

# COLUMBIA AND BLOOMSBURG GENERAL ADVERTISER.

LEVI L. TATE, Editor.

"TO HOLD AND TRIM THE TORCH OF TRUTH AND WAVE IT O'ER THE DARKENED EARTH."

\$2 00 PER ANNUM.

VOL. 14.—NO. 31.

BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA., SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1860.

VOL. 24.

## THE Columbia Democrat

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING, BY LEVI L. TATE, IN BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA.

OFFICE

At the new Brick Building, opposite the Exchange, by side of the Court House. "Democrat's Head-Quarters."

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.  
\$1 00 In advance, for one copy, for six months.  
1 75 In advance, for one copy, one year.  
\$3 00 If not paid within the first three months.  
2 50 If not paid within the first six months.  
2 00 If not paid within the year.  
No subscription taken for less than six months, and no paper discontinued until all arrearages shall have been paid.  
Ordinary Advertisements inserted, and Job Work executed, at the established prices.

### TO-MORROW

Did we but know what lies beyond  
This varied, shadowy path we tread,  
How often would our souls depend,  
Our eyes the tears of sorrow shed?  
But God, who knows what's best to do,  
Who sees us from his stony throne,  
His way is hidden from our view,  
That which had best remain unknown.  
We walk to-day in conscious pride,  
And hang the flag of hope on high;  
But ah! to-morrow by our side  
Some friend may lay his down and die;  
Some early flower that wooed our praise,  
Some other where we laid our trust;  
Such flowers, ere the evening rays,  
May trampled be, and laid in dust.  
Youth dreams of many glorious things,  
As on his pleasure's track;  
Each day some new-born passion brings,  
He turns, no eye of sorrow looks;  
The flowery fields are all before,  
His eyes on some bright star are set;  
Life to him a sunny shore,  
He'll soon be in his shadow's net.  
To-morrow! In his secret shrine  
A little know what is for aye;  
I may be with my father's land,  
Or wrecked on some misfortune's sea,  
But far beyond life's boundary lives  
The everlasting array bright,  
And he alone who takes or gives,  
Can guide my wandering feet bright.

ADDRESS  
To the Voters of the Twelfth Congressional District.

### READ AND CIRCULATE.

On the second Tuesday of October, the voters of this District will be called upon to cast their suffrages for a Representative in Congress. Ever since the organization of the District, it has been steadily and largely Democratic. Owing to causes other than party strength, the Opposition has, now and then, carried the District, but every well informed man knows that the "Twelfth" is to-day thoroughly opposed to the doctrines of Black Republicanism as it previously was to the other forms which the Opposition has, from time to time, assumed. The "irrepressible conflict" and the disguised Abolitionism of Seward, Sumner, Giddings and Greeley, are viewed with loathing and disgust by the sturdy yeomanry of Wyoming, Luzerne, Columbia and Montour. The leaders of the Abolition party in this District, know, full well, that to succeed they must deceive, and their past conduct, as well as their present position, lead us to believe that systematic deception, smooth hypocrisy, and an unparading use of money, will again be their resort. Voters of the "Twelfth," a word with you about the candidates who are seeking your suffrages, and the principles involved in their selection.

The Republican candidate, GEORGE W. SCRANTON, is the present incumbent. He is a gentleman of intelligence, of good moral character, and of great wealth. He came to Luzerne county some twenty years ago and settled in the upper end of the county in company with other parties he bought land—laid out a town—speculated in town lots—built a furnace—started a store—and made money. Like thousands of other men, he has been successful in business, and has acquired that kind of local greatness which belongs to money and success. Two years ago, while the opposition were calling themselves the "People's party," some half a dozen politicians started the name of Mr. Scranton for Congress.—The Rev. Reuben Nelson and Davis Alton Esq., were already in the field. These gentlemen were known as thorough-going anti-slavery men, and the sincere abolitionists were their friends. But their claims were disregarded. A fraud was to be perpetrated, and neither Nelson nor Alton were the men to head it. In Mr. Scranton was found the instrument which the manipulators could handle. Engaged for twenty years in the pursuit of wealth, he had not troubled himself about politics—had not even professed to have any political opinions, and had cared little for parties or partisans. To nominate such a man, said the wire-pullers, will be a master-stroke of policy. He was nominated. The shrewd speculator was all at once become the politician and the leader of a party. Before him was Congress—behind him Wall Street. To work he went.—Leaving to the wire-pullers aforesaid the task of reconciling the friends of Nelson and Alton—the honest abolitionists—he himself solicited in person the support of Democrats on the ground that he was just as much a Democrat as anybody. When they questioned him, he pointed to his votes—for Bigler—for Wright—for Buchanan—and pledged himself, if elected, to pursue a conservative, no-party course. His impudence, if not entirely modest, was certainly very earnest. The trick succeeded. Democrats voted for Scranton the Democrat—old line Whigs voted for Scranton the Whig. The abolitionists voted for Scranton, the anti-slavery man

A financial panic had overspread the world—Scranton was the Archimedes, and Congress the lever, which was to lift the world out of its dependency and despair up into the happier atmosphere of wisdom and wealth. Mr. Scranton was elected.—He went to Congress with the good wishes of the confidence, and the votes of all parties. How did he fulfill his high obligations? Where does he stand now? These are pertinent questions to the voters of this District now that he asks for a re-election. Let the following article from the *Luzerne Union* of September 13th, express our views on this point:

COL. SCRANTON.  
The Republicans of this district have nominated Col. Scranton unanimously for re-election to Congress. We expected this would be the case; indeed, had it not been so for other reasons than the positive declaration of the Colonel, it would have been an instance of flagrant ingratitude from his party.

So far the nomination seems to have fallen still born upon the public. It must look ominous to the Colonel and his partisans when they contrast the reception of his nomination two years ago and now.—We learn that then all was enthusiasm on every street corner and from every alley and by path was heard the shout for "Scranton." He represented himself and was represented by his friends as having no sympathy with partisan Republicans. He had voted for Bigler in '54, for Packer in '57, for Col Wright for Congress in '54, and it was said boldly that he did not vote for Fremont, and many were the insinuations among Democrats that he voted for Buchanan. His election was asked on the ground that the business interests of the district, prostrated and languishing, demanded the election of a man who was thoroughly identified with them; and who would go to Congress above partisan objects and ready to co-operate with any party to advance our great industrial concerns. Col. Scranton will not himself deny that this was the position he put himself in before the people. He even went so far as to insist that Hon. G. A. Grow could not speak in his behalf in this country because of this ultra partisan position and also because he was known to be a freetrader, and had voted in Congress in favor of reducing the Tariff in 1857. Mr. Grow was sent back to the Wilmet district leaving his appointments at Pittston and other places to be filled by others. Now what did this man Scranton, when he took his seat in Congress, with all these pledges to his constituents resting upon him? The very first vote he cast in that body was for this same free trader, Grow, for Speaker! And not only for Grow the free trader, but also for Grow the bitter, malignant abolitionist, who recently made a speech at Montrose, which will be found reported in the *Record of the Times* of week before last, and which for violence of language and intemperate abolition sentiment, is fully up to the standard of Wm. Lloyd Garrison or John Brown! For weeks Col. Scranton, forgetting his conversation, forgetting the tariff, forgetting every pledge he had given during the canvass for his election, struggled to organize the House by placing such a man in the chair, where his word would be law in the formation of committees, and where his influence would be potential with his party on all matters of Legislation. After having spent weeks in this fruitless attempt to organize the House, under the goadings of the press and the unmitigated pressure of public sentiment at home, Col. Scranton professed to return to and be willing to redeem his oft-voluted pledges, and to vote for a conservative candidate for speaker. He therefore left Mr. Grow and voted for Smith of North Carolina. He, and a few acting with him, were taken at their word, and Mr. Smith was elected; but behold, as soon as the result was known, and before it was announced by the clerk, Col. Scranton changed his vote, thus undoing what had been done in good faith. The whole country was amazed at this act of perfidy, and Col. Scranton found it necessary to explain from the floor of Congress. And what was his excuse? Standing upon that floor where truth and candor and frankness should be most sacredly regarded, if anywhere in the wide world, he professed that his reason for changing his vote was that Mr. Smith was not sound on the tariff! Now Mr. Scranton will not pretend that he had any conversation with Mr. Smith on the tariff between the time of his voting for him and the time of changing his vote. This reason then was neither frank or honest, but as though to make his insincerity more palpable, he had all along been voting for Grow, a known and avowed free trader! His vote for Smith then was only for the purpose of satisfying the conservative element of his district, which he thought he could cast safely, as there could be no danger of his of his election.

These were exploits in the last Congress and beyond these his constituents heard nothing of him as of the least importance in that body to their interests or the interests of the country at large. He has located himself with the Republicans, and no specious pretenses will avail him now for the purpose of obtaining Democratic votes. He is entitled to the support of the Republicans, but the prestige about him which carried him so triumphantly through the campaign before is broken. Democrats need not fear him, with anything like a respectable nomination. This district can and must be redeemed, and Mr. Scranton will find this time as he passes through the district, that his glory has departed, and that instead of bonfires and illuminations

and buzzes, he will meet the sullen determination of a people who will not be twice deceived.

The only intellectual feat performed by our representative in Congress, was the recital of a long, dry manuscript essay on conservatism, &c., which we judge must have been remarkable at least for *clearness* as the reports state that the Hall of the House was soon left nearly vacant. As some indication of the standing of our representative among his contemporaries, we quote a paragraph from the correspondence of the *New York Times* (a Republican paper,) published during the last session of Congress. Speaking of Mr. Scranton it says:

"He is a very good looking man, and might do in a board of directors of a railroad company, yet how such a man came to be pitchedforked into Congress, is a mystery!"

The Democratic candidate, DAVID R. RANDALL, is a member of the bar of Luzerne county, to which he was admitted in 1848. He is now forty two years of age. His father was a New Hampshire farmer, who came to Chenango county, New York, when some eight years later, leaving a large family of children and little property. Young Randall found himself, at the age of fifteen, the head of a family, who looked to him for support and protection. Left thus, with seven brothers and sisters, young Randall struggled on to support the family and educate himself. Daytime found him at his work on the farms in the neighborhood, or any other labor that he could find to do that was honorable, and the night-time found him at his books by the light of pine faggots. In this way he educated himself and supported a widowed mother and his brothers and sisters, till he arrived at the age, and acquired the necessary education, to enable him to become a teacher. In this profession he rose rapidly till he became a teacher in the Seminary of the town near by. There he labored with the same energy that had characterized him from early boyhood, and was finally appointed Superintendent of Common Schools for the county of Chenango. Devoting his time and efforts to the cause of education in this capacity for two years, he then concluded to enter upon the study of the law. He accordingly entered his name in the office of Ransom Balcomb, now one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of New York. This was in 1843, and he continued to read law with Judge Balcomb till 1846, being obliged, however, to devote much time to teaching, &c., to support the family. Judge Balcomb became so much interested in his student that of late years he has several times visited Providence for the purpose of spending a few days with him at his home.

In 1846 Mr. R. left his home and came to this county, commencing here to build up his fortune by teaching, soon after entering his name with Charles Silkman, Esq., of Providence. Here, as in New York, he was obliged to teach day-times and study nights, for there was ever before him the dependence of his mother, brother and sisters. Struggling along with persistent energy, in 1848 he was admitted to the Bar of Luzerne. He opened an office at Providence, and soon his studious habits, frank manners and ready business tact, brought him clients, the number of whom increased, till of late years he has had a large and lucrative practice.

Mr. Randall is a frugal, industrious, honest, blunt man. He always says what he means and means what he says. From his practice he has accumulated a neat, comfortable home for his family, aided largely to educate his young brothers and sisters, the youngest of whom, a sister, he is now supporting at a female Seminary in New York. His mother died the present season, not living long enough to witness the honors so soon to be extended to her son, by a people who have witnessed his heroic struggles in life, and who will ever reward those who have the manhood, courage, ability and will to rise superior to all obstacles in youth, and make to themselves a place among the men of our country. At the Bar he is universally respected; indeed we believe that Judge Conyngham was the first to suggest his name for Congress, and there is not, among over fifty members of our Bar, one to be found, no matter what may be his politics, who will not bear cheerful testimony to the integrity and high character of David R. Randall.

Indeed his truthfulness, candor and honorable bearing are proverbial, and we challenge the severest scrutiny of the character of our gallant standard bearer. His nomination was a tribute of which any man might be proud. The office sought the man, not the man the office. Mr. Randall has all his life been a steady, consistent, thorough Democrat. He is an earnest supporter of the electoral ticket formed at Reading, and regards the defeat of Sectionalism as the paramount object to be attained at the coming election. His views upon the Tariff are just those which all intelligent Pennsylvanians entertain, and are equi-distant from the bald heresies of such Republicans as Willmot, Grow and William C. Bryant, on the one hand, and from those of such idealists, dreamers and Abolitionists as Henry C. Carey, on the other. In regard to the homestead bill, he would so direct legislation as to give every old soldier a home and people our western prairies with honest industry, while he would restrain,

if possible, that corrupt tide of legislation which is pouring wealth into the coffers of the monster corporations, whose existence is a reproach to America, the world over.

THE DUTY OF DEMOCRATS.  
With such a nomination regularly made, no Democrat should for a moment hesitate as to what his duty is. Let us not be twice deceived. Mr. Scranton has forfeited all claim to Democratic support. He is running now as the candidate of a party whose only hope of existence is in perpetuating sectional strife and in maintaining eternal agitation. Let us redeem the District, and prove our attachment to the ancient faith. Especially let the young Democracy recognize in the nomination of honest Dave Randall a tribute to those qualities, which, sooner or later, bring their own reward. Let them see in it an illustration of the truth, that industry, good character, high honor and a steady adherence to sound principles, is better than wealth or wire-pulling. Let us all see to it, that the Twelfth Congressional District is not again mis-represented upon the floor of Congress.

### A LEAF FROM THE RECORD.

A friend has placed in our hands a copy of a speech delivered by Mr. Douglas in the city of New York on the first of June, 1854, immediately after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which has an important bearing at this time, showing as it does how Mr. Douglas then understood the Senatorial question. We call attention to the following extract:

"Some of the Northern members of Congress desired that the principles of the Wilmot proviso should be applied to this Territory, and that slavery should be forever prohibited within its borders. The Southern men, on the other hand, demanded a positive recognition of slavery. Congress refused to grant either of these extreme requests, and left the matter entire to the people of the Territory. When they shall request to be admitted as States, it will then be for them to settle the question. My object, as Chairman of the Committee on Territories, was to conform with the principles of the compromise of 1850."

In this speech Mr. Douglas indicated when, in his opinion, the people of the Territories should settle the question. He did not say that they had the power to do so at any time after the organization of the Territory, but when, and only when, they shall request to be admitted as States—which request was of course to be made through a State Constitution.

Furthermore, he said that his object was to conform with the principles of the compromise of 1850. This question is directly answered by the celebrated report of Mr. Clay upon introducing the Compromise bills. Listen to the language of that report:

"The true principle which ought to regulate the action of Congress in forming territorial governments for each newly acquired domain, is to refrain from all legislation on the subject in the territory acquired, so long as it retains the territorial form of government—leaving it to the people of such Territory, when they have attained to a condition which entitles them to admission as a State to decide for themselves the question of the allowance or prohibition of domestic slavery."—(See *Congressional Globe*, May 10, 1850, page 945.)

This evidence is conclusive as to the understanding of Mr. Clay and Mr. Douglas of the principle of the compromise of 1850. It cannot be repudiated now, nor can it be successfully controverted by the advocates of squatter sovereignty. We venture to say that none of them will attempt the task.

TEA.—In Taylor's "Travels in China," the signification of some of the names by which the different brands of Teas are known, are given, which are as follows—making due allowance for the changes and corruption they undergo, in form and sound in being Anglicized: "Hysm" means "before the rains," or "flourishing spring"—that is, early in the spring.—"Hence it is often called "Young Hysm." "Hysm Skin" is composed of the refuse of the other kinds, the native terms for which means "tea skins." Refuse of a still coarser description, containing many stems, is called "tea bones." "Bohed" is the name of the hills in the region where it collected. "Pehow" or "Pecow" means, "white hairs"—the down on the tender leaves. "Pouchong"—"folded plant." "So-chong"—"small plant." "Twankay" is the name of a small stream in the province where it is bought. "Congo" is from a term signifying "labor," from the care required in its preparation.

Cesar, dis child's gwine to Wash' ington to ply for offis ob de Government."  
"Well what are you tryin' to post now, eh?"  
"Ise gwine to ply for de post ob sex-ton in de post offis apartment."  
"Sexton ob post offis apartment?"  
"Yes, sah! I berry de dead letters."

least of it, thought Mr. Curtin was a very dangerous man with a revolver in hand. After this excitement Curtin left and the crowd dispersed.

SAMUEL H. SNYDER.  
Chapman, Sept. 17 1860.  
Snyder County ss.

Before me, the subscriber, one of the Justices of the Peace, in and for the county of Snyder, personally appeared, the above named, Samuel H. Snyder, and after being duly sworn according to law, doth depose and say, that the above statement is true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

HENRY MOTZ, J. P.  
Freeburg, Sept. 18, 1860.

Henry D. Foster and the Tariff.  
We recently published extracts from the speeches of Henry D. Foster, while a member of Congress from the Westmoreland District, in favor of a judicious tariff securing reasonable protection to the great interests of Pennsylvania. From the position taken in these speeches, years ago, Mr. Foster has never deviated in the slightest degree. As a representative in Congress, as a candidate before the people, and as an advocate of political principles on the stump, he has ever maintained the most undeviating consistency upon this question. His record cannot be impeached. And yet we are surprised to see that Mr. McClure the Chairman of the Republican State Committee, and the confidential friend of Mr. Curtin, had the effrontery to declare, in a speech recently delivered in Philadelphia, that Mr. Foster was opposed to the Tariff and hostile to the interests of Pennsylvania. Mr. McClure as a wily politician, and has the reputation of not being over scrupulous in what he says or does, but he has not displayed his usual sagacity in this flying in the face of the record, to help the sinking cause of Mr. Curtin. If Mr. Foster is not a friend of Pennsylvania interests, there is not a man in the Commonwealth whose fidelity can be relied upon.

Mr. Foster's record can be pointed to as an evidence of his sincerity upon this question, but where is Mr. Curtin's record? He professes to be in favor of a Tariff, and we have no reason to doubt that he is; but it must not be forgotten that he is now using the question as a political hobby, while he is associated with a party which has neither the power nor the disposition to legislate for the interests of Pennsylvania. The people of this State should understand that if they ever succeed in procuring a Tariff favorable to their interests it must be through a combination of portions of all parties. It cannot be effected solely through a party so sectional and so unpopular with the conservatives of the country as the Republican party committed to the doctrine of protection. It is true that most of the Republicans at the last session of Congress voted in favor of the Morrill Tariff bill, but it was with the expectation that it could not pass, and with the express object of accumulating ammunition to be used in this Presidential campaign. We have to point only to a few facts to show that the Republican party is not a tariff party. Their candidate for Vice President, Mr. Hamilton notoriously a free-trader, representing a free-trade State, and as a Senator from Maine voted for the Tariff of 1846, an act for which Mr. Dallas was denounced by the Opposition all over Pennsylvania. William C. Bryant, editor of the *New York Evening Post* and for forty years a consistent and persistent advocate of free-trade, has been placed at the head of the Republican electoral ticket by the Republican Convention of New York, which clearly shows that hostility to the Tariff does not impair a man's standing with the Republican party of New York. Every well informed man knows that the Republicans of the Westmoreland do not make the Tariff an issue, for the reason that the party is divided as to the expediency of legislating in behalf of the interests of Pennsylvania. These are well established facts; and yet, professing that they are unknown to the people of Pennsylvania, the Republican candidate for Governor and his Chief Committeeman are engaged in the demagogic game of misrepresenting the position of Mr. Foster and claiming for the Republican party what it cannot and will not perform.

The only way by which Pennsylvania can ever obtain legislation for her peculiar interests, is for her people to act unitedly and exclusively of party. If she places her interests entirely in the charge of one party, and that party the Republican, which is detested by nearly two-thirds of the

people of the United States, she will never obtain the protection desired; and the sooner her citizens learn to realize this truth the better for them. The first great step they should take towards the accomplishment of their object is the election of HENRY D. FOSTER, whose whole political life testifies his devotion to Pennsylvania interests, and the defeat of Mr. Curtin, who would ride the Tariff to death to secure his personal elevation.

From The *Atlestown (Pa.) Democrat*.  
A Few Questions.  
Democrats! cut this out and ask your Know Nothings and "Republican" neighbors the following simple questions:  
Who are in favor of giving negroes the right of suffrage, which they refuse to foreign born citizens?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who passed the law in Massachusetts preventing foreign born citizens from voting, when duly naturalized according to the Constitution of the United States?  
The Know Nothing, and "Republicans."  
Who recommended the same law to be passed in New Jersey?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who recommended the same law to be passed in New York?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who sanctioned and approved that odious measure in Pennsylvania, by giving silent consent in their late State Convention?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who introduced a bill in the Legislature of Ohio to strike out the word 'white' from the Constitution, in order to give negroes the right of suffrage?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who are in favor of foreigners not voting until they are twenty one years in this country?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who voted against admitting Minnesota as a free State?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who voted against admitting Oregon as a free State?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who carried banners in 1856, upon which only sixteen Stars appeared, where there should have been thirty-one?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who were in favor of letting the Union slide?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."

Another instance of bravery has been related which took place at Winetka, upon Saturday last, among the passengers of the Lady Elgin. Among the rafts and pieces of wreck tossing in the surf, one raft was anxiously watched, to which were clinging five persons, among them John Jervis, of Milwaukee, his wife and child. As the raft was drawn in the surf it was capsized, and all disappeared for a moment beneath the angry waters. When it arose Jervis alone was clinging to it. He instantly left it however, and swam for his wife and child, and recovered them. Twice and thrice he repeated this heroic act. Finally when the shore was almost reached, the raft was for the last time capsized, and when it reached the surface, Jervis alone was clinging to it.—Again, he left it, and swam for a long time in search of those whom he had so long and so nobly protected, but all in vain, and he was obliged at last to swim to the raft to save his own life.

A man was indicted out west, lately, for felony. His innocence was proven, but notwithstanding this, the jury found him guilty. The Judge was shocked, and arose and said:—  
"Gentlemen, the prisoner's innocence was clearly proven."  
"Yes," said the foreman, "he is innocent of the crime now charged against him, but he stole my gray mare last Christmas."  
"It is very well for little children to be lambs, but a very bad thing for them to grow up sheep."  
"Bon, did you hear that my father gets married again next Easter?"  
"No, Tom I did not. Does he get an old woman?"  
"No sir-ee! He gets a new one."

AFFIDAVIT.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

### PICARD'S LETTER.

At the special request of many persons, who wish to have the following letter and affidavit in connection, we have consented to republish both. One reason, why we do it, is because it was attempted to throw a doubt upon the author's credibility; and the letter with an affidavit to it will doubtless settle the matter.

### LETTER TO ANDREW G. CURTIN.

MR. CURTIN—As you are now a prominent candidate before the people of this Commonwealth for the highest office the people of a sovereign State alone can confer, and as you doubtless desire every man in the State to vote for you for Governor, I take this reasonable occasion to give you, as well as the public, my reasons why I cannot and will not vote for you. When you was Secretary of this Commonwealth, a circumstance occurred in Bellefonte, the place where you reside, showing satisfactorily to my mind that you possess too malicious a spirit to fill, with any creditable degree of dignity, the honorable position of Governor over a free, civilized and enlightened people. The circumstance was one of too serious a nature to be lost; and as I told you then, that I would on some future occasion remind you of it, I shall now proceed to do so without the fear of your REVOLVER in my hand.

I will here first state that I am only a poor man, and by profession am a huckster. At the time above referred to, I came to Bellefonte on business. I had an excellent dog with me to guard my wagon. A number of boys began teasing the dog by running at him; and some went so far as to throw stones at him. So soon as the dog would defend himself against these unjust attacks, the ungodly boys ran into the houses; but no sooner had the dog again returned to his wagon, than the boys would also return and repeat the insult. Among these boys was the son of A. G. Curtin; who, being a little tardy in reaching the house, was caught by the dog at the leg of his pantaloons. The dog was at once recalled and tied in the stable belonging to the hotel, so as to prevent the boys from teasing him. Soon after that you came to me and asked me whether it was my dog that had caught your boy. I told you that you should keep a "little cool," and I would explain the matter; but you would not hear me, and walked off greatly excited, and returned with a REVOLVER in your hand and a crowd following you. You walked up to me and drew your REVOLVER and said: "You damn Dutch Son-of-a-b—, if you say one word I'll shoot you G—d D—d Dutch Son-of-a-b—'s brains out!"

That, Mr. Curtin, was my introduction to our Secretary of State! It was a loud and strong introduction; and I must say I never had an introduction to any official gentleman (!) so well remember.

You then turned to the poor dog and shot him three times, and said you had another ball left for me.

The subscriber is ready at any time, when called upon, to verify these statements by good and reputable citizens who were present and witnessed the scene.

These, then, Mr. Curtin, are some of my reasons why I really and honestly think you are unfit to be the head of a free Dutch and sovereign people like that of Pennsylvania. You seem to have a very contemptible opinion of Dutchmen; but allow me, Sir, to tell you that the Dutchmen of Pennsylvania will show you by next October that they have an equally contemptible opinion of you. They will shoot you, not with revolvers, but with something more effectual and honorable—paper balls!

R. PICARD.  
Middleburg, Pa. August 6, 1860.

### AFFIDAVIT.

I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

people of the United States, she will never obtain the protection desired; and the sooner her citizens learn to realize this truth the better for them. The first great step they should take towards the accomplishment of their object is the election of HENRY D. FOSTER, whose whole political life testifies his devotion to Pennsylvania interests, and the defeat of Mr. Curtin, who would ride the Tariff to death to secure his personal elevation.

From The *Atlestown (Pa.) Democrat*.  
A Few Questions.  
Democrats! cut this out and ask your Know Nothing and "Republican" neighbors the following simple questions:  
Who are in favor of giving negroes the right of suffrage, which they refuse to foreign born citizens?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who passed the law in Massachusetts preventing foreign born citizens from voting, when duly naturalized according to the Constitution of the United States?  
The Know Nothing, and "Republicans."  
Who recommended the same law to be passed in New Jersey?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who recommended the same law to be passed in New York?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who sanctioned and approved that odious measure in Pennsylvania, by giving silent consent in their late State Convention?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who introduced a bill in the Legislature of Ohio to strike out the word 'white' from the Constitution, in order to give negroes the right of suffrage?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who are in favor of foreigners not voting until they are twenty one years in this country?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who voted against admitting Minnesota as a free State?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who voted against admitting Oregon as a free State?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who carried banners in 1856, upon which only sixteen Stars appeared, where there should have been thirty-one?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."  
Who were in favor of letting the Union slide?  
The Know Nothings and "Republicans."

Another instance of bravery has been related which took place at Winetka, upon Saturday last, among the passengers of the Lady Elgin. Among the rafts and pieces of wreck tossing in the surf, one raft was anxiously watched, to which were clinging five persons, among them John Jervis, of Milwaukee, his wife and child. As the raft was drawn in the surf it was capsized, and all disappeared for a moment beneath the angry waters. When it arose Jervis alone was clinging to it. He instantly left it however, and swam for his wife and child, and recovered them. Twice and thrice he repeated this heroic act. Finally when the shore was almost reached, the raft was for the last time capsized, and when it reached the surface, Jervis alone was clinging to it.—Again, he left it, and swam for a long time in search of those whom he had so long and so nobly protected, but all in vain, and he was obliged at last to swim to the raft to save his own life.

A man was indicted out west, lately, for felony. His innocence was proven, but notwithstanding this, the jury found him guilty. The Judge was shocked, and arose and said:—  
"Gentlemen, the prisoner's innocence was clearly proven."  
"Yes," said the foreman, "he is innocent of the crime now charged against him, but he stole my gray mare last Christmas."  
"It is very well for little children to be lambs, but a very bad thing for them to grow up sheep."  
"Bon, did you hear that my father gets married again next Easter?"  
"No, Tom I did not. Does he get an old woman?"  
"No sir-ee! He gets a new one."

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another ball left for Mr. Picard. I did not know Mr. Picard before then, but I thought at the time, from the manner in which Mr. Curtin behaved he would shoot him. And to say the

Affidavit.  
I, the subscriber, am personally acquainted with Col. Andrew G. Curtin, the present candidate for Governor. I was present only to witness the latter part of the scene, when Mr. Curtin shot Mr. Picard's dog.  
I lived in Bellefonte at the time it occurred. I heard a fuss at the stable belonging to the Pennsylvania Hotel. I thought some persons were fighting and went to see. When I came there I saw Mr. Curtin in a great rage, with a revolver in his hand and damning and cursing Mr. Picard. While I was present Mr. Picard gave him no word which would insult him, but Curtin shot the dog and declared he had another