

John Est

THE STAR OF THE NORTH.

W. H. Jacoby, Proprietor.

Truth and Right—God and our Country.

[Two Dollars per Annum.

VOLUME 10.

BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA., WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1858.

NUMBER 17.

STAR OF THE NORTH.

OFFICE ON MAIN ST., 3RD SQUARE BELOW MARKET.
TERMS—Two Dollars per annum if paid within six months from the time of subscribing; two dollars and fifty cents if not paid within the year. No subscription received for a less period than six months; no discontinuance permitted until all arrears are paid, unless at the option of the editor.

SPEECH OF HON. PAUL LEIDY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE ADMISSION OF KANSAS.

Here he states that he had asserted to the people that they had, or would have, this privilege; meaning, evidently, to convey the idea that he had assured them that the constitution would be submitted to them. Now, let us see what he did really say on that occasion. This is his language:
"You should not console yourselves, my fellow-citizens, with the reflection that you may by a subsequent vote, defeat the constitution. Although most anxious to secure to you the exercise of that great constitutional right, and believing that the convention is the servant, and not the master of the people, yet I have no power to dictate the proceedings of that body."

How different the ideal! Instead of a positive assertion that they should have such an opportunity, he cautions them against trusting to any such hope: that it is by no means certain that they can have that opportunity. And for that very reason they should be sure to attend the election, and secure such delegates as would express their will. I hope we shall hear no more of garbled extracts after this exhibition of garbling.

I have said nothing about the submission of the slavery article to a vote of the people. I do not deem it of any particular importance to notice the objections to the form or manner in which this article was submitted; for the reason that I do not believe the convention was bound, in law or by precedent to submit any part of the constitution to the vote of the people; and if they chose to submit the same, or any part of it, to a vote it was for them to say what part, and in what manner. But, in passing, I will remark that I cannot see the force of the objections raised by my honorable colleague (Mr. Montgomery) to this submission. First he objects, because, in voting on the slavery article, either for or against, he says the people were compelled to vote for the constitution. Now, sir, I deny this. I aver that the constitution was not submitted to a vote; that no privilege was given to the people to vote for or against the constitution. That instrument, all except the seventh article, was withheld from the people; and the vote could not, by any possibility, be construed as a vote in favor of the constitution. True, whichever way the people voted on the seventh article, the constitution would be adopted, except that seventh article; but not by virtue of that vote, but by the action of the convention.

Now, I do not wish to be understood here as asserting that the convention acted properly in withholding the whole constitution from a vote of the people. I think they should have submitted it. I believe with the President, that these instruments should in all cases be submitted to the test; but I do not agree that there was any binding obligation upon that body to submit it, or any part of it, to such a test, and no greater obligation to submit the slavery clause than any other, except that which grew out of the state of feeling which existed in the Territory on this subject. But the honorable gentleman says the people were subjected to a test; they were required to swear to support the constitution, if adopted. Well, suppose they were? Is it not the duty of every citizen to support the constitution of his own State? and is not this duty binding, whether he is required to take an oath to do so or not? If adopted, would not all the people of Kansas be bound to support it, and every part of it? What objection, then, to taking an oath to do that which is right and obligatory, even without an oath? But he says, in swearing to support the constitution, they were required to swear to the truth of all the averments contained therein; in other words, that every man who swears to support the constitution of his State, or of the United States, swears that all that is contained therein is true and right, and also swears that it shall not be altered, except in the manner therein provided for. This is certainly a novel doctrine, a monstrous doctrine. What! Will the honorable gentleman say here, that every man who swears to support the constitution of his State perjures himself unless he believes that all the averments contained in that instrument are true, and all the principles embodied therein are sound? Will he tell us that, because the constitution of the State of Missouri contains an averment precisely like that contained in the constitution of Kansas, declaring the right to hold property in slaves, therefore the honorable gentleman from Missouri, (Mr. Blair,) on the other side of this House, who is a Republican, and who, I take it, is honestly opposed to slavery because he believes it wrong, that he cannot hold an office in his own State, because he would be required to swear to support that constitution? Will he tell us that all those upon this floor who do not believe that the section in the

Constitution of the United States which requires the rendition of fugitive slaves to their proper masters, or that section which gives to slaveholding States a representation on this floor for three fifths of their slaves, is not just, nor correct in principle, perjured themselves when they took the oath here to support the Constitution of the United States? Or that every man who sits in a convention for the amendment or alteration of his State constitution, is perjured if he ever previously took an oath to support the Constitution, unless the mode of alteration was prescribed in the constitution, and strictly adhered to in all the steps taken for its amendment. What is this oath to support the constitution? It is an oath to support and obey it as a fundamental law, not to believe it as a fundamental truth. It is an oath to support it as while it continues to be the constitution of the State, not perpetually, nor after it has ceased to be such.

But the honorable gentleman says further that the constitution of Kansas repeals the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Is this true? How? Why, says the gentleman, this constitution declares that all laws now in force in the Territory of Kansas, which are not repugnant to this constitution, shall continue and be of force, until altered, amended, or repealed, by a Legislature assembled under this constitution; and that thereby this convention nullified the right of legislation secured to the Territory by the Kansas Nebraska act, after the 7th day of November, '57; and that if Kansas is admitted with this constitution, all the laws passed by the territorial Legislature, at the extra session, are thereby repealed. Let us examine this a moment. To what point of time does this act refer? Does it refer to the day that this clause was approved in convention? Does it refer to the day when the instrument as a whole was adopted in the convention? Does it refer to the time when the people were to vote upon the slavery question? or to the time when Kansas shall be admitted by Congress, and thereby become a State? Here is in this instrument itself a clause which fixes the time when the constitution shall go into effect, namely, when ratified by the vote of the people upon the slavery question as therein provided. And hence the word "now" cannot possibly mean any time anterior to that; and if the gentleman will refer to the dates, he will find that this event occurred on the 31st of December, after the extra session of the Territorial Legislature had adjourned; and that consequently that law passed by that body were not only repealed by the convention, but, according to his construction were rendered entirely irrevocable until after the State should be organized. But I am inclined to the opinion that the construction which should be put upon this clause would fix the point of time indicated by this word "now," as the time when Kansas should be admitted and thereby become a State. I think this construction the fair one, and one that would preserve in tact all the legitimate powers of the Territory while it remained a Territory, and at the same time effect the object evidently had in view by the convention, namely, the perpetuation of the territorial laws under the State organization until these laws should be altered by the State assembly.

Having now disposed, as I think, satisfactorily of these objections, I will next consider the vote of the 4th of January, 1858, under the act of the Territorial Legislature, for and against the constitution. At this election it is admitted, at least I admit it, that a large majority of the votes of the Territory voted against the constitution. And the question is, what is the effect of that vote? I do not, sir, deny the validity of that act authorizing the vote on the 4th of January. I admit that it was within the scope of legislative authority—that it rests upon the same authority as the act passed by the same Legislature, to determine whether a convention should be called to form a constitution. But the question here is as to its effect; and I wish to call the attention of gentlemen to this act itself. You will observe, by a reference to this act, that it does not pretend to give any legal efficacy to this vote. It authorizes a vote to be taken, but it does not go on to say, "and if, upon the summing up of all the votes cast, it shall appear that a majority of the votes cast at that election were against the constitution, then, and from that time forth, as well the said constitution as all acts and proceedings theretofore had under the same, shall be null and void." If the Legislature had intended that this vote should have the effect of a veto upon the action of the Lecompton Convention, they would undoubtedly have expressed it in some such language as the foregoing. But they did not assume such power. They knew full well that they did not possess the power; and acting Governor Stanton, in his message, had just given it as his opinion that the convention, having acted under the previous law, it was incompetent for the Legislature to repeal the law. And if the Legislature could not do this directly, they could not authorize a vote of the people, the effect of which would be to repeal it. I have not the time to discuss this point at length; but the point to which I wish to call attention, and which I think is decisive of the question, has been sufficiently indicated—namely, the want of legislative jurisdiction over the action of the convention.

I do not wish here to be understood as, in any sense, denying the power of the people to review the actions of the convention; but what I contend for is, that it must be done in accordance with the prescribed mode of law. And those forms would have required an act of the Legislature authorizing the election of delegates to a second convention, for the purpose of revising, altering, or amending this constitution. In this way the people can, I take it, at all times control and regulate their constitutions, as well before they have been presented to and admitted by Congress, as after; but I know of no other way prescribed by law to do it. And if now, under the present law of Kansas, (if they really have a law to that effect, about which there seems to be some dispute between the Legislature and Governor Denver; if, under this law, the convention elected should assemble and remodel the Lecompton Constitution, or make an entire new one before Kansas is admitted, and present that here in due form, either with or without having first submitted it to a vote of the people, I hold we should be bound to receive it; and if it was found to have been made in conformity with the requirements of law, giving a full and fair opportunity to participate in the proceedings, I think we would be bound to accept it as the last expression of the sovereign will of the people; for I hold that the power of the people is not exhausted by being once exercised. Upon this point, however, I do not hereby design to commit myself. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

I do not agree with some honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, that the vote for State and legislative officers under this constitution, on the 4th of January, by the free-State men, is an estoppel, and closes their mouths against a denial of the legality of the constitution. Under strict rules of law, I admit, it might have such effect. But I cannot admit that these rigid rules apply to this high court in such a case. I am of opinion they had a right to guard against a contingency by electing officers under the constitution, and at the same time protest that the constitution was void; so that, if it should be afterwards decided against them in this court, they would have the advantage of their election. I think they had a right, a legal and constitutional right, on that day, peaceably, at the polls, first to vote for the State and other officers under the constitution, and then immediately vote, under the provisions of the territorial law, against the constitution. In this view I think I am sustained by the instructions of the President to Governor Denver, to see that the people were protected in their right to vote at that election. They had also a right to send the result of that vote here, just as they would have presented a petition making known their views and wishes; and then the result is with us. If we find, upon examination, that they come here with clean hands; if the grievances of which they complain are real, and are such as we can redress, it is our duty to redress them. I extend to them in this case every right and privilege which equity can claim; and if they have a case in which equity can entitle them to relief, then, in the name of that sacred, just and right, give them relief. But if, upon investigation, we find that these grievances are the result of their own negligence and inaction, their own folly and crime; if we find that the law affords them ample means of protecting themselves against these wrongs, or of redressing the wrongs after they were committed; if we find, as we do in this case, that the wrongs of which they complain are the consequence of their own willful and obstinate resistance of the law and violation of its requirements, combined with a stubborn refusal to avail themselves of its provisions; then, sir, there is no principle of equity or justice that they can invoke. They may invoke our sympathy; they may ask for favor; but justice and equity they cannot demand.

I propose next to consider briefly the right of the people to amend the constitution. In a case growing out of the Dorr rebellion, the Supreme Court use the following language:
"No one, we believe, has ever doubted the proposition that, according to the institutions of this country, the sovereignty in every State resides in the people of the State, and that they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure."

Following out the idea herein expressed, the constitution of Kansas, in the bill of rights, declares:
"2. All political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit; and therefore they have at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to alter, reform, or abolish their form of government in such manner as they may think proper."

Here we have it first laid down by the Supreme Court as a settled, unquestioned proposition, that the sovereignty of the State resides in the people of the State; and that, as a consequence resulting from the foregoing, this people, being sovereign, may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure. Then we have, in the constitution of Kansas itself, the truth of this proposition reaffirmed and still more emphatically set forth, declaring that the people of Kansas have at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to alter, reform, &c., their government in such manner as they may think proper—not at such times and in such manner as is prescribed in the constitution, the fundamental law of the government, but at all times, and in any manner. And this right is "inalienable and indefeasible;" the parties possessing it cannot part with it themselves; cannot alienate

nor can they be deprived of it by others. Now, if this is a right inherent in the people, inalienable and indefeasible, existing at all times, then I take it that no provision whatever in the constitution could possibly affect it, or restrain its exercise.—But in the constitution of Kansas no attempt is made to restrain this right; but, on the contrary, it is expressly reserved and acknowledged. The natural of political rights of an individual or community cannot be divested but by express positive law; but here seems to be a right which is above laws and constitutions; the owners cannot part with it; constitutions and laws cannot deject it. There is, however, no attempt in this constitution to interfere with this right. It is true, there is in this instrument an article, or section, regulating amendments after the year 1864; not amendments by the people, but by the Legislature. Why it is asked why this section relating to amendments was introduced, if not to prevent amendments in any other manner than therein expressed? I answer, the Legislature has not, except by a constitutional grant, any power over the constitution, either to make, alter, amend, or abolish; and this section was inserted for the purpose of giving to that body this power. But the grant, regulations, and restrictions contained in this section apply exclusively to the Legislature, and do not in any manner affect, limit, or restrain the rights of the people. Under this grant, the Legislature may, after 1864, alter and amend the constitution as therein provided. Prior to this time no such power can be exercised by that body; for even if the power to alter and amend did not depend upon the constitutional grant, still the fixing of a day after which this power may be exercised would, by implication, preclude the exercise of the power prior to that day.—And surely, during this period which must elapse between the time of State organization and the year 1864, no exercise of the power of the people, in the way of making amendments or alterations, can conflict with any legislative powers, for no such powers exist. How is it after 1864? I do not see any difficulty even after that date. Suppose the Legislature, after 1864, refuse to amend the constitution in the manner there prescribed, which requires a two-thirds vote; and suppose, by a majority of that body, a law is passed providing for the election of delegates to a convention to amend, and in this manner the constitution should be amended; would this act of the people conflict in any way with the legislative right? The Legislature refuse to act in the premises in the manner prescribed by law, and then the people, in the exercise of their original inherent power, act for themselves. I see no inconsistency, no conflict of power.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other matters connected with this subject which I desire to notice, but time will not permit. The subject of frauds, on which so much stress has been placed in the discussion of this question, might properly claim a little more consideration than I have been able to give it. I can, however, merely allude to it again. I do not pretend that there were no frauds perpetrated by the successful party in Kansas. On the contrary, I have no doubt there were frauds, gross frauds and wrongs, perpetrated there by individuals of both parties—such as must forever disgrace the parties who participated in them, and forever render them unworthy of the confidence and respect of honest men. That these frauds and wrongs were not confined to either party, cannot now be denied; that a few lawless men in Kansas, aided and encouraged by men equally lawless outside of that Territory, have not only disgraced themselves, and disturbed the peace and retarded the prosperity of her people, but have agitated the whole nation, will not be controverted; and that the great mass of the people there really desire a cessation of these evils, and will gladly accept of the opportunity which a State organization will afford them of ridding themselves of the power and influence of these "pestilent fellows," is, I believe, equally true.

Mr. Chairman, I have now presented all that time will permit, in defence of the immediate admission of Kansas as a State, under the constitution which she has presented to us. I might add many other considerations which have their influence upon my mind; but I will here briefly say, I shall vote for the admission of Kansas, because I believe that the people of that Territory, of all parties, really desire to have a State organization, as has been sufficiently indicated, not only by the direct vote upon that question, but by their applications made here for admission. Because I believe that she has the requisite population, that the interests of Kansas and of the nation require it. I shall vote for its admission under the Lecompton constitution, because it is the only instrument presented here with her present application. Because I believe that the proceedings, so far as we can judge, under which that constitution has been prepared and adopted, have been conducted in conformity with the requirements of law, and in such manner that the people of Kansas have had full and fair opportunity to participate "through their representatives" in its formation, and that it must be regarded as the legal expression of the will of the people. Because it will place the people of Kansas in a condition to have their own Governor and other State officers, who, being elected by themselves, and from among themselves, will necessarily command more fully the confidence of the people than such officers appointed by the

national Administration, and therefore subject to external influence and control, could possibly receive; which officers, coming directly from the people, and dependent upon them alone for political preferment, having all their interest, personal and political, identified with those of the people, will have the strongest possible motives for consulting their will and wishes. Because, with their State organization, with the legislative and executive officers all under their own control, and subject to their will, that will must at once become the law of the State, and will indicate itself in their legislative acts as well as in the speedy alteration of their constitution to such form as they may desire. Because, without admission, I see no prospect of an end of strife and agitation which have so long vexed and disgraced not only the people of Kansas, but us as a nation. And with admission, I entertain the fullest confidence that peace and harmony and prosperity will be at once restored to that divided and distracted people.

I shall vote for admission because of the consequences which will, in my opinion, inevitably result from a rejection of this application. If we reject this application for the reasons which have been urged by the Opposition, we hold out to the future the strongest possible inducements for a recurrence of these scenes whenever any Territory is hereafter about making application for admission as a State. If we allow the pervasiveness, the lawlessness, the obstinacy, and rebellion of a portion of the people of Kansas, be it a minority or a majority, to constitute a ground for the rejection of the application of those who, whatever may be their errors, their follies, or their crimes, have sustained the authority of the Government there, and in their proceedings have conformed to all the requirements of law, we offer a reward for perverseness, lawlessness, obstinacy, and rebellion in the future. But if we, as in duty we are bound to recognize only those proceedings which have been in accordance with law; if we refuse to recognize the irregular action of the turbulent and the lawless; if, by our decision, we give notice to all others in like cases offending that no advantage can possibly result from such a course, that they thereby peril their most important interests, we shall present a strong motive for the future observance of law and order.

Another consequence has been suggested by some honorable gentlemen as likely to result from a refusal by Congress to admit Kansas under this constitution, namely, a dissolution of the Union. Although I have no fears of such a result from any cause, and much less from such a cause; and although this is the first time that I have had the honor to address a legislative body, I cannot conclude my remarks without entering my protest against this cry of dissolution. I am aware that this is no novel project.—Since the first organization of the Republic we have heard these intonations. Scarcely had the ink become dry upon the parchment on which was recorded the sacred compact, until these "prophecies of woe" began their doleful predictions. Massachusetts and South Carolina, Alabama and Wisconsin, and other States, each in her turn has pronounced the doom of the Union. Vain prediction! Idle threat!

Dissolve this Union? And for what? Is the nominal freedom of a few thousand negro slaves an object so dear to the hearts of northern gentlemen, that to effect it they will hazard the liberties of the millions of freemen both North and South? Is the extension of the domains of slavery of such paramount importance to the interest, the prosperity, and the honor of southern gentlemen, as to be purchased at the sacrifice of the priceless legacy bequeathed to them by their Washingtons, their Jeffersons, their Madisons, Monroes, and Henrys, and the long list of other worthies of whom they are so justly proud? Shall we, the sons of those great and good men who framed this glorious structure, and with such admirable skill adjusted its several parts, who laid its sure foundations deep imbedded in the principles of eternal truth, and firmly based upon that immovable rock, the right of man to self-government, who cemented it together with their hearts' best blood, and consecrated it with their devoutest prayers, who left upon its every part the impress of their lofty patriotism and their deep devotion to the principles of civil and religious liberty; shall we, their sons, for such inadequate considerations, demolish this grand edifice, and scatter its fragments to the winds? Never, never!

We upon this floor may talk of dissolution; and we forget that there is, behind us, and above us, an irresistible power, which holds, and will forever hold, this Union firm and indissoluble—the power of the people—a people who cherish this Union in their heart of hearts; whose blood and treasure are forever pledged to its support and defense. That people will never permit this Union, sanctified by the blood of their ancestors, and hallowed by every feeling of national and individual pride and honor, to be dissevered by any ruthless hand.

Sir, this Union was formed to be perpetual; and it will live through coming time. And even but half a century hence, when this Hall shall have ceased to be the scene of our national councils and our national conflicts; when the capitol of this great nation, seeking some more central point, shall have fixed its location on one of the broad prairies west of the Mississippi; when, perhaps, Kansas, now the scene of turmoil and strife, shall have become the seat and centre of this empire of freedom; when fifty States shall cluster round that centre, and fifty stars shall grace our still unsullied and unruined flag, our sons, then grown gray with age, will, as they read the history of these days, smile at our causeless fears and marvel at our weakness. Mr. Chairman, I repeat it, I have no fears of a dissolution of this Union. For—
"What God in His wisdom and mercy designed, And armed with His weapons of thunder, Not all of earth's despots and factions combined Have the power to conquer or surrender."

FORMER HAPPINESS.—It is wondered how cheap happiness used to be. It used to grow in the field; we have found it there, but not lately. It lay about like sunshine at arm's length of everybody. Sometimes five speckled eggs in a grassy nest constituted it; sometimes beautiful, blue ones in the lilacs; it used to swim in the brooks, and turn up its silvery and mottled sides, like a polished little sassa, sprinkled with the color of fame which is generally supposed to be crimson. We have found it many a time, beside a mossy stone, when it looked very much like a spring flower; we have seen it coming down in the snow, and heard it descending in the rain. What a world of it used to be crowded into a Saturday afternoon. An old newspaper, with cedar ribs, a tail like three bushaws, and a penny's worth of twine, have constituted many a time—that is, many an old time—that entire stock in trade, of one perfectly happy.

A better subject for young men to discuss and meditate upon was never written than the following by Dean Swift:
"No man ever made an ill figure who understood his own talents, nor a good one who mistook them. Young men do not fail in the pursuit of life because they lack ability to succeed, half as often as a misdirection of talents. A right use of a moderate capacity will accomplish more than a wrong application of the most brilliant qualifications. Study, therefore, yourselves. Aim to find out the actual talents you possess, and then, endeavor to make the best possible use of them, and you can hardly come short of making a good figure in the world, and what is more being among those who live not in vain."

Two IRISHMEN, on landing in this country, and sitting down to their first dinner on shore, found on the table a dish of prepared mustard, which neither of them had ever happened to meet before. One of them took a spoonful at a venture, which quickly brought to his eyes tears to his eyes.
"What are you crying about?" asked his companion.
"I was crying at the recollection of my poor father who was hung about twenty years ago."
The dinner proceeded, and soon the other made a dip into the mustard, with a similar result.
"What are you crying about?" was the brave inquiry of his companion.
"I am crying because you were not hung when your father was."

"NEARER HOME."—Jas. T. Buckingham, the once brilliant editor of the Boston Courier, a beautiful letter of two columns, which concludes with the following fine pathos:
"For me the problem of immortal life, or eternal life, will soon be solved. The great Caravanserai is in sight; the steps which conduct to its portal will be few, and, I trust, unfalling."
"Nightly I pitch my moving tent, A day's march nearer home."

A Virginia paper records the marriage of Miss Jane Lemon and Mr. Ebenezer Sweet; whereupon our *devil moralizes* as follows:
How happy in extremes to meet
In Jane and Ebenezer;
She's no longer sour, but Sweet,
And he's a Lemon squeezer!

"Come here my dear; I want to ask all about your sister. Has your sister a bean?"
"No, it's the jaundice she's got; the doctor says so."

An Albany man advertises for his runaway wife—who "is but fifteen years of age, and of a loving disposition, and had on three rattan hoops."
A new play is announced in Boston under the title of "an Editor with \$5000." The Providence Journal wonders whether he was a government officer, or had robbed a bank.

"We never yet knew a man disposed to scorn the humble, who was not himself a fair object of scorn to the humblest."
There is iron enough in the blood of forty-two men, to make a ploughshare weighing twenty-four pounds.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS.—Both Houses of Congress have resolved to adjourn on the 7th of June.
A beautiful inscription, it is said, may be found in an Italian grave yard:
"Here lies Etalio, who transported a large fortune to Heaven in acts of charity and has gone thither to enjoy it."
When are people's toes like oaks? When they bear oak corns.

Rest satisfied with doing, and leave others talk of what they please.

Influence of Song.
Most of us have experienced the luxury of tears when listening to an old ballad.—We know an old man who, having lived a long career of vice and crime, was at length banished from the country; and who, while undergoing his period of banishment amidst the wilds and jungles of a distant land, heard in the summer evening a sweet voice, singing in his own language the very song which had lured him to his infant slumber, when he knew crime by name, and knew its only to abhor. It had been sung, too, by the cradle of an infant sister, one who had died young and now was in heaven; the mother, too, was no more.

But the song—the old song had not lost its influence over him yet. Back came trooping upon him the old memories which had so long slumbered down there in the unconscious depths of his heart; the mother and the father; the household gathering; the old school house; the time-worn church, half-hidden by the old yew-trees, where he had first heard the Bible read, all came back upon him as fresh as if it were yesterday; and overpowered by his feelings, he gave vent to them in a flood of tears. And then the old man grew calm, and his latter days were his best days; and when the terms of his punishment had expired, he came back to his father's land and there in that old village graveyard, amid whose grassy hillocks he played and gambled, and where the mother and her little ones were sleeping, he laid down his weary limbs, and sank peacefully away into a common grave.

Unhappy Homes.
Small matters are often needlessly made the subject of daily comment and blame; and in the end it comes that home is sometimes anything but the happy place we choose to make it out in songs and fictions of various kinds.

This, when it occurs, is a great pity. I am for making home very happy to children, if it can be managed; which, of course, is not to be made by weak compliances, and having no fixed rules. For no creature is happy, or even free, as Grotius has pointed out, except in the circuit of law. But, once having laid down laws and regulations all within those bounds should be very kind at home.

Now listen to the captious, querulous scoldings that you may hear, even as you may hear, even as you go along the streets, addressed by parents to children; is it not manifest that in after-life there will be too much fear in the children's mind, and a belief that their father and mother never will sympathize with them as others even might—never will forgive them? People of all classes, high and low, err in the same way; and in looking about the world, I have sometimes thought that a thoroughly judicious father is one of the rarest creatures to be met with.—*Olive Branch.*

A young friend of ours tells the following story of himself:—When young he had read the well known story of George Washington's love of truth and the father's love of the noble principle of his son, so well manifested on the occasion referred to, of George's cutting down the cherry-tree, acknowledging his transaction and receiving a free pardon, besides praises and kind caresses from his father. So Jim, actuated by so noble an example, thought he would try the experiment on. He supplied himself with the hatchet, and going into his father's orchard, cut down some choice fruit trees. He then coolly sat down to wait the old man's coming, and as soon as he made his appearance, marched up to him with very important air and acknowledged the deed, expecting the next thing on the programme to be tears, benediction and embraces from the offended parent.—But sad to relate, instead of this, the old gentleman caught up a stick and gave him an "all fired lamming."

ACTIVITY.—Miserable is he who slumbers in idleness. Idleness is the workman who sleeps before the hour of rest, or who lies down in the shadow whilst his brethren work in the sun. There is no rest from labor on earth. There are always duties to perform and functions which are ever enlarging and extending in proportion to the growth of our moral and mental station.—Man is born to work, and he must work while it is day.

Addison says, "I have found that men who are really most fond of the society of ladies, who cherish for them a high respect, are seldom the most popular with the sex. Men of great assurance, whose tongues are lightly hung, who make words supply the place of ideas, and place compliment in the room of sentiment, are the favorites. A true respect for woman leads to respectful action towards them; great distance is mistaken by them for neglect, or want of interest."

The editor of the Jamestown Democrat is "posted" in Biblical learning, and gives an example thus:
"Somewhere in that story it tells about a man whose name was Saul, or Paul, or Haul, or something of that kind, who went down from Damascus to Jerusalem and fell among thieves. And sometime about midnight, a light from Heaven shown down brighter than the sun, so that a man whose name was Levi, who was passing that way, was enabled to bind up his wounds, and take him to a hotel, where he gave the landlord twenty-five cents, and told him if it cost more than that he would foot the bill."