

Rafferty's Journal.

BY S. B. ROW.

CLEARFIELD, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1856.

VOL. 3.—NO. 9.

"MASON AND DIXON'S LINE."

From the National Intelligencer.

These are words which, it may well be said without poetry, have been for years past more familiar in men's mouths than even the most distinguished of the gallant band who shed their blood with Prince Hal on the memorable 'feast of Crispian'; but we doubt whether one in ten thousand of those who have been in the habit of repeating them ever took the trouble of inquiring how they originated or what they meant. This was a task for the curious seeker into dusty records and the forgotten annals of our colonial history; and the knowledge of them which has been recently unveiled is one of the happy results of the many Historical Societies scattered over our Union. Their learned and laborious researches have already illustrated many obscure passages in our early history; for, young as our nation yet is, the country is old enough to bear within its bosom many monuments of race infinitely superior in all the arts of life to the aborigines found here by Columbus, Cabot, or Smith, showing antecedents of a nature and character to excite the interest not only of Americans, but of the world; which but for their profound investigations might have remained, like the origin of the Gipsies, unknown to the present day. If it had been made a penal offence in any one to utter a phrase or a word of which he could not interpret the meaning, what a multitude of culprit's would "Mason and Dixon's Line" have caused to be called before the tribunal of justice! And what a crowd of mingled feelings must the repetition of them awaken in those who can remember the evil uses made of them by the lovers and promoters of excitement for excitement's sake! Those words, we verily believe, had as much to do in bringing about the first sectional disputes and jealousies as any other taunt, or all other irritating taunts together, ever uttered by North or South against each other. They were the war-cry of Round-Heads and Cavaliers; the tocsin that invited demagogues, in and out of Congress to civil discord—the menace of separate and independent empire. And yet there never were words of more harmless import in their origin and meaning. If the venerable men who crossed the Atlantic for the sole purpose of laying down this invisible and innocent line, which has given immortality to their names, could have foreseen "to what base uses" it would be brought, we are persuaded, little as we know of their characters, that even a royal mandate would have failed in moving them to undertake it.

For our attention being brought at this time to the geographical significance of this famous line we are indebted to the researches of Mr. John H. B. Latrobe, of Baltimore, a gentleman whose profound acquirements and literary taste have contributed much to enrich the common stock of knowledge. The subject was chosen by him for an address before the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; and as we presume but a very limited number of copies were printed for distribution, we shall not subject ourselves to the charge of carrying figs to Athens if we quote a few passages from it for the benefit of our readers. Speaking of the political turn given to a purely geographical question, he says:

"A consequence of this state of things has been to perpetuate the memory of the old surveyors who established it—a rare good fortune as regards their fame; for, while the engineers who located the road across the Simpson have been forgotten in the all-absorbing renown of the master whom they served; while, of the thousands who sail past the Eddystone, not one perhaps knows who it was that erected, on a crag in the midst of the sea, the wondrous light-house that has now defied the tempests of a century; while oblivion has been the lot of other benefactors of mankind, whose works, of every-day utility, should have been their enduring monuments. Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon, who eighty-six years ago, ran a line through the forest, until the Indians forbade the further progress of chain and compass, and whose greatest merit seems to have been that of accurate surveyors, have obtained a notoriety for their names as lasting as the history of our country."

It was in 1763 that the proprietaries of Pennsylvania and Maryland agreed with Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon to survey the boundary between their respective grants; and these "two mathematicians or surveyors" landed in Philadelphia in November of the same year, and entered at once upon the work agreed upon. According to their own account their new line did not vary an inch eastward of that which had been established by previous surveyors; "so that, after all," says Mr. Latrobe, "the sighting along poles and the rude chain measurements of 1761 and 1762 would have answered every purpose, had the proprietors only thought so."

He gives a minute account of the progress of this work from time to time, and thus continues:

"The lines whose history has thus been given were directed to be marked in a particular manner, both by the agreements of the parties and the decree of Lord Hardwicke; and the surveyors accordingly planted, at the end of every fifth mile, a stone graven with the arms of the Penns on one side and of the Baltimore family on the other, marking the intermediate piles with smaller stones having a P on one

side and an M on the other. The stones with the arms were all sent from England.—This was done on the parallel of latitude as far as Sideling Hill; but here all wheel transportation ceasing in 1766, the further marking of the line was the vista of eight yards wide, with piles of stone on the crests of all the mountain ranges, built some eight feet high, as far as the summit of the Allegheny, beyond which the line was marked by posts, around which stones and earth were thrown the better to preserve them."

All the efforts of Mr. Latrobe to discover some information in regard to the characters and personal appearance of these two remarkable individuals proved fruitless. "Their letters," he says, "were the merest business letters, their journal is the most naked of records," and he therefore amused himself by divining their characters from their respective autographs. From these he very ingeniously deduces that "Mason was a cool, deliberate, pains-taking man, never in a hurry; a man of quiet courage, who crossed the Monongahela with fifteen men because it was his duty to do so, though he would have much preferred three times the number at his heels." From Dixon's signature he infers "that he was a young man, more active than a man of an impatient spirit and a nervous temperament; just such a man as worked best with a sober-sided colleague."

In a note he tells us that Lalande, in his *Bibliographie Astronomique*, says that Dixon was born in a coal mine. He died in Durlam, England, in 1777, but Mason survived him ten years, and according to the *Encyclopedia Americana* died in Pennsylvania in 1787. One of the stones—that which marked the northeast corner of Maryland—being undermined by a brook, in the course of time fell, and was removed to form a part of a chimney to a neighboring farm-house. Upon the stone being missed Mr. Latrobe says "the Legislatures of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Delaware took the matter in hand, and a joint commission was appointed, which, obtaining the services of Lieut. Col. James D. Graham, a distinguished officer of the Topographical Engineers of the United States, caused the work of Mason and Dixon to be reviewed as far as necessary. Col. Graham's work corroborated in all important particulars the work of his predecessors. Some errors were discovered, however."

By the correction of one of these errors the State of Maryland gained an addition to her territory of "one acre and eighty-seven hundredths of an acre," but whether the loss fell upon Pennsylvania or Delaware does not appear. Another of the errors corrected was of a rather singular character. Colonel Graham says in his report: "Mr. W. Smith, a gentleman who has once served as a member of the Legislature of Delaware, resided a full half mile within the State of Pennsylvania," and Christiana church, by the same re-survey, was found to be in Pennsylvania.

These are all curious facts, well worthy to be made the subject of an address to any historical society; and the manner in which Mr. Latrobe executed his task shows the discriminating judgment of the Pennsylvania society in selecting an individual so every way competent to its satisfactory performance.

ON BOTH SIDES.

The *Vicksburg*, Mississippi, *Sentinel*, a strong Buchanan paper, says:

"We dare and defy any one to point to a SINGLE VOTE that Mr. Buchanan ever gave, during his Congressional career, involving the question of SLAVERY, that was NOT ON THE SIDE OF THE SOUTH, and opposed to the Abolitionists."

That is the way they electioneer for Buchanan in the South. Now, let us give a sample of the way the thing is done at the North.—The *Providence*, Rhode Island, *Post*, also a strong Buchanan paper, says:

"Mr. Buchanan NEVER UTTERED A WORD IN DEFENSE OF SLAVERY, or whispered a word in favor of its existence, or cast a vote which any honest man could CONSTITUTE into a wish to support the institution."

Now, where does Mr. Buchanan stand on this question? Or, is he on both sides? Why not? He was a Federalist, then a Democrat—a free trade man, then a tariff man—in favor of Congressional power over Slavery in the Territories, and then in favor of "squatter" power. Why may he not be even slavery-propagandist in Mississippi, and an Abolitionist in Rhode Island or Pennsylvania? That is the way Locofocoism seeks to cheat the people of the North into the support of Buchanan.

AN UNLUCKY DAY FOR THEM.—In Ottawa, Illinois, the following good one was got off. The Democrats had a grand rally and barbecue. An Irishman went to some of the Democratic leaders and, reprovingly, said:

"And sure didn't ye know better than to have a barbecue on Friday, when two-thirds of the Democratic party can't eat mate?"

The Democrats ought to have more respect for their party than to appoint a barbecue on a day when two-thirds of it "can't eat mate."

At the Bay State Mills, in Lawrence, Mass. there are annually manufactured 400,000 shaws, valued at upwards of \$1,500,000. The mills consume 40,000 pounds of wool in a day, or upwards of 12,000,000 per year, requiring annually, the fleeces of at least 3,000,000 sheep.

WHO CONQUERED CALIFORNIA?

TESTIMONY OF JAMES BUCHANAN.

The following highly interesting document was received by a late steamer from England. It is a certified copy of the evidence for the defence in the case of Gibbs vs. Fremont, being the copy of depositions taken before commissioners under the authority of the Court of Common Pleas, London, in 1852. It will be remembered that Colonel Fremont was arrested in London on account of debts contracted in California. The defence was, that these debts were contracted on account of the United States Government. Col. Fremont drew bills of exchange to the amount of nineteen thousand five hundred dollars upon the Secretary of State of the United States, the liabilities having been incurred on Government account while Col. Fremont was Governor of California. The bills fell into the hands of persons in London, and being protested for non-acceptance, the holders sought to hold Col. Fremont personally liable. The evidence of James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania—upon whom, as Secretary of State, the bills were drawn—being considered material to the issue, the Court appointed Henry L. Gilpin, Hugh Campbell and Peter McCall, of Philadelphia, Commissioners to take depositions of witnesses for Col. Fremont in Pennsylvania. They were to be sworn and then administer oaths to interpreters, clerks, &c.—the testimony so taken to be sent under seal to Sir James Parke, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

MR. BUCHANAN'S EVIDENCE.
James Buchanan, of the County of Lancaster, in the State of Pennsylvania, gentleman, called, sworn and examined, as a witness on the part of the said defendant, deposed and said, to such of the several interrogatories as are respectively distinguished by the number set opposite to, and placed at the commencement of each of his answers thereto, as follows, that is to say:

Question.—What is your name, your present residence, and your profession?
Answer.—My name is James Buchanan, my present residence is in Lancaster county, Pa., and I am not engaged in any particular occupation, business or employment.

Q.—Do you know the defendant in this case, and how long have you been acquainted with him?
A.—I do know the defendant in this case, and have been acquainted with him at least ten years.

Q.—Where were you residing in the year 1847?
A.—In the city of Washington.

Q.—Were you then personally acquainted with the defendant?
A.—I was.

Q.—Did you see the defendant during that year?
A.—I did see the defendant during that year, but not till after his return from California, in the latter end of summer or commencement of autumn of that year.

Q.—Was the defendant then, or at any other time, in the service of the United States Government?
A.—The defendant was in the service of the U. S. Government as Lieut. Col. of the Regiment of Mounted Riflemen throughout the whole of that year; he was appointed to this office in the latter end of May, 1846; he had been for six or more years previously a Lieutenant in the corps of Topographical Engineers, in which the brevet of Captain had been conferred upon him for meritorious service in his exploring expeditions.

Q.—Did the defendant in the year 1847 hold any, and if any, what office or offices under the said Government, and did he hold the said office or any of them, in the month of May, 1847?
A.—During the whole year he held the office of Lieut. Col. in the regiment of Mounted Riflemen.

Q.—Do you know who was the Military Commandant and Governor of California, within the territory of the United States in the year 1847?
A.—I know that in the first months of that year there was a dispute between Colonel Fremont, the defendant, and General Kearney, of the United States army, as to which of them was the legitimate Military Commandant and Governor of California, and this dispute existed throughout the month of March, 1847; after this time General Kearney was the undisputed Military Commandant and Governor of California till the beginning of June, when he was succeeded by Col. Mason, of the United States Army, who continued in this position until after the end of the year.

Q.—Do you know who was the person in actual command of the land forces of the Government of the United States in California in the year 1847, and in the month of March in that year?
A.—Col. Fremont, the defendant, was in California at the commencement of hostilities between the United States and the Republic of Mexico; he there raised and commanded a battalion of California Volunteers, consisting of about four hundred men; his services were valuable; he bore a conspicuous part in the conquest of California, and, in my opinion, is better entitled to be called the CONQUEROR OF CALIFORNIA than any other man. He continued in the actual command of the

battalion through the month of March, one thousand eight hundred and forty-seven; but there were other troops in California, other troops of the United States, under the command of General Kearney, who was afterwards the Military Commandant and Governor of California, as I have already stated in my answer to the eighth interrogatory. I cannot undertake to decide the dispute to which I have already referred, between Col. Fremont and Gen. Kearney; but as long as the California Battalion existed, they were under the separate and independent command of Col. Fremont, while Gen. Kearney commanded other troops of the United States. For the rest of the year I refer to my next preceding answer.

Q.—Do you know whether in any part of that year, 1847, hostilities existed between the Government of the United States and the Republic of Mexico? If yes, when did such hostilities commence, and how long did they continue?
A.—Hostilities existed between the United States and the Republic of Mexico throughout the whole of the year 1847—these hostilities commenced on the 24th of April, 1846, and the existence of the war between the two Republics was recognized by the act of Congress on the 13th of May, 1846. Hostilities continued between them until the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace of Guadalupe Hidalgo, on the 2d of February, 1848.

Q.—Were such hostilities existing in or previous to the month of March, 1847?
A.—They were, both in and previous to the month of March, 1847.

Q.—Do you know whether any, and if any, what forces of the said United States were, in the year 1847, engaged in hostilities with the said Republic of Mexico?
A.—All the forces of the United States were engaged in the hostilities with the Republic of Mexico, except such as were indispensable for the performance of other duties; and this throughout the year 1847.

Q.—Were the said forces of the said Government of the said United States, in California, or any part of those forces, engaged in the said hostilities with the Republic of Mexico in 1847?
A.—The forces of the United States in California were engaged in hostilities with the Republic of Mexico in the year 1847.

Q.—Under whose command were the forces of the Government of the United States in California so engaged in hostilities with the said Republic of Mexico?
A.—These forces were under the command of Commodore Robert F. Stockton, Colonel Fremont, the defendant, and Gen. Kearney, and afterwards Gen. Kearney and Col. Mason. The last actual resistance, of which I am aware, was on the 8th and 9th of January, 1847. The forces of the United States in these engagements were so disastrous to the enemy that the leaders of the Californians, a few days thereafter, met Lieutenant Fremont, [who was in command of the battalion of California Volunteers and who was hastening to the scene of action, but did not arrive in time to take part in these engagements,] and entered into a capitulation with him, whereby the people under arms and in the field agreed to disperse and remain quiet and peaceable. There was no actual battle fought afterwards in California to my knowledge, but the state of war between the two Republics continued, of course, till the treaty of peace.

Q.—Do you know whether any, and if any, what forage or other necessities were supplied to or for the said forces of the said United States so engaged in hostilities with the said Republic of Mexico? And particularly, do you know whether any such supplies were necessary for the forces of the defendant? and if any, what?
A.—I know not whether any, and if any, what forage or other necessities were supplied to or for the said forces of the United States so engaged in hostilities with the Republic of Mexico; but I do know that such supplies were necessary for the forces under the command of the defendant, and that no appropriation had been made by Congress to pay for these supplies.—Congress could not have anticipated that Col. Fremont would raise a California Battalion by his own personal exertions, and without previous instructions."

[Here follows a series of questions and answers about the drawing of the bills in favor of Hultman & Co., of no public interest now except the following:]

Q.—Do you know whether or not the defendant himself individually, or for his own private use or benefit, ever received any consideration for the said bills or any of them, or was there any consideration whatever for the drawing or the accepting of the same bills, or any of them, other than the said supplies to or for the United States?
A.—I neither know nor believe that the defendant himself individually, or for his own private use or benefit, ever received any consideration for said bills or any of them, and do not believe there was any consideration whatever for drawing or accepting of the same bills, or any of them, other than to procure supplies for the forces under his command in California.

[Here follow a number of other questions and answers in regard to the bills of Hultman & Co., of no public interest.]

Q.—Is there within your knowledge, any other matter or thing touching or concerning the matters in issue in this cause, or the parties thereto material or necessary to be known and adduced in evidence on the trial thereof? If yes, state freely the particulars hereof.

A.—To the best of my knowledge, the originals of the bills and the copies of which are now produced and shown to me, and are here-to annexed, marked Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, were presented at the State Department, in the City of Washington, for acceptance and payment. But I do not recollect the individual or individuals by whom presented. I should have accepted and paid these bills, from my general knowledge of the transactions in California, had Congress appropriated any money, and placed it at my disposal, which could be applied to their payment, though it would have been more correct to have drawn these bills on the Secretary of War. I should have accepted and paid these bills and had them charged in account against Col. Fremont, to be settled for at the general settlement of his account as Commander of the California Battalion, had any such appropriation been made; I know of no other matter or thing touching or concerning the matters at issue in this cause, or the parties thereto material or necessary to be known and adduced in evidence on the trial thereof.

[The last answer on cross-examination is as follows:]

I have gone through my answers to the interrogatories put to me in behalf of the defendant, John Charles Fremont, and state that I have answered the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, twenty-fourth and thirty-sixth from my own knowledge and observation. I have answered the eighth, ninth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, twenty-third and twenty-fifth, not from my own personal knowledge and observation, but from my own close observation of the events of the Mexican War as they occurred, and from information derived from official documents, as a member of the Cabinet of President Polk, who was President of the United States during the whole of the Mexican War. My knowledge of the matters to which I have deposed is derived from hearsay in no other manner than I have herebefore stated. I have stated that I have no knowledge of the matters referred to in the other interrogatories.

JAMES BUCHANAN.
HENRY D. GILPIN,
HUGH CAMPBELL,
PETER MCCALL,
Commissioners.

NATURAL HISTORY OF THE BUCK.

Francis P. Blair, of Maryland, in a letter to his neighbors, speaking of the Buck's head and horns, which the Buchanan men recently raised above the American flag, near his residence, gives this sketch of the natural history of the animal:—

"Of all animals the deer is the most timid, and although the head of the buck is, at one season of the year, armed with a multitude of points as sharp as spears, it never confronts an enemy that it can escape with flying feet.—The grand antlers are the mere emblem of warlike prowess, and evidence only of that species of gallantry that distinguishes the stag, and gives to a class of gentry of our species, the name of bucks, young or old.

The old buck is a sort of old bachelor, like his fellow of the woods, addicted to no mate, and whose insignia of horns have, time out of mind, been held to characterize his pursuits. Is this an ensign to be exalted above that of the country, and chosen to exemplify the virtues of one who aspires to the Chief Magistracy? If the crowning virtue be attributed to the coronet which distinguishes the old buck's head, and which now takes the place of the liberty cap on Democratic banners, it should be remembered that it is a virtue that comes and goes with the seasons. An old buck's honors begin to bud and grow in the spring time—they are in the velvet in June, and throughout the summer. This smooth covering is slipped off in October. In November, their vitality is blighted, and in March, the crown of weather beaten antlers drop from the old buck's brow, and he hides, droops in solitude, abandoned by all his fellows. The hunters of the Alleghenies and of our frontiers will apply this piece of natural history, and interpret its augury."

ORIGIN OF GETTING THE SACK.—Two gentlemen, one a Spaniard, and the other a German, who were recommended by their birth and services to the Emperor, Maximilian II, both coveted his daughter, the fair Helena Scharfequin, in marriage. This prince, after a long delay, one day informed them, that esteeming them equally, and not being able to bestow a preference, he should leave it to the force and address of the claimants to decide the question. He did not mean, however, to risk the life of either, and consequently would not permit weapons to be used, but had ordered a large bag to be produced. It was his decree that whichever succeeded in putting his rival into this bag should obtain the hand of his daughter. This singular encounter between the two gentlemen consequently took place, and before the whole court. The contest lasted for more than an hour, when the Spaniard yielded, and the German, Eberhard von Talbert, having "planted" his rival in the bag, took it upon his back and very gallantly laid it at the feet of his mistress, whom he then espoused.

The good or ill hope of a good or ill life, Is the good or ill choice of a good or ill wife.

ties thereto material or necessary to be known and adduced in evidence on the trial thereof? If yes, state freely the particulars hereof.

A.—To the best of my knowledge, the originals of the bills and the copies of which are now produced and shown to me, and are here-to annexed, marked Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, were presented at the State Department, in the City of Washington, for acceptance and payment. But I do not recollect the individual or individuals by whom presented. I should have accepted and paid these bills, from my general knowledge of the transactions in California, had Congress appropriated any money, and placed it at my disposal, which could be applied to their payment, though it would have been more correct to have drawn these bills on the Secretary of War. I should have accepted and paid these bills and had them charged in account against Col. Fremont, to be settled for at the general settlement of his account as Commander of the California Battalion, had any such appropriation been made; I know of no other matter or thing touching or concerning the matters at issue in this cause, or the parties thereto material or necessary to be known and adduced in evidence on the trial thereof.

[The last answer on cross-examination is as follows:]

I have gone through my answers to the interrogatories put to me in behalf of the defendant, John Charles Fremont, and state that I have answered the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, twenty-fourth and thirty-sixth from my own knowledge and observation. I have answered the eighth, ninth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, twenty-third and twenty-fifth, not from my own personal knowledge and observation, but from my own close observation of the events of the Mexican War as they occurred, and from information derived from official documents, as a member of the Cabinet of President Polk, who was President of the United States during the whole of the Mexican War. My knowledge of the matters to which I have deposed is derived from hearsay in no other manner than I have herebefore stated. I have stated that I have no knowledge of the matters referred to in the other interrogatories.

JAMES BUCHANAN.
HENRY D. GILPIN,
HUGH CAMPBELL,
PETER MCCALL,
Commissioners.

NATURAL HISTORY OF THE BUCK.
Francis P. Blair, of Maryland, in a letter to his neighbors, speaking of the Buck's head and horns, which the Buchanan men recently raised above the American flag, near his residence, gives this sketch of the natural history of the animal:—

"Of all animals the deer is the most timid, and although the head of the buck is, at one season of the year, armed with a multitude of points as sharp as spears, it never confronts an enemy that it can escape with flying feet.—The grand antlers are the mere emblem of warlike prowess, and evidence only of that species of gallantry that distinguishes the stag, and gives to a class of gentry of our species, the name of bucks, young or old.

The old buck is a sort of old bachelor, like his fellow of the woods, addicted to no mate, and whose insignia of horns have, time out of mind, been held to characterize his pursuits. Is this an ensign to be exalted above that of the country, and chosen to exemplify the virtues of one who aspires to the Chief Magistracy? If the crowning virtue be attributed to the coronet which distinguishes the old buck's head, and which now takes the place of the liberty cap on Democratic banners, it should be remembered that it is a virtue that comes and goes with the seasons. An old buck's honors begin to bud and grow in the spring time—they are in the velvet in June, and throughout the summer. This smooth covering is slipped off in October. In November, their vitality is blighted, and in March, the crown of weather beaten antlers drop from the old buck's brow, and he hides, droops in solitude, abandoned by all his fellows. The hunters of the Alleghenies and of our frontiers will apply this piece of natural history, and interpret its augury."

ORIGIN OF GETTING THE SACK.—Two gentlemen, one a Spaniard, and the other a German, who were recommended by their birth and services to the Emperor, Maximilian II, both coveted his daughter, the fair Helena Scharfequin, in marriage. This prince, after a long delay, one day informed them, that esteeming them equally, and not being able to bestow a preference, he should leave it to the force and address of the claimants to decide the question. He did not mean, however, to risk the life of either, and consequently would not permit weapons to be used, but had ordered a large bag to be produced. It was his decree that whichever succeeded in putting his rival into this bag should obtain the hand of his daughter. This singular encounter between the two gentlemen consequently took place, and before the whole court. The contest lasted for more than an hour, when the Spaniard yielded, and the German, Eberhard von Talbert, having "planted" his rival in the bag, took it upon his back and very gallantly laid it at the feet of his mistress, whom he then espoused.

The good or ill hope of a good or ill life, Is the good or ill choice of a good or ill wife.

A 'ROORBACK' EXPOSED.

Every one knows how zealously the opponents of Col. Fremont labor to create the impression that he is a Roman Catholic. In this dirty work of wholesale and willful lying, with malice prepense, the Philadelphia *Daily News* exceeds all others, and the course it pursues is only calculated to elect Buchanan. One of the witnesses relied upon to sustain the charge of Romanism against Col. Fremont, was Father Olivetti, a Catholic priest at Whitehall, N. Y., who it was purported had said of Col. Fremont, that "he [Olivetti's] certain knowledge he is a Roman Catholic, and as such I 'support him.' But this falsehood was short-lived, for no sooner did it come to the knowledge of Olivetti, than he publishes a letter which fully exposes the rascally falsehoods and fabrications of the dishonest politicians who are engaged in aspersing the character of a man who is honest as honesty itself, and as good a Protestant as ever the American flag waved over. Here is the letter, which is a most emphatic denial of the bold and malignant fabrication above named, and which also shows that catholic clergymen do marry those who are not members of their church:—

WHITEHALL, AUG. 28, 1856.
To the Editor of the *Whitehall Chronicle*:
The Albany Statesman has published a statement, purporting to have been made by me, in which I am understood to say that Col. Fremont was a Catholic, and for that reason would receive my vote. Being a minister of the Gospel, I appear before the people with reluctance; but as my name has been dragged into the political arena against my consent, to give countenance to a misstatement, no other course is left me. I therefore say that I do not know that Col. Fremont is a Catholic. I never intended to say that he was a Catholic. I never stated that I should vote for him. I have heard of no evidence to prove that he was a Catholic; the fact that he was married by a Catholic Priest, if such was the case, furnishes but little evidence that he was a Catholic. Catholic clergymen often marry those who are not Catholics.—The duties of my profession are such as to unfit me to take part in politics, and I do not intend to vote for any of the candidates for President at the next election. In reply to the assertion made, whether Americans have to follow shoulder to shoulder with Popish leaders, I have only to say, I have never seen an American God, and it is a blasphemy to pronounce it. But I have a firm faith in the one God infinitely perfect, that he cannot contradict himself or be divided into sects; therefore I say there is no other name on earth so glorious as the name of Catholic. And I am astonished to see the prejudice of people mingling religion with politics in this Republican Union. Yours respectfully,
REV. MICHAEL OLIVETTI.

Such a refutation of a falsehood should convince any reasonable man that the charge of Romanism against Col. Fremont is false, and that those who make it, know that they are "bearing false witness against their neighbor."

ALL COMING RIGHT.—The South, after a Rip Van Winkle sleep, has awakened to the reality that there is a federal union, which cannot be endangered by the excitement of politics, and that freedom of speech may be exercised against the extension of slavery as well as for its protection under constitutional guarantees. The New Orleans *Delta* confesses that the absurdity of Southern argument on the subjects connected with the Presidential election, "must be painfully clear to every person who has observed the course of Northern philanthropy, inasmuch as the Black Republicans are fighting for the control of the balance of power, and not for the emancipation of the negro race," and then it asks:—"what interest has Sam in Sambo? What does Mr. Slick, of Slickville, care for Uncle Tom? Is there any love, or respect or kindness lost between them? Look at the Five Points of New York for a reply. Observe Sambo in the cellar when Sam is glorifying him in the Tabernacle?" All such admissions as these are refreshing, after all the thunder and lightning which have agitated the Southern horizon, and seem to have cleared its atmosphere and its political perceptions, for the *Delta* further admits as follows:—"We have to deal with the question of the balance of power and nothing else. We have to preserve our political status, the only thing assailed by the North, as we would preserve our very lives. Everything else, so far as the present controversy is concerned, is mere leather and prunella." So the Pennsylvania may continue to cobble and hammer away on its lap stone of abolition, but the South will not follow suit.—*Phila Sun.*

PLAIN TALKING.—They have a straightforward way of doing business in Arkansas, that is perfectly refreshing. A minister out there, a few weeks ago, undertook to come down on slavery. The next day one of the Deacons dropped him a line saying that "people in his diggings went to church to hear the devil abused and not slavery, and if he persisted in violating their taste any farther," all that he had to say was that geese still grow feathers and North Carolina tar."

ANDREW JACKSON was once making a stump speech out west, in a small village. Just as he was concluding, Amos Kendall, who sat behind him, whispered: "Tip 'em a little Latin, General; they won't be contented without it." The man of the iron will instantly thought upon the few phrases he knew, and in a voice of thunder, wound up by exclaiming, "E pluribus unum—sine qua non—ne plus ultra—nihil in parvo!" The effect was tremendous, and the Hoosiers' shouts could be heard for miles.