

glad, and I awoke; and then I cried all to myself, for it was only a dream.

The last words said very mournfully, and with a drooping of Mary's lids, until the tear ginned fast my close upon her cheeks. Another period of deep silence followed; for the oppressed listeners gave no utterance to what was in their hearts. Feeling was too strong for speech. Nearly five minutes gilded away and then Mary whispered the name of her father, but without opening her eyes.

Morgan answered and bent down his ear. "You will only have mother left, she said—only mother! And she cries so much when you are away."

"I won't leave her, Mary, only when I go to work," said Morgan whispering back to the child; and I'll never go out at night any more."

"Yes, you promised me that."

"And I'll promise more."

"What, father?"

"Never to go into a tavern again."

"Never!"

"No, never. And I'll promise still more."

Father?"

"Never to drink a drop of liquor as long as I live!"

"O father! dear, dear father!"

And with a cry of joy Mary started up, and flung herself upon his breast. Morgan drew his arms tightly around her, and sat with his lips pressed to her cheek, whilst she lay against his bosom as still as death. As death? Yes; for when the father unclasped his arms the spirit of his child was with the angels of the resurrection.—*Arthur's tea nights in a bazaar.*

Importation of Felons.

There is an abundant evidence that several, if not most, of the European monarchies have reduced to a system the exportation of their felons to other shores. By this, they effect two objects, 1. Get rid of the most dangerous and burdensome class of their subjects; 2. Extract or keep active prey against Republians among their better disposed subjects, whom they wish to retain at home, by multiplying murders and other crimes in this country; and so diffusing the belief that Liberty leads naturally to outrage and insecurity.—The following are well assured, is a correct translation of an official Circular widely disseminated through Belgium:

CIRCULAR.

No. 1, 1854.—LIEGE, (Belgium,) March 14, 1854. *Emigrants for the United States—Transportation.*

GENTLEMEN: The transports for emigrants for the United States will take their departure from Antwerp. A large number of vessels are prepared already to leave at various periods of this month. A certain number of liberated prisoners from Vilvoorde, and from some poor-houses (deport de mendicité) are on the point of departing.

The price of the passage, all expenses included, is 180 francs, which sum should be paid in advance at the bureau of the Governor of the Province.

I beg of you to let me know as soon as possible if your district has any passengers to be forwarded.

Each individual should be sent to the jail (aison d'arrest) of Antwerp, and have in his possession simply a certificate on the following model:

"The Burgomaster of the district of— Province of Liege, (Belgium) certifies that— (give the age, place of birth, parentage) is unmarried.

The departure will take place during the year, every fortnight.

The Commissary of the Arrondissement.

To the Burgomaster and Council of—

—We would suggest to our honest and reputable Adopted Citizens that it especially behoves them to watch (through their friends remaining in Europe) and expose every attempt to flood our ports with European criminals and paupers. The burden must be borne by us all, but the adopted Citizens are subjected to an undue share of being exposed to peculiar reproach and obloquy because of these cargoes of iniquity and meanness so unworthily thrust upon us. Will they not act?

N.Y. Tribune.

The Times New Territories.—Some time ago we mentioned that the national administration had framed a plan for organizing three new territorial governments in the Indian country south of Kansas, to consist severally of the countries of the Cherokees in one territory, the Creeks in another, and the Choctaws and Chickasaws in a third. This plan it was stated on the authority of a person who had just arrived from the Chickasaw nation, had been sent out to be canvassed by the tribes concerned, and who, under it, were to be constituted citizens of the United States. At the last session of the Senate a bill was presented by Mr. Johnson, of Arkansas, which embodied the features of this scheme, and which, though it was not acted on, will probably form a subject of discussion at Washington next winter. This bill proposed with the assent of the tribes named, to extend over them the constitution and laws of the Union, and to organize three territories, of which the Indians are to be recognized as citizens. The title of the first of these will be Cherokees and will include the Cherokees, Osages, Senecas, Shawnees, and Quapaws. The title of the second is to be Muscogees, and it will include the Creek and Seminoles; and the third is named Chatta, and will include the Choctaws and Chickasaws. It seems probable that action was only delayed upon this scheme in Congress in order to allow time to secure the consent of all the tribes designated. Efforts are now being made to this end, and possibly the next session of Congress will witness the passage of the bill.

The Easton Farmer (Dem.) of Aug. 24th, has the following moral on the Lachlan pardon:

"The apologists of Gov. Bigler, in the Lachlan case, say that the fine is not repented. How is it? Gov. Bigler, in the purlieus, says that this man was improperly convicted upon the testimony of a 'felon' who was not entitled to credit. In other words, he bases the pardon upon the ground of innocence. Now we ask any sensible man if it is reasonable to suppose for a moment that if Gov. Bigler believed Lachlan innocent, he would release him from 12 days confinement, and leave a fine of \$2,500 resting upon him? Not a bit of it. He has a 'full and free pardon,' and although the Sheriff has been prosecuted for the fine, we wish our readers to mark our prediction, the Lachlan will never pay it. The county has been robbed—the robbers are Gov. Bigler and the persons who recommended the pardon."

"Our neighbor of the Union must be mistaken, in saying that 'so long as the Clayton amendment was retained, the Governor, we believe, was opposed to the passage of the Nebraska bill.' We say *must be* mistaken, because the Clayton amendment is precisely the same as a provision in the compromise measures of 1850, relating to the territories then organized; which measures the Governor has uniformly approved, in every part, from the time of their passage to the present moment.—*Keystone.*

The N.Y. Tribune, on account of the pressure of the times, has falling off of advertising, and the increased price of paper has slightly reduced its size.



The Susquehanna Register.

H. FRAZIER AND THOS. SMITH, EDITORS.

MONTROSE, PA.

Thursday, September 7, 1854.

WHIG STATE TICKET.

Governor.

JAMES POLLOCK, of Northumberland.

Canal Commissioner.

GEORGE DARSIE, of Allegheny.

Judge of Supreme Court.

DANIEL M. SMYSER of Montgomery.

ATTY. R. PALMER, the American Newspaper Agent is the only authorized Agent for this paper in the cities of Boston, New York and Philadelphia.

Pollock Endorsed by the Free Democracy!

Withdrawal of Mr. Potts!

Our readers will recollect that a Free Democratic State Convention assembled at Harrisburg, August 30th, to consider the best course to be pursued by the friends of freedom in this crisis. That Convention, representing the Free Democracy of the whole State, solemnly declared that Governor Bigler, from his position on the Slavery and Temperance questions, is unworthy of support and that James Pollock's position, on both these great questions, is satisfactory. The Convention, therefore, with the consent of Mr. Potts, withdrew his name as a candidate for Governor, and recommended the Free Democracy of the State to support Pollock. They believe that the Nebraska question is *an issue* in this election, and act accordingly. The Resolution and correspondence of the convention appear in an other column?

A Queer Convention.

On Monday last what purported to be a Democratic County Convention was held in Montrose. Nothing that we have recently witnessed, has more plainly evinced the existence of that spirit before which the wire-railers are shaking in their shoes. The Convention was evidently got up with much care and precaution. In several of the townships, probably in most of them, the test question to voters at the delegate elections was, "Bicker or anti-Bigler?" The delegates regularly elected for Chocoont township, were thrown out of the Convention, the allegation against one of them being that he was "anti-Bigler," and, in addition, that he voted for the Temperance candidate for Representative last fall, which, according to the straight-laced party men who controlled the Convention, was arrant Whiggery, or made him a "mongrel," though he declared himself a Democrat. We did not hear that there was any objection to the other one, unless it was that a Whig, whom the Nebraskaites had brought to the polls—just as they tried to do in Montrose—was permitted to vote, and so vitiated the election. At any rate, the Chocoont delegates were thrown out, the "purity" of the party was vindicated, and independence was rewarded. Thus purified—but still retaining among its delegates men who were strong Whigs some two years ago, and whose chief claim to the name of Democracy now consists in open advocacy of the Nebraska bill and its supporters—the Convention proceeded to business. And didn't they nominate a mongrel! Bigler men and anti-Bigler men, Nebraskaites and anti-Nebraskaites mixed together in promiscuous confusion! The following is the ticket:

For Congress, Galusha A. Grow; for Representative, William J. Turrell; for Sheriff, Martin J. Mumford; for Prothonotary, F. M. Williams; for Register and Recorder, F. P. Hollister; for Commissioner, Jasper Stanley; for Auditor, O. S. Beebe; for Coroner, Benjamin Dix.

The Convention then adjourned without adopting any resolutions.

So the Nebraska question is not considered worthy the notice of the Regulars of Susquehanna county. Has the promise, made to the Free Soil men, in the Montrose-Democrat, been kept?

Our Country, Present and Prospective.

We have examined with some care, Gaston and Johnson's New Map of our Country," just published, and in our opinion it is the very best we have ever seen. It gives our present boundaries, including the late ten million purchase from Mexico—the newly organized territories of Kansas and Nebraska—all the railroads completed and contemplated—defines the boundaries of every county in each State—and in general accuracy is much superior to any other of the new maps of our country, with which we have become acquainted. The following recommendation is from one well qualified to judge:

"Having been employed for a long time as draftsman in the General Land Office at Washington, and having carefully examined all the different Maps of the United States up to the present date, in my estimation there are none that in point of accuracy can compare with Gaston & Johnson's New Map of our Country."

JAS. F. MCLEAN, Civil Engineer.

Washington, July 21, 1854.

Mr. Baldwin, the agent, proposes to canvass this and some of the adjoining counties to make sale of the above Map, and our readers may therefore have an opportunity to examine it and judge of its merits for themselves.

"We observe that the report of the Governor's remarks on the Nebraska question, in Fulton county, which appeared originally in the *Valley Spirit*, is widely copied in papers of all parties in this State, as containing a plain statement of Bigler's position, from his own mouth. Would it be too much to ask the *Montrose Democrat* to follow the example of the *Luzerne Union*, and other staid Democratic sheets, and lay that report, together with the *Keystone's* comments thereon, before its readers? It might do good, in more ways than one.

The GOVERNOR AND THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

Governor Bigler, with all his pro-slavery antecedents, after having recommended to the State Legislature the enactment of laws favoring the institution of slavery, after having used his influence to prevent the voice of Pennsylvania being given through her Legislature against the Nebraska bill, after having consented to run as the candidate of a party fully committed in favor of that bill, and which makes adhesion to it a party test, after having tacitly assented to the assertion made by all the leading papers of his party that he is of it, after the Democratic State Committee have prepared under his supervision and published to the world an address in favor of it, and, finally, after he has himself declared, in a public speech, as reported by one of his own partisans, J. M. Cooper, Esq., editor of the *Valley Spirit*, that he approved the Nebraska bill, and would defend it, as founded on the great principle of self-government—Governor Bigler, we say, with such antecedents, made a speech in Montrose, last week, which the editor of the *Montrose Democrat*, who claims to be a strong anti-Nebraska man, affirms "has taken away all reasonable cause of complaint from any quarter." After such an assertion, from what purports to be the party organ in this section, it is worth while to examine, with some care, what the Governor said here, and see on what sort of a foundation the assertion is based. Whoever reads the report of his speech, can hardly fail to perceive its striking similarity to Address No. 3, of the Democratic State Committee, a document which that well-known Democratic paper, the *Bradford Reporter*, justly characterizes as the following terms:

"It endeavours with a disingenuousness worthy of the *doughface* who wrote it, to confound the honest indignation of Freemen at the violation of a National compact, with the treacherous acts of abolitionists. It employs the same dirty game which those who do the disgraceful work of slavery always use, a great pretension of patriotism, a love of the Union, and an appearance of disunion. While it carefully skulks the true question, and the iniquity of the outrage perpetrated upon the North, it has a lively sense of the indiscretions of the overzealous opposers of the measure."

It is true there were some things the Governor approved in the address intended for general circulation, which he did not deem it prudent to repeat in so many words in this locality. For instance, the address says,

"The only matter of inquiry has long been how it (the institution of slavery) was to be managed to the greatest advantage of both the white and the black races. The latter number several millions, and we are forced to the dilemma of retaining a large portion of them in bondage, or make them our companions and equals, and permit them to share the honors of the State, and intermarry with our daughters and friends."

He showed his discretion by not urging such an argument in favor of the perpetuity and extension of human bondage before the freemen of Susquehanna county. He did not say, he durst not say here, personally, as he says, through the State Committee, in the address, "Let us, fellow citizens, discard the doctrines of the abolitionists and anti-slavery agitators, and lay upon the opinions which they have promulgated, and are now pronouncing, as the false lights thrown out by the ancient federalists, during the Missouri controversy, to mystify the people, and regn[e] lost power." The Whigs some two years ago, and whose chief claim to the name of Democracy now consists in open advocacy of the Nebraska bill and its supporters—the Convention proceeded to business. And didn't they nominate a mongrel! Bigler men and anti-Bigler men, Nebraskaites and anti-Nebraskaites mixed together in promiscuous confusion! The following is the ticket:

For Congress, Galusha A. Grow; for Representative, William J. Turrell; for Sheriff, Martin J. Mumford; for Prothonotary, F. M. Williams; for Register and Recorder, F. P. Hollister; for Commissioner, Jasper Stanley; for Auditor, O. S. Beebe; for Coroner, Benjamin Dix.

The Convention then adjourned without adopting any resolutions.

So the Nebraska question is not considered worthy the notice of the Regulars of Susquehanna county. Has the promise, made to the Free Soil men, in the Montrose-Democrat, been kept?

Our Country, Present and Prospective.

We have examined with some care, Gaston and Johnson's New Map of our Country," just published, and in our opinion it is the very best we have ever seen. It gives our present boundaries, including the late ten million purchase from Mexico—the newly organized territories of Kansas and Nebraska—all the railroads completed and contemplated—defines the boundaries of every county in each State—and in general accuracy is much superior to any other of the new maps of our country, with which we have become acquainted. The following recommendation is from one well qualified to judge:

"Having been employed for a long time as draftsman in the General Land Office at Washington, and having carefully examined all the different Maps of the United States up to the present date, in my estimation there are none that in point of accuracy can compare with Gaston & Johnson's New Map of our Country."

JAS. F. MCLEAN, Civil Engineer.

Washington, July 21, 1854.

Mr. Baldwin, the agent, proposes to canvass this and some of the adjoining counties to make sale of the above Map, and our readers may therefore have an opportunity to examine it and judge of its merits for themselves.

"We observe that the report of the Governor's remarks on the Nebraska question, in Fulton county, which appeared originally in the *Valley Spirit*, is widely copied in papers of all parties in this State, as containing a plain statement of Bigler's position, from his own mouth. Would it be too much to ask the *Montrose Democrat* to follow the example of the *Luzerne Union*, and other staid Democratic sheets, and lay that report, together with the *Keystone's* comments thereon, before its readers? It might do good, in more ways than one.

The GOVERNOR AND THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

Governor Bigler, with all his pro-slavery antecedents, after having recommended to the State Legislature the enactment of laws favoring the institution of slavery, after having used his influence to prevent the voice of Pennsylvania being given through her Legislature against the Nebraska bill.—And for his reentry at that crisis, for his subservient to Southern policy, we doubt not the people will take him at his word and "strike him down."

Both the speech and the "address" say

"It is scarcely possible that the election of Governor, whoever may succeed, is to have any practical bearing upon the future policy of those territories;" and that "the repeal of the Missouri compromise is not an issue in this contest." If the people could be made

to believe this, it would alter the Governor's prospects very materially—but they cannot.

This question is not an issue.

We had almost said it was the only issue—it certainly far exceeds all others in importance. The moral sense and feelings of the people have been outraged by this act of their unfaithful servants at Washington; and as their prayers and petitions have been treated with contempt, they have determined to use the sovereign power secured to them by the constitution, and see if they cannot make themselves heard by means of the ballot box.—

The question is whether the election of one or the other of the candidates would be

understood as an endorsement or condemnation of the Nebraska bill. That that measure was adopted by the National Administration and forced through Congress as a Democratic measure, and that its support is declared by the Administration press to be a test of party adhesion, no one can deny. It is always understood that the triumph of a party, immediately after the adoption of a new principle or measure by that party, must be construed as an endorsement of that principle or measure by the people, while a defeat, like that of the Nebraskaites in Iowa, most emphatically pronounces its condemnation.—Then, when we see the leaders of a great organization which styles itself the Democratic party, openly accepting the Nebraska bill as a party measure, and at the same time Governor Bigler tells us that his election would not be an endorsement of that measure, we naturally ask, when did the Governor leave the Democratic party? So far from leaving it, he stood up before us, the other day, and told us how proud he was to belong to that great, glorious, and stainless party, that never did anything wrong! Does that look like withdrawing from the party, or condemning the Nebraska bill? So far from it, let a measure be once christened "Democratic," and it forthwith becomes sanctified in his sight. The party can do no wrong. Well might he affirm that what he said here was substantially the same that he said in Fulton county, where he undisguisedly declared he still held substantially what he did in Fulton county; that he was *in favor of the Nebraska bill*. The issue is now fairly made, between him and Judge Pollock, the anti-Nebraska candidate. If Free-Soil men believe, as they affirm, that freedom or slavery is the great issue now before the people, they cannot have any doubt, which of the two to support. The Free Democracy, who met in State Convention at Harrisburg, August 30th, withdrew their candidate from the field, and recommended the friends of freedom to unite on Pollock—have settled the question; and their decision will be ratified by the people at large, in October, in a manner that will convince the pro-slavery conspirators that the freemen of Pennsylvania cannot be counted on to aid them in their unholy crusade against Freedom.

Both the speech and the "address" declare

"that the so-called Slave Law, or anything in fact, that

showed the least sympathy with the Free-Soil men? No; yet to Chase his speech

was quite satisfactory. So the thin mask