

THE CENTRE DEMOCRAT is published every Thursday morning, at Belleville, Centre county, Pa.

TERMS—Cash in advance, \$1.00. If not paid in advance, \$2.00. Payments made within three months will be considered in advance.

A LIVE PAPER—devoted to the interests of the whole people.

No paper will be discontinued until arrearages are paid, except at option of publishers.

Advertisements are calculated by the inch in length of column, and any less space is rated as a full inch.

Foreign advertisements must be paid for before insertion, except on yearly contracts, when half-yearly payments in advance will be required.

Business notices, in the editorial columns, 15 cents per line, each insertion.

Local notices, in local columns, 10 cents per line. Arrangements of names of candidates for office, 25 cents.

Announcements of marriages and deaths inserted free; but all obituary notices will be charged 5 cents per line.

Special notices 25 per cent. above regular rates.

OUR temperance people have made another advance upon the outposts of the enemy. They held a convention at Harrisburg last week, and after the usual discussion of the evils of intemperance and the insufficiency of our laws to control it, propose that the temperance people "shall continue to respectfully ask the Legislature to change the policy of the State on the liquor question from that of license and regulation to that of prohibiting by adequate laws the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for public drinking purposes; and shall continue the demand until the wish of the people becomes permanently reflected from the statute book."

They formulate a bill to be submitted to the Legislature, which defines ale, porter, cider, beer, and all wines and cordials, containing alcohol, to be intoxicating liquors within the meaning of the act, and their sale or manufacture for sale, as well as distilled spirits, prohibited under heavy penalties, and makes the vender responsible for the acts of an intoxicated man. It is also proposed that the people, male and female, over the age of twenty-one years, shall be clothed with legal power in counties, townships, cities, boroughs and wards, to accept or reject, by vote, the traffic therein.

The measures proposed by this convention are formidable and aggressive, but gather no strength from the local option principle adopted, except it be for the mere purpose of ascertaining the wishes of the people, which is proper to be tested by public meetings or petitions to the Legislature. It needs no act of assembly for that purpose. There is such a thing as doing too much.

DEATH OF BISHOP AMES.—The death of this venerable Methodist divine took place at Baltimore on Friday morning last after a protracted illness from diabetes and pulmonary troubles. He entered the ministry in 1830, and was elected Bishop in 1852 and throughout his ministerial life, was very energetic and efficient in the discharge of duty. He traveled all over the country and was probably one of the best known men in the church. He was in the seventy-fourth year of his age.

THE infamous partisan, Judge Bond, of the United States Court, commenced a session in South Carolina with a packed jury under the test oath, has abandoned the trials and adjourned the Court. The test oath question has been so thoroughly ventilated and its effects so clearly portrayed since discussion commenced at the extra session, that the Republicans could afford not to allow this Court to proceed with the practical illustration which the proceedings afforded. They have called a halt.

CONKLING tried his great effort last week, in a rehearsal of the arguments of other stalwart speakers, and a general ill-natured scold of the Democrats. Nobody hurt. The New York Senator has the ability to rise to the dignity of a statesman, but his violent partisan feeling and bad temper always defeats the attempt to utilize it. The "best effort," is therefore still struggling for development.

AN ACT to secure to operatives and laborers engaged in and about coal mines and manufacturing of iron and steel, the payment of their wages at regular intervals and in lawful money of the United States.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by authority of the same, That from and after the first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine, all persons, firms, companies, corporations or association in this Commonwealth, engaged in mining coal or mining and manufacturing it, or manufacturing iron or steel, or both, employing ten or more hands, shall pay their employes as provided in this act.

SEC. 2. All persons, firms, companies, corporations or associations, engaged in the business aforesaid, shall settle with their employes at least once in each month, but the employes shall have the privilege to give orders for money or merchandise on his employers for such amounts as he may have earned and have to his credit from time to time during the month, and pay them the amounts due them for their work or services in lawful money of the United States, or the cash order as described and required in section three of this act.

SEC. 3. That it shall not be lawful for any person, firm, company, corporation or association, their clerk, agent, officer or servant, in this State, to issue for payment of labor any order or other paper whatsoever, unless the same purports to be redeemable for its face value in lawful money of the United States, bearing interest at legal rate, made payable to employe or bearer, and redeemable within a period of thirty days by the person, firm, company, or association giving, making, or issuing the same; and any person, firm, company, corporation or association engaged in the business aforesaid, their clerk, agents, officers or servants, who shall issue for payment of labor any paper or order other than the one herein specified, in violation of this section, he, she or they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding five hundred dollars, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 4. That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, company, corporation or association engaged in mining or manufacturing as aforesaid, and who shall likewise be engaged or interested, directly or indirectly, in merchandising, as owner or in the per centum of profit obtained from the sale of any such merchandise, to knowingly and willfully sell to any employe any merchandise whatever for a higher price than the same article is selling and can be purchased in the same community from other persons engaged in selling like goods; and any person or member of any firm, company, corporation or association, his or her clerk, agent or servant, who shall violate this section of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and for each offense, upon conviction, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding five hundred dollars or undergo an imprisonment in the county jail for a period not exceeding six months, or both or either, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 5. That if any person, firm, company or association, shall refuse or neglect to pay any of their said employes at the intervals of time as aforesaid, or shall neglect or refuse to redeem any of the cash orders herein provided for within the time specified, if presented, and suit should be brought for the amount overdue or unpaid, judgment for the amount of said claim proven to be due and unpaid, and a penalty of five per centum of such amount added to the principal sum, shall be rendered in favor of the plaintiff in such action: Provided, That nothing in this act shall interfere with any previous contract between the employers and employes.

SEC. 6. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act be and the same are hereby repealed.

That every corporation, co-partnership, firm or individual doing any business within this Commonwealth in which laborers are employed shall pay their laborers or employes at stated periods in money or merchandise or other commodity, as may be agreed upon between the parties at the time of the contract of hiring and in accordance with the terms thereof, and it shall be unlawful for any corporation, co-partnership, firm or individual, doing business as aforesaid, to knowingly and willfully charge their employes more or a greater price for any article of merchandise furnished than that at which the same article and quality of merchandise is sold at for cash in the same town or neighborhood by other merchants or others trading in such articles. That it shall be unlawful for any retail merchant doing business in this Commonwealth to receive any order that may be drawn upon him for the payment of labor at less than its face value, or to discount the same, or to furnish store goods or merchandise therefor, charging a greater or higher price for the same than he would sell the same quality of goods at for cash, or than the same quality of goods or merchandise can be purchased at for cash in the same town or neighborhood. That any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall pay a fine of not less than ten dollars or more than fifty dollars for each offense, and shall refund to the party whom such goods or merchandise shall have been sold the difference between the price charged and the cash price thereof.

DR. J. K. BARNES, Surgeon General of the army in a letter under date of 16th ult., addressed to the Philadelphia Press, states he was the physician in constant attendance of Edwin L. Stanton, late Secretary of war. That the story circulated some time ago and recently revived, that Mr. Stanton committed suicide is wholly untrue:—"that there is not any foundation whatever for the report that Mr. Stanton died from any other than natural causes."

A CRAZY man named Gray attempted to assassinate Edwin Booth in the Chicago theatre, last week. He fired two shots at the great actor while upon the stage, and was in the act of firing the third when arrested. He would give no reason for his attempt on the life of Mr. Booth.

[Concluded from 3d page.]

whatever to do with it. It was an amendment relating to succession on a money bill for the support of the Army and the Navy. The Lords resisted it for a time, but finally gave way. This is in fact the law of the realm to-day. The Commons are absolutely masters of every subject of this kind. In their character as the representatives of the people they have enforced this and other great rights at the expense even of the blood of kings and the forfeiture of their thrones. The safety of the civil liberties of the people is above all price. No lesser motive should cause or ever has caused them to use this great power, nor should nor does any lesser one prompt us to use it now.

But it is asserted that this is revolutionary and coercive. The first answer to this argument upon this subject is that we have no right to assume in regard to this bill that any feature of this bill will meet disapproval anywhere. Why should such an assertion be made? Coercion is not asserted in the bill itself; it is not asserted by the committee; and why should the legislative branch of the Government, the immediate representatives of the people and of the States, be charged with coercion and told that their measures are revolutionary?

The practice of twenty years upon appropriation bills and the precedents that I have cited demonstrate that this is not a revolutionary measure, but that the processes are constitutional methods and in accordance with precedent. It is said we deny supplies to coerce agreement with us. There is no such threat in this bill. We grant supplies, but we connect the grant with a provision that the troops who are to be supplied shall obey the laws that we enact. According to this argument our sole power is to vote supplies and to tax the people for those supplies, but we are denied the power to say how the Army shall be used. We are denied any control as to what shall be done with the money we vote, or if we seek to do so we are accused of being coercive and revolutionary. The argument is that we deny supplies and threaten coercion.

Sir, let us look at this subject. Congress has three branches. Each one is independent in its sphere. Each branch of Congress has a negative on the other, and that fact is a vital fact in the preservation of the liberties of this people. The English system of separate branches is our system, and it is vital in it that the Senate shall have an absolute negative upon the proceedings of the House, and the House shall have an absolute negative upon the proceedings of the Senate. But because the Senate refuses to pass a bill that has matter in it that the Senate will not agree to when it comes from the House, and refuses to pass a bill because of that matter, is the Senate revolutionary? Does that follow? It is the plainest proposition in the world that this is a constitutional right and invaluable as a check. It cannot be dispensed with as a part of the governmental theory of this country that each House is to have an absolute negative upon the other. And the negative of the Executive is a check upon the legislative branch, limited by the two-thirds provision.

The exercise by either House of its right to refuse to pass a bill because of denied matter in the bill is the exercise of a plain, clear, constitutional right. The exercise of this right by the Senate is by no means revolutionary. A President has the right to veto a bill. It is by no means revolutionary that he should veto a bill; yet he undertakes by the exercise of his qualified negative to require us to do what he wishes. That is a part of his clear right; it belongs to him under constitutional authority, and I would be the last to attempt to take it away from him. It is vital here as it is in the legislative branch. But when the Executive vetoes a bill and we pass the bill by two-thirds, we are practically coercing the Executive. That is the inevitable conclusion, but this is constitutional coercion. The Executive, in pursuance of his qualified negative given to him by the Constitution, returns us to him with his objections, and two-thirds of the legislative branches pass the bill over his veto. We are coercing the executive power, but are we revolutionary? We are exercising the legislative power of this Republic, and it is neither revolutionary nor coercive.

But suppose the bill comes here and we have not the necessary two-thirds to pass it over his veto, what follows? We undertake to pass the bill, we put it under reconsideration in accordance with the Constitution and it fails for want of two-thirds, what then? Are we to be coerced in regard to legislative right? Are we to say that we must pass the bill in the form he wishes because the Executive has vetoed it? The right of non-action, the right to decline to act under such circumstances, is as much the right of this House and of the other House and of the two Houses acting in their legislative capacity as is the right of the President to veto a bill. We may decline to act and go no further; we need not initiate the legislation anew. If we could be compelled to do this, then the independence of each branch and the independence of the legislative power is absolutely gone, and you have no longer a majority rule for the President, and the minority can coerce legislation and thus the minority become the majority, and with an unscrupulous Executive cohering the power of the minority patronage and place you have your Government revolutionized by with the minority usurping and controlling the power of the majority, in which, under our system, it is vested by the Constitution and the laws. This is the inevitable result. There is no such power anywhere. It belongs to the legislative branch to act or to decline to act. When it does decline to act, it is exercising a plain, clear, constitutional right, and it must act, as must the Executive act, in full view of its responsibilities to the people. That is where the responsibility comes at last. The power to do this is with us, but we must act in the view that it is ultimately to be judged of by the last tribunal in this country, the tribunal of the people, and if we are not standing by doctrines and measures which the people will approve, if we are not maintaining the rights and liberties and the ancient freedom of this people, they will not sustain us, and they ought not; but if, on the contrary,

we decline to act, in obedience to our clear constitutional right, in defense of the rights and liberties and privileges of a free people, they will sustain us, and this Congress will write upon the history of this people an ineffaceable record of their representatives in the Forty-sixth Congress were true to the liberties of the American people.

Sir, each must be responsible for its conclusions and its actions to the people themselves, and each must act in full view of that ultimate tribunal. The power of the legislative branch to raise armies and vote supplies is to be exercised as that legislative branch judges wise. There is no power to control, to direct, or to coerce it. If the Executive differs, his negative controls unless two-thirds override it. If not, the bill falls, but his negative does not compel us to act.

Sir, this mode of coercion never was intended to be used upon the legislative branch. There is nothing in the Constitution or in the history of this people that can be construed to mean that the legislative branch shall act at the dictation of the Executive; it is not found in our system anywhere, and it cannot be cited to deter us from that which is a plain, clear duty.

The independence of the legislative branch and the rights of the people are often to be preserved best by this defensive power of non action. The Senator from Maine read from Mr. Clay, let me read what he said in 1819, upon a question of constitutional interpretation upon an Army bill, an issue between the President and him as to what should be put upon that bill in regard to internal improvements. Mr. Trimble had moved an amendment allowing troops to be used to make a road and appropriating money for that purpose. This involved the question of internal improvements. Mr. Clay, who was then Speaker, when the House was in Committee of the Whole, said this:

Mr. Clay hoped that this motion would not be insisted on, and, if insisted on, would not prevail. The object in view was to present the simple, unmixt proposition whether the Executive has the power to employ the money of the country in constructing roads; if associated with the company proposed, (the amendment) it would make the sense of the committee equivocal on the important question presented by the motion of Mr. Trimble. For that motion, Mr. Clay said, he meant to vote. It would declare that by a formal act that it was competent, by the grants of power, for Congress to authorize such works. Mr. Clay said he thought Congress had been wanting in its duty in delaying so long to legislate on this subject. It was proper to pass a bill and present it to the President, and if he refused to sanction it, then, Mr. Clay declared, he had no hesitation in avowing he should be ready to proceed to hostilities with the President on this point, and withhold every appropriation until he conceded the point.

That was in January, 1819. Another argument has been made use of in regard to the exercise of the negative of the President, which it seems to me is without foundation; that is, that he has the right to judge at all times and under all circumstances of the character of the legislation that he shall veto. Where this power is used upon a bill that he judges to be unconstitutional, or is hasty, unwise, or improper legislation, then it is very clear that he has this right, and he ought to have it. But when in the history of this Government was he ever called upon to do or did any President ever veto a repealing statute? When, where, under what circumstances, in what condition of affairs, did the President of the United States ever veto a bill that repealed a law which clothed him with power and took it from the people? When and where did any President of the United States ever veto a bill to repeal a law that gave to him control to send troops to the places of election with the power to coerce the people and take from them their rights? When and where has the President ever vetoed a bill giving the people of this country any of their liberties, or repealing a statute which took from them their rights? There are none such, and the people will never sustain such action.

The Executive negative practically refers the question to the people, and to them we and he must appeal. This power never was intended to be used to keep a yoke on the people or to destroy a repealing statute. Ordinarily the people sustain vetoes. Why? Because of the refusal by the Executive to accept power wrung from the people; but suppose you reverse this and by your repealing statute give to the Executive more power, which power is wrung from the States and the people, then there comes an entirely different question; and I tell Senators that we can face the ultimate tribunal of the people in denying supplies to the Executive power on a bill which gives back to them a great cardinal right. In such a case we will have the old question of kingly prerogative against popular right; and upon that issue we can go to the people with perfect confidence and safety.

But it is not a strange argument that the legislative power which controls the purse, and through that the sword, has no right to say how troops are to be used; that the legislative power is not to have any control over this subject? It seems to me this is a very singular argument. The purse was given to the legislative power to control the sword, and they go together, and the rights and the liberties of this people are to be taken care of by their immediate representatives and the representatives of the States in this Chamber as the legislative power of the country, and when an attempt is made to coerce them from an effort to restore to the people their plain, clear rights, a new issue is made up, and one that we can very well place ourselves upon.

Sir, the veto power never was intended and never has been used to deprive the people of free elections or to strike down any other of the cardinal rights of a free people. When it is used for such a purpose we may with implicit trust await the verdict of a betrayed and outraged people. If it be to such a result in such a cause the American people are invited, the legislative majority in Congress will aid in writing upon the pages of our history a new and startling proof of the proud determination of American freemen to defend and maintain their own system of free elections.

Sir, we were never called to a plainer

or more imperative duty, and we should be faithless if we faltered in its performance. The restoration of the liberties of the people, of the landmarks of civil liberty; the removal of the burdens that have come to this people from the changed condition which four years of civil war brought upon them; a restoration to them of the rights that that changed condition deprived them of, is our sole purpose in this bill. We have no other. We should not be true to the people if we had any other. No department of this Government has the right to resist our constitutional demand for the repeal of this menace to free government, which it is, as it stands upon the statute-book to-day. Sir, some writer has said our liberties are traceable through one thousand years of English and American history. They are the possessions of those who ever advance, not by senseless clinging to the present, but by holding, repairing, improving, grasping the good of the present, remodeling the political fabric when decay is present, and improving at every step of essential progress.

Many of the best changes of later times have been made in casting aside innovations, removing the debris that time and tyranny have fastened upon the sturdy base, and in advancing by falling back upon original principles. The great charter, the petition of right, the bill of rights, and the Declaration of Independence contained nothing new in either. They were but the reassertion of the old, the reassertion of the rights of the people. In all great political struggles it is not new laws or new principles that prevail and give form, force, and coherence to the victorious party, but better redress of grievances, more faithful observance of laws, and a restoration of the rights and privileges of the masses which by neglect or from oppression or misuse have become lost, obscured, or denied. This great right of free elections has been menaced, obscured, and denied.

The disputed section of this bill is an effort by the legislative power of this Congress to return to original principles. This great right menaced by these statutes, the control of which never belonged to the Federal Government but always has belonged to the people and the States, has been menaced, obscured, and denied, and the disputed section in this bill is simply an effort by the legislative power of this Congress to return to original principles; its purpose is to restore the military to strict subordination to the civil power, to permit a free system of laws to be based again upon a free ballot everywhere, and to expunge from the statute-book a menace to free institutions.

Vassar's Vexations.

ELOPEMENT OF A MILLIONAIRE'S DAUGHTER WITH A POOR YOUNG MAN.

The latest elopement case arises in Philadelphia, and has come to light in the newspapers, though it has been the talk of the upper circles ever since it took place—about three weeks ago. The father of the girl is one of the best known business men in this city. He is reported to be worth \$2,000,000. The Merchant's Exchange Bank—one of the few State banks now in existence—he is not only President of, but he is virtually its owner, but few shares of its stock being held outside of himself. He is well known all over the country as one of the first and now one of the most extensive manufacturers of the fertilizer known as the superphosphate of lime. For the business he has a large warehouse on Delaware avenue, below Chestnut street, and very extensive works on Cooper's creek, Camden. He is also the owner of what is known as Moro Phillips' wharf, a valuable property on the Delaware river. Upon the wharf he has erected a large warehouse, which is plainly used for the storage of crude sugar. He is also the proprietor of the Hotel Lafayette, a six-story structure erected at the advent of the Centennial at Broad and Sansom streets, across the way from the Union League Club House.

About two years ago Moro Phillips sent his daughter Minnie to Vassar College, the New York female seminary celebrated for its romantic escapades and gymnastic exercises. Among the many young ladies that she met there, she selected as her bosom friend Mary Hillosten, the daughter of a New York tradesman, residing at No. 479 West Twenty-second street. Mary Hillosten was full of praise of her brother, and in the course of the strong friendship that sprang up between the two girls, Minnie Phillips had eternally dined into her ears the many accomplishments of William Hillosten. During the various holidays the girls exchanged visits, the New York tradesman's daughter being entertained at Mr. Phillips' in this city, and Minnie Phillips stopping for a time in New York with her new-made friend.

During one of these latter visits Miss Phillips became acquainted with William Hillosten, who is said to be rather handsome and a dashing sort of a fellow. The usual result followed. The young man proposed, but the cruel father had grander intentions. The young girl met her lover in the street and hid to the railroad depot hotly pursued. Both sets, pursuers and pursued, rode toward New York, but the young couple skipped off at a way station, and were married by a country justice. The indignant father of the girl when he arrived on the ground found it too late.

This was three weeks ago. Yesterday, however, the young lady came out of her father-in-law's and husband's house quietly and stepped into a carriage, accompanied by her father, and drove to the steamer and sailed for Europe, leaving the bridegroom behind.

Philadelphia society is upset by what they term a mesalliance, and it is thought that the trip to Europe is only to give time and opportunity for divorce proceedings.

Benjamin Rush Clark, Republican Representative from the Fifth district of Iowa, died suddenly at his quarters at the National Hotel, in Washington, Sunday afternoon, after an illness of only a few hours' duration.

An exchange says: By the bursting of kerosene lamps many lives have been sacrificed and even cities have been destroyed. A tablespoonful of salt in the oil will make it as non-explosive as water.

Sir, we were never called to a plainer

The Principle of It.

From the Washington Post.

It required only eighty bayonets, sent to the polls in Philadelphia in 1868, to arouse the entire population of Pennsylvania, irrespective of party, to a lofty height of indignation.

The manly protest of her Republican governor expressed the unanimous sentiment of her people. With one voice—a clear, earnest, ringing utterance—all the sovereigns of the Keystone State spoke out against a repetition of what they deemed an insulting interference with their local affairs, and an insolent doubt of their capacity for self government. A single bayonet, a solitary soldier under the orders of the Government, undertaking to "protect the ballot-box" in Philadelphia, would have excited the same bitter feeling, and called forth an equally vehement protest.

It is the principle involved in this question, not the number of troops employed, that arouses opposition.

The traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race evolved from the lessons of history, are all arrayed in implacable hostility to the interference of the military in civic concerns. Added to this there is the natural feeling of insult and degradation that every honorable man experiences when he is subjected to surveillance, and that agitates every community in this country, when told, by an act more expressive than words, that they are incapable of self-government without the actual presence of brute force in its highest of expression.

We are told that this sort of talk is mere sentimentalism; that the soldier at the polls harms no one, and that only the disturber of the public peace need fear.

Well, every great movement that has checked tyranny and preserved what there is of freedom in the world has been equally sentimental.

It was not the money that the men of 1776 were required to pay for the royal stamps, but the principle on which the stamp tax was based that proved their righteous wrath and gave birth to the Declaration of Independence. It was not so much the cruelty of laws made by the Parliament of England, as the fact that the colonies had no voice in that Parliament, that impelled our fathers to throw off their allegiance.

Those stern men of the Revolution were "mere sentimentalists," according to the modern definition of the term. They cared more for principles than for tangible realities. It was the claim of the right of the King and Parliament to do certain things, not the things done, that plunged them into war with the mother country.

The same sentiment exists to-day. Time has not impaired its force. It is a part of the very nature and being of every manly man of our race.

And the men who have blindly chosen to array their party in opposition to this sentiment will find their leadership declined, their policy repudiated and their arts condemned.

A State Loan.

In accordance with the provisions of a recent act of Legislature, an official call has been issued, inviting proposals for a State loan of \$2,000,000, to be indorsed as follows: "Proposals for Pennsylvania 5 per cent. loan, Proposals for Pennsylvania 4 1/2 per cent. loan." Said proposals will be received for the \$2,000,000, which bonds are registered and reimbursable in fifteen years from the 1st day of August, A. D. 1879, and payable in twenty-five years, and bearing interest at the rate of 5 per centum per annum and 4 1/2 per centum semi-annually, on the first days of February and August of each day. The loan will be awarded the bidders for the 4 1/2 or 5 per centum bonds, or a part to each, as may appear for the best interests of the Commonwealth.

The bonds will be dated May 15, 1879, and interest will be paid on August 1, 1879, for the two and a-half months then due, and thereafter semi-annually on the first days of February and August. No bids for less than par will be considered. The bonds will be issued in sums of one hundred, five hundred, and one thousand dollars, to be free from state, municipal or local taxes, as the act provides.

The proposals will be received at the state treasury department at Harrisburg, until noon, May 15, and must be accompanied with a deposit of 5 per cent. on the amount bid for, as an evidence of the good faith of the bidder.

ANOTHER INCREDIBLE NEVADA STORY.—The fossilized remains of a gigantic prehistoric man has been discovered 200 feet beneath the earth's surface in a cave recently opened in the Kit Carson mines near Eureka. The lower limbs, head and neck were as those of the Cardiff Giant (?) and in some respects the traces of the human feature were plainly marked. That they have found the remains of some prehistoric being is beyond question. One of the lower extremities was broken off and is now on exhibition at Jack Perry's saloon, where it has been examined by numerous people recently, those posted in the anatomy of the human frame pronouncing it a wonderful petrification, the minor points all being perfect to nature.—Eureka (Nev.) Leader.

The Massachusetts papers state that the migration of Southern negroes has already perceptibly affected the business interests of that State, large orders for the coarse goods used by plantation hands having been countermanded by Mississippi and Louisiana dealers. An advance in sugar and heavy purchases of raw cotton are also noted, both caused by an anticipated decrease of product this year. The relations of trade between the North and South are so intimate that one section cannot be injured without the injury being felt by the other. As a rule, whatever is good for one section benefits the other, and vice versa.

"Where there cats in the ark?" is a question that is troubling the religious editor of an exchange. Certainly there were, and the first thing they said after leaving the ancient craft was "If there is Ararat round here we want to gopher it."

Don't leave your horse stand on the street unhitched.