

The most lamentable portion of this news is the death of Col. Baker, Senator from Oregon, who fell gallantly rallying his regiment to the charge.

Senator Baker was a statesman as well as a soldier, and one of the most eloquent and patriotic men in the country.

THE COMBINATION AGAINST MEXICO.

The latest arrivals from Europe do not confirm the previous reports of a combination having been formed by England, France and Spain to compel Mexico to pay her indebtedness.

But in every citizen there is a sacred duty in defending his sacred rights of liberty.

My informant is well posted in regard to the situation of affairs in the States.

Not only all of them have brought my attention to the fact that the same large masses as they did before.

In the year 1830 Belgium seceded from Holland and made war on it.

From Paris, a correspondent writing on the 4th inst., remarks that the political agitation there is so great as to cause forebodings of rebellion in this country.

This agitation in France is attributed to the late commercial treaty formed with England, the effects of which have been to inundate the French with British manufactures.

The superior machinery and cheaper labor of England have prostrated manufacturing in France, and consequently discontented among the millions who have been affected by this change.

As long as this feeling exists among Frenchmen, there is not likely to be any cordial union between their government and England for any purpose whatever.

On the contrary the treaty alluded to has alarmed the French people, and the government is beginning to consider the necessity of getting rid of it, even if a war should be the consequence.

These two governments have no confidence in each other's sincerity it is evident enough.

France is backward in joining England, and has also objected to the proposed expedition against Mexico.

The English journals, two weeks since, stated that the French Emperor had consented to join this expedition, but since then their official organ has given this statement a flat contradiction.

So the manner in which matters stand at present, across the water, does not look as if either Mexico or the United States was soon to suffer from invasion.

France, it is said, has positively refused to join England against Spain, but it is intimated that she has given Spain encouragement in her preparations against our unfortunate neighbor.

It is not improbable—Mexico having once belonged to the Castilian government—that Spain has a hope of again adding her to her dominions.

That government has of late exhibited an energy and ambition worthy of her ancient renown, and in her old days she may remind us of the time when her banner invaded Peru, and planted the Spanish flag on the walls of vanquished Quilo.

In the last quarter of a century Spain has increased in population over four millions, while poor Mexico has been receding in power and numbers.

It would be a strange revolution in the affairs of these two countries to see now old, decrepit Spain rise to second manhood and conquer back her dominion revolted Mexico.

The new life and vigor exhibited by old Monarchical Spain, and the decrepitude of the young Republic of Mexico, suggest reflections not dreamed of by the patriots who conquered and established Mexican independence.

The St. Louis Republican anticipates a fight between the contending forces in Missouri as early as day. It is anxious to see whether there is any fight in General Price's army.

The Union columns are now fairly after the fugitives, pursuing them sharply, and the latter can have a better right off, if they will only say the word.

Though it has been difficult to procure sufficient transportation, Gen. Fremont has determined to press on with such outfit as he has been able to gather, being unwilling to delay longer his important expedition.

We suppose we will know before long what was really the object of Price's precipitate retreat from Lexington—whether it was to draw the Union forces as far as possible into a hostile country, or to select some eligible position where to make a stand.

A Good Proposition.

I fear the means for the support of the families of our brave volunteers have been poorly provided for at the beginning of this war.

We shall the necessary funds be raised by an additional taxation of the laboring men, who, becoming poorer every day, by want of labor, will be hardly able to sustain themselves through this time of trial.

Shall it be raised by the inducements of the stockholder, whose hands at present lie idle?

Shall it be raised by the stockholder, who, suffering from the business prostration, have lost all their former earnings, and are by a long way, going to ruin?

Shall it be raised, gentlemen, this glorious Union, this mighty Republic, this noblest of all nations, is not able to provide for the wives and children of those who volunteered to serve her with their blood in her hour of need?

The middle class has sacrificed everything for the sake of our Union. The middle class has sent her sons to the battle field, and the Congress and the shores of the Potomac, the mountains of Western Virginia, the banks of the Missouri and Ohio rivers, who are now defending noble old Kentucky, are composed, nine out of ten, of men of the middle class.

But in every citizen there is a sacred duty in defending his sacred rights of liberty.

Every man who owns a piece of property in this country, what is his name? No. No.

Not only all of them have brought my attention to the fact that the same large masses as they did before.

In the year 1830 Belgium seceded from Holland and made war on it.

From Paris, a correspondent writing on the 4th inst., remarks that the political agitation there is so great as to cause forebodings of rebellion in this country.

This agitation in France is attributed to the late commercial treaty formed with England, the effects of which have been to inundate the French with British manufactures.

The superior machinery and cheaper labor of England have prostrated manufacturing in France, and consequently discontented among the millions who have been affected by this change.

As long as this feeling exists among Frenchmen, there is not likely to be any cordial union between their government and England for any purpose whatever.

On the contrary the treaty alluded to has alarmed the French people, and the government is beginning to consider the necessity of getting rid of it, even if a war should be the consequence.

These two governments have no confidence in each other's sincerity it is evident enough.

France is backward in joining England, and has also objected to the proposed expedition against Mexico.

The English journals, two weeks since, stated that the French Emperor had consented to join this expedition, but since then their official organ has given this statement a flat contradiction.

So the manner in which matters stand at present, across the water, does not look as if either Mexico or the United States was soon to suffer from invasion.

France, it is said, has positively refused to join England against Spain, but it is intimated that she has given Spain encouragement in her preparations against our unfortunate neighbor.

It is not improbable—Mexico having once belonged to the Castilian government—that Spain has a hope of again adding her to her dominions.

That government has of late exhibited an energy and ambition worthy of her ancient renown, and in her old days she may remind us of the time when her banner invaded Peru, and planted the Spanish flag on the walls of vanquished Quilo.

In the last quarter of a century Spain has increased in population over four millions, while poor Mexico has been receding in power and numbers.

It would be a strange revolution in the affairs of these two countries to see now old, decrepit Spain rise to second manhood and conquer back her dominion revolted Mexico.

The new life and vigor exhibited by old Monarchical Spain, and the decrepitude of the young Republic of Mexico, suggest reflections not dreamed of by the patriots who conquered and established Mexican independence.

The St. Louis Republican anticipates a fight between the contending forces in Missouri as early as day. It is anxious to see whether there is any fight in General Price's army.

The Union columns are now fairly after the fugitives, pursuing them sharply, and the latter can have a better right off, if they will only say the word.

Though it has been difficult to procure sufficient transportation, Gen. Fremont has determined to press on with such outfit as he has been able to gather, being unwilling to delay longer his important expedition.

We suppose we will know before long what was really the object of Price's precipitate retreat from Lexington—whether it was to draw the Union forces as far as possible into a hostile country, or to select some eligible position where to make a stand.

We apprehend it will make but little difference, which of these was the actual intention. The only hypothesis creating alarm on our part being that the enemy means to dodge and escape into Arkansas. Nothing will please the Union soldiers more than the prospect of a good, hard, substantial and decisive battle.

From Arkansas.

We find the following interesting items from Arkansas in a letter of the Rolla correspondent of the St. Louis Democrat:

A gentleman arrived here yesterday from Jacksonport, Jackson county, Arkansas. He went to that place from Illinois about eighteen months ago, engaged in school teaching.

He was engaged in school teaching, and having been watched rather too closely for comfort, he resolved to leave the State.

He left Jacksonport about four weeks since, was taken sick on the road, and crossed the Arkansas line two weeks ago. At Batesville he heard that Hardee was ordered to Kentucky.

He saw some of Hardee's soldiers at Evening Shades, who were out on furlough. They represented that Hardee had shipped part of his troops from Pittman's Ferry to Kentucky, down the White river.

On the 10th inst. he saw a party of about thirty men, the border three squads of negroes were met, one of these—numbering some sixty or seventy—was on the way to Mississippi, having been taken from owners eight or ten miles west of Springfield, Missouri.

At Jack's Fork, in the western part of the State, Mr. M. came across Hamilton Lusk. The latter had been pilfering and pillaging the country under the pretence of getting supplies for the Confederate army.

My informant is well posted in regard to the situation of affairs in the States.

Not only all of them have brought my attention to the fact that the same large masses as they did before.

In the year 1830 Belgium seceded from Holland and made war on it.

From Paris, a correspondent writing on the 4th inst., remarks that the political agitation there is so great as to cause forebodings of rebellion in this country.

This agitation in France is attributed to the late commercial treaty formed with England, the effects of which have been to inundate the French with British manufactures.

The superior machinery and cheaper labor of England have prostrated manufacturing in France, and consequently discontented among the millions who have been affected by this change.

As long as this feeling exists among Frenchmen, there is not likely to be any cordial union between their government and England for any purpose whatever.

On the contrary the treaty alluded to has alarmed the French people, and the government is beginning to consider the necessity of getting rid of it, even if a war should be the consequence.

These two governments have no confidence in each other's sincerity it is evident enough.

France is backward in joining England, and has also objected to the proposed expedition against Mexico.

The English journals, two weeks since, stated that the French Emperor had consented to join this expedition, but since then their official organ has given this statement a flat contradiction.

So the manner in which matters stand at present, across the water, does not look as if either Mexico or the United States was soon to suffer from invasion.

France, it is said, has positively refused to join England against Spain, but it is intimated that she has given Spain encouragement in her preparations against our unfortunate neighbor.

It is not improbable—Mexico having once belonged to the Castilian government—that Spain has a hope of again adding her to her dominions.

That government has of late exhibited an energy and ambition worthy of her ancient renown, and in her old days she may remind us of the time when her banner invaded Peru, and planted the Spanish flag on the walls of vanquished Quilo.

In the last quarter of a century Spain has increased in population over four millions, while poor Mexico has been receding in power and numbers.

It would be a strange revolution in the affairs of these two countries to see now old, decrepit Spain rise to second manhood and conquer back her dominion revolted Mexico.

The new life and vigor exhibited by old Monarchical Spain, and the decrepitude of the young Republic of Mexico, suggest reflections not dreamed of by the patriots who conquered and established Mexican independence.

The St. Louis Republican anticipates a fight between the contending forces in Missouri as early as day. It is anxious to see whether there is any fight in General Price's army.

The Union columns are now fairly after the fugitives, pursuing them sharply, and the latter can have a better right off, if they will only say the word.

Though it has been difficult to procure sufficient transportation, Gen. Fremont has determined to press on with such outfit as he has been able to gather, being unwilling to delay longer his important expedition.

We suppose we will know before long what was really the object of Price's precipitate retreat from Lexington—whether it was to draw the Union forces as far as possible into a hostile country, or to select some eligible position where to make a stand.

We apprehend it will make but little difference, which of these was the actual intention. The only hypothesis creating alarm on our part being that the enemy means to dodge and escape into Arkansas. Nothing will please the Union soldiers more than the prospect of a good, hard, substantial and decisive battle.

Ministers Mason and Hildell.

That faithful and cautious chronicler of passing events, Occasional of the Phila. Press, prints the following pleasing picture of the Southern Ministers to England and France:

Jefferson Davis understands the fitness of things. He selects his instruments like a workman who knows his business.

He is neither more nor less than the overblown of a business and liberal Government, and the establishment upon its ruins of an unrelieved despotism,—he makes no more that does not harmonize with his origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

The Duke of Newcastle Upon American Affairs.

The Duke of Newcastle, a member of the English government, and the companion of the Prince of Wales in his last year's visit to this country, made a speech a few weeks ago before the B. B. Hood.

He is neither more nor less than the overblown of a business and liberal Government, and the establishment upon its ruins of an unrelieved despotism,—he makes no more that does not harmonize with his origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

At the Duke of Newcastle Upon American Affairs.

The Duke of Newcastle, a member of the English government, and the companion of the Prince of Wales in his last year's visit to this country, made a speech a few weeks ago before the B. B. Hood.

He is neither more nor less than the overblown of a business and liberal Government, and the establishment upon its ruins of an unrelieved despotism,—he makes no more that does not harmonize with his origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister to England, and John Hildell as minister to France, to represent the Southern cause, he acted upon the theory that they, of all men, were most competent to advocate this treason, because they had been prominent in its origin, and he naturally identifies with his policy.

Who are more aptly appointed James M. Mason as Minister