THE MONTROSE DEMOCRAT.

A. J. GERRITSON, Publisher. | MONTROSE, PA., THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 1863. | VOLUME XX. NUMBER 31.

BUSINESS CARDS.

H. GARRATT,

DEALER in Flour, Feed, and Meal, Barrell and Dairy Salt, Timothy and Clover Seed, Groceries, Provisions, Fruit, Fish, Petroleum Oil, Wooden and Stone Ware, Yankee Notions, &c. &c. ☞ Opposite Railroad Depot, New Milford, Pa. Mch 24, 1863.—1y.

A. LATHROP, H. C. TYLER, J. P. W. RILEY.

LATHROP, TYLER & RILEY,

DEALERS in Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, Ready Made Clothing, Boots & Shoes, Hats & Caps, Wood & Willow Ware, Iron, Nails, Sole & Upper Leather, Fish, Flour and Salt, all of which they offer at the very

☞ Lowest Prices. ☜

Lathrops Brick Building, Montrose, Pa.

April 6, 1863. y.

EVAN JENKINS,

Licensed Auctioneer,

FOR SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY.

[Post Office address, Dundaff, or South Gibson, Susq'a County, Penn'a.]

Feb. 3, 1863.—1y30

WM. HUNTTING COOPER. HENRY DRINKER.

WM. H. COOPER & CO.,

BANKERS,—Montrose, Pa. Successors to Post, Cooper & Co. Office, Lathrops' new building, Turnpike-st.

J. B. M'COLLUM. D. W. SEARLE.

McCOLLUM & SEARLE,

ATTORNEYS and Counsellors at Law,—Montrose, Pa. Office in Lathrops' new building, over the Bank.

DR. H. SMITH & SON,

SURGEON DENTISTS,—Montrose, Pa. Office in Lathrops' new building, over the Bank. All Dental operations will be performed in good style and warranted.

JOHN SAUTTER,

FASHIONABLE TAILOR.—Montrose, Pa. Shop over I. N. Bullard's Grocery, on Main-street. Thankful for past favors, he solicits a continuance—pledging himself to do all work satisfactorily. Cutting done on short notice, and warranted to fit. Montrose, Pa., July 2th, 1860.—tf.

P. LINES,

FASHIONABLE TAILOR.—Montrose, Pa. Shop in Phœnix Block, over store of Read, Watrous & Foster. All work warranted, as to fit and finish. Cutting done on short notice, in best style. jan '60

JOHN GROVES,

FASHIONABLE TAILOR.—Montrose, Pa. Shop near the Baptist Meeting House, on Turnpike treet. All orders filled promptly, in first-rate style. Cutting done on short notice, and warranted to fit.

L. B. ISBELL,

REPAIRS Clocks, Watches, and Jewelry at the shortest notice, and on reasonable terms. All work warranted. Shop in Chandler and Jessup's store, MONTROSE, Pa. oc25 tf

WM. W. SMITH,

CABINET AND CHAIR MANUFACTURERS.—Foot of Main street, Montrose, Pa. aug tf

C. O. FORDHAM,

MANUFACTURER of *BOOTS & SHOES*, Montrose, Pa. Shop over Dewitt's store. All kinds of work made to order, and repairing done neatly. je3 y

ABEL TURRELL,

DEALER in Drugs, Medicines, Chemicals, Dye Stuffs, Glass Ware, Paints, Oils, Varnish, Window Glass, Groceries, Fancy Goods, Jewelry Perfumery, &c.—Agent for all the most popular PATENT MEDICINES.—Montrose, Pa. aug tf

DAVID C. ANEY, M. D.,

HAVING located permanently at New Milford, Pa., will attend promptly to all calls with which he may be favored. Office at Todds' Hotel.

New Milford, July, 17, 1861

MEDICAL CARD.

DR. E. PATRICK, & DR. E. L. GARDNER,

LATE GRADUATE of the MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF YALE COLLEGE, have formed a copartnership for the practice of Medicine and Surgery, and are prepared to attend to all business faithfully and punctually, that may be intrusted to their care, on terms commensurate with the times.

Diseases and deformities of the EYE, surgical operations, and all surgical diseases, particularly attended to.

☞ Office over Webb's Store. Office hours from 8 a. m. to 9 p. m. All sorts of country produce taken in payment, at the highest value, and CASH NOT REFUSED.

Montrose, Pa., May 7th, 1862.—tpf

TAKE NOTICE!

Cash Paid for Hides.

Sheep Pelts, Fox, Mink, Muskrat, and all kinds of Furs. A good assortment of Leather and Boots and Shoes constantly on hand. Office, Tannery, & Shop on Main Street.

Montrose, Feb. 6th. *A. P. & L. C. KEELER*

FIRE INSURANCE.

THE INSURANCE CO. OF NORTH AMERICA,

AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

Has Established an Agency in Montrose.

The Oldest Insurance Co. in the Union.

CASH CAPITAL PAID IN,	$500,000.
ASSETS OVER,	$1,900,000.

THE rates are as low as those of any good company in New York, or elsewhere, and its Directors are among the first for honor and integrity.

CHARLES PLATT, Sec'y. ARTHUR G. COFFIN, Pres.

Montrose, July 15, '63. BILLINGS STROUD, Ag't.

HOME INSURANCE COMPANY,

Of New-York.

CASH CAPITAL, ONE MILLION DOLLARS.

ASSETS 1st July 1860,	$1,481,819.97.
LIABILITIES, " "	43,063.63.

J. Milton Smith, Sec'y. Chas. J. Martin, President.
John McGee, As't " A. F. Wilmarth, Vice "

Policies issued and renewed, by the undersigned at his office, in the Brick Block, Montrose, Pa.

nov29 y BILLINGS STROUD, *Agent.*

REMITTANCES

To England, Ireland and Scotland.

ABRAHAM BELL'S SON'S DRAFTS, in sums of one pound and upwards, payable in all the principal towns of England, Ireland and Scotland, for sale by

WM. H. COOPER, & Co., BANKERS,

20—'63 Montrose, Pa.

J. B. HAZLETON,

Ambrotype and Photographic Artist, Montrose, Pa.

☞ Pictures taken in all kinds of weather, in the best style of the Art. oct10.

S. M. Pettengill & Co.,

NO. 37 PARK ROW, New York, and 6 State Street, Boston, are our agents for the *Montrose Democrat* in those cities, and are authorized to take advertisements and subscriptions for us at our lowest rates.

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE DEMOCRAT.

History of the Republican Party—No. 9.

Daniel Webster Denounced Executive Usurpation of Power.

"The burden of the oratory of Gov. Seymour, Ex-President Pierce and all the other Democratic speakers, was the sacredness of the Constitution, and the duty of defending it against the alleged despotism of President Lincoln. The power of the President, it is true is an enormous one, and with this power conferred on him by Congress, he is able to put down domestic enemies with an iron hand; and this is just the power we want him to have. It is just the power which the founders of the Republic meant he should have in a time like this. Our only regret is, that we have no Andrew Jackson to teach these men the full meaning of it. The power to remove them from our midst, as the President has removed Valandighim." Rep. paper, July 1863.

"The burden of the oratory of the two greatest American Orators, that ever lived, was the sacredness of the Constitution, and the duty of defending it against the alleged despotism of Andrew Jackson.

In the Senate of the United States in 1834, Daniel Webster says: "Mr. President: The contest for ages has been to rescue liberty from the grasp of executive power. On the long list of the champions of human freedom. There is not one name damned by the reproach of advocating the extension of executive authority; on the contrary, the steady purpose of all such champions was to restrain it." Now who are the champions of human freedom. The Democrats or the Republicans? Whose name will stand damned by the reproach of advocating the extension of executive authority.

At last, crowned heads have been compelled to submit to the restraints of law, and the people, with that intelligence, and that spirit which make their voice resistless, have been able to say to prerogative, "thus far shalt come and no farther." Through all the history of the contest for liberty, executive power has been regarded as a lion which must be caged." (The republicans are now calling for the lion to be let loose upon their advocates of Liberty.) So far from being considered the natural protector of popular right, executive power has been dreaded, uniformly dreaded as the great source of its danger. And who is he that belies the blood, and libels the fame of his own ancestors, by declaring that they with solemnity of form and force of manner, have invoked the executive power to come to the protection of liberty, who is he that charges them with the insanity of putting the lamb into the watchfulness of executive power, *beneath the lions paw?* No, sir! Our security is in the Constitution, and he shall act wisely by preserving every restraint which the Constitution has provided. I am for the Constitution as it is, and I will not trust executive power, vested in the hands of a single magistrate, to keep the vigils of liberty."

Did Daniel Webster believe that Congress could put away such power into the hands of the President as the Republicans claim that it had? If so, what security was there in the Constitution, any more than in the will of the President. Webster says:

"The grant of power, the whole source of power, as well as the restrictions, and limitations which are imposed on it, is made in, and by the Constitution. It has no other origin, and it is this which distinguishes our system so very widely and materially from the systems of Europe. Our Governments are limited Governments, limited in their origin, in their very creation, limited, because none but specific powers were ever granted either to any department of government, or to the whole. In asserting power for an American President, I prefer the assertion should be made on American reasons. It is true that in England the King is regarded as the original fountain of all honor and all office. All liberty was formerly considered as a favor and concession from the Monarch. But whenever and wherever civil freedom could get a foothold and maintain itself, these favors were turned into rights. But with us, there never was a time when we acknowledged unrestrained sovereign power among us. The President is President. His office and name of office are known, and both are fixed and prescribed by law. Being commander of the army and navy, holding the power of nominating to office, and removing from office, and being by these powers the fountain of all patronage and all favor, what does he not become, if he be allowed to superadd to all this the character of single representative of the whole people? Sir, he becomes what America has not been accustomed to see—what this Constitution has never created, and what I cannot contemplate without alarm. He, who may call himself the single representative of the nation, may speak in the name of the nation, may undertake to wield the power of the nation, and who shall gainsay him in whatsoever he chooses to pronounce as the nation's will."

Now who is this single representative of the whole people but Abraham Lincoln? Why are the Republicans so alarmed lest Gov. Seymour should retain the control of the forces of his State which the Constitution has given him? They say "Therefore the Governors of the several States controlled the military forces of the States, but the power vested in the President, ignores their right to govern only in time of peace." In time of peace Governors have no use for militia forces. The President has become what the Constitution never created, and that Daniel Webster said he could not contemplate without alarm. Another great orator, Ogden Hoffman, equally alarmed as he, at the same period, said, "If like him who reared on the ruins of the French republic a splendid despotism, Andrew Jackson should declare himself Consul for life, will it then be desertion to leave him? Or if in progress of ambition, he should convert the President's chair into a throne of his power, will it then be treason to abandon him? But we have never sworn allegiance to Andrew Jackson, we have sworn allegiance to the principles which raised him to power. I owe no allegiance, but to my country—her Constitution and her laws. I know of no alternation between attachment to Gen. Jackson and love to my country. Of him I cannot speak unkindly. I would not tear one leaf from his brow. I am willing that the glory he acquired in his country's defence, should adorn the brightest page in the military annals of our country, but I am willing that that glory should play upon the free institutions of our country like the rays of the sun on a palace of ice, melting it, and wasting it away, while it beautifies and illumes it." Webster says: "The President swears that he will "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution." Would any one argue that the oath itself is any grant of power, or that, because he is to preserve the Constitution, he is therefore to use what means he pleases, or any means, for such preservation, except those which the Constitution has given him? Such an argument would be preposterous. Sir, if all this means anything, it means that the President may do anything and everything which he may expect to be tolerated in. He may go just as far as he thinks it safe to go, and Cromwell and Bonaparte went no farther. I ask again, is this the true nature of a government with written laws, and limited powers."

Such is the burden of the oratory of every Democratic Statesman, denounced by the Republicans as traitors—Copperheads and Secessionists. They believe with Webster, that "The first object of a free people, is the preservation of liberty, and liberty is only to be preserved by maintaining constitutional restraints, and just divisions of political power. The simplest governments are despotisms. The next simplest, limited monarchies. Every free government is necessarily complicated, because all such governments establish restraints, as well on the power of government itself, as on that of individuals. We may easily simplify governments, we may easily bring it to the simplest of all forms, a pure despotism," and Madison says, "remove the corner-stone of democracy, state rights, and you have a monarchy. Take away the rights of the States, said he, and what further materials do the artificers of Monarchy need to build up their favorite system?"

And what more do the Republicans need to establish a Monarchy—a Despotism, than to succeed in their attempt to take away the rights of the States? This, and this alone, is what they need to retain the power which they say is already in the hands of the President, "a power transcending that of any Monarch since the days of Rome." Thus, by shielding themselves under the name of that great military Hero, Gen. Jackson, every one of whose political doctrines they regret—as they do the doctrines of the party, to which he belonged. The prophecy of Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, will be fulfilled. An Alexander, a Cæsar—a Cromwell or a Bonaparte, will sit in the Chair once occupied by Washington—and the friends of liberty will have to fight its battles over again. The struggle to day, as in the Revolution, is between a Democracy and a Despotism. I.

AT LIBERTY AGAIN.—Henry J. Stahle, Esq., editor of the Gettysburg *Compiler*, who was arrested about the time of the recent battle of Gettysburg, on the charge of having pointed out to the rebels the houses in which Federal soldiers were concealed, has been released from his imprisonment in Fort McHenry and reached Gettysburg on Sunday evening last. The charge, from beginning to end, was a base, malicious lie, gotten up by the abolitionists for the purpose of injuring the character of a gallant and efficient member of the Democratic party. Instead of pointing out the hiding places of Union soldiers, he had a Lieutenant Colonel of an Indiana regiment and several of his men concealed in his house. The charge originated with a class of unmitigated scoundrels in Gettysburg who procured an abolitionist mean and low enough to make an affidavit to it. We trust Mr. Stahle will not let the matter drop here. The scoundrels deserve and should fill a felon's cell. They are guilty of perjury and should be dealt with to the fullest extent of the law.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Workingmen.

The wealth of our country is in its labor, and labor is honorable. While the rich manufacturer heaps up his hundreds of thousands of dollars, produced by the labor of those who toil for a bare living, he cannot lawfully or rightfully interfere with the workingman in his great privilege of voting according to the dictates of his own conscience. In that he is equal to the millionaire. "It is his prerogative, and makes him feel that, although he may be poor, yet he has an interest in the affairs of the government; and any attempt to interfere with his right of suffrage, is an insult to his manhood as an American citizen. The efforts of "Loyal Leaguers," whose headquarters are in palaces, and whose members generally roll in "greenbacks," cannot restrain the honest, hard-fisted working man from casting his vote in our elections. The money of this shoddy aristocracy will be despised when offered to induce honest laborers to betray or desert their party. We have more faith in the workingmen than in "Leaguers." They cannot be bought like cattle. The Democratic party is the only one for the workingmen. They remember how the country was prosperous under Democratic rule; how, with gold and silver as a currency, cheap provisions, and various other blessings, they then enjoyed life in our now distracted land. The workingmen have a great duty to perform in the coming elections. They owe it to themselves, to their wives and children, to their country, to be firm and uncompromising in casting their votes for the Democratic candidates. If they want to be without the competition of emancipated slave labor, or not to be reduced to the level of the negro, they will vote the Democratic ticket. If they are opposed to abolitionism—the joint idol, with the Golden Calf, of "Loyal" or "Royal Leaguers"—they will vote the Democratic ticket. The Democratic party is now the only party left in which there is any safety to the country. Restore it to power, and it will assert the supremacy of the laws and the Constitution.

The Old Hypocrite and Traitor Greelsy.

The Pharisee of the *Tribune*, who for years past, in company with Garrison and Phillips, has been denouncing the Union, ridiculing the national flag, and proclaiming the Constitution a "League with Hell and Covenant with Death," has the audacity to insert the following editorial in his paper of yesterday, (the 20th:)

"HANG OUT THE OLD FLAG!—The absence of the national flag in all parts of the city during the past week during the riot was a noteworthy circumstance; but now that citizens have taken breath and a new start, let the dear old flag be flung to the breeze from every flag staff in the city, that all may thus anew give sign of patriotism and loyalty."

This radical revolutionist and black-hearted traitor and Abolitionist, only four years ago, in June, 1859, published the following lines, in token of his feelings *then* in regard to that same "dear old flag." Let them be read, and the hypocrite and traitor spurned by all honest men:

From the Tribune, June, 1859.

THE AMERICAN FLAG.

All hail the flaunting Lie!
The stars grow pale and dim;
The stripes are bloody scars—
A Lie the vaunting hymn;
It shields a pirate's deck,
It binds a man in chains,
It yokes the captive's neck,
And wipes the bloody stains.

Tear down the flaunting Lie!
Half-mast the starry flag!
Insult no sunny sky
With hate's polluted rag!
Destroy it ye who can!
Deep sink it in the waves!
It bears a fellow-man
To groan with fellow-slaves.

Furl, furl the boasted Lie!
Till freedom lives again,
To rule once more in truth
Among untrammeled men.
Roll up the starry sheen,
Conceal its bloody stains;
For in its folds are seen
The stamp of rustling chains.

Our Hope

We have frequently charged upon the Abolitionists the sole responsibility of all the disorder, anarchy, and bloodshed, which have recently disgraced our country.—These outrages have been so firmly fastened upon them, that they can never "escape history." To this charge must be added that of attempting to justify the inevitable dissolution of the Union. Mr. Wm. H. Seward, in one of his speeches in the Senate of the United States, thus spoke:

"The free States and slave States of the Atlantic, divided and warring with each other, would disgust the free States of the Pacific, and *they would have abundant cause and justification for withdrawing from a Union* productive no longer of peace, safety, and liberty to themselves, and no longer holding up the cherished hopes of mankind."

In spite of Mr. Seward, the Democratic party will cling to the Union and the Constitution, and frown upon every effort, no matter from what quarter it may come, to produce further disintegration among the States of the Republic. The hope of reconstruction is our only one for the future. This will never be abandoned, while a single star remains in the bright constellation of our national Union.—*Ex.*

Preaching a Practical Sermon.

A number of years ago, Parson B. preached in a town in the interior of this State. A sound theologian was Parson B., as a published volume of his sermon, evinces; but like many clergymen of the past generation, he was too much given to preaching 'doctrinal sermons,' to the exclusion of practical themes; at least, so thought one of his parishioners, Mr. C. "Mr. B.," said he one day to the clergyman, "we know all about the doctrine by this time. Why don't you preach real practical discourses?" "Oh! very well. If you wish it, I will do so. Next Sunday I will preach a practical sermon." Sunday morning came, and an unusually large audience, attracted by the report of the promised novelty, were in attendance. The preliminary services were performed, and the parson announced his text; opening his subject, he said he should make a practical application to his hearers. He then commenced at the head of the aisle, calling each member of the congregation by name, and pointing out his special faults. One was a little inclined to indulge in creature comforts; another was a terrible man at a bargain, and so on. While in mid volley, the door of the church opened, and Dr. S. entered. 'There,' went on the parson, 'there is Dr. S. coming in, in the middle of services, just as usual, and disturbing the whole congregation. He does it just to make people believe that he can't get time to come to church in season; but it isn't so—he has not been called to visit a patient on a Sunday for three months.' Thus went on the worthy clergyman. At last he came to Mr. C., who had requested a practical sermon. 'And now,' there is Mr. C.; he's a merchant—what does he do? Why, he stays at home on Sunday afternoon to write business letters. If he gets a lot of goods up from New York on Saturday night, he goes to the store and marks them on Sunday, so as to have them ready for sale on Monday morning. That's how he keeps the Sabbath; and he isn't satisfied with doctrinal sermons; he wants practical ones. At the conclusion of the services, the parson walked up to Mr. C., and asked him how he liked the 'practical sermon.' 'Mr. B.,' was the reply, 'preach what you please after this, I'll never attempt to direct you again.'—*Christian Inquirer.*

Political Bitterness.

An exchange well says, "the bitterness in political matters, at this time, is altogether owing to the low slanders and to the vulgar and characteristic behavior of the abolition leagues. They have attempted to crush by vulgar abuse and low epithets the law abiding and Constitution loving majority of the people.—They have thought to ride by violence, threats and incendiaryism over the conservative and decent majority of society. That they have been met by a determined spirit on the part of the people, who mean to maintain every right and shadow of a right, at whatever cost, is not strange. The wonder is that decent men have not reached this end of endurance sooner, and taught these mobocrats at an earlier day that they would not further be trampled upon by the miserable Jacobin destroyers of a country, built up by democratic hands and made great and glorious through democratic policy. The abolitionists have no past history to sustain them. It is black with treason to the Constitution and the Union; it is full of curses against constituted authority.—They have nothing in the present to recommend them. Their course is marked only by opposition to the Constitution and intrigue against civil liberty. Judging from their acts, they seek to tear up the very foundation stones of society, and substitute vulgarity, brute force and the baser passions of the lowest orders of men for the more noble attributes of reason, prudence and justice, which common sense would dictate. The end of this policy is at hand. Men born to freedom and laboring for the right, will teach those who, enjoying their own freedom would usurp that of others, that justice is true to herself."

The Philadelphia "organ" of the Administration, in commenting upon the terrible riot in New York, seeks to throw the responsibility of the fearful outbreak upon the shoulders of the Democratic party in that city. This perversion of the truth was, of course, expected from that journal; but what will the public say of the editor of the *Press*, who, in an address delivered at Lancaster, uttered the following inflammatory sentiments:

"What is there in our happy country to make men afraid of the light of day, or of *honest inquiry?* Have we a *conscript law* that tears the husbandman from his plow, the father from his family, the son from his widowed mother, to go forth and act as gladiators for the amusement of a few ambitious kings? Have we a gang of hired tax-gatherers to drain the substance of the people? Is our President an Attila or a Caligula? Is our Senate a Council of Ten? Is our House of Representatives a body of tyrants, armed with power to ravish and destroy? Secret usurpation against such wrongs would be justifiable and right, for we are taught the great lesson that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

The Abolitionists Exposed.

The Abolition schemes for dissolving the Union and establishing the Southern Confederacy, has received a new illustration in Mr. Conway's proposition to Mr. Mason to stop the war, through the influence of the Abolitionists, if the South would abolish slavery. The denunciation of the Constitution as a league with hell; the burning of it at Framingham by Abolitionists; the avowal by Phillips that he had labored nineteen years to effect disunion; the proclamation of Wade, many years ago, that the Union was already divided: the willingness expressed to "let it slide;" the declaration by Seward in 1860, that there was an irrepressible conflict between the North and the South; the circulation of this very Conway's paper by Charles Sumner under his frank, all prove that Conway truly represented the feelings of the Abolition Republicans when he avowed they were willing to become a peace party and sacrifice the Union if the South would emancipate their slaves. This doctrine, at this moment, the Abolitionists think unpopular to avow, generally, and hence they deny Conway's authority to act as their ambassador; but this is an old trick of the Abolition Republicans. It was through their efforts Hooker was appointed Burnside's successor. The Altoona Convention was warmly in his favor, if not called to secure his promotion; when Governor Andrew retired from that famous assemblage, he said Hooker was the man to be placed at the head of the Potomac Army; now they turn and rend Hooker as a pack of wolves turn upon one of their wounded, and are ready to destroy him. So with Conway—he proves too clumsy to hide the treason he was commissioned to perpetrate, and his Abolition fellows deny him with all the vehemence of exposed treachery and cowardice. But Conway will stick to them like the shirt of Nessus—they cannot shuffle him off as easily as they hope, for his proposition is consistent with their whole conduct. We have heard that Charles Sumner said, when the South was making its final preparation to separate, in reply to the question if he thought the Southern States really intended to leave the Union, that they not only intended to leave but would be compelled to leave if they did not go of their own accord. Mr. Greely has avowed his willingness to see the Union divided upon certain contingencies, which have been realized, and the New York Times said, this week, that "the Confederate States need no recognition of their Government, as it is a *fait accompli*—a fixed fact—whether we recognize it or not." Why don't they own up, like men, and not try to make a scapegoat of Conway?—*Boston Post.*

RESPECTABLE MOBS.—The President's organ in this city recognizes two different species of mobs—a respectable and a disreputable one. A mob is respectable, according to the notion of the President's organ, when it is composed of Abolitionists bent on the distruction of Democratic newspapers: and it is disreputable when there are Democrats among the rioters who seek to wreak vengence on the demagogueism of the Abolitionists. The distinction is nicely taken and shows abject servility of government logic. A "respectable mob" is about equal to a "gentleman blackguard," who rails at "Copperheads" and wishes them hung. Chesterfield had a different notion. He called *any number of gentlemen* a mob if they met without a moderator to preserve order and decorum amongst them. We look on a mob as the most terrible infliction on society, and hold that it must be put down under all circumstances, by every available means in the possession of the properly constituted authorities.—*Phil. Age.*

☞ Dr. Lawson's physician had the dreadful habit of profane swearing. Lawson consulted him once about his health. The physician, swearing, said:

"Sir, you are the slave of a bad habit, and you will not soon recover unless you give it up."

"And what is the habit?" asked Lawson.

"Smoking," replied the other.

"Well," said Lawson, "I can abandon the pipe, but will you permit me to give you a hint, too, as to a vile habit of your own?"

"What is that?"

"I refer to your habit of profane swearing," replied the divine.

"True," said the doctor, "but that is not an expensive habit like yours."

"Ah, sir," said Lawson, "you will discover it to be a very expensive habit indeed when your account is handed to you.

The War Department has decided that under the conscription act a negro cannot be offered as a substitute for a white man. This is strange ruling, in view of the fact that negroes and Indians are enrolled as well as the whites, and are as liable to be drafted. Governor Andrew ought to look after this. Here is a decision as bad as that in the Dred Scott case, for it puts it upon record that a colored man is not as good as a white man, or in the words of the decision, "is not an equivalent." Now that this matter has been settled, the country will be anxious to know if a white man will be accepted as the substitute for a negro.