



THE COMPILER.

LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION.
GETTYSBURG, PENN'A.
Monday Morning, April 20, 1857.

Democratic State Nominations.

FOR GOVERNOR,
WILLIAM F. PACKER, of Lycoming.
CANAL COMMISSIONER,
NIMROD STRICKLAND, of Chester.

The Connecticut Election.

The very extraordinary Democratic gains exhibited by the returns of the late election in Connecticut, afford a most satisfactory and convincing proof of the great re-acton which has been steadily progressing in the minds of a large body of those who antagonized the Democratic party, in the non-slave-holding States, in November last. In moments of frenzied excitement men are frequently tempted to hope for, and to contribute to producing results, which in the hours of cool reflection they would deeply deplore. Under the operation of such influences, a large body of voters were marshalled up to vote for Fremont who have doubtless since regarded his defeat rather with gratitude than with sorrow. When we consider how peacefully and harmoniously the angry surges of the Presidential strife have subsided, and what heart-felt confidence the whole nation reposes in the wisdom, patriotism and exalted ability of the distinguished statesman who occupies the Presidential Chair, and the superior Cabinet he has called around him, and then contrast all this, with the deplorable evils which would have inevitably resulted from the triumph of the opposition, it is impossible to repress a sentiment of gratitude for the happy result.

At the charter election on Monday, in Cleveland, the Democrats elected their candidate for Mayor by 342 majority, and the balance of their entire municipal ticket by a similar vote. This is a great gain, and shows that "bleeding Kansas" is dead!

Brilliant Democratic Victory in Trenton.—The Democrats of Trenton achieved a brilliant victory at their election on Tuesday, and elected their whole ticket for City Officers by three hundred majority.

Something Rare.—We learn from the Louisville papers, that on the close of the session of the Legislature of that State, a motion was made to allow Mr. A. Warner, Secretary of the Senate, \$500 extra compensation, when that gentleman immediately arose and requested the mover to withdraw it; saying that he accepted the office with a knowledge of the salary, and wanted no more! Here is a bright example of honesty, which we would wish to see imitated by some men who hold office this side of Louisville. But such a thing was never heard of in this region, and we doubt whether it will ever happen.—*Pennsylvanian.*

Col. Rice will refer to the Journals of the House of Pennsylvania, for the session immediately following the close of the Mexican War, he will find a precedent in Pennsylvania for the act he so much admires in the Secretary of the Senate of Kentucky. Gen. BOWMAN, of the *Hollford Gazette*, then Adjutant-General of this Commonwealth, holding his commission by virtue of an appointment from Gov. SHUNK, declined to accept extra compensation tendered him by the Legislature for "extraordinary services performed in organizing the Pennsylvania Regiments for the Mexican War." We cite the fact to show that Mr. WARNER is not the originator of this "bright example." Our friend BOWMAN is entitled to that merit.

The Washington Union.—The Hon. Wm. A. Harris, the new editor of this journal, assumed his control on Thursday. In his salutatory, he announces that he will be its sole editor and proprietor, and that he shall render to Mr. Buchanan and his administration all the support which party ties and personal friendship can inspire.

The Philadelphia News, a radical opposition paper, is out very bitter against Wilmore for Governor; and denounces him as a British Free Trader, who in 1846, and since, has lent himself to the South, as the tool of their policy.

The Muncy Luminary, the organ of the opposition in Lycoming county, does not raise the flag of the fusion candidates. No other intimation is contained in its columns whether it intends to support them or not. We remember that the *Luminary* was very bitter against Wilmore in 1846, for voting for the repeal of the Tariff of '42.

Issued.—A lithograph likeness of General Packer, the Democratic nominee for Governor. The General is a man who will bear inspection—physically, mentally, and politically.

George W. Porter has been appointed post-master at Harrisburg, in place of John H. Brant, resigned, to take effect from and after the 30th of April, 1857.

Gov. Geary is in Washington for the purpose, as has been stated, of closing his affairs with the government. Much use has been made of the anti-slavery papers of his reported conversations, which seem to be contradictory of his official statements; but it is asserted, on good authority, that he discards any responsibility for reported conversations, the statements as to which are contradictory in themselves.

The jail at Hagerstown was destroyed by fire on Friday. All the prisoners were rescued in safety.

Showing signs this morning.

Chief Justice Taney.

The opposition are unparalyzing in their abuse of Chief Justice TANNEY, who so ably fills the highest judicial position in our country, on account of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case. We do not propose to defend his private character, for its purity and its sacredness render it invulnerable. Nor do we presume to stand as the advocate of his lofty abilities and legal learning—but few, even of his contemporaries, are equal to the task. History is his defence and his eulogy. Her testimony is, that never has there existed in this gifted land a mind more endowed with comprehensiveness and discrimination, or a heart more full of honor and nobility, than that of Roger B. Taney. The mantle of Chief Justice, Marshall has fallen upon him with all its adorning virtues, increased by time and polished by experience.

His course has always been thus unimpeachable, and Henry Clay himself, in his highest partisan excitement, never impugned the honesty and purity of the motives of the noble old Democratic Justice. But he is charged with being the advocate of slavery and its propagandism, and that only because of his acting in accordance with his oath, and expounding the Constitution by its true letter and spirit. Let the decision speak for itself. But Mr. Taney personally is opposed to slavery, in principle and practice. Forty years ago, although never wealthy, he freed every negro in his possession, and has paid servants wages ever since. They were all valuable, and one, his body servant, has been the head waiter of the largest hotel in Baltimore for many years.

Judge Taney has always been the truest friend of the black man, and it is related by a contemporary that the most eloquent speech he ever made was at the Frederick county bar, in defence of a little negro girl, in which he thrilled his auditors by exalting the happy construction of our courts and the justice of our laws in allowing the circuit to be stopped in order to give that poor little negro girl her rights and her lawful protection. And, although the little creature had most likely committed crime, Mr. Taney's eloquent appeal rescued her from the vengeance of the law. Thus have all his acts, public and private, been characterized by justice and generosity.

The editor of the *Star*, ever ready to go to the assistance of a cornered Know Nothing, and feeling the truth of our strictures in reference to several acts of the late Steward of the Alms-house, "pitches in" to defend Mr. Scott; but after being in, finds himself in a situation akin to that of the Know Nothings soon after they established their Council in this place,—"caught, in the act." We anticipated the editor's course in this matter—his attempted defence, and consequent "break down." That he would resort to filthy epithets and slang we also believed, partly because the defeat of Know Nothingism in this county (involving a loss of patronage to him) has turned his heart into gall and wormwood, and partly because fact and argument fail him. They are not to be had in defence of any public officer—and especially one connected with a charitable institution—who takes advantage of his official position in order that he may minister to the keeping up of so corrupt and despicable a concern as Know Nothingism.

We have nothing to say against Mr. Scott as a citizen. All the puffing which the *Star* gives him as such, is of no consequence in this connection. We expressed it as our opinion—and it was the main purpose of our article—that the Steward could have had no other notice than to make political capital, when he interposed as to the place of their birth poor wayfarers who called there for the crust of charity. The editor is careful not to say a word about notice, but cites an old regulation of the Poor-house to justify the course of the Steward. It may be that he calculates upon humbugging a credulous portion of the public by the section which he quotes, but he certainly would not, as a lawyer, attempt anything of the kind before a Court—if he did, it should at once be set down as evidence that he had acquired very little of law, and less of common sense. The old regulation which he quotes is in these words, as he gives them:—"The Steward shall keep a fair and regular list of all the Poor, together with their sexes and ages, as near as can be ascertained, and the time when received into the House, and from whence."

Upon "from whence" it appears to build his justification of Mr. Scott; and yet we will venture to say that no one, from its framers down, ever construed it to refer to the birth-place of the poor any more than it did to the man in the moon. "From whence" has reference to other counties, and the provision was put in for no other purpose than to carry out certain regulations which the counties had, and probably still have, one with another. And it is not uncharitable to suppose that Mr. Scott and the editor of the *Star* in their secret hearts believe with us; but take this prop from their position, and they fall under the weight of our charge of "unbittered partizanship."

But there is another fact not to be explained away by personal and vindictive abuse on the part of the *Star*. The editor intimates that Mr. Scott's course is justified by an old regulation. How comes it then that former Stewards, in making up their reports for publication, were not governed by it? We have examined a large number of them, and can find no such classification as Maj. Scott makes; nor in any of his own reports. It is a regulation which was published just previous to his going out of office, because superseded by a Democratic! If that old regulation governed him in his last year, why not in the publishing of those which preceded it? This strikes us as a knotty question, and leaves that of notice—the only matter at issue—exactly where we have placed it.

We asserted a week ago that Know Nothingism has much to answer for, and to its credit then in our view may now be added that of an attempt to twist the plainest terms in our language so as to mean what their framers never intended they should mean, and what no one ever before thought they did mean.—If Maj. Scott had published his late report in "golden times, when parties were more honest and demagogues less reckless," (Know Nothingism was not dreamed of then,) it would have contained no political items whatever. No more it be.

Runaways from School.

The following article is taken from the last Chambersburg Valley Spirit, and is commended to the careful perusal of Know Nothings with "strong sympathies" hereabouts, who delight in lending a helping hand in "under-ground operations."

Prosaic school girls, who like their "Shanghai" beaux better than their books, and run away from the latter in order to enjoy the luxury of billing and cooing with the former, own a great deal to the Know Nothing party. Formerly it was the practice to condemn as silly the conduct of pupils who quit school without the permission of their parents or guardians, but now we have a party in our country which seems to have been formed for the purpose, among others, of encouraging unruly school girls (and boys) to run away from the institutions to which they are sent to be educated. This party would do a great favor to the institutions from which they encourage these desertions, if they went no further than to induce the giddy girls to leave. But they do not stop here.

Knowing that the business in which they are engaged, however beneficial it may be to the morals of the institution, is a rather disagreeable one, they feel the necessity of offering some defence. Their defence usually consists of allegations derogatory to the character and habits of persons connected with the institutions as teachers. Miss Bunkley, who bruised her feet and tore her trowsers running away from Emmitsburg a year or two ago, did so, as the Know Nothing newspapers informed us, to get rid of the annoying advances of some man in the institution. But she changed her name so soon after her romantic adventure, that we are led to think it was not so much to escape a man within the institution as to get at one without it, that she scaled the fearful heights of a four feet lattice fence, and bounded through the pathless woods to the nearest tavern on the road, without a friendly arm or a protecting hoop around her. Miss Bunkley's exploit has been imitated lately by a Miss Miller, who has created quite a furor in Know Nothing circles by running away from a Catholic institution in Nelson county, Ky. In her letter—of course she has written and published one—she says she left the school because she was "repeatedly confined in a room two, three and once five days at a time, deprived of her allowance of food, for no other reason than that of refusing to go to confession." The Know Nothing papers are making the most of this silly girl's eloquence, but we hardly think they will get enough capital out of it to carry them through the next campaign. It is a common thing for vicious and ungovernable apprentices to run away from good masters, and by no means uncommon for intractable pupils, both male and female, to unjustly absent themselves from good and well-governed institutions of learning.

As Miss Miller's story has been published all over the country, we think it no more than right to publish the account given by the lady who has principal charge of the institution from which Miss M. fled. We have no doubt that the facts are as stated by the Superior.

NAZARETH, March 13th, 1857.
MESSRS. EDITORS.—A friend has sent me the Louisville Journal of the 12th inst., in which is an article headed—"Exposition of Roman Catholic Persecution of a Protestant Scholar at Nazareth." I shall forbear making any comment on the editorial remarks preceding the insertion of a letter purporting to have been written by Miss Mary Miller, who on the 10th of February, at 8 o'clock, P.M., left our institution and proceeded to Mount Washington, where she has since remained. She states in this letter, that the reason of her leaving the Academy was that the Sisters endeavored to force her to the practice of the religious observances of the Catholic Church, especially confession, and kept her confined for several days, depriving her of her allowance of food, because she would not go to confession. This assertion is utterly false, as can be attested by all our pupils, both Catholic and Protestant. Miss Miller was never known to join the Catholic pupils in any of their special devotional exercises; and it is well known to every one in the house that no effort, either by word or act, was made to induce, much less to force, her thoughts.

This young lady was placed here in January, 1856, by Mr. Wm. Miller, her half-brother, who said he feared we would be unable to keep her, as she was of an unruly disposition; but he begged that we should make the effort. Finding upon trial, said young lady by no means inclined to study, and as her brother had assured us, of an unruly disposition, we wrote to him requesting him to come for her or remove her from the Academy. The first letter having been unattended by him, other letters were written; yet he neither wrote nor came; nor did he, after her entrance, give anything towards the defraying of her expenses.

On the very day that Miss Miller left the institution, when, according to her statement, she was kept all day in close confinement, she took a walk with the young ladies as far as the toll-gate house; and during the evening recreation she was with them. She said, at the close of the recreations, two who were near her, "Good night! I am going to the infirmary to stay to-night, as the Sister told me to come, that she would give me some medicine." They laughed at the idea of her taking medicine, as she was in perfect health. In the walk to which I referred, Miss Miller remarked to a person who was walking by her side, that if her brother did not come for her, she would run off. The individual thought nothing of this at the time, being accustomed to hear Miss Miller use exaggerations in speech.

It is well known to all our pupils that Miss Miller was not confined or punished by deprivations of food, and that no one ever concerned herself in any way about her religious persuasion or practice. We are convinced that our numerous pupils of the Protestant churches, who are at present under our care, or who have returned to their homes, after seven years' sojourn with us, can bear ample testimony to the fact that neither persuasion nor coercion is ever used to induce them to change their religious principles; nor do we presume that the public in general will do us the injustice to believe that we have pursued or do pursue a course so opposed to the dictates of common sense as well as religion; but I deem it due to truth to state that the assertions respecting punishments having been used or means employed to force Miss Miller to embrace or practice the Catholic religion, are

entirely and absolutely false. We are not disposed even to think that her adopting Catholic doctrines or practices would be of all benefits to the Church, whatever such a course might prove to herself.

In a short time after Miss Miller's departure she was missed and search made for her, but without effect, till our overseer finally overtook her the next day, as he states, between 11 and 12 o'clock beyond Mount Washington. He conducted her to the tavern there. On his return I immediately wrote a letter to Dr. Mattingly, requesting him to go to her, authorizing him to take her to Bardstovon, and then send her to Nashville in the stage. He was kind enough to start immediately, and promised Miss Miller that he would himself accompany her, if she desired it, to Nashville. But she refused to come with him to town. He on leaving her, advised her to reflect on what he had said to her, and told her if she chose to come to Bardstovon when the stage passed, that his house would be open to her, and he would attend to her departure for Nashville, and even as he had previously promised, to accompany her there himself.

My object in sending for her was by no means to have her re-enter the school, but merely to send her in a becoming manner to the place whence she came. Her trunk I sent on the morning of the 17th inst., to the Mansion House in Bardstovon, directed to Nashville.

Instead of preventing Miss Miller from informing her friends of her condition, as she states, I strongly urged upon her to write to an uncle who, she said, resided near Nashville, to come for her. And I myself wrote to another gentleman residing in Nashville, that she named as being her uncle, and in whose family she had lived, as she said. My first letter being unanswered, I wrote again to the same gentleman after her leaving, stating the manner of her departure, and subsequent facts. To this letter he replied (my first not having been received) that he had never heard of her, nor had she ever resided in his family.

Hoping that you will give an early insertion to this simple statement of facts.
I am respectfully yours,
FRANCES GARDNER,
Mother Superior.

Sale of the Main Line.

Some time since the House of Representatives directed the Committee of Ways and Means to prepare a bill for the sale of the Main Line of the Public Works. The committee took the subject in hand and on Thursday week reported a bill of which the following is an outline:

It provides that immediately after its passage, the Governor shall advertise a notice in the Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Washington, Baltimore, Boston, New York and Harrisburg papers, that the Main Line will be offered for sale at the Merchants' Exchange, on a day to be designated by him, not more than 40 days after the passage of this act. Any person or persons, or railroad or canal company incorporated by the State, may become the purchasers, for any sum not less than seven and a half millions of dollars. If necessary the Company purchasing may increase their capital stock or borrow money and issue their bonds to any amount not exceeding 50 per centum above the amount of the purchase money. In case individuals purchase, the Governor is empowered to incorporate them. No bid will be received unless the bidder deposits in the hands of the Governor \$100,000 in cash or State bonds as a forfeit. If the highest bidder fails to comply with the act, the Governor may, if he thinks proper, tender the Works to the next highest bidder. If the Pennsylvania Railroad Company become the purchasers, they are required to pay \$1,500,000 in addition. The whole purchase money to be paid in five per cent. bonds of the Company, payable semi-annually; said bonds to be a lien upon the Main Line; ten per cent. interest shall fall due on the 1st of July, 1860, and the remainder in ten equal annual installments thereafter. Upon the execution and delivery of said bonds, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and the Harrisburg and Lancaster Railroad Company shall be released from the payment of the mortgage tax imposed by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company also to be released from all other taxes imposed by the State. The purchasers of the Main Line may purchase or lease the Harrisburg and Lancaster Railroad, or construct a road from Harrisburg to any point on the Columbia river. They may extend the Columbia road to the Delaware river, and alter the route of the same. The purchasers are required to keep the canal and railroad open from Hagerstown to Philadelphia, and so much of the Western Division as lies between Blairsville and Pittsburgh until the North-western Railroad shall be opened for business from Blairsville to the Allegheny River, and furnish motive power for the use of transporters. The purchasers may lease any portion of the Canal for a period of ten years, subject to the same conditions.

The price fixed in the bill (remarks the Lancaster Intelligencer) is low enough, in all conscience, but when we see that the first payment is not made to fall due until the year 1860, and only ten per cent. of the amount, at that, and the remainder in ten equal annual installments, it looks very much like a grand farce. We doubt very much whether a single rational man, uninfluenced by gain, could be induced to vote for such a bill. It would be worse than giving away. For if presented to somebody the State would be released at once from any further charge, but if sold under this bill, the parties purchasing can use the line for 30 years, without making any but compulsory repairs, making a princely fortune, and then forfeit their \$100,000 pledged, let the contract fall and compel the State to take the works back. That would be disposing of the State debt with a—hook!

Chinese Discovery of America Fourteen Hundred Years Ago.—A correspondent of the San Francisco Bulletin, James Hanley, a Chinese interpreter, directs attention to the fact that Chinese history contains descriptions of a vast country many thousands of miles eastward from them which they called Fusang, and which it is contended must be California and Mexico. Their account states, that in A. D. 439, Buddhist priests had gone to Fusang, (or America) and distributed Buddhist tracts and images among the inhabitants. In A. D. 490, forty years afterwards, several Buddhist priests arrived at Hingeban, and reported various particulars in reference to this country. The Chinese historian calls the country Fusang, from the name of a particular tree that grew there.

The Rev. Mr. Elder, of Mt. St. Mary's, has, it is stated, been appointed Catholic Bishop of Natchez, Miss.

Wm. F. Packer, (our next Governor) was 60 years of age on the 2nd inst.

"Taken Away?"

The editor of the *Star* is evidently writing under the castigation he received a week ago, and consequently has devoted more than a column and a half of his last issue to unmanly, whining complaints against the *Compiler*, for having exposed him in his true light. His "simple notice," as he now calls it, of pretended facts in relation to the lad who left Mount St. Mary's College, was treated according to its deserts. Each and every material allegation was pronounced a falsehood—and the conduct of the officious intermeddlers in the case was truthfully characterized as "disorderly and lawless"—the attempt to make some little political capital for bankrupt Know Nothingism was good humoredly ridiculed as "a flash in the pan," and the tendentious-philanthropic professions of the editor and other sympathisers, received the very name that best describes them.—They were told that such barefaced "hypocrisy" could deceive no one.

If an honest and honorable man by any accident publishes statements affecting the characters of others, which are immediately denied as false and slanderous, his course is clear. He at once either substantiates them by satisfactory proof; or, as a true gentleman, acknowledges his mistake, retracts the charges and thus makes the proper amends. He does not strive to make new issues, appeal to existing prejudices, invoke the sympathies of bigotry and stir up ill-will and hatred against the object of his attack. He does not seek to hide his discomfiture, and cover his cowardly retreat under a shower of words.

The editor of the *Star*, however, has a policy of his own, rules of honor and morality somewhat different from these, and of course pursues his own tactics. Convicted of as many falsehoods as there are material allegations in his article, does he retract all or any of them? Not he. Catch a Park Lawrenson with his accusations? Oh, no; but he proves his solennity and almost heart-rending eloquence of a hypocrite in fear of being unmasked, about the matter in question, but "in jest," "the spirit of malignant defamations," "diatribes of invective," "Miss Bunkley, the escaped novice," "Miss Miller, of N. S. W. Tenn.," "Loyola," "Kings," "Rocks," "Dungeons," "nameless Torture," "Free Institutions," "Catholic Europe," "Dark-lantern lodges," "Protestant America," "an Free Press," "Howling Raving," "Impudent assertions," and as many more subjects equally relevant, and then concludes this grand first-work display of words with the solemn asseveration, that "the use of light and Truth and Justice in the Providence of God must and will triumph." Admirable argument! Touching eloquence! But unfortunately it does not touch a single point in question. And yet with the solitary exception of one statement, resting as yet on a very questionable basis, and which, true or false, proving nothing to the purpose, namely, the assertion, that somebody received a civil note from the boy's guardian, the entire article contains not a single word, besides abuse of the *Compiler*, which it can scarcely stoop to notice.

His first, and most important accusation, for, if substantiated, it might give some coloring of probability to the rest, was that the lad in question was taken away from the College in consequence of communications made by sympathetic gentlemen to the child's friends at Lancaster—moreover, that a gentleman from Lancaster was authorized to demand the boy's discharge from the officers of the College. In the last *Compiler* this charge was pronounced a falsehood. Does the *Star* undertake to prove its truth? Not a word of the kind. Does he, then, like an honest man and good christian, retract the slander? He disclaims such old-fashioned morality, and like a true member of the dark lantern order, having set in circulation a good, round falsehood, he can't bear to give it up, sticks to it as well as he can, hastens to show off once more the dear little baiting, (though rather ashamed of its paternity this time,) treats an authorized act of notice of the slander with genuine Know Nothing indifference, shouts "defamation" against the *Compiler*, at the top of his lungs, and tries, by words of magic influence with ignorant bigots, to raise a cloud of dust and smoke, under cover of which he may escape, as the pickpocket in our large cities sometimes evades the hands of justice by crying "stop thief!" louder than anybody else.

Now it is either true or false, that the lad was taken away because his guardian was disconcerted with his treatment at the College. The editor of the *Star* knows that it is absolutely false; yet he has the effrontery to repeat it, and to pretend still to believe its truth. The same remark applies to every allegation, which has been characterized as false and slanderous.—He knows of his own knowledge, that some of them are absolutely false, and that he has no good reason for believing any of them.

The whole case is simply this: a columniar has been exposed, hypocrisy unmasked, a few pennies of political capital lost, and the editor of the *Star* finds himself in about the same ugly fix as a forger dragged to justice with a pocket full of his own counterfeits. Mark, how he writhes and strives to wriggle out of the tight place, in which he has put himself. Thus he begins:

"THE SPIRIT OF JESUITISM."
The simple notice in last week's local department of the *Star*, of the escape—recapture—and subsequent removal of a lad from Mount St. Mary's College—has aroused the Jesuit sympathizers and their masters, who control the *Compiler*, and rekindled the spirit of malignant personal defamation," &c. "The simple notice"! Why it contained at least half a dozen of malignant slanders on the officers of a neighboring institution, who are respected by all who know them in this community! They were represented as "ruefully whipping and maltreating" an orphan child, as stopping "this communication" with his uncle and friends, "of employing 'active spies,'" &c., and of being compelled, (for this manifestly was the impression intended to be produced,) by the "indignant" guardian to release the boy on demand of a person authorized to take him away from these inhuman persecutors of innocent childhood. There's a "simple notice" for you! Does the writer and publisher of this "simple notice" know anything of the value of a good character? Is he then so habituated to the task of vilifying his fellow-men, that with him and in his paper, the foulest calumny is but a "simple notice"?

But mark again, how he would, if he could, sneak out of the responsibility he has incurred. "The statements contained in our article, carefully given to the reader without note or comment, were based upon the representations of respectable citizens conversant with the facts, who had seen and conversed with the lad and with the gentleman who had removed him from the Institution. These gentlemen have called upon us within a day or two and re-assert the correctness of the statements." A pretty good dodge, most varnicious editor of the *Star*—but you sha'n't

shuffle out of the scrape so easily—you sha'n't shift the responsibility at will. You are accused of slandering your neighbor, and it won't do, while you repeat the calumnies, to plead the old pretext of all convicted slanderers: "Oh, I only repeated what others told me."

But is it so? Were you really told these things? and did you believe them on the authority of those to whom you refer as your informants? Yes, for "these gentlemen," you say, "re-assert these statements." Then they "re-assert the statement" that the child was taken away by a guardian discontented with his treatment at the College, which you and they too, must know to be a falsehood—and all the other slanders denounced a week ago, and known by you and them to be nothing but slanders. Such are your backers, the witnesses to prove your character for veracity!

No wonder they break down in the first attempt. You thought you had escaped the hands of justice, that you were clear; and yet you have only proved, at best, that others are as guilty as yourself. Admitting they did tell you these falsehoods, were you bound to believe them? and to publish them, too? Don't you know the principle of law, that the receiver is as bad as the thief? Moreover, you have republished these slanders in your last issue, and made a great show, as if you still believed them; though they had been fully contradicted, stood without a particle of proof, and could no longer be credited by any rational man. Are those to whom you refer as your authorities to bear the responsibility of this double breach of God's commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

But mark once more the shuffling of a detected calumniator. "With the question of veracity raised by the *Compiler*, as between the lad and the officers of the institution, at which he alleges he was so cruelly maltreated, we have little disposition to interfere." Really, this is the smartest dodge of all. "The question of veracity between the lad and the officers of the institution"! Isn't that cool? Why, Mr. editor of the *Star*, the only responsible person, when veracity is in question, is yourself, unless you still insist on dragging down your compurgators with you. You published a tissue of slanders against the College and its officers. When they are indignantly contradicted and qualified by their proper names, and there is not left a shadow of doubt; that they are pure, unmitigated and malignant falsehoods, you unblushingly justify them again; and while you try to father them upon others, still affect to credit them yourself; and then you talk of "issues of veracity"—of an "issue of veracity" between a spoiled child of twelve years and those same gentlemen whose characters you have vainly tried to blacken! No, there is but one issue, and you shall not change it. Benedict Arnold charging his brother officers in the Revolution with treason, or Julius Lescarot accusing other Apostles of perfidy, might be a less contemptible, but not a more amazing spectacle than the editor of the *Star* questioning the veracity of men, whom, though they never offended him, he has twice slandered publicly, and the second time at least, with full knowledge and deliberate malice.

Destructive Fire in Baltimore.

Fearful Accident and Loss of Life.—A Number of Persons Seriously and Fatally Injured.

A few minutes after 8 o'clock, on Tuesday evening, it was found that those large and handsome five-story warehouses, Nos. 37, 39 and 41 South Charles, a few doors north of Lombard street, Baltimore, had been set on fire, and were burning briskly. Flames were first seen illuminating the windows near the stairway, which runs sideways of the buildings, and owing to the large quantity of inflammable material, such as cloths, paper, &c., the former used in the manufacture of caps by the Baltimore Cap Company, whose apartments were in the upper stories, and the latter kept in a lower story, the fire spread with considerable rapidity, until the three houses became enveloped in flames.

The fire communicated from the rear of the stores on Charles street to the large four-story iron store of E. L. Parker & Co., on Lombard street, which, with its contents, was entirely destroyed.—The fire then spread to the three-story stores east of Parker's building.

The first store was occupied by Hodges & Emack, hardware merchants. The next by Hanby & Bro., as a wholesale grocery; and the third by Gilpin & Bailey, as a wholesale drug store. They were entirely consumed, with their contents. A small two-story building between Parker's and Hodges & Emack's stores, was also consumed.

About half-past ten o'clock, while a number of persons, supposed to be about twenty, were on the first floor of the grocery store of Hanby & Bro., the upper part of the building, as well as those on both sides being in flames, the floor above fell upon them, enveloping them in flames and covering them with the ruins. A number of them were got out, seriously burned and injured.

Up to Thursday evening, thirteen dead bodies had been taken from the ruins, and three persons were still missing. Nine were wounded, several of them fatally.

This fire is the most ruinous and memorable that has occurred in Baltimore for many years. That of June, 1821, on McElderry's wharf, when the aggregate loss was nearly a million of dollars, alone being greater in its destruction.

Later from Nicaragua.

Defeat of General Lockridge.—Terrible Steamboat Explosion and Loss of Life.

New York, April 16.—The steamer Tennessee, from San Juan, arrived here this morning.

It appears by her advices that Gen. Lockridge, instead of capturing Castillo, as reported in the fillbuster stories brought by the George Law, has actually abandoned the attack and retreated, leaving the important post of Serapiqui and the whole of the river San Juan in complete possession of the Costa Ricans. He retreated without striking a blow, destroying on his way down all the fortifications below Castillo. Subsequently he formed a new battalion of his scattered forces and would endeavor to join Walker by way of Panama.

The steamer J. N. Scott had been blown up on the San Juan river, during the retreat of Lockridge, and over sixty officers and men were either killed or wounded. The wounded were sent in the steamer Rescue to Punta Arenas, while Lockridge remained on the river with his remaining force. He was well supplied with provisions.

A Good Appointment.—ANDREW HOPKINS, Esq., the able editor of the Harrisburg *Patriot and Union*, has been appointed Register of the Land Office, in the Nebraska District, Nebraska Territory. He has richly merited this appointment and his many warm friends throughout the State will be highly gratified to hear of his good fortune.

Sudden Death.—The death of Col. Edward Schley, a prominent citizen of Frederick, Md., which took place on Sunday night last, was caused by a violent attack of pneumonia a few days previous. Mrs. Mary Ann Evert died suddenly in the same city on Monday night, of apoplexy.