to get angry, nervous or argue with a blockhead, Remember the Duke the next time you set yourself