

AMERICAN CITIZEN.

"Let us have Faith that Right makes Might; and in that Faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it"—A. LINCOLN.

VOLUME 4.

BUTLER, BUTLER COUNTY, PENN'A, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 1867.

NUMBER 28.

Original Poetry.

For the Citizen.
Suggested by seeing young men outside the Church during service.

As we to-day in the Church did meet,
We marked, oh many a vacant seat—
And sadly thought of the painful truth—
That the companions of our youth—
The pride of many a parent's heart,
Could thus with the scold bear a part,
And letting the precious moments glide
So thoughtlessly, thus remain outside.

We saw with pride that a few there were
Whose brows were not marked by age or care,
Who waited to hear the word to-day,
Nor did with the thoughtless members stay,
And we felt their lives would lengthen out,
And happier for their sturdy,
Than theirs, though the doors be open wide,
Who still will choose to remain outside.

But oh, young men, when your youth has fled,
And its bright hopes are withered and dead,
When age has drawn its lines on your brow,
And your limbs are no longer active as now,
Will the thought of the youth who died away
Brighten the hours of declining day?
And will you recall with pleasant pride,
The hours when you chose to remain outside?

And when death has stilled your now beating heart,
And from all you have on earth you must part,
And you, at the Bar of the Just, must appear,
To render an account for the years spent here,
Will you then enter in to the place of rest,
And see the party that as they open wide,
Will you then be content to remain outside?
SAMANTHA H.

Miscellaneous.

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS.

What he thinks of the Rebellion.

"Mack" prints in the Cincinnati Commercial an entertaining account of a visit to the home of Alexander H. Stephens, the principal part of which we give below:

"Returning from the farm, Mr. Stephens talked freely of the late war. The South, he believed, made two fearful mistakes: First, in going to war at all, and secondly, in the object for which they went to war. It was a great absurdity to think that there could be such a thing as permanent separation of the two sections. He was opposed to secession in the first place; but when he could not resist that—when Georgia went out, and he, as a State's rights man, felt bound to go with Georgia, then he wanted to fight only on terms of reconstruction, such as would cement the country on a better basis than it ever stood. Jeff. Davis and the fire eaters fought for Southern independence, and ruined the South in doing so. I called his attention to reports in Southern newspapers during the war, that he, Stephens, had declared his opposition to reconstruction upon any terms. They were all false, he said, and he was sorry to see in Pollard's Lost Cause, which he considered a wretchedly bad history of the war, what pretended to be an extract from a speech made by him at Charlotte, North Carolina, after his unsuccessful attempt to confer with Lincoln at Fortress Monroe (before the Hampton Roads conference), in which he is represented as saying that under no circumstances would he consent to reconstruction. 'He never said any such thing. He was a reconstructionist,' he said, from the first day of the war till the last. Referring to politics in the North during the war, he expressed his regret that the peace party had not been successful in 1864. He thought the Democrats made a mistake in nominating a war man. If a straight-out peace man had been nominated he might have been elected, and the reconstructionists of the South would then have made terms of peace and reunion with them. 'But,' said I, 'in the North the people could not be persuaded that the peace party was not a secession party.' 'There's where you made a great mistake,' said Mr. Stephens. 'Jeff. Davis wanted Lincoln elected; he told me so. The reconstructionists of the South wanted you of the North to elect a peace man, and we would then have overthrown the Davis war party of the South, and made terms of reunion with our difficulty.' I replied that I thought if the people of the North had had any assurance that the election of a Peace Democrat would have restored the Union on honorable terms they would have elected one. But the Democratic party of the North had made itself obnoxious as a secession party; its leaders had been to a great degree instrumental in bringing the war about by assuring the Southern fire eaters of a fire in the rear party, and while they might prefer Union to secession they certainly preferred secession to war—while the Republican party preferred Union to any thing else, and were willing to keep the war ten years to secure it. Besides, if there were so many reconstructionists in the South, why did they not make their influence felt—why not make overtures to the Republican party of the North?' Mr. Stephens replied, 'there were a great many of us; but we could not get the helm. One man at the helm of a ship has more power than five hundred amiship. But, if the first desire for peace had come from the North we would have broken down the permanent separation party. All we wanted was for you of the North to show that you wanted peace and reunion; and then we could have responded. Take the State of Georgia, for instance. While there was an immense majority in favor of keeping up the war as long as the Federal army was in the field against us, there was a great majority in favor of reconstruction, but they wanted the first indications to come from the North.'

Speaking of the conduct of the war on the part of the South, Mr. Stephens criticised it as extremely unwise. It ought never to have been an offensive war, and if the resources of the South had been properly economized, instead of being wasted in aggressive battles, the North would certainly have been worried into giving up the contest. Then in a few years the South would have gone back to the Union without a doubt, for the dream of a separate nationality would soon have been dispelled. The great error of the North, he thought, was in adopting the policy of coercion. If South Carolina had been permitted to go, and a few other States with her, secession would soon have been at an end. The South was getting very sick of it when the call for 75,000 troops came out. A tariff of twenty per cent. on every thing produced in the country had been levied by the Montgomery Congress, and it had caused a rise in prices and great discontent. One thing after another had occurred to persuade the people that secession was a foolish undertaking, but when troops were called for to invade the South the tide immediately turned the other way, and the separatists triumphed every where. He regarded Jeff. Davis as a man of kind heart, who meant well in what he did, but was not fitted for the lead of a nation in a time like that of the late war. He would listen to no advice, and heed no warning. Because he wanted to succeed, he thought therefore he must, and he had no idea of giving up the contest until Lee telegraphed him that his lines were broken, and that he must evacuate Richmond. The capture of Jeff. Davis, Mr. Stephens thought a great *faux pas* for the North; better a good deal have let him go wherever he wanted to go. I asked where Davis was going when he was captured. Mr. Stephens said he didn't know—he doubted if Davis knew himself. He seemed to him to be running about like a gad-fly in a stable, after the boys had taken his eyes out—bobbing up and down, running against everything and hitting everything, utterly unconscious of what he was doing or where he was going. He believed the government would release Davis without any trial. The Supreme Court decision in the injunction cases would have an important bearing on the trial. If the injunction was not granted, he could not see how Davis could be tried for treason—for the refusal would convey with it the assertion that the Southern States were not States of the Union, and therefore their citizens could not have been guilty of treason in rebelling. This seemed to him to be the light in which Charles O'Connor, who was counsel in both cases, viewed it.

I remained at Mr. Stephens' residence that evening and during the following day until train time. He expressed great wonder when I told him of my intended departure, and begged me "stay a week and see the country," or, in any event, to "come back this way," and call to see him again. I spent Friday evening in conversation with him, and found him the most delightful and inexhaustible talker I had ever listened to. Many of the events connected with the war, with which I was already familiar, he related to me with such an interesting and attractive manner that I forgot I had ever known anything of them, and listened to them as to something entirely new and startling.

He spoke of the Hampton Roads conference as having been consented to by Jeff. Davis only to thwart another proposition looking to peace and re-union. The Confederate Congress was about to pass a joint resolution in favor of a cessation of hostilities, for the purpose of calling a national convention to settle all existing differences. Davis wanted to defeat this, by making the Southern people believe that the North would accept no terms but an unconditional surrender, and this he thought the Hampton Roads conference would accomplish. Mr. Stephenson on his return from Hampton Roads felt convinced that the Southern cause was lost, and told Jeff. Davis so, but Davis would not believe it. He soon after returned to his home in Crawfordville, where he remained until arrested by Wilson's cavalry, and taken to Fort Warren. He is now engaged in collecting and arranging the materials for a book to be styled "The War, Its Causes, Conduct and Results." It will be in two volumes, the first to appear about the close of the present year. He told me he would say very little about battles, or battle-fields, for he has an utter loathing for them. He holds that war degrades any people that engage in it, and retards instead of advances civilization. His book will be on the war in its relation to civil liberty and republican government in this country and throughout the world.

Respecting the present civil contest in the South he desires no public expression of his views. As one who is disfranchised and a paroled prisoner, he feels it prudent for him to keep quiet and take no part in public affairs. I shall therefore say nothing in this letter touching his position on reconstruction under the Military Law. He converses freely on the subject, and has no hesitation in giving his opinion when asked in his own house. He does so, however, with the injunction that no public use shall be made of what he says on the subject—and he has a right to demand this much. No man in the country loves the American Union more than he does, or more sincerely desires its preservation; no one is more ardently devoted to constitutional liberty than he; no one is less of a monarchist or an aristocrat, or more of a republican. He takes little interest in parties, except as they tend to promote the cause to which he is so warmly attached, and views all questions as a philosopher rather than as a politician.

HENRY JENKINS, whose arrest in New York for embezzlement, last year, caused so much excitement, died at a city hospital to which he was removed from the jail a short time since.

ERROR IN RECONSTRUCTION.

The late arguments in the Supreme court show some of the mistakes which the country has made upon the question of reconstruction. Yet they are natural errors, and are such as reveal the prudent and wise habit of the popular mind which declines to act until it perceives the reason of action. The problems with which the fall of the rebellion confronted the country were wholly new and of the most vital importance. There was a technical, summary, superficial solution of them, very easy to understand, and also very sure to make the war ridiculous. This solution was merely the policy of treating the rebellion as a riot. Certain citizens have resisted the authority of the Government; it was urged; they would not disperse upon reading the riot act, and it was necessary to call out the military force. That has succeeded in quelling the disturbance, and now everything will resume its ordinary course. This was a view which was very plausible in 1861. It had become sheer folly in the year 1865.

The rebellion was a death struggle between the two principles which disputed the mastery of the Government. The dispute was maintained under the form of interpretation of the constitution. The principle known as the South claimed that the constitution was a treaty between sovereign States, which might be annulled in its own case by the will of any one of the States.—This was the claim. The object was the perpetuity of human slavery as the cornerstone of a Southern Empire. The principle known as the North held that the constitution was a national bond under which the Union had become a nation, and that secession was national dissolution, which was consequently opposed by every patriotic instinct. This was the theory. The conviction was that by the laws of society and human nature slavery would be peacefully ended and a great, free, and happy republic established.

The controversy became at last too radical and intense for a peaceful solution.—There was no tribunal which could settle it, and war was invoked to decide what the constitution meant. Thus it was not upon the side of the North a war merely for the constitution, but the constitution as the North understood it; while the South, in seceding, was attempting to interpret the constitution as the South understood it. Of course the side which was victorious won its interpretation of the constitution. The North, not merely as a section, but as an explanation of the constitution, triumphed. Its first duty, therefore, was to make the constitution say what the last irreversible appeal had declared it to mean. That was what the South expected. It looked to see the North remove the disputed point from future controversy by dispelling the obscurity of the constitution upon the question. And this, clearly, is what should have been done. We should have distinctly forbidden secession by the fundamental law, and we should have provided in the constitution that any State which attempted secession should assume its relations in the Union only upon such conditions as Congress might require.

This we should have done while the surrendered States still remained under the military authority of the Government. And when it was done we should have proceeded to settle the conditions upon which they might return. Then there would have been no Georgia or Mississippi petitions; and the Supreme court would have had no voice in the question unless it had undertaken to declare that the constitution had been unconstitutionally amended—a declaration which we doubt if even the eloquence of a Robert J. Walker could have won from it. The present difficulty is, that the war has distinctly decided the constitution to mean what we have not made it distinctly express. The old verbal obscurity therefore remains, and the lawyers in the Supreme court are repeating the speeches of Webster and Hayne in the Senate. The framers of the constitution intentionally left the question of State rights and sovereignty obscure. They feared that Union would be impossible if they did not. From that cloud came the war. The war has dispelled the obscurity in fact, but we have not yet stricken it out of the instrument; and as courts and lawyers deal with verbal interpretations, we are actually witnessing the absurd spectacle of a nice technical dispute in a court-room of an issue which has been decided by the most tremendous war.

Every written constitution is a perilous folly and snare if it is not most liberally interpreted and amended just as fast and fully as the public sentiment demands. The reverence for the constitution as a complete and inspired instrument, needing no change, which has been so sedulously inculcated in this country, is an incredible stupidity. It has discouraged independence of political thought, so that since the days of the revolution and of the Federalist we have added nothing whatever of importance to political philosophy but the speculations of Mr. Calhoun and a few essays like Sidney Fisher's. Calhoun was the most fearless political thinker in our history except the men of '76 and '89, and a few of the living radicals. His political theories were purely medieval, indeed, but his mind was sincere and independent. He at least saw what his followers do not, that to make the supreme court a political tribunal of the last appeal is to subvert the Government.

In the Military bill, Congress has acted in the spirit of the great decision of arms. It has acted according to the constitution as

the final resort has decided the constitution to mean. But it has made the necessary verbal amendment of the constitution more difficult. For when, under the conditions of the Military bill, the State which tried to secede are once more restored to their functions in the Union, one of which is voting upon amendments to the constitution—they will necessarily have a vote upon any clause forbidding secession, and prescribing the penalty of the attempt.—*Harper's Weekly.*

Hancock and the Kiowa Indians.

The St. Louis Democrat's correspondent writing from Hancock's expedition, writes from Fort Hayes, May 3d, gives a long account of the council held between General Hancock and Satauta, principal chief of the Kiowas, at Fort Larned, on the first. Satauta's speech was full of peace, and promises to keep his young men quiet, and to use his influence with other tribes. He said the Cheyennes and Sioux abandoned their villages because they were afraid of the troops, and thought Hancock did wrong to burn them. He was opposed to the railroad running through the Arkansas River region, and charged Col. Leavenworth with selling Kiowa annuity goods for his own benefit.

Col. Leavenworth replied he had kept back annuities by orders from Washington. General Hancock replied at length, going over much the same ground as in the former speech, but laying particular stress on the point that unless the Indians faithfully performed their treaty obligations, and preserved peace, they would be severely punished. He explained that he burned the Cheyenne and Sioux villages because those tribes lied to him and acted very treacherously. They began the war by burning stations and killing whites on Smoky Hill route, and would be punished; and similar conduct on the part of other Indians would meet with like results.

A gentleman who left Sioux city on the 9th inst., says that nothing was known there of the reported capture, murder of the crew and burning of the steamboat Miner.

Have the Mormons Bribed Congress?

Our last Salt Lake Union *Vidette* don't give any signs of having sold out to the Mormons. It charges the Saints with having bought up leading Congressmen—Ashley, chairman of the committee on Territories, is meant, among others—as to state off any more anti-Mormon legislation, and quotes the following significant bragging from the Mormon paper, the *Telegraph*, as some evidence of it:

"It is a common saying that the Rothschilds, by their purse-strings power, exercise no mean influence over the shape and color of European politics. The Mormon chiefs are moving in a similar direction. It is common enough to read in the newspapers of 'long heads,' 'great executive and financial ability,' and well secured 'piles of the useful,' as characteristic of the chiefs of the Mormon church, while for industry and application to the arts of peace the Mormons have evinced an aptitude that, in a few years, must place them in the van in those respects. We see occasionally, broad hints of this corporate body and that corporate body, this Legislature and that Legislature, and even Congress, being particularly sensitive to money arguments, that cash will carry any measure through. Now if the Mormons, like the Jews, have a habit of making to themselves friends of the unrighteous Mammon, the god of this world, it will not be very difficult for them to control quite a help of politics in the new world, and would it not be a very curious thing if in a few years the polygamist Jews should control politics in the Eastern hemisphere and the polygamist Mormons in the Western?"

AN INCIDENT OF FORT FISHER.—A person who was in Fort Fisher during the bombardment, tells the following story in an English magazine:—"Oh! the agony of despair to see ball and shell falling harmlessly from those turrets of iron, or rolling like pellets along the low decks, while the gallant defenders of Fort Fisher were falling in shreds within a fortification which would, four years before, have defied the efforts of any navy—as Porter says, 'stronger than anything Sebastopol could boast of.' One day a happy shot from the Fort succeeded in finding its way into a weak spot of a two-tiered monitor, a piece of iron evidently was turned up, and jammed the turret. Hurrah! one at last disabled, thought the poor Confederates. By Jove! see two sailors quietly walk out, and set themselves down, the one holding a chisel, the other striking with a hammer. They were cutting away the obstruction; and so secure was the monitor against any vital injury being inflicted on her, that, although silenced, she would not retire from her position. A swarm of Southern riflemen were thrown out to slay the two bold Federals; but no one hit them, and they worked on calmly until General Whiting generously interfered, and said, 'Such gallant fellows deserve to live; cease firing, my lads, at them.' So the iron was cut away."

The Georgia injunction case, only, was dismissed by the U. S. Supreme court for want of jurisdiction. The case of Mississippi, as amended making Arkansas a party to the complaint, and covering Gen. Ord's action with regard to the treasury of the late State, was to have been argued on Friday 17th instant. It is hoped by the complainants that the Arkansas treasury case will furnish a proper clause upon which the court can base jurisdiction.

Last Wager of Battle in England.

An English paper says: "There has died in Birmingham a poor old man, one event of whose history forms an important mark in the progress of civilization in England, especially as relating to the old barbarous mode of settling disputes, and trying causes by the 'wager of battle.' The deceased, William Ashford, was the last person who was challenged in an English court to meet in single combat a man whom he had accused as the murderer of his sister. On the 26th of May, 1817, a beautiful young woman named Mary Ashford, in her 20th year, went to a dance at Erdington, without proper protection. She left the festive scene at a late hour, accompanied by a young man named Abraham Thornton, a farmer's son in the neighborhood. They were last seen talking together at a stile near the place, but next morning she was found dead in a pit of water; and there were evidences that she had been murdered. General suspicion pointed to Thornton. He was arrested and tried for murder at Warwick assizes in August; but, though circumstantial evidence was against him, the defence, which was an *alibi*, obtained a verdict of 'not guilty.'"

"The feeling of surprise and indignation at his acquittal was so intense that a new trial was called for, and an appeal was entered against the verdict by William Ashford, the brother, and next of kin to the murdered girl. Thornton was again apprehended, and sent to London in November, to be tried before Lord Ellenborough and the full court of Queen's Bench. Instead of regular defence by arguments, evidences and witnesses, Thornton boldly defied all present modes of jurisdiction, and claimed his right, according to ancient custom, to fight him, and decide his innocence or guilt by the 'wager of battle.' His answer to the court was 'Not guilty, and I am ready to defend the same by my body.' He accompanied these words by the old act of taking off his glove and throwing it down upon the floor of the court."

"At this stage of the proceedings William Ashford, who was in court, actually came forward, and was about to accept the challenge by picking up the glove, when he was kept back by those about him. What wonder did the assembly, and indeed the nation, ask 'Can a prisoner insist on so obsolete a mode of trial, in such a time of light as the nineteenth century? But with greater wonder and regret was the judgment of the court received; for, after several adjournments, it was decided in April 1818, that the law of England was in favor of the 'wager of battle,' that the old law sanctioning it had never been repealed; and that, although this mode of trial had become obsolete, it must be allowed. Thornton was therefore discharged, and, being set at liberty, left England for America, where he died in obscurity."

Reform, Here and There.

England is all astir with excitement in favor of reform. Able men are discussing it, immense meetings are held, politicians are risking their positions and influence on the enterprise; the throne itself is trembling—or is supposed to be so, as scores of times before, although it has never quite toppled over. All this for the purpose of securing to some persons the privilege of voting. The United States has its reform project of a similar kind going on with discussion, big meetings, party arrangements, speeches, newspapers and all political machinery. This is to secure to the black people, lately slaves, the privilege of voting. Voting seems to be the *summum bonum* and chief end of life, in all cases.

Of course we are satisfied—every good citizen must be so—to see a disposition prevailing to extend to all people the civil rights and privileges that belong to them. But as voting has an aspect towards the public interest, as well as towards private and individual rights, some solicitude should be felt about the qualifications of voters. On this depends great consequences connected with the public interests. Blind partisanship needs no qualifications, and therefore, those who have only partisan ascendancy as their end, are indifferent about the intelligence or moral fitness of voters. If they hold a ballot between thumb and finger, and hand it in at the polls, it is enough. The suffrage, in the eye of the citizen who regards the public good, demands more than this—some understanding of the nature of the Government; some power of discriminating between right and wrong in politics.

In England and in this country classes are appearing to the right of suffrage which have not heretofore enjoyed it. The claim meets with opposition in both cases, and in both has a powerful support. And it would not be strange if in both—we think we see it clearly—there should be a predominance of the partisan over the patriotic motive, in much that is said on both sides of the question. The right of suffrage being granted, the contest for the control of the new political element naturally ensues. This is the phase now presenting itself in the Southern States, where those who opposed the grant are quite as keen for taking advantage of it as those who favored it.—*Pitt. Com.*

SENATOR WILSON, on his trip from Atlanta to Montgomery, Alabama, addressed several white audiences, and was severely catbawed about certain customs in the North, but was able to make suitable replies to all questions. On Saturday he addressed an audience of the usual mixed character, and in the course of his speech made no reference whatever to confiscation. He was replied to by a prominent lawyer named Clanton, who urged in argument that the negro did not owe his freedom to the Republican party; that President Lincoln had promised the rebellious South two years after the commencement of the war that their slaves would be undisturbed. After the speeches, General Swaine called for the sense of the colored people as to who were for the Republican party, and the response was a unanimous affirmative.

DECORATE THE HOMESTEAD.

The mild breath of spring and the music of the early birds reminds us that the season approaches for planting, not only vegetables and grains necessary for man's subsistence, but shrubs, trees and flowers to feed the eye and nourish the taste.

There is no homestead on which a little judicious labor will not result in more or less pleasure hereafter. None on which there is not some nook or corner that can be beautified by a vine, a shrub or a plant of flowers. Nature will do her part if we perform ours, and many a barren and unsightly yard or common may thus become a thing of beauty, adding to the pure joys of home. Next to wholesome food, home pleasures are necessary to enliven our spirits, promote our good health and give zest to rural life. What can give greater satisfaction to a family of refined taste than to have the grounds around the homestead decorated with the beauties of nature so bountifully furnished us? The species and varieties of trees, shrubs, roses, vines, &c., are now so numerous that a choice selection can be made to suit every climate, soil and exposure, and to bloom and fruit all the season. See them tastefully arranged and gorgeously dressed with foliage of various colors, and decked with blooms far transcending the most costly jewelry in brilliancy, and perfuming the air with their fragrance. In windy days they gracefully bow, prance, and whirl around like sprightly youth in the dance, and the melody of the breeze serves them for music. How beautiful the picture and great the enjoyment to those who can appreciate them. It makes a cot a palace, a home a paradise; the owner a king, and his wife a queen; it imparts a dignity to the manly graces of sons, and lustre to the beauties and virtues of daughters. The passing way-farer is delighted with the scene, and sets it down in his mind as the abode of the great and good in heart, and the virtuous and wise in action.

After planting climbing vines to clothe the veranda, and a few deciduous trees around the house for shade in summer, all the other trees, shrubs and roses should be so arranged over the lawn that all will be seen at one view. Set the more dwarf nearer the house, and the taller farther off, and they will appear to rise in graceful folds as they recede from the eye, and the contrast of size, form and color of the various individuals will show to greater advantage, and that will give additional graces to their charms.

The Southern States and the "Iron Heel."

In his late speech at Augusta, Georgia, Ex-Governor Brown put very pointedly the dilemma in which the petition of Governor Jenkins and the argument of Mr. O'Connor leave the State of Georgia. If, he says, as Governor Jenkins and the rest have constantly claimed, Georgia is a foreign State conquered by the Union, what claim has she to any privilege in the Union except what may be conceded? If, on the other hand, Georgia is and always has been a State in the Union, all of us who rebelled are guilty of treason and liable to be hanged, and our property to be confiscated. "We either did go out, and the Government has the right to deal with us as a conquered people; or else we did not secede, and we were rebels and liable to be dealt with as rebels."

If the loyal people of the country insisted upon being literally logical, and upon treating a great national crisis in the spirit of a Tombs pettifogger, which is the policy of the Democratic party, this would be the inevitable dilemma in which the Southern States would be plunged. But because the Government will neither treat the late rebels exclusively as foreigners nor traitors, but regards them as citizens who may resume their national relations upon certain moderate and just conditions, it is amusingly described as "the blood-hound party," and its policy of restoration, which neither hangs nor confiscates nor exiles nor imprisons, but merely gives a vote to those who never rebelled, is nothing less than "the iron heel." The New York *World*, whose political allies were in the habit, before their rebellion, of chasing with actual blood hounds the loyal men whom the Government has enfranchised, and who had a pleasing and summary way of stamping the iron heel of the state, the halter, or the mob upon American citizens who asserted the plainest principle of the Government, is peculiarly glib in the use of this kind of rhetoric. It is the same excellent "conservative" sheet that felicitously called the murderous mob which in the summer of 1863 hunted and massacred the defenseless colored population of New York, and tried to inaugurate the rebellion in this city, "the laboring population." Of course a party which enfranchises instead of enslaving colored Americans is in its view a "blood-hound party," and the policy which would protect them from Mayor Monroe's lambs, who, we suppose, are "the laboring population" of New Orleans, is "the iron heel."—*Harper's Weekly.*

ERRORS IN THE PRINTED BIBLE.—A London paper notices a curious misprint in one of the editions of the New Testament printed at Oxford where the word *glad* is converted into *clad*. The person who detected the error received the reward of one guinea which the Oxford Press offers for such a discovery; it is an extraordinary fact that, with this standing offer of a reward, and all the vigilance of readers, Sunday School teachers and scholars, this error of a single letter is the only one that has been detected in upwards of sixty different editions.

Speech of Fensan Burke after his Conviction for Treason.

By the last arrival of mails from England we have the following extract from the speech of Fenian Burke, after his conviction for high treason:

"It is not my desire now, my Lords, to give utterance to one word against the verdict which has been pronounced upon me. But fully conscious of my honor, as a man, never impugned; fully conscious that I can go into my grave with a character unsullied, I can only say this, that these parties, actuated by a desire either for their own aggrandizement, or to save their paltry, miserable lives, have pandered to the appetite—if I may so speak—of justice, and my life shall be paid for the forfeit. Fully convinced and satisfied of the righteousness of my every act in connection with the late revolutionary movement in Ireland, I have done nothing that would bring the blush of shame to mantle my brow. My conduct and career here and in America, if you like, as a soldier, are before you; and even in this, my hour of trial, I feel a consciousness of having lived as an honest man, and I will die believing that I have given my life to give freedom and liberty to the land of my birth. I have done only that which every Irishman, and every man, whose soul throbs with the feeling of liberty should do. I seek not the death of a martyr, but if it be the will of Almighty and Omnipotent God that my devotion for the land of my birth should be tested at the scaffold, I am willing there to die in defence of the right of men to be free, to give the right of an oppressed people to throw off the yoke of thralldom. I am an Irishman by birth, an American by adoption, by nature a lover of freedom, and an enemy to the power that holds my native land in bonds of tyranny. It has so often been admitted that the oppressed have the right to throw off the yoke of oppression—even by English statesmen—that I deem it unnecessary to advert to it here. Ireland's children are not, never were, and never will be, willing or submissive slaves; and so long as England's flag covers one inch of Irish soil, just so long will they believe it to be a divine right to conspire and devise means to hurl down its power and erect in its stead the God-like structure of self-government."

WONDERS.—When a young man is a clerk in a store and dresses like a prince, smokes foreign cigars, drinks nice brandy, attends theatres, dances and the like, I wonder if he does all on the avails of his clerkship?

When a young lady sits in the parlor during the day, with her lily white fingers covered with rings, I wonder if her mother doesn't wash the dishes and do the work in the kitchen?

When the deacon of the church sells strong butter, recommending it as a good article, I wonder what he relies upon for salvation?

When a lady lazes her waist a third less than nature made it, I wonder if her pretty figure will not shorten life a dozen years or more, besides making her miserable while she does live?

When a young man is dependent upon his daily toil for his income and marries a lady who does not know how to make a loaf of bread or mend a garment, I wonder if he is not lacking somewhere, say toward the top for instance?

When a man receives a periodical or newspaper weekly, and takes great delight reading it, and does not pay for it, I wonder if he has a soul or gizzard?

WHAT NEXT.—A gentleman riding near the city overtook a well dressed man and invited him to a seat in his carriage. "What," said the gentleman to the young stranger, "are your plans for the future?"

"I am a clerk," said the gentleman.

"And my hope is to succeed, and to get into business for myself."

"And what next?" said the gentleman.

"Why, to continue in business, and accumulate wealth."

"And what next?"

"It is the lot of all to die, and I of course cannot escape."

"And what next?" once more inquired the gentleman; but the young man had no answer to make; he had no presupposed reached beyond the present life. How many young men are in precisely the same condition!—What pertains to the world to come has no place in all their plans.—*American Messenger.*

W. B. MARSH, President of the Bank of Lexington, N. C., and D. Hampton, one of the Directors, were taken to Salisbury, on Tuesday 14th instant, by order of General Sickles, under charge of embezzling the specie of the bank about the time of the surrender of the rebel General Johnston. The complaint was made by J. W. Thomas and others. The parties have had a hearing, the evidence forwarded to General Sickles, and the accused will remain in custody of the military until the General is heard from.

JUDGE KELLY addressed the people of New Orleans on Saturday evening, 11th instant, on the political status of the South. His audience was the largest mass meeting of citizens known in that city for some time. Resolutions of a strong Republican character were adopted after the meeting. The remarks of the Judge were frequently applauded.

Horace Greeley is attempting to justify himself in the eyes of the public for becoming Jeff. Davis' bondsmen.