



D. W. MOORE, Editor and Proprietor.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

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

VOL. XXXVI.—WHOLE NO. 1361.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1865.

NEW SERIES—VOL. V.—NO. 47.

THE TRIAL OF THE CONSPIRATORS.

Monday's Proceedings.

WITNESSES, RESUMED.

Witness stated that the visit to Sarrattville on Tuesday, the 11th, with Mrs. Sarratt, they stopped two or three times; did not know if it was at Uniontown. Knew Floyd; met him three times; knew him as Mrs. Sarratt's tenant; copied the instrument of lease. On that occasion of Tuesday Floyd drove past the buggy in his carriage; Mrs. Sarratt called him; he got out and approached the buggy; Mrs. Sarratt put her hand out and conversed with him, did not hear what he said; did not hear shooting-irons mentioned. Mrs. Sarratt spoke to Mrs. Offutt, Floyd's sister-in-law, about having this man, Howell, take the oath of allegiance and get released; said she would see Gen. Angur or Judge Turner about it. Interview lasted five or ten minutes; did not know if it was raining; was a dark, murky day.

John M. Floyd, recalled.
Did not recognize one of the carbines; did not think the cover the same; the other looked like the one he saw. Corrected his previous statement that he met Mrs. Sarratt on Monday—it was on Tuesday. Thought also that he laid the bundle given him by Mrs. Sarratt on a sofa in the dining room, instead of carrying it upstairs. Admitted that he was in liquor when he had the interview with Mrs. Sarratt.

Mary Vanline.
Witness resides at No. 420 G street; notes rooms. About the 10th of February Arnold and O'Laughlin took rooms. Knew Booth, who came to see gentlemen; came frequently to see Arnold and O'Laughlin. They said they were in the city business; they left about the 20th of March for Pennsylvania, they said. Booth's visits were very frequent—mostly in day time. Never saw any arms in their rooms, except once, a pistol. Witness received complimentary tickets to see Booth play "Teacups," from O'Laughlin. Never was present at any conversations.

Henry Williams, (Colored.)
Witness met O'Laughlin in Baltimore; carried a letter, in March last, from Booth to O'Laughlin. Never saw Arnold; carried a letter for him, but gave it to a lady to give to him. Said subsequently did not know whether the letter was for Arnold. Was to deliver O'Laughlin's letter at Exeter street, but found him at the theatre. The other was directed to be left at a house on Fayette street; witness did not know who it was for. [The testimony was stated by the Judge Advocate to be merely to show Booth's intimacy with Arnold and O'Laughlin.]

J. C. Early.
Came from Baltimore in the cars with O'Laughlin on Thursday previous to the assassination. Was with him most of the day, and slept with him at the Metropolitan that night. Took breakfast together and went to the National, where witness was separated from him for a few moments. Upon his return he was informed by Henderson, who said he was waiting for O'Laughlin, that the latter was up stairs with Booth. Witness waited three-quarters of an hour and then went away. Saw him again at 4 o'clock. Witness drank considerable that day; saw O'Laughlin come out of "Lee Shore" restaurant pretty late; don't know whether it was after the assassination. Witness went to bed soon after. Saw O'Laughlin next day; went to Baltimore, they went to see a gentleman's wife who was sick at Washington; then met his brother, who said that there had been parties looking for O'Laughlin. O'Laughlin did not show much excitement about the assassination; said he would not stay at home that night; his brother told him they would be after him on account of his intimacy with Booth. Came to Washington with O'Laughlin, Henderson and Murphy to have a good time on account of the illumination. Drank considerably; took two dinners; was not sure that the time he saw O'Laughlin, was before or after the assassination. Saw nothing desperate, during the visit, in O'Laughlin; was jovial, and showed no nervousness in coming down to the cars next morning. Went to the station Saturday morning. Henderson bought tickets; witness proposed to Henderson to get O'Laughlin to stay till after-noon, and they stayed. When O'Laughlin's brother told him they were looking for him, he said he would not like to be arrested at home—it would kill his mother. Went up town with him and returned home.

Lieutenant Henderson.
Witness saw O'Laughlin on Thursday and Friday; told witness on Friday that he was to see Booth in the morning; did not know if he meant he was to see him next morning or had seen him that morning.

Samuel K. J. Steeg.
Have known O'Laughlin for years; saw him and Booth and another person in conversation on the Avenue near the Treasury about the first of April. O'Laughlin called witness aside and said Booth was busy with his friend talking privately. Did not know the third party; did not recognize him among the prisoners.

L. S. Sprague.
Witness was a clerk at the Kirkwood House. Was present when the room was broken open. All he saw was a revolver. Knew of no one calling for Atzeroth.

David Stanton.
Recognized O'Laughlin as a man whom he saw at the house of the Secretary of War the night before the assassination. He simply saw him there. He remained

until witness requested him to go out. He asked him where the Secretary was; witness said he was standing on the stoop. Did not offer any explanation for his presence. Gen. Grant was there that night; did not ask about Grant; went away when told to; it was about 10 1/2 o'clock; a band was serenading Gen. Grant, and a crowd gathered around. When the Secretary of War was pointed out to him he did not go to him, nor tell what his message was.

D. C. Reed.
Know John H. Sarratt by sight. Saw him on the 14th of April, alone, standing on the street below the National at 2 1/2 o'clock. Wore drab clothes; had on spurs; bowed to him as he passed. Have known him a good while; saw him last October; was light complexioned; hair rather sandy; did not recollect any whiskers; paid most attention to his clothes; makes them himself.

James W. Pompephery.
Keep a livery stable; was acquainted with Booth; came to his stable at 12 and 4 o'clock on April 4th; wanted a sorrel horse at four o'clock; couldn't give him the sorrel; gave him a bay mare; have never seen the mare since. Recognized Booth's photograph. He said he was going to Grover's theatre to write a letter; he would put her in the stable back of that; he said he was going to take a pleasure ride. Did not know any of the prisoners. Sarratt was with Booth the first time witness saw him, which was six weeks before the assassination. Booth was alone on Friday. Sarratt was about five feet ten inches high; light goatee and sandy hair thin features.

Rufus Scales.
Keep a livery stable. Knew Booth, Sarratt and Atzeroth. Saw them at his stable frequently, down to the 21st or 22d of March. Sarratt kept two horses there. Atzeroth did not use the horses, but rode out occasionally with Sarratt. Atzeroth told witness that Sarratt had been to Richmond and got into difficulty and that the detectives were after him. Atzeroth took away one of Sarratt's horses—a blind one; it was paid for on the 29th. Booth paid for the horses. Atzeroth afterwards came to the stable to sell the horses to Howard, the owner of the stables; Atzeroth rode one horse, and a stranger the other; Sarratt claimed both horses; Booth paid for their keeping. The witness was sent out to identify the horses.

Peter Flatterholt.
Keep a restaurant near Ford's theatre. Booth was there ten o'clock or little after on the night of the 14th of April. He called for whiskey, paid for it and went out. Restaurant adjoins the theatre. Booth was alone. Did not hear the report of pistol. After Booth went out thinks it was a night or ten minutes before he heard of the assassination. Knew Harold. Saw him either the night of the murder or the night previous; he inquired if Booth had been there; thinks he was alone; the time was between six or seven o'clock.

Sergeant James M. Dye.
Was sitting in front of Ford's theatre about half-past nine o'clock, on the 14th of April. Saw an elegantly dressed gentleman come out of the passage and commence a conversation with a rough-looking person; then another joined them and the three conversed. After a while, and about the end of the second act, the elegantly dressed party said "I think he will come out now." This one then went, after waiting awhile, into the saloon and stood long enough to take a drink and came out as though he was getting intoxicated; stepped up to the rough-looking, and then went into the passage that leads from the stage to the street. The smallest one stepped up as the well-dressed one appeared again, and called out the time. He went up the street and remained awhile; came back and called the time again, louder than before—thinks it was ten minutes after ten. Then he started at a fast walk up the street; the best dressed one went inside the theatre. Witness started for a saloon, and had just ordered oysters when he was informed the President was shot. Recognized the photograph of Booth as the well dressed party. Witness thought if Spangler—pointing to that individual—had a moustache, he the rough-looking man; it was rather dark, but the party had a moustache. Did not recognize the third party among the prisoners; he was a neat, well-dressed, and wore a moustache, and wore fashionable clothes. The witness could not account of the darkness describe particularly the articles of dress worn by the slovenly man; did not observe the color of his eyes or hair; moustache was black; wore an overcoat; did not notice the color of his coat; stood at the right end of the passage on the pavement; the President's carriage was near the curbstone; kept the same position all the time; does not know whether he stood there when the well dressed man went into the theatre; was about five feet eight inches high; thinks Spangler has his countenance without the moustache.

John M. Bushingham.
Was doorkeeper during April at Ford's theatre. Saw Booth about 10 o'clock on the night of the murder; he came in and went out again, and returned in a few minutes; asked witness what time it was; was told to step into the lobby and he could see. He went out and walked in at the door leading to the parquette; then came out and walked up the stairway leading to the dress circle; that was last witness saw of him till he leaped on the stage. Is acquainted with Edward Spangler; did not see him enter or go out at the front entrance; every person passing into the lower part of the theatre, the par-

quette, dress circle, and orchestra had to pass witness; Spangler could not have passed him without witness seeing him; is satisfied he did not see him that night never saw him wear a moustache.

James P. Ferguson.
Keep a restaurant, No. 452 10th street, adjoining Ford's theatre—upper side. Saw Booth on the afternoon of Friday, about three or four o'clock; was at his door on a horse. Next saw him about ten o'clock in the theatre, pushing open the door leading to the boxes; next saw him rush to the front of the box and jump over; saw the gleam of a knife as he jumped; recognized him as he jumped and ran across the stage. The pistol was fired in the box. Gave his testimony to Gen. Angur that night. Next day, Gifford, the stage carpenter said that it was a bell of a statement he had made about the pistol being fired in the box when it was fired through the door. Went and saw the hole; found a gimlet hole enlarged with a penknife. The President's box is on the south side. Heard Booth's exclamation—"Sic semper tyrannis"; thinks he heard him also say—"I've enge for the South. Booth's spur caught in the flag. Did not observe whether the hole in the door was fresh cut. Could not find the bar used to fasten the door. Know Spangler; did not see him that night; never knew him to wear a moustache.

The Private Testimony.
Evidence of an officer of Gen. Johnson's Staff.
The testimony taken before the doors were opened to reporters for the press includes that of a man who was for several years in the military service of the so-called Confederate States, employed in the topographical department, on the staff of General Edward Johnson. He was in Virginia in the summer of 1863, twenty miles from Staunton.

He became acquainted with three citizens of Maryland, one of whom was Booth and the other name Sheppard. He was asked by Booth and his companions what he thought of the probable success of the Confederacy, and he told them that after such a chase as the rebels had then got from Gettysburg, he believed it looked rather gloomy.

Booth told that was nonsense, and added: "If we only act our part right the Confederacy will gain its independence, and old Abe Lincoln must go up 'the spout.' The witness understood by the expression 'must go up the spout' that he meant he must be killed. Booth said that he saw as the Confederacy was nearly whipped, that was the final resource to gain the independence of the Confederacy.

The companions of Booth assented to his sentiments; the witness was at the camp of the Second Virginia Regiment, and there was a second meeting of rebel officers on that occasion. He was not present at the meeting, but one of the officers who was stated its purport; he believed that Booth was at that meeting.—The purpose was to send certain officers on detached service to Canada and the borders to deliver prisoners, to lay the Northern cities in ashes, and finally to get after the members of the Cabinet and kill the President. The name of the officer who gave him the information was Lieutenant Cockerill.

Booth was associating with all the officers. He heard very often that the assassination of the President was an object finally to be accomplished. He had heard it freely spoken of in the streets of Richmond. This necessity was generally assented to in the service.

A Lady.
A lady from New York testified to having met Booth and a man named Johnson, and overheard their conversation. She picked up two letters which they had dropped, and one of them was addressed "Dear Davis," saying that the "lot had fallen upon him" to be the Charlotte Corday of the nineteenth century. She must drink the cup; you can choose your own weapons, the knife, the bullet, &c. The letter is signed Charles Seely.

Two Others.
Two other witnesses testified that they were in Canada, and saw Booth in conversation with George Sanders, and believed they also saw Booth talking with Clay, Holcomb and Thompson.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]
"Do you keep nails here?" asked a sleepy-looking lad, walking into a hardware store the other day.
"Yes," replied the gentlemanly proprietor, "we keep all kinds of nails. What kind will you have, sir, and how many?"
"Well," said the boy, sliding towards the door, "I'll take a pound of finger-nails, and a pound and a half of toenails."
"We like to see a woman tread the high and holy path of duty unblinded by sunshine and unscattered by storm.—There are hundreds who do so from the cradle to the grave, heroines, of whom the world has never heard, but whose names will be bright hereafter, even beside the greatest angels."
"A gentleman having a horse that started and broke his wife's neck, a neighboring squire told him he wished to buy it for his wife to ride on. "No, no," said he, "I can't sell the little fellow, because I intend to get married again myself."
"The planters of Georgia are putting in large crops of grain, and some of them are resuming the cultivation of cotton.—They have lost comparatively few of their slaves."
"Alex. H. Stevens has been sent to Fort Warren."

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 "JOHN BROWN RAID."

[Continued.]
So much for the honored Senator from Illinois and his doctrines. I stated in the beginning that what I was saying in reference to the Senator from Illinois, was rather outside of the line of remark which I intended to make on the occasion. I stated that I should endeavor to show that the recent demonstrations made at Harper's Ferry had been the legitimate result of certain teachings for a great number of years in this country. I shall begin by calling the attention of the Senate and the country to doctrines promulgated in reference to the North and South prior to the year 1800, about ten years after the Federal Government was formed. I propose to read an extract from the fourth volume of Mr. Jefferson's works, an entry under the head of December 13, 1803:

"The Rev. Mr. Coffin of New England, who is now here soliciting donations for a college in Green county, Tennessee, tells me that when he first determined to engage in this enterprise, which he meant to get signed by clergymen, and a similar one for persons in a civil character, at the head of which he wished Mr. Adams to put his name, he being the President of the United States, and the application going only for his name, and not for a donation. Mr. Adams, after reading the paper and considering, said he saw no possibility of continuing the Union of the States; that their dissolution must necessarily take place; that he, therefore, saw no propriety in recommending to New England men to promote a literary institution in the South; that it was, in fact, giving strength to those who were to be their enemies; and therefore, he would have nothing to do with it."

Thus we find that prior to the year 1800, when a simple application was made to the elder Adams for the use of his name by a New England man, the Rev. Charles Coffin, to solicit subscriptions to aid in building up an institution in the South, it was refused on the ground that the South would ultimately become, and was now in process of becoming, a free State; and that as dissolution would finally take place, it was a bad investment for northern men to put their funds in southern institutions. I referred to this circumstance, which is familiar to me, as a beginning point, as a specimen brick of the building out of which this whole fabric has been reared against the South and southern institutions. In the 27th Congress, at the extra session, John Quincy Adams said, upon the celebrated 21st rule, prohibiting the reception of abolition petitions:

"He would say that, if the free portion of this Union were called upon to expend their blood and their treasure to support that cause which had the curse and the displeasure of the Almighty upon it, he would say that this same Congress would sanction an expenditure of blood and of treasure, for that cause itself would come within the constitutional action of Congress; that there would be no longer any pretension that Congress had not the right to interfere with the institutions of the South, inasmuch as the very fact of the people of a free portion of the Union marching to the support of the masters, would be an interference with those institutions; and that, in the event of a war (the result of which no man could tell) the treaty-making power comes to be equivalent to universal emancipation."

And do we not see the whole idea, to get up a party, make a descent on a southern State, establish a provisional government, and if the Federal Government is called upon to interfere, under the treaty-making power, we will emancipate all your slaves? This idea has been longer inculcated than many are willing to believe. Mr. Adams' speech continues:

"This was what he had then said; and he would add to it now, that in his opinion, if the decision of the House, taken two days ago, should be reversed, and a rule established that the House would exercise no position on this subject, the people of the North would be ipso facto absolved from all obligation to obey any call from Congress."

Here is the whole doctrine laid down broad and wide, upon which those recent depredations were to be committed: They have been the result of teachings like these. The idea was thrown out as to the manner in which the Federal Government could be caused to interpose, and the treaty, by its interposition, under the treaty-making power, all the southern slaves were to be emancipated: This was what Mr. Adams said in the Twenty-Seventh Congress—sixteen years ago. About that time, in a letter written to the Abolitionists of Pittsburg, on the subject of anti-slavery societies, he said:

"On the subject of abolition, abolition societies, anti-slavery societies, or the liberty party, I have never been a member of any of them. But, in opposition to slavery, I go as far as any of these; my sentiments, I believe, very nearly accord with theirs. That slavery will be abolished in this country, and throughout the world, I firmly believe. Whether it shall be done peaceably or by blood, God only knows; but it will be accomplished, I have no doubt; and, by whatever way, I say let it come."

If it is to come by blood, let it come; that was his language then. Now, let me ask my brethren of the North, what are

we to infer from teachings like these? We find that, before 1800, it was predicted by prominent, influential men, that this Union was not to stand; that the South was your enemy. In 1840, 1841, and 1842, we find the same doctrine reiterated by Mr. Adams the second. We find in the letter, which I have just read, that he says he firmly believes the end will come; and, by whatever means, even if it comes by blood, let it come. Are we prepared to submit to a state of things like this? Are we to have these teachings year after year, and behold the recent developments, and say that we feel no apprehension? If I were to go into the speeches of Senators I could show you that the same idea and the same doctrine, in reference to a dissolution of these States, has been inculcated by the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. Wilson,] and the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. Wade.] We find the same doctrine promulgated by the Senator from New York, [Mr. Seward] in a remarkable speech delivered, not in this body, but before a portion of his constituents. I remarked before, that I presented a specimen brick, and I want to follow it up. I speak now of Mr. Seward as a politician, making a speech to the people of Rochester, as I have a right to do, and I shall not misrepresent him if I know it. In that speech, the honorable Senator from New York:

"Hitherto, the two systems have existed in the different States, but side by side within the American Union. This has happened because the Union is a confederation of states. But in another aspect the United States constitute only one nation. Increase of population, which is filling the States out to the very borders, together with a new and extended network of railroads and other avenues, and an internal commerce which daily becomes more intimate, is rapidly bringing the States into a higher and more perfect social unity or consolidation. Thus these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results."

The Senator continues—I want to quote him fully and fairly, and not tear a portion of the speech from the context, and thus do him injustice:

"Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore it is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by free-labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rice fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered to their farmers to slave culture, and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free States, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, vain and ephemeral. Startling as this saying may appear to you, fellow-citizens, it is by no means an original or even a modern one."

The doctrine here proclaimed is, that there is an irrepressible conflict between slave labor and free labor. I hope the Senate will pardon me if I digress again from the line of my argument, to combat what, as I conceive, is a false proposition, which has no foundation in truth. The premises of the Senator are wholly incorrect; but, as long as the conclusions drawn from are not combated, they have the same strength as if the premises were correct. Now, sir, is there, in fact, a conflict between slave labor and free labor? If I know myself, I want to be fair and honest on this subject; and as humble as I conceive myself to be, and as poor an estimate as I put in any argument of mine, I wish to God that I might to-day speak to the citizens of every free State in this Confederacy, and could get them, with unprejudiced minds, to look at this proposition as it is. What, sir, is a conflict, an irrepressible conflict between free and slave labor? It is untrue. It is a mistaken application of an old principle to an improper case. There is a conflict always going on between capital and labor; but there it is not a conflict between two kinds of labor. By sophistry and ingenuity, a principle which is conceded by all, is applied to a wrong case. There is a war-like way going on between capital and labor; but there is a material difference between two descriptions of labor, and a conflict between labor in the aggregate on the one hand and capital on the other.

Where is the conflict? We know that as far as labor and capital are concerned, labor is always trying to get as much capital for labor as it can; on the other hand capital is always trying to get as much labor for capital as it can. Hence there is an eternal warfare going on between capital and labor, labor wanting to absorb capital and capital wanting to absorb labor. Does that make a conflict between two kinds of labor? Not at all. Where is the conflict in the United States between slave labor and free labor? Is the slave who is cultivating the rice fields in South Carolina, is the slave who is following the plow in the rich and fertile plains of Mississippi, in competition with the man who is making boots and shoes in New York and Massachusetts? Is there any conflict between their labor? Is there any conflict between the man who is growing nutmegs and bogs and horses in the State of

Ohio, and the man in the South who is raising cotton, rice and tobacco with his slaves? The assumption is false, and upon these false premises a conclusion has been drawn which has deluded thousands of honest men in the country.

THE ANTI-CATHOLIC WAR.

Opening of Hostilities Against the Roman Catholics—Sweeping Charges Made Against Them.

["WHAT DOES IT MEAN?"]

Recent numbers of the Canadian papers inform us that the Rev. Mr. Cameron, a Protestant Clergyman, who has gained a certain notoriety for his zeal in behalf of the rebels, and who recently attracted general attention by openly expressing joy over the assassination of President Lincoln, has been received into the Roman Catholic Church. The same step, it is stated, has been taken by Dr. Blackburn, who is now under trial for concealing the Fenian plan of importing by means of infected rags, the yellow fever into New York. Lieut. Young, also, the chief of the Vermont raiders and bank robbers, has declared that he is utterly dissatisfied with Protestantism, and has a decided preference for Roman Catholicism. Mrs. Sarratt, whose house was the rendezvous of the assassins of President Lincoln, and who swore when her house was searched that she did not know Payne, and had never seen him, while at the very moment he was within sight of her, and had been a regular visitor of the house since February, is a devout member of the Roman Catholic Church, and has been accustomed to go to confession every other week. It is said that the majority of all the assassins are Roman Catholics.

The instigators of the bloody riots in New-York in 1863, were known to be so predominantly Roman Catholic, that the archbishop of New-York would have a soothing influence upon them, and invited them to meet before his house to hear an address from him. While the entire Protestant press of all denominations has been almost a unit in loyalty supporting the government, the great majority of them speak of the attitude of the *Frooman's Journal* and the *Metropolitan Record*, of this city. Whoever has read a few numbers of periodicals, especially the latter, will have seen that if a paper here in the North wished the success of the rebels, the insurrection and revolution, and the removal, by force, of the President twice chosen by the people, it could not have spoken more to the point than these two did. The Roman Catholic periodicals have distinguished themselves by violent and factious opposition to the government and open sympathy with the rebellion.—The *Harold and Visitor*, of Philadelphia, used language so violent and abusive, that it was openly censured by some of the bishops, and had to be discontinued. The *Monitor* of San Francisco, has recently been mobbed, being regarded as one of the most obnoxious rebel sheets. The *Baltimore Mirror* has always been in sympathy with the party who intended to carry Maryland over to the Southern Confederacy. In Missouri there is hardly a Roman Catholic in the party which after so desperate a struggle, saved Missouri for the Union and freed it from the base of slavery. The Catholic vote of the State was almost a unit against the measures looking toward emancipation. The only pro-slavery member in the next Congress from Missouri is the publisher of the Catholic organ of the State.

The Catholic organs of all the countries of Europe have been nearly unanimous in wishing success to the rebels. The *Monde*, in Paris, the leading ultra-montane paper of the world, the *Weekly Register*, of London, the *Tablet*, of Dublin, and nearly all the Catholic papers of Germany, have expressed about our war the same views which we used to find in the rebel journals of Richmond. Of all the governments in the world, there is only one who has entered into a direct correspondence with the government of the rebel Confederacy, and which has given its President the title of "most illustrious President." This only government is that of the Pope.

ANOTHER ATTACK OF THE SAME SORT.

[From the Boston Recorder.]

The real extent of Romish control at this moment is unsuspected. It may be sufficient in 1868 to give us a President, two-thirds of both houses of Congress, and the Governors and a majority in both houses of all the States! An amendment of the Constitution could thus be effected, making papacy the national religion and the only one to be tolerated. But the most sanguine may not hope so much so soon. Rome may see it safe to aspire no farther in 1868 than to a Vice President. To make a President of him would need but a skillful dose of poison—a trifle that Rome never wanted when the motives were adequate. Rome hopes that at some future day, some future or present party shall find itself obliged to sell itself to her. If so, and another rebellion arises in consequence of its ruin or success (either would bring it on), mightier means on this side of the Atlantic and certain recognition on the other, will attend its very opening.

GENERAL WOLFE.—General Wolfe invited a Scotch officer to dine with him; the same day he was also invited by some brother officers. "You must excuse me," said he to them, "I am already engaged to Wolfe." A smart young ensign observed he might as well express himself with more respect, and said General Wolfe, "Sir," said the Scotch officer with great promptitude, "we never say General Caesar or General Alexander." Wolfe, who was within hearing, by a slow bow to the Scotch officer, acknowledged the pleasure he felt at the high compliment.