The Bradford Reporter.

E. O. GOODRICH, Publisher. REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER. $2 per Annum, in Advance.

VOLUME XXVII. TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., AUGUST 2, 1866. NUMBER 10.

TERMS OF PUBLICATION.

The REPORTER is published every Thursday Morning, by E. O. GOODRICH, at $2 per annum, in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS exceeding fifteen lines are inserted at TEN CENTS per line for first insertion, and FIVE CENTS per line for subsequent insertions Special notices inserted before Marriages and Deaths, will be charged FIFTEEN CENT. per line for each insertion All resolutions of Associations; communications of limited or individual interest, and notices of Marriages and Deaths exceeding five lines, are charged TEN CENTS per line.

	1 Year.	6 mo.	3 mo.
One Column,	$75	$40	$30
¼	40	25	15
One Square,	10	7½	5

Estray, Caution, Lost and Found, and other advertisements, not exceeding 15 lines, three weeks, or less, $1 50
Administrator's and Executor's Notices 2 00
Auditor's Notices 2 50
Business Cards, five lines, (per year) 5 00

Merchants and others, advertising their business will be charged $20. They will be entitled to a column, confined exclusively to their business, with privilege of change.

Advertising in all cases exclusive of subscription to the paper.

JOB PRINTING of every kind in Plain and Fancy colors, done with neatness and dispatch. Handbills, Blanks, Cards, Pamphlets, &c., of every variety and style, printed at the shortest notice. The REPORTER OFFICE has just been re-fitted with Power Presses, and every thing in the Printing line can be executed in the most artistic manner and at the lowest rates. TERMS INVARIABLY CASH.

Political.

THE BRAVE BOYS IN BLUE.

A CAMPAIGN SONG.

Respectfully Dedicated to the Pennsylvania "Boys in Blue."

AIR—RED, WHITE, AND BLUE.

We come from the hill and the mountain
To stand by the flag of the free,
And rivers that roll from the fountain,
And swell on their way to the sea;
From forges where hammers are ringing
The vows of the brave and the true;
For GEARY, we all gather singing,
Three cheers for the Brave Boys in Blue.

CHORUS.

Three cheers for the Brave Boys in Blue!
Three cheers for the Brave Boys in Blue!
For GEARY we all gather singing,
Three cheers for the Brave Boys in Blue!

We come from the plain and the valley,
From furnace, and foundry, and mine,
And round our bold leader we rally,
While "fighting it out on the line;"
Our banner we will not surrender,
But here our devotion renew,
For GEARY, the Union defender,
The choice of the Brave Boys in Blue.
CHORUS—The choice of the Brave, etc.,

On treason we've all put a stopper,
And back to "the last ditch" it rolls,
The Iron Boys don't carry "copper,"
When forward they march to the polls;
They stand by the Union forever,
And GEARY, the bold and the true;
No foeman the Union can sever,
When kept by the Brave Boys in Blue!
CHORUS—When kept by the Brave, etc.

—*Wm. Oland Bourne.*

TO THE HON. EDGAR COWAN.

DEAR SIR—I trust you will not take it amiss in me, if, in a frank, and not unfriendly spirit, I animadvert, in a general way, on your present political position. I am constrained to this from a sense of duty, and not so much on your account, as that of others over whom your political action has influence. I take this step the more freely too, because, like yourself, I am an old Whig, and, if your position on the duties of the hour is right, I have very much mistaken the early teachings imbibed in the whig party.

Allow me to premise further, by saying, that I have read with care most of your late speeches, and that they fail to satisfy. As forensic displays, they are doubtless good, evincing comprehensive intelligence, aptness and power, but to me, they appear to lack conscience. They are the able lawyer's pleas for the acquittal of those whom he knows to be guilty, and, especially is this the case of that on the Civil Rights Bill. It is logical and eloquent, indeed, has all elements of the skillful debator, but it is deficient in soundness. The just constructions of the law are overlooked, while the constrained and improbable are held up to view, and no one knows better than yourself that the provisions of all statutes are liable to perversion; that perversion is unfair, and that if we wait for perfection in human laws, we will never have any.

In your reply to Mr. Howard, and against the proposition to amend the Constitution, it seems to me, your logic is greatly at fault; and my sole object in referring to this, is, to show you how far estray a delusion may lead even the ablest. For, I am almost certain, you would not assume a position so untenable, if zeal for your wrong course did not blind you.

You hold, in that speech, that we should make no effort to keep the Southern people from getting into power again, and that there is no danger to be apprehended from them, because a common interest will keep them in order. Now why does not the interest which all have in society, keep down crime? and why did this common interest not keep the Southern people in order before? They had as much interest in peace before they made war, as now, yet they did not preserve it. What ground, therefore, have you for saying they will *now*?

Again. If, as you say, it is wrong to protect ourselves against a repetition of Southern folly and wickedness, it must be wrong in society to punish crime to protect itself. According to this theory, if your corn and horses are stolen, it is wrong in you to lock your premises in order to secure your possessions. You insist on it, that it is not right to punish the thief, and still a greater wrong to hinder his depredations. Is this not queer logic to come from a lawyer, and a United States Senator? And if it is not a blind theory, I am at a loss to know what it is.

In assuming that the majority in Congress alone are responsible for the radicalism which obtains in the country, you make a grave mistake. Nineteen-twentieths of the republicans of the nation, are more extreme on what you call radicalism, than the congressional leaders of whom you complain so much. The people—and if you please, the old whigs among them—want Treason made odious by disgraceful punishment. They want rebels kept out of franchises, and out of all influence in the government they labored so hard to destroy; and these views are constantly pressed upon republican Congressmen. If they disregard, or oppose them, these members of Congress will become as unpopular, with republicans, as you are. The reason, too, for these extreme notions of the masses, is obvious. They see, daily, men punished with extreme rigor for theft, arson and murder; yet because these crimes have been carried on for years, and to a fearful extent by the Southern people, there is a disposition manifested in certain quarters, to acquit them entirely of punishment, especially the ring-leaders. This, the people say, is *because they are* the "big men." If they were "poor little men," they would surely suffer. Hence arises the desire to see equal justice meeted to all.

You were elected to the very high and responsible position of Senator of the United States, as an opponent of the democratic party, and you could not have been so elected, had you not been recognised as such. Now, however, nineteen out of every twenty of the opponents of the democrats of the state, who acquiesced in your election, object to your public action, while the democrats as generally approve it. So there is a radical change somewhere. Either your former political friends have changed, or you have, and which is it? Probabilities favor the latter alternative. For it is not likely that so large a number of men as constitutes the republican party of this State—nay, of the United States—would simultaneously desert a political faith, yet individual changes are common occurrences. Besides, the fact that the democrats, and the republicans, as partizan organizations, occupy, relatively, the same position now as when you were elected, goes far towards showing that you are in a different attitude. For, if you have not changed, both these whole organizations have; and who does not know better?

In this position of antagonism to the republican party, you contend that you are right, and the party is wrong. I propose to examine this question. But first, you seem to forget to practice, in your party obligations, on the lesson of submission to the will of the majority, you have lately given. The chief reason why submission to the will of the majority is inculcated, is because, as a rule, the majority is right; and if this holds good in one case, it does in another. So that in the outset, the inferential deduction is, that you are wrong, and that the party is right.

But, the great difficulty with you seems to be the abolitionism of the republican party, or, the abolitionism of its recognized leaders. It does seem a little singular that an old whig, one who, with his party, resisted the Texas Annexation outrage, the annulment of the Missouri Compromise, the brutal assault upon Sumner, and other aggressive measures of slavery propagandists, should leave his party on questions growing out of the abolition of slavery, forced, as it was, upon the country. As a party, the whigs objected to slavery because it was wrong in itself, believing that it had a pernicious influence on the whites among whom it existed, and that it begat class distinctions, and sectional animosities. True, they did believe also, that neither the General Government, or the people of the free states, had any right to interfere with slavery where it was established; but they believed further still, and that was, that the Government had a right to prevent its extension, and this as well by the inculcations of the Missouri compromise of the early days of the republic, as by the general duty to oppose all deleterious influences in society, and Government; and that one thus educated, should object to abolitionism in any form it can now present itself to an American citizen, when in self-defense, and to save its own existence, the Government was compelled to abrogate slavery, is a great marvel to your former political associates.

I am led to infer from your action in the premises, that you think, since the slaveholders have rebelled, and butchered our people by the hundred thousands, there is not so much evil in slavery as when whigs opposed it for the reason that it was wrong. Or, is an evil in society, and in Government, of less moment to you now?

I hold, in common with nine-tenths of the old whig party, that as slavery in itself was wrong, and had a pernicious influence, it was the duty of that party to uphold a measure abrogating it, *provided, this action did not interfere with the rights of any class in community.* If, under such circumstances, the whigs did not approve of the abolition of slavery, they would most grossly belie their former professions. Then I hold, too, as do nearly all the other old whigs, that by waring against the Government, and the majority of the states, and the people, as they did, the slave-holders *lost their right to hold slaves*, and every other right they held under the Constitution, even to that of their lives. Nor does your version of the cause of the rebellion, viz: that the abolitionists provoked the south to rebel (having in this adopted the democratic theory) change the fact. If A spits in B's face, and B thereupon murders A, B loses his means of redress, his personal liberty, and may be his life. So that whigs must now be abolitionists from the very necessities which surround them.

We must not forget that President Lincoln abolished slavery as a war, and not as a party measure: that he was willing to save the country, with, or without slavery: and that the latter, at last, seemed to him, the only alternative. To this, almost all the whigs said amen. I fear you did not say amen. You loved slavery better than the country. The great wrong of attempting, through rivers of the best blood of the nation, its division, and thereby its destruction, was not so serious in your eyes, as the supposed violation of the Constitution in abolishing slavery. Oh no, it would not be a great wrong to steal and to burn a man's property, and do whatever else human ingenuity and wickedness could contrive, to ruin and kill him; but it would be a grave wrong, an unenduring wrong, in the poor man to defend himself! Let me tell you, that the masses of the old whig party consider this monstrous doctrine; and that they have but little regard for the misguided mortal who regulates himself by it. They can not understand how it is that the Constitution can hinder the Government from saving its own existence.—The Bible is our guide to Eternal Life; yet skeptics fly to it to prove that there is no such thing; and the Constitution is the life of our Government, yet when men have a folly, or an absurdity to prove in our system of civil polity, they fly to the Constitution. The former, however, are about as successful in misleading the christian world as the latter are in making the liberty-loving masses of this country believe that their Constitution is nothing more than the hand-book of demagogues.

Why is it that the masses of the old whig party, now mostly republicans, sided with President Lincoln in his determination to free, and afterwards, equally settled purpose to maintain the freedom of the slaves! Simply because they saw the necessity, and the utility of the measure, nearly as soon as he did. So that in this, he was only the exponent of the mind of his party. For times of peace, the plank in the Chicago Platform against interference with slavery was very well: but dreadful war came, and the old plank in our platform against that stupendous evil, which the fathers of the party had placed there, promised relief when relief was sadly needed. The people saw this, and our great leader had the sagacity to see it also, and he gave the order the people wanted, and the Government needed. You, on the other hand, see in this changing of a plank from the back to the front side of our platform, the grave of the Constitution. As if changing a wind-shredded sail, or broken mast, in a dire emergency, for a sound one, was endangering the craft; or, as if saving the Government was not saving the Constitution. But few, however, saw as you did, and perhaps this has vexed you into opposition.

As your former political associates understand your present position, you are allowing their opponents to use you to promote their political schemes.

In the first place, a sharp politician, who makes use of politics to advance individual interests, or aspirations, usually looks upon such conduct as suicidal; and in the next place, a man assuming to represent a party, and take care of its interests, i i any given position, has no right to do otherwise. In a moral light, our Ministers to England and France, have as much right to use their respective positions, and the influence they carry with them, to promote English and French interests. You would regard such conduct in our representatives abroad, as monstrous. Yet you attempt to justify the betrayal of your party; and while the attempt may, in your estimation, have doubtless lessened its enormity in your own eyes, they have failed to do so for the eyes of your immediate constituents. When you could no longer sustain the policy of the Government, and the party whose interests you had agreed to uphold, you should have resigned the place the party had given you. This would not only have been right, but it would have brought you great reward as a man of integrity. As it is, the award is, that you are not an honest politician. There may be one in ten, or one in twenty, of your former political friends, who do not subscribe to this verdict, but this will not save you. Remember, John Tyler persuaded himself, and about the same proportion of his old associates, that he was right, yet no public man of our country, save James Buchanan, sank to a lower depth, and under a heavier load of odium, although he had the mighty Daniel Webster as one of his supporters.

But further. As a whig you opposed the democratic party because it was wrong. I oppose it for the same reason now. You affect to believe that abolitionists are worse and turn to resisting them, instead of the country's common enemy.

You know very well, that from the beginning to the end of the war, the very men of whose public action you complain, were true to the interests of the country. They fought the enemy in the forum and in the field. They it was who would not compromise with rebels; and on their line of policy the country was saved. Men may mar, or try to hide this fact, but it is still the truth; and, if, as you allege, the abolitionists were enemies of the country before the war, why should we reject them when they become its friends? We always believed the democrats were wrong; but those of that party who turned to defend the country in its peril, were hailed with joy. The whole loyal population lauded them, and they deserved it. They were obliged, in this action, to turn on their political associates, deserving therefor more credit than we, who were in the line of duty while in the line of bias. You would then give these democrats credit for doing right in this emergency; but from Sumner, Stevens and Lovejoy, and their associates, and whom years ago we thought equally wrong with the democrats, you would withhold this meed of praise. Where is the fairness of this? On the other hand, the loyal people applaud this latter class of men as well as Stanton, Dix, Holt, Butler and their compeers; and this is right. The masses, and the old whigs among them, have no personal partialities, and no animosity to indulge, in respect to the true friends of the country Nor can you, with all your adroitness, make them believe that the men who have given such evidence of devotion to the true interests of the country, in her hours of terrible need, are now centralizing power for the purpose of abusing it. In my way of thinking, this attempt will recoil with fearful fold on you for so far forgetting that which is due to right.

The rebellion was *not* put down on the line of policy marked out by you, and I have wondered whether personal pique, or envy of those men who were more fortunate in this particular, has not had some thing to do in leading you to change your base. McClellan changed his base from fighting the enemy to quarreling with the Government—which had made him all he was—and that change was his ruin. Your action looks to me not dissimilar, while a striking similitude is apparent in the accruing results.

It is notorious that small things will some times control the most important actions of men's lives, even of great men: Napoleon Bonaparte declared war against Russia, and followed it up by leading an immense army to Moscow to be immolated by a Russian winter, because his pride was wounded by the Emperor Alexander's refusal to give him his sister in marriage. The French Emperor gave very different reasons for this war; but the reader of history sees very plainly that had he been true to his first love, Josephine and his inward promptings, would have counselled him from the path that led directly to ruin; and may there not be some personal motive actuating you in this juncture?

While the considerations thus far hinted at, have some weight in producing the general condemnation which has gone out against you from the republicans, they are still *not* the chief causes of complaint.—Your efforts to organize a third party in this State, is clearly designed to aid the democrats to power; and it is here where your conduct appears the most reprehensible to the old whigs.

Why did you formerly oppose the democratic party? You cannot have forgotten its past history, and the reasons why whigs opposed it. I have not. Democrats say that abolitionists provoked the southern people to rebellion, and it is the ground on which they justify their sympathy for rebels; and while you know very well that there are no sympathizers with rebels outside the democratic party, you seem to acquiesce in their theory by a very general, and nearly as spiteful a denunciation of the abolition leaders in Congress. Am I to infer from this, that you have not known, forgotten, or choose to hide the whig theory of the rebellion? Let me remind you of this as I understand it.

You can not have forgotten that the democratic party had its origin in the early societies of that name, which so much troubled the administration of George Washington. The "Whisky Insurrection," to suppress which, the President was compelled to call out 15,000 soldiers, was as much the work of the leaders of the democratic societies of that day, as was the late mob resistance to the draft in New York City, and other parts of the country, the work of the leaders of the democratic party of the present day. There can be no doubt of this. So that this rebellion during the presidency of Washington, was, in reality, a democratic rebellion. Nor can it have slipped your mind, that it required all the wisdom, and all the influence Washington possessed, t protect the Government from the sinister machinations of these democratic societies, during the last half of the first, and the whole of the last term of his administration; and that had any one of less administrative power, less firmness, and less influence, been at the head of affairs, in all likelihood, an effort would have been made to overturn the Government by these societies, fomented into fo Jacobin Genet.

The rebellious demonstrations made against the Excise Law, in the counties of Northumberland, Bucks and Montgomery, in this State, had the same origin; and in the contest betw en the federalists and the democrats for the election of a President in 1801, leading democrats threatened to arm the people, if the federalists did a thing they never thought of doing, the obvious interpretation of the threat being, that if Jefferson was not elected President, the party would arm for rebellion. These were the early seeds of the rebellion we have just subdued, and came upon us too, because the democrats failed to elect a President. Moreover, it is pretty well settled now, that all the lawless violence of the democratic opposition to Washington's administration, and to the elder Adams, was adopted to secure political power, and make the opposition odious to the people. This part of democratic inculcations has ever since been faithfully followed up. To defeat an opponent, or a measure of the opposition, law or right were never regarded. Democrats believed their party to be right, therefore, it was right to do anything to uphold it; and mobs, riots and rebellions, have been the result, from the days of its inception to the closing of the great rebellion. The Whisky and the Excise Insurrections, the South Carolina Tariff-Law rebellion, the Dorr rebellion, the Buck-Shot war, the Slaveholders rebellion, and the late resistance to the Draft in Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois and New York City, were the fruits of democratic teaching. How can it be otherwise? A party teaching its votaries to resist by violence opposition to its men and measures, must secure violence as a consequence, and I aver, therefore, that the late rebellion was the legitimate result, positively the culmination of the doctrines and practices of the democratic party. Every one familiar with its history, and capable of giving an unbiased opinion, must come to this conclusion.

It is worthy of note too, that the abominable precepts and practices of that party, as evolved in its administration of the Government, would long since have overturned our system of civil polity, had it not been that the severe industry, and practical genius of our people, their increase, aided by immigration, so swelling wealth and population, as to absorb the public attention, and thus hinder the irritating causes of mal administration, from swelling into magnitude. That also, which materially aided this fortunate condition of the people, was the fact, that the opposition to the democratic party, always powerful in intelligence and numbers, constantly counselled obedience to law, and it was by means such as these, that the country was saved so long.

No better proof of the truthfulness of these statements, need be adduced, than is furnished in the condition of the country, just previous to the breaking out of the late rebellion. Starvation prices for labor and its products, were the order of the day, North as well as South. The people were in debt and restless, moving Westward and Southward, while in the south, the whig party—always the advocate of submission to law—had been completely crushed out, all growing out of democratic rule in the general as in the state governments, so that the mad counsels of slaveholders were left free to act upon an unquiet people, and the result was a rebellion This could not have been consummated if the people had been in prosperity, and the whig party had been in full organization and influence.

While holding these opinions of the democratic party, it is but fair to say, that few if any of its votaries, saw its tendencies in the light here presented, but rather viewing it as the best exponent of the principles of our republican form of government, and followed its fortunes for this reason; but this does not prove that the baleful tendencies here hinted at did not exist, and whigs saw and pointed them out many years ago.

This then, is the rational, and the whig theory of the causes of the rebellion, so far as causes outside of slavery effected and aided in bringing it on. Slavery was the pretext, and the immediate instrument of it, but democratic doctrines and practices had demoralized the sentiments of the people towards the government, and made a rebellion possible, and upon no other hypothesis can the fact be accounted for, that a few desperate leaders were able so grossly to mislead and abuse four millions of the people of this country, as were the southern people in the case of this rebellion. For, if slavery alone misled and corrupted the southern people, how comes it, that the democrats north, with few exceptions, agreed in sentiment with, and were as much in favor of rebellion, as those of the south? Slavery did not make rebels of these, but democratic precepts did just as they did in the south. In further proof of this view of the case, I may well ask, what other party in this country has produced such a trio of discontented spirits, as those of Aaron Burr, J. C. Calhoun, and J. C. Breckenridge. These are fair exponents of the tendencies of the Democratic party, from its rise to its fall. Yet you, familiar with all this, adopt the thesis of our opponents, false and insatisfactory as it is in its conditions, and why? I fear more as a justification for your defection, than as a belief it its correctness.—And it is this opponent of ours, the democratic party, after its sinister policy and unwise measures have culminated in one of the boldest, most formidable, destructive, and causeless rebellions, with which any nation was ever afflicted, and whose precepts and practices you had been taught must so result, that you now coalesce with, in order that it may again secure power, and which you must know will end in further evil to the nation. Sir, this is a grevious wrong, and one that will load you with more odium than you can withstand successfully.

When the war commenced the northern democrats were separated from their southern associates by the military lines of the two armies, and the south organized for itself. Now however, the obstructing lines are down, and these respective divisions of this party organization, are preparing for re-union, chiefly from partizan considerations. Old sympathies, and common affinities, to be sure, are attracting them together; but the hopelessness of political success, from separate action, makes a union a necessity, and the party, in view of these temptations, expects any thing else. So for all political purposes, the northern and southern democrats must be considered a unit.

Suppose then, that the democrats, with your aid, that of President Johnson, and other defections from the republican ranks, succeed in making a majority of the people of the United States believe, that the republican party is an unsafe custodian of the government, resulting in the election of a democratic President and congress, for the next term. Such a contingency does not now appear to me to be probable, but, it is possible, and if it should occur, the southern democrats will furnish the largest number of electors and congressmen. This, of right, will give them the preponderance in this new administration, and under it, what will they claim? I think they will desire a restoration of slavery, and will make an effort to that end; and as their allies, the northern democrats, are not opposed to slavery, there will not be many serious obstacles in their way, you may not agree with me in this. Then, I think they will attempt to make the general government responsible for the confederate debt. Here too, you may demur. But, without further speculation as to the probable purposes of the southern democrats, should they soon again become masters of our government, allow me to advert briefly to this question of the confederate debt. This debt is variously estimated, but that the total amount of it is enormous can not be doubted; and it is held, for the most part, by the ruling class of the south. Now is it reasonable to suppose, that the holders of this debt, with their wasted estates, their general poverty and helplessness, will make no effort to recover their losses in the confederate debt, in the event of again securing power? I would not believe this of the northern people, and certainly their morality in respect of the government, is better than that of the southern. In short I would believe it of no people. Yes sir, just so soon as the south gets the control of the general government, just so soon will the entire political, monied, and social power of the south, be brought to bear on this question. There can be no doubt of this; and if it can not be reached in any other way, the one half of this debt will be converted into a corruption fund. The holders of the Confederate bonds will readily give a moiety to make safe the remainder, and what Congress, where parties are nearly balanced, can withstand a corruption fund of two or three thousand millions! Is the thought of this not frightful? and can any man, having the least regard for the public weal, contemplate it without apprehension? Remember, that if the history of the democratic party proves any thing, it is, that it stands at nothing when partizan interests are to be served. Does any one suppose that a party that would make the efforts which the democrats have made to break up the Government, would make any scruples about running it further into debt. So that whether the proposed amendment to the constitution, forever barring the assumption of the rebel debt, and compensation for manumitted slaves, be passed or not, it will all be the same. If this amendment should be ratified by enough states to make it part of our organic law, there will be allegations of illegal forms, or some other exceptions taker to the action of some of the states, on which to found an excuse for annulling it. Only give them the power and it will be done; and no sane man, who is not a democrat, thinks otherwise. Depend upon it sir, we have no security against this, save in the present overwhelming republican majority in Congress. Should it be much decreased there would be danger: but as it is, the corruption fund of former slave-holders, and all, will be unavailing.

Nor will the idea, that ruin to all must follow the addition of the rebel debt to our own, effect this contemplated action of the democracy. For, while it may for a time very much depress the public securities, they will, nevertheless, rise again to par.—This supposed legislation may take a decade to accomplish, and if the wonted prospects of this country continues uninteruptedly for two decades, the public debt, with that of the rebels added, will hardly be felt.

Then how stands the question of slavery? Will a people who have so lavishly sacrificed all for that institution, yield it up without further effort? I do not believe this, and, aside from any expressions of feeling or sentiment, manifested on the subject, since the war, we have the force of the habits and customs of a people, to which they have been trained for more than a century, and on which the strong passions of cupidity, ambition, love of ease, authority, education and prejudice have centered, to encounter; and the man who says these combined will not control human action, has yet to learn its mainsprings. So that if the South secures power while her strong convictions in favor of slavery last, it follows to a certainty, that she will make efforts for its re-establishment, and this will bring back to our halls of legislation the disgraceful scenes of the past between the impassioned men for and against slavery. Do you desire this? Are you so indifferent to the harmony of the councils of our government, the peace and prosperity of our people, as to have no concern on this head? Why sir, if for no other reason, if the positive wrongs of slavery had no influence to this end, duty would prompt me—and I should think would prompt every one—to be an abolitionist, merely to hinder such a consummation; and this too, independent of the reason that another such a dreadful war as we have had, must follow. For my life then, I can not see how any right-minded man, much more one educated in the whig ranks, can see or feel otherwise.

Such then are the calamities which your public conduct invokes upon the country, and superinduced as it is, by personal considerations alone, the result is the same whether these are of a public or a private nature. If you have been led in this direction by convictions of duty, you can not have had a clear perception, either of the healthful tendencies of the old whig doctrines, or the more glaring revolutionary intuitions of the democratic party. And that what seems to me surprising in your conduct, is the fact, that while patriotic and honest democrats are leaving that old organization (and they have always been doing this) by the score, and as fast as they discover its reckless tendencies, and mischievous practices [illegible] but it is in accordance with the sentiment that it is "alike safe to entrust the government with either of the great parties of the country." Political principles hanging so loosely on a man, he can have no deep convictions of duty on the subject, and is therefore unsafe. He will serve any party, and any equally indifferently. I, on the other hand, have opposed the democratic party, because in my heart-of-hearts, I believed its doctrines, practices, and tendencies dangerous to the stability of the government, and my whole life (of little account to be sure) has been guided by this conviction. This too, I believe is the case with the old whig masses. Sure I am, that without deep and honest convictions, no man can amount to any thing, and no party can long exist without it.

This being the stand-point from which I view your political conduct, I trust you will see reasons for justifying the liberty I have taken. We are apt to think the man wise who agrees with us, and him the fool only who differs, but in whatever light you may regard my disapproval, I wish you to bear in mind, that it is not in anger but in sorrow that it is made manifest.

I am sir,
With considerations in the highest degree respectful, Your Obedient Servant,
E. GUYER.

HIGHLAND, Bradford Co., Pa., July 26, 1866.

Miscellaneous.

NEVER TRAVELED.—A good story is told of an old lady who lived near Rochester, who had never seen or traveled on a railroad. Wanting to go on a visit to a small town a short distance from the city, she thought she would try one of the "pesky things." So she went to the ticket office, carrying her reticule on one arm, and an old fashioned rocking chair on the other. She bought her ticket, walked out on the platform, put down her rocking chair, sat down in it, took out her knitting, and went to work diligently. Steadily she rocked, and worked, trains coming in and leaving, as the car times came round. The old lady made no attempt to get on the cars, but kept a knitting.

The day drew to a close and night came on. The last train was about starting when the depot master went up and asked her if she was going out.

"Yes, sir," replied the old lady.

"Hadn't you better get aboard and secure a seat?" said the depot master.

"Thank you, sir, I'm very comfortable," replied the elderly dame.

The train left. The depot master came around again. "Madam, I shall have to disturb you, it is late, the trains have all left, and we must close the depot. Shall I send you to a hotel?"

"Well," exclaimed the old lady, dropping her knitting and holding up her hands, "ain't the tarnal thing goin' to move?—Here I brought my chair from home so as to have a seat, on which some pesky man could'nt squeeze himself. I've set here all day waitin' for the thing to go, and here I've had all my trouble for nothing. I thought it was a long time movin' I declare that these here railroads is the biggest nuisances and humbugs as ever was!" and the old lady, with bag on one arm, and rocking chair on the other, gave a toss of her head and marched off in high indignation. She mistook the depot for the cars, and expected to travel in it.

WHY CHILDREN DIE.—The reason why children die is because they are not taken care of. From the day of their birth they are stuffed with food, choked with physic, suffocated in hot rooms, steamed in bed-clothes. So much for indoors. When permitted to breathe a breath of air once a week in summer, and once or twice during the coldest months, only the nose is permitted to peer into daylight. A little later they are sent out with no clothes at all, as to the parts of the body which most need protection. Bare legs, bare arms, bare necks, girted middles, with an inverted umbrella to collect the air and chill the other parts of the body. A stout, strong man goes out on a cold day with gloves and over coat, wollen stockens, and thick doubled-soled boots. The same day a child of three years old, an infant in flesh and blood, and bone and constitution, goes out with soles as thin as paper, cotton socks, legs uncovered to the knees, neck bare; an exposure which would disable the nurse, kill the mother in a fortnight, and make the father an invalid for weeks. And why? To harden them to a mode of dress which they are never expected to practice.

THE VICE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES.—A correspondent desires to know the names of the Vice Presidents of the United States. They are as follow:

1. John Adams, Mass., 1789--1797.
2. Thomas Jefferson, Va., 1797—1801.
3. Aaron Burr, N. Y., 1801—1805.
4. George Clinton, N. Y., 1805—1813.
5. Elbridge Gerry, Mass., 1813. Died in office.
6. Daniel D. Tompkins, N. Y., 1817--1825.
7. John C. Calhoun, S. C., 1825—1833.
8. Martin Van Buren, N. Y., 1833—1837.
9. Richard M. Johnson, Ky., 1837—1841.
10. John Tyler, Va., 1841. Became President by the death of President Harrison.
11. George M. Dallas, Pa., 1845—1849.
12. Milliard Fillmore, N. Y., 1849. Became President by the death of President Taylor.
13. William R. King, Ala., 1853. Died in office.
14. John C. Breckinridge, Ky., 1856—1861.
15. Hannibal Hamlin, Me., 1861—1865.
16. Andrew Johnson, Tenn., 1865. Became President by the death of President Lincoln.

It thus appears from the organization of the Government we have had sixteen Vice Presidents. Of these three became President by the death of the Chief Magistrate. Two Vice Presidents have died in office—Mr. Gerry and Mr. King. Five of the Vice Presidents were afterward President, viz: Adams, Jefferson, Van Buren, Fillmore and Johnson. Three of the Vice Presidents signed the Declaration of Independence, viz: Adams, Jefferson and Gerry. New York has had the Vice Presidency more than any other State, viz: Four years under Burr, eight years under Clinton, eight years under Tompkins, four years under Van Buren, and one year under Fillmore. Total, twenty-five years, or about one-third of the time.

PATERNAL DUTY.—The father who plunges into business so deeply that he has no leisure for domestic duties and pleasures, and whose intercourse with his children consists in a brief word of authority, or surly lamentation over their intolerable expensiveness, is equally to be pitied and to be blamed. What right has he to devote to other pursuits the time which God has allotted to his children? Nor is it any excuse to say that he cannot support his family in their present style of living, without this effort. I ask by what right can his family demand to live in a manner which requires him to [illegible] under obligations to leave them that competence which he desires? Is it an advantage to them to be relieved from the necessity of labor? Besides, is money the only desirable bequest which a father can leave to his children? Surely, well cultivated intellects; hearts sensible to domestic affection; the love of parents, and brethren and sisters; a taste for home pleasures; habits of order and regularity, and industry; hatred of vice and vicious men; and a lively sensibility to the excellence of virtue—are as valuable a legacy as an inheritance of property—simple property purchased by the loss of every habit which could render that property a blessing.

THE SHORTEST SERMON.—Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg's sermon at the funeral of the late Robert B. Minturn, Esq., is the shortest on record, though several are recorded with as few words of the Prophet Micha: "He hath shown thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" And then added: "So did he."

One sermon, having the same number of words, but more letters, was once preached by the Irish Dean Kirwan. He was pressed, while suffering from a severe cold, to preach charity sermon in St. Peter's Church, Dublin, for the benefit of the orphan children of the parish school. The church was crowded to suffocation, and the good Dean, on mounting the pulpit, and announcing his text, pointed with his hand to the children in the aisle, and simply said: "There they are!" The collection on the occasion exceeded all belief.

It was Dean Swift who was to preach a charity sermon; and giving out as a text, "He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth to the Lord," then added: "If you like the security, down with the dust."

A FLEA UNDER A MICROSCOPE.—When the flea is made to appear as large as an elephant we can see all the wonderful parts of its formation, and are astonished to find that it has a coat of armor much more complete than ever a warrior wore, and composed of strong polished plates, fitted over each other, each plate cover like a tortoise shell, and where they meet, hundreds of strong quills project like those on the back of a porcupine or hedge hog. There are the arched neck, the bright eyes, and the transparent cases, piercers to puncture the skin, a sucker to draw away the blood, six long-jointed legs, four of which are folded on the breast all ready at any moment to be thrown out with tremendous force for that jump which bothers one when they want to catch him, and at the end of each leg hooked claws to enable him to cling to whatever he alights upon. A flea can jump a hundred times his own length, which is the same as if a man jumped to the heighth of 800 feet; and he can draw a load of 20 times his own weight.

PEOPLE'S BAROMETERS.—A veteran observer of the weather says:

In the olden times in England, when traveling on horseback was the ordinary means of locomotion, and when the comforts of a good Inn were not willingly parted from to buffet a storm, the following wise saw guided the sojourner for the night, and is equally true in our hemisphere:

"Evening red and morning gray,
Will light the traveller on his way;
But evening gray and morning red,
Will cause the traveller to keep his bed."

With us, when a thin film, almost like the thread of a cobweb, is seen to stretch across the horizon near sunset, it is the sure precursor of foul weather within the next twenty-four hours. When strata of clouds stretch across it, like the closed fingers of the hand, the lower part of each looking darker than the top part, look out for rain in a few hours.

In wet weather, when the edges of the paving stones of the sidewalks, along the joints, show even so narrow a dry slip, clearing uy weather has begun.

How does the hair-dresser end his days? He curls up and dyes.

WOMAN,—an essay on grace, in one volume, elegantly bound.

GENTLEMAN—A manual of good manners, bound in cloth.

A DOGMA is defined as an opinion laid down with a snarl.

OUR vanity is incessantly the enemy of our self-love.

PERFECT integrity and a properly-cooked beef-steak are rare.