

B. F. HOAGAN, Editor.
TUESDAY MORNING, JULY 26, 1859.
State Democratic Ticket.
RICHARDSON L. WRIGHT.
JOHN ROWE.

The Gazette is becoming bold and meddlesome in its slanders and misrepresentations of the Democratic party. We are not so thin-skinned as to think a political opponent has no right to criticize the policy of our party, and hold its leaders and public men to a strict accountability for their acts and sentiments—but when a paper week after week, without the semblance of an excuse, persists in mistating our own position, as well as that of the party we represent, we think it about time to enter our protest against that kind of warfare. In the turmoil of a political contest, a slight departure from the strict line of truth may be attributed to the heat of debate—but to sit down coolly now, with the thermometer at 90° in the shade, and state, as the Gazette does this week, that the propositions to "re-open the slave trade, and to enact a slave code for the territories" "form prominent planks in the Democratic platform," is a departure from truth that no respectable paper ought to be guilty of. We are aware there are people who think it no harm to promulgate a political falsehood—but it seems to us that a person whose moral sensibilities are blunt enough to adopt such a rule of action in politics, will sooner or later adopt it in private life. Suppose we should gravely tell our readers, who are quite as numerous and quite as respectable as those of the Gazette, that a prominent plank in the Republican platform was the spiritual wife system, and that the corner stone of the whole Republican fabric rested on the idea of "amalgamation"—Would not our readers know that we grossly slandered that party? And is it not equally clear to every intelligent reader of the Gazette that when it states that the propositions to "re-open the slave trade and enact a slave code for the territories," is a "prominent plank in the Democratic platform," it states what is notoriously untrue in fact and in inference. No such propositions can be found in the Cincinnati platform, which was formed by the last convention of the representatives of the Democratic party of the Union. Until the Convention meets in Charleston in 1860, that, and that "platform" alone is the platform of the party, north, south, east and west. Nor can any proposition, even remotely hinting at such a course, be found in any "platform" adopted by any of the Democratic conventions of the several states which have recently been held. On the contrary the very reverse is the case. It is but a short time since that Georgia held her convention, and re-affirmed the Cincinnati platform. The Democracy of Virginia have but just come out of a contest in which their gallant leader, LEE, took the negative side of these very questions, while GORDON, the "opposition" candidate, with whose success the Gazette was ready to Kentucky, at this very moment, the Democratic candidates are meeting their "opponents" upon these questions—meeting them, too, upon a "platform" which distinctly repudiates congressional intervention in the territories. The same may be said of Tennessee—neither a "slave code" for the territories, nor the "re-opening of the slave trade," is found inscribed upon the banner of the Tennessee Democracy. Where then can these propositions be found in the "platform" of the Democratic party? Not certainly in Pennsylvania, nor Maine, nor Vermont, nor Ohio, nor Iowa, nor any other Northern state. The Gazette may say that Gov. WISE and a few other fanatics south of the Potomac have declared in favor of such a course. Possibly; but suppose a thousand WISES should do so, that would not make those propositions a part of the Democratic "platform." The opinions of individuals have nothing to do with the creed of a great party—besides, the Gazette should recollect that Gov. WISE, and his mad-cap followers, are arrayed in opposition to the National Administration. They are partners in the treason of John W. FORNEY, and with him are endeavoring to dismember the Democratic party. The treason of Arnold did not make the American patriots royalists—nor does the treason of Forney and Wise make a "congressional slave code for the territories and the re-opening of the African slave trade" a part of the Democratic platform.

But the Gazette, not satisfied with promulgating the misrepresentation, we have referred above, in one article—must needs follow it up with another, based upon the recent letter of Gen. Cass, as Secretary of State, in regard to the rights of naturalized citizens when they return to their native land. This letter Gen. Cass says it has not been even noticed by us, and it goes on to suppose diverse and sundry reasons, all of which are very profound, we suppose, for the omission. Now, the leading editorial of the Observer of July 23d, was upon this very question, and it closed by quoting the identical letter of Gen. Cass, which our truth-telling neighbor says we have "not even noticed." Starting us with so petty a falsehood, it is no wonder the Gazette should follow it up with larger base coin from the same mint. For example, the Gazette says "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

out the pale of the law by which a compliance may be enforced. If a Prussian subject severs his allegiance to his sovereign, he cannot, by his act, incur pre-existing obligations, and if he becomes a citizen of another country, he necessarily is accepted upon the condition that it is impossible for that country to ignore those obligations when he places himself within the sphere of their legitimate enforcement, without the assent of that sovereign. This, Gen. Cass says, is the doctrine of most of the Governments of Europe, and until treaties are made with them to relinquish this claim, the adopted citizen who returns to his native country does so at his own peril. It will thus be seen that stating an existing fact, and announcing a theory or "doctrine," is quite a different affair. But whether this position of Gen. Cass is true or false, it is a "new doctrine" in no sense; and what is more, it is the position assumed by the Fillmore administration upon the same question—and every body knows that administration received the unqualified endorsement and support of the Gazette. We quote from the National Intelligencer: "The National Congress has declared to adopted citizens that they are not entitled to equal rights, privileges and franchises with native citizens," and that it is a "new doctrine that Naturalized citizens are not American citizens." In the first place Gen. Cass has declared no "doctrine" at all upon the question. He has only declared a simple fact, that in most countries of Europe the Government does not recognize the right of a subject to denationalize himself. He says, in many words, that if Johannes Smith becomes a citizen to migrate to America and become a citizen of the Union, he enjoys all the privileges of a native citizen, except those specified in the Constitution, against the whole world, on land or on sea, provided that all his engagements were complied with to his mother country prior to the time of his emigration; and he is even secure from anterior engagements while he keeps with-

FOREIGN NEWS.

Particulars of the Battle of Solferino.
The New York Tribune of the 12th July, contains a long and interesting account of the battle of Solferino, which was fought on the 24th of June. The account is written by a correspondent who was present at the battle, and who has been able to obtain a great deal of information from the French and Austrian officers who were present. The account is very full and interesting, and gives a very clear and accurate picture of the battle as it was fought. It is a very valuable contribution to the history of the war, and is well worth reading to all who are interested in the subject.

It is becoming apparent every day that Judge Douglas desires to be relieved from the odium of a political connection with Forney. He appears to be satisfied that the support of such a man, and such a paper as the States, will do him no good, and that he is better off without it. He is a man of high position, and his name is well known in the country. He is a man of high position, and his name is well known in the country. He is a man of high position, and his name is well known in the country.

A letter has been shown to us from a distinguished gentleman in Georgia, from which we have taken the following extracts: "As a friend of Judge Douglas, I wish you to express my thanks to the editor of the States for the exposition which he has made of Forney's true position, and all the Black Republicans who are his followers. Forney must not be allowed to speak for the distinguished Senator of Illinois. Such a slave would ruin even such a master. The great tribune of the people must speak for himself to the people, and when he speaks they will listen. But in this crisis of the national existence, no hiring mercenary must put words in his mouth. As to the re-opening of the African slave trade, there never was a more unscrupulous notion entertained. It meets with little favor even in the South, and that title is growing smaller by degrees."

The New York papers record the melancholy death, by drowning of the Rev. Kingman A. Not, of the Broome street Baptist Church. The particulars are briefly these: Feeling the necessity of invigorating recreation, Mr. Not went to Perth Amboy, N. J., on Wednesday last, in company with a sister, and on the evening of that day preached a sermon (his last) in the village church. On Thursday he went with a party of friends, to Raritan river for a swim. After remaining some time in the water, he was observed lying on his back and beating with his arms, and a moment afterwards he sank from sight. Aid was immediately summoned, but without avail. The body was not recovered for an hour. It is supposed that the unfortunate man was attacked by cramps, a theory substantiated by the fact that the water in which he was bathing was quite shallow—between five and seven feet in depth. Mr. Not was only twenty-five years of age at the time of his sad and sudden death. He was gifted with unusual pulpit powers, and filled a prominent place in the religious world of New York.

Two foolish young men of New York, with all their folly were wise enough to fall in love; it was their misfortune rather than their fault that their affections met in the same young lady. Their simplicity developed itself in a determination to fight a duel about the matter. New Jersey was the State selected for the wager of combat, and pistols were the weapons. The result was fatal to the character of both as marksmen, but to nothing else. The lady not being present, the two combatants engaged in a duel about 7 o'clock, and the cannon had ceased for a time to take part in it, the fight had meantime gone on, and when I again resumed my post of observation, the cannoning commenced quite on the extreme left of the entire field, and at 5 o'clock while the cannonade was still going on, the French army crossed the Castiglione, and the Austrian force followed from the lower end of Lake Garda and emptied into the Po; but the batteries of the French army, which were positioned on the left bank of the river, north of a line connecting the towns of Castiglione, Solferino and Volta. At one point after another sharp cannonading would arise and continue for half or three-quarters of an hour, and after each such cessation the French army would retreat, until after night-fall an incessant and most terrible combat was here kept up. The batteries of the two armies were apparently about half a mile apart, and at the outset of the battle the French army was in an effective position, but the Austrians gradually slackened their fire and several times took up new positions while the Sardinians poured a rapid and uninterrupted shower of balls upon them, suspending only for a few minutes at a time, and then renewing it again with redoubled fury. The wind had now gone down. The air was still, and the sound of musketry as well as of the cannon was distinctly heard. The extreme left of the French army, and incessant firing, and the sharp and incessant pattering of ball upon a roof, while the latter was occasionally suspended, but while it lasted was overwhelmingly grand and terrible. The Sardinian park rose a dense cloud of smoke directly upwards, a sides perfectly upright and well defined, and spreading outward, was at the top, like an enormous sheaf of wheat. The sun was making a glorious setting in the west, and a light gradually departing in the vivid flashes of the discharge of cannon gleamed through the breast of an enormous cloud. Sometimes only a single flash would be seen, then two or three at intervals, and then a long and incessant break forth in an instant succession. The break beginning to be dark when I turned to descend the hill, and all the way down I still heard the roar of the cannon and the clattering of the guns of the infantry; but the extreme left of the French army, and could scarcely have failed to sustain a total rout. Malakoff estimates the French loss at about 25,000, including 10,000 wounded.

THE COMPLETION OF THE ALLIED VICTORY.
The London News remarks, with great force, on the completion of the Allied victory, in the battle of Solferino, and the consequent fall of the Austrian army. The article is very full and interesting, and gives a very clear and accurate picture of the battle as it was fought. It is a very valuable contribution to the history of the war, and is well worth reading to all who are interested in the subject.

LETTERS FROM VERONA, published by the Austrian camp, establish one or two important points relative to the great battle of Solferino. On that occasion the Emperor's army abandoned its position in Italy. The Emperor was there to excite emulation; he felt to plan the attack, and to inspire his officers, officers of his army, and to inspire his officers, officers of his army, and to inspire his officers, officers of his army.

THE TROY WHIG says that the wife of a prominent merchant—a Spiritist—who has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge.

As Good as it is True. The New York Tribune says that the following story was lately told by a reformed libertine as an apology for such of the folly of drinkards: "A man was engaged to a woman, and was to be married in a few days. The man was a very good man, and the woman was a very good woman. They were both very good people, and they were both very good people. They were both very good people, and they were both very good people.

THE TROY WHIG says that the wife of a prominent merchant—a Spiritist—who has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge.

As Good as it is True. The New York Tribune says that the following story was lately told by a reformed libertine as an apology for such of the folly of drinkards: "A man was engaged to a woman, and was to be married in a few days. The man was a very good man, and the woman was a very good woman. They were both very good people, and they were both very good people. They were both very good people, and they were both very good people.

THE TROY WHIG says that the wife of a prominent merchant—a Spiritist—who has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge, has been compelled to take office as a judge.

As Good as it is True. The New York Tribune says that the following story was lately told by a reformed libertine as an apology for such of the folly of drinkards: "A man was engaged to a woman, and was to be married in a few days. The man was a very good man, and the woman was a very good woman. They were both very good people, and they were both very good people. They were both very good people, and they were both very good people.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE.

THIS BEST OF ALL FAMILY SEWING MACHINES, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE.

THIS BEST OF ALL FAMILY SEWING MACHINES, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE.

THIS BEST OF ALL FAMILY SEWING MACHINES, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine.

THE QUEEN SEWING MACHINE, is now offered for inspection. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine, and it is a very good machine. It is a very good machine,