Democrat and Sentinel.

THE BLESSINGS OF GOVERNMENT, LIKE THE DEWS OF HEAVEN, SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED ALIKE UPON THE HIGH AND THE LOW, THE RICH AND THE POOR.

NEW SERIES. EBENSBURG, SEPTEMBER 14, 1854. VOL. 1. NO. 51.

TERMS:

THE DEMOCRAT & SENTINEL, is published every Thursday morning, in Ebensburg, Cambria Co., Pa., at $1 50 per annum, IF PAID IN ADVANCE, if not $2 will be charged.

ADVERTISEMENTS will be conspicuously inserted at the following rates, viz:

1 square 3 insertions,	$1 00
Every subsequent insertion,	25
1 square 3 months,	3 00
½ " 6 "	5 00
" " 1 year,	12 00
col'n 1 year,	25 00
1 " " "	50 00
Business Cards with one copy of the DEMOCRAT & SENTINEL, per year,	5 00

Miscellaneous.

ADDRESS
of the State Central Committee—No. 4.

To the People of Pennsylvania:

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—There have been antagonistical principles and antagonistical parties in governments, from their first institution to the present time. The one, taking from the people all power of self-government, and in effect denying their right as well as their capacity to govern themselves. The other, claiming in the language of our Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments, are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

It was these antagonistical principles that led to our war of Independence. The great mass of the American people then asserted, distinctly and unequivocally, that all power was inherent in the people. That they not only possessed the right of self-government, but the capacity also to exercise the right. The British of that day and their adherents in this country, denied this right as well as this capacity. Our fathers heroically maintained their positions, and established their governments upon the principles for which they fought, and the right of man to govern himself, and his capacity to do it, in this country at least, are truisms which no man dare deny.

But although we conquered from reluctant England, and obtained from all the governments of Europe the recognition of our government, thus established, yet the despots of the old world have ever looked with a jealous eye upon our republican institutions, and we had a party among us during the war of the revolution, and we have never been without such a party since, that practically have denied man's right and ability to govern himself.

When the constitutions of the several states of the Union were under consideration, this party, without an exception, were strenuous in their endeavors to clothe the government with strong, if not with arbitrary power; to keep, as they said, the people in check. They took all the power they could from the people and vested it in the governments, thus reversing the declaration that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed; and it has taken the friends of the people from that time to the present to correct these arbitrary provisions in their organic law. In some of the States, the aristocracy has so intrenched itself behind the barriers of wealth and exclusive privileges, that, even in this age of progress, the people have not yet been able entirely to dislodge them; and, if not in their organic law, in their ordinary legislation the people of those states have been subjected to a restriction of their rights, and a tyranny in their government scarcely exceeded in those countries where despotism prevails.

In framing the constitution of the United States, these opponents of the people's rights endeavored to establish a consolidated government, which should tend to centralize in the general government all the powers and rights of the several states, as well as of the people. They claimed to establish a strong and magnificent government with numerous offices, high salaries, a standing army, and a large navy, and whenever they were in power, and had the opportunity, they carried these views into effect.

The other party, in the days of the revolution, was composed of those who asserted and maintained the rights of the people, who put forth the Declaration of Independence, and based their government upon the principles contained in it. Ours was the first government ever established upon those principles, and it has been a model for all subsequent governments. In the stormy days of the revolution, the Union of the states was held together more by a sense of mutual danger, and a sense of mutual dependence, than any coercive authority existing in the government of the Union. In the organization of the several state governments, the friends of the people endeavored to make them as democratic as they could. Still, the influence of habit, an attachment to the ordinary forms to which they had been accustomed, a partial ignorance of the forms in which their principles could be best carried out, and a disinclination to enter upon new and untried theories, prevented as full and complete a reform in their governments as experience has since shown to be necessary, and enabled those of the other party to succeed in their views to a greater extent than they ought to have done. When the throes and the troubles of the revolution were passed, and it was found necessary to establish a better form of government for the Union than the old articles of confederation afforded, the convention of 1787–88 assembled to accomplish this purpose. Here the same antagonistic elements were found at work. The friends of the people, believing that the country was best governed in which the government was least felt by the people, were in favor of retaining to the people and to the state governments, all power not necessarily requisite to the transaction of the business of the general government They wished to confer upon the general government only certain specific and enumerated powers, that were absolutely necessary for such a limited government or confederation. Their opponents, as has been stated, were for clothing the general government with almost unlimited powers, which, if granted, must have made it a consolidated government, and in the end swallow up the state governments entirely. The result of that convention was to establish a government for the Union, of unrivalled excellence, which combines the federative and the democratic principle, and makes it a government of compromise, in which the powers of government are limited, restricted and confined, to those expressly granted, or which follow by direct and necessary (not merely convenient) implication from those granted. This government, when properly administered, has all the powers necessary for its purposes, and yet leaves to the people and to the states all their rights uninfringed.

The immortal Washington was, by unanimous consent, placed at the head of the government. He called around him the statesmen and soldiers of the revolution—yet in his cabinet were found very discordant materials. Both the antagonistical principles to which we have before alluded were there represented, and it required the whole weight of that eminent man's character to prevent their operation to the prejudice of the country

Col. Hamilton, a man undoubtedly of talents, who had been conspicuous for his services in the revolutionary army, during which he had enjoyed much of the confidence of Gen. Washington, had been selected for the situation of secretary of the treasury. In the convention of 1787—88 he has, however, shown his predilections for a strong government, which, if adopted, would have made us little better than an elective monarchy, with a president and senate for life. He of course headed the party who coincided with his views, and distrusted, or affected to distrust, the power of the people to govern themselves. They assumed to themselves the name of federalists, falsely alleging that they were the exclusive friends of the form of the general government then organized and in practice

The immortal Jefferson, the great apostle of republicanism, the author of the Declaration of Independence, was selected for Secretary of State. He espoused the cause of the people, and favored a strict construction of the constitution. He was able, to a very great extent, to counteract the influence of Alexander Hamilton. He was not, however, able to succeed in all things; and Hamilton, to the great regret of the republicans of that day, succeeded in establishing the old Bank of the United States, which very soon prostituted itself to political purposes. Before the close of Gen. Washington's administration Mr. Jefferson withdrew from it, as he was unable to affiliate with Col. Hamilton and those who held his political views.

In 1796, Gen. Washington having declined a second re-election, John Adams, then vice president, and Mr. Jefferson became competitors for the presidential chair. As the law then stood, the candidate who received the highest vote became president, and he who received the next highest vote the vice president On counting the electorial votes it was decided that Mr Adams was elected president and Mr. Jefferson vice president Many persons however were even then strongly impressed with the belief that this result was unfairly produced. Mr. Adams entered upon the presidential duties on the 4th march 1797, and affiliating to a great extent with the views of Col. Hamilton, selected his cabinet from those entertaining like views, and disposed of the patronage of the general government among those of like character With the powers of the government and the monied influence of the bank combined, this administration soon began to show their disposition for arbitrary power By the sedition law they sought to prevent the freemen of the country from speaking their thoughts, and made it a criminal offence punishable by fine and imprisonment, to either verbally or in writing comment upon or investigate the improper acts of the government; thus effectually crushing the liberty of the press, the great palladium of the people's rights. By the alien law they gave the president the power to order any foreigner out of the country at his own discretion, and in case of refusal, to suffer imprisonment so long as the president might think the public safety required. They raised a large standing army, unnecessarily expended millions in the increase of the navy, imposed direct and indirect taxes upon everything which the citizens owned, and filled the country with hosts of revenue officers; that, like the locusts of Egypt, ate up their substance and became the pliant tools of government in being spies upon the people and prosecuting them for alleged sedition and treason, under the laws to which we have already referred.

The reign of this party, emphatically and truly styled "the reign of terror," happily was of short duration, and expired with the term for which Mr. Adams had been declared to be elected. Federal vituperation and abuse had been resorted to without stint, to calumniate the great republican portion of our citizens. The horrors of the French revolution were held up as bugbears to frighten the timid and declared to be the necessary result of the democratic tendencies of the republican party. The Terms democrat and Jacobin were heaped upon them as names of reproach. The republican party, believing that the term democrat, which in its signification meant an advocate of the government of the people, was correct, assumed the name and gloriously carried out its meaning.

Pennsylvania, the keystone of the political arch, in the election of 1799, gloriously triumphed in her democratic principles, and gave an earnest of what was to follo in the succeeding year. In the fall of 1800 the people of the Union elected Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr, the two highest candidates for president and vice president of the United States, each receiving an equal number of votes, although it was perfectly well understood that the former was to be the president and the latter the vice president. The election had to pass into the house of representatives to select the president and vice president from the two, and if we before had specimens of federal arrogance and tyranny, we then had exhibited the fullest evidence of their utter profligacy as a party. They whispered into the ear of Aaron, who was a bold, bad man, as the sequal showed, that if he would accede to their views, they would defeat the voice of the people—they would make him president. They were enabled for a long time (the members voting by states) to prevent the majority of the states going for Mr. Jefferson. They never were able to maintain a majority for Burr. The democratic members proved true to their trust, and the federal members of one state at length yielded, and Mr. Jefferson received the majority. He was inaugurated the 4th day of march, 1801. He surrounded himself with the ablest and best men of his party, and having obtained the majority in each house of congress, he repealed the obnoxious laws passed during the administration of his predecessor, simplified our government, reformed the abuses in its administration, lessened its expenses, and abolished all parade and ostentation—in fact, made it the model of republican government it was originally intended to be, and generally has been since After administering the government for eight years, he voluntarily withdrew, and was succeeded by Mr. Madison. During the whole of the administration of these two statesmen, the federal party were rancorous and malignant in their opposition to the government of the Union, in the doings of the Essex Junta—the Hartford Convention—the refusal to furnish men and means to carry on the war in which we were engaged with Great Britain from 1812 to 1815, emphatically called the second war of Independence, and their constant apologies for the acts of Great Britain during that war, mourning over our victories and rejoicing at those of our enemies. Jackson, however, ended that war in a blaze of glory at New Orleans on the 8th January, 1815. Jackson fought many battles, martial and civil, for his country.

Up to the time of this war, federalism although foiled and defeated, had held its crest erect and displayed a portion of its former pride and arrogance. During this war, however, it assumed the name of the "peace party," and since then has been known by almost as many names as there have been political conflicts in the country. About the conclusion of the war, one of its leading editors in writing to another, about equally prominent in its ranks, advised a change of tactics, urging that it would be better to waive the proud pretensions they had assumed, of possessing all the talents, all the decency, and all the learning of the country, and seek success "by fanning the embers of discontent in the democratic ranks." The hint was taken, the party name was dropped, and since then they have been found, upon every occasion, fomenting divisions in the democratic ranks, by inflaming the passions and prejudices of any portion of our citizens affected either from the influence of circumstances and trade upon their pecuniary affairs, from political or personal disappointments, from local prejudices or habits, from sectarianism or fanaticism in religion or any other cause. But they have never changed their principles. Whiggery of the present day is the federalism of 1799, grown more cunning. It has stooped from its high perch, and is now a mere truckler for office, in which, if once firmly reinstated, it would show all its obnoxious traits of character over again. The attempt to elect Burr in 1801, and the attempt to defeat the election in Pennsylvania in 1838, by the acts connected with the Buckshot war, are but different efforts of the same party "to treat elections by the people as though they had not taken place."

The democratic party have ever been true to their professions. Recognizing to their fullest extent the right and ability of the people to govern themselves, they have deemed it the best policy to have the people governed as little as possible—to abstain from the passage of all arbitrary laws affecting their persons, property or rights—to require the citizen to give up the fewest of his natural rights, that will be consistent with the safety of society, and clothe the public servants with only those powers that are absolutely necessary for these ends—to require that all power, delegated to public servants, should return at stated and short periods to the people to whom all power belongs, that the same may be conferred either on the former incumbents, when found worthy, or upon others more meritorious. For although power does not always corrupt, of which we have had many admirable examples, yet its tendency is to corrupt, of which we regret to say we have had not a few.

The principles of these two antagonistical parties are involved in the coming contest in Pennsylvania. The democratic party, ever honest and candid, avow their principles in open day; they bear the same honest name they have borne for more than half a century. That name conferred upon them as a term of reproach has won its way to public confidence and esteem, and so much is the power of that name felt, that ancient federalism, now modern whiggery, has often sought to steal it, to deceive the people. Democracy advocates the equal rights of all our citizens, it abhors all exclusive privileges to the few, it knows no distinction between our native born and naturalized citizens, other than those which the constitution has created. One of its first acts when Mr. Jefferson came into power was to amend the laws and facilitate the means for the naturalization of foreigners. It remembered among the causes assigned for declaring our country independent, an important one, that the king of England had obstructed the laws for the naturalization of foreigners; and in this as in all other acts they have carried out the principles of 1776—not the principles of the miscalled "sons of the sires of '76."

Our adversaries are endeavoring to crawl into power at this time by a concentration of all their own partizans proper and an attempt to excite among other prejudices foreign and inimical to the constitution of the United States, in relation to the subject to which I have alluded to excite the sympathies and prejudices of portions of our citizens. The constitution of the United States left the institution of slavery, which had been imposed upon us by the mercenary cupidity of Great Britain, just where it found it—a mere municipal regulation of the states in which it existed Pennsylvania, immediately upon the close of the revolution, abolished this institution within her borders, and almost all the northern states have since followed her example. Before the revolution it existed in all the states. If the true motives of its abolition could be reached, we fear that the northern states will not be entitled to as much credit as many claim for its abolition. It was found that slave labor was unprofitable for mere farming purposes, and these, the motives of pecuniary interest, superadded to what were deemed the principles of humanity, procured its abolition in all the original states north of Maryland and Delaware. The compromises of the constitution upon this subject, which prevented any action by the general government on the subject of slavery, have been faithfully carried out by the democratic party, in every portion of the Union. They hold that no one state has a right to interfere with what appropriately belongs to another.

The congress of the United States has the power to admit new states into the Union, and they have wisely determined that, in creating territories and admitting new states, the people of such new states or territories shall have a right to make their own laws upon the subject of slavery, or any other subject that belongs rightfully to a municipal government. Our adversaries taking advantage of the agitation produced on this subject of slavery by the erection of the new territories of Kansas and Nebraska, are charging the democratic party with favoring the cause of human slavery. They have done no such thing. They have merely determined that congress, according to the constitution, has no right to interfere with the subject, and that to the people of the territories and states, respectively, this whole subject belongs, and they have unquestionably decided rightly. Pennsylvania or any other state of the Union, might to-morrow revive the institution if it were thought right. Yet our adversaries are endeavoring to excite your sympathies in the cause of humanity, so as to induce you, practically, to violate the constitution of our country.

They are also endeavoring to foment difficulties between different classes of our citizens and to array our native born and naturalized citizens in opposition to each other, and to effect this they would bring to their aid sectarian feelings in religion Our forefathers wisely inhibited this, when, in every state constitution we find a provision substantially declaring, that every man has a right to enjoy his liberty of conscience and to worship God in the manner he shall think to be most acceptable, and the constitution of the United States prohibits the general government from giving preference to any one religious denomination over another. That constitution, too, confers upon naturalized citizens all the rights conferred upon those who are native born, without one exception. We, therefore, protest, in the most distinct and solemn manner, against any indirect attempts to accomplish that which the constitution and laws of the United States and of the several states so pointedly and so properly prohibits. It would be sapping the foundations of our free institutions It would be loosening the bonds which hold us together. It would be a practical wrong upon a portion of our citizens, who have equal rights with ourselves and making a distinction which the constitution of the United States does not make or permit.

We should guard against all attempts to violate the principles of that constitution. It is the ark of our political safety It should never be touched with unhallowed hands. Open and bold attempts to violate it are seen through and at once excite our resistance. It is from secret, insidious and undetected attempts to undermine it, that we shall be exposed to the greatest danger.

Opposition to those of foreign birth constitutes much of the political capital of our adversaries of the present day. In this they are close imitators of the federalists of '98.

By the 3d section of the alien law, every master or commander of any ship or vessel, which shall enter any port of the United States shall immediately make report in writing to the collector or other chief officer of the customs, of all aliens on board his vessel, specifying their names, age, the place of nativity, the country from which they shall have come, the nation to which they belong and owe allegiance, their occupation, and a description of their persons, and on failure to do so, to forfeit the sum of three hundred dollars; and in default of payment the vessel was to be detained by such collector or other officer. The collector was also required fortwith to transmit to the department of state true copies of all such returns. This was virtually closing our harbors to foreign emigration, at the most important crisis of the Irish rebellion, when many of the heroes and patriots of that gallant people which rendered so much service to the cause of liberty in our own revolutionary struggle, were engaged in imitating our example, and being unsuccessful, were driven from home and country, to seek an asylum elsewhere.

Many of that noble and generous, but unfortunate people, after they had failed in their exertions to emancipate their bleeding country, relying upon the assurance given by the congress of 1775 to the Irish nation, that the fertile regions of America would afford them a safe asylum from oppression," resolved upon making this country their residence. Rufus King, a high-toned federalist, one of the party of the "well-born," and a faithful representative of their intolerance and bigotry, was, at that time, the American minister in London, at the court of St. James, and resisted the emigration of these Irish patriots A number of them who were confined in dismal dungeons, and who had an offer of their release on condition of their going to America, applied to Mr. King to withdraw his opposition to their so doing. In answer to a letter written him by one of the Irish state prisoners, Mr. King said:

"I ought to inform you that I really *have no authority* to give or refuse permission to you or any other foreigner to go to the United States; the admission and residence of strangers in that country being a matter that by a late law, (the alien law) *exclusively belongs to the president*.—It is true that the government of this country, (England,) in the course of the last year, in *consequence of my interference*, gave me assurance that *a particular description of persons in Ireland, who, it was understood, were going to the United States*, should not be allowed to proceed without *our* consent. This restraint would doubtless be withdrawn in favor of persons against whose emigration *I should not object*. I am sorry to make the remark, and shall stand in need of your candor in doing *so, that a large portion of the emigrants from Ireland, and especially in the middle states, have arrayed themselves on the side of the malcontents*, (i. e., the democrats and adherents of Mr. Jefferson.) If the opinions of the emigrants are likely to throw them into the class of malcontents, they might become a disadvantage instead of a benefit to our country."

This is the leaven that has leavened the whole lump. The democrats and their political opponents have ever been at issue upon this subject of foreign emigration and the laws of naturalization. The one constituting as a fundamental principle of their political faith the free and full extention of the rights and blessings they enjoy to all the human family that desired to partake of them, who sought our shores as refuge from oppression in their native land. The other party dreading the expansion of that spirit of liberty, and that hatred to titled dignitaries and various forms of oppression in monarchical governments, that urge continually the tide of emigration from Europe, have always advocated such restrictions upon citizenship, and pursuad such a hostile policy to foreigners, that had they continued in power, and been enabled to carry their views into effect, the new flourishing and populous western states of this Union, would have still been territories, and our national character degraded and disgraced, instead of having a great name and power and glory among the nations of the earth.

The first naturalization law, passed in 1790, only required a residence of two years to become a citizen. The act of 1795 extended the time to five years. But the federalists discovering that when foreigners were naturalized they generally voted the republican ticket, conceived the idea of punishing them for their contumacy, and accordingly the time of probation was still further extended by the act June 18, 1798, *to fourteen* years, and a declaration of intention *five* years before the admission of the applicant to the rights of citizenship It is somewhat remarkable that this act was passed on the 17 June, 1798, the alien law on the 25th June, and the sedition law on the 14th July, of the same year. It would seem as if the whole energies of federalism were roused to one tremendous exertion to crush the spirit of the people, and destroy the liberties of the country All these acts were repealed on Mr Jefferson's accession to the presidency, and the time of residence necessary for a foreigner to become a citizen brought back to five years, at which it has ever since remained.

Nearly every civilized nation has adopted liberal naturalization laws, particularly where they have been situated as we are with a sparse population, and extensive regions, millions of acres of uncultivated lands. It is our policy to draw the power and productive industry of other nations to ourselves. France, Holland, Russia, and even England, have all in turn pursued this policy to great advantage, at different periods in their history. In the time of the Edwards, the Henrys and in the reign of Elizabeth, alien citizens and manufactures were invited to England and naturalized without any previous residence, or even an oath of allegiance.

But the miserable know-nothings of the present day, have refined upon the cruelty and tyranny of the federalism of '98—for they would repeal all naturalization laws, and prevent foreigners from becoming citizens at all. They would also add *religious* to political intolerance. They would not only enact laws by which those not born on American soil would be shorn of all the attributes of freedom, but they would deprive native as well as foreign born of the blessed privilege of worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences. The comparison is manifestly in favor of the black cockade federalism of "the reign of terror," in the time of the elder Adems

The democracy respect all religions, and in the spirit of our institutions tolerate all. This was the spirit of our revolutionary fathers. They persecuted neither protestant nor catholic, neither puritan nor quaker, but extended the broad ægis of the fundamental law of the land over them, for their protection. In December, 1787, General Washington wrote to the Roman catholics of the United States as follows:

"As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. *I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberty.* And I presume that your fellow citizens will not forget the patrotic part you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government, or the important assistance received from a nation in which the catholic religion is professed."

When, therefore, fellow-citizens, we find that a consolidated government, a love for exclusive privileges and monied corporations, a desire to draw implied powers from the constitution, and exercise them for their own selfish purposes, and to establish a restriction to citizenship, constitute the favorite dogmas of our political adversaries, it is reasonable to believe that a change in our very system of government would follow their ultimate success.

This historical view of the parties, their principles and their acts, has occupied more space than was expected, and we must hasten to the conclusion of this our last address. Remember, fellow-citizens, that the motto of our party is, "principles and not men." Yet in popular elections men must be selected as the standard bearers of parties and of their principles. They, however, are but the representatives of their party and are bound to carry out its principles. Test the coming contest by principles—let no false issues be introduced into it. Confine the issue to that for which our fathers fought and bled—the rights of the people.—Every other element attempted to be introduced into it is a device of the enemy—a stepping stone to get themselves into power, which, whenever possessed, they have abused. Remember the cause of the old democracy; its upright, straightforward course. Rear its banner on high, march boldly in solid column to the fight—victory will crown your efforts, and the cause of popular rights will be safe.

J. ELLIS BONHAM, *Chairman.*

GEORGE C. WELKER, *Secretary.*

From the St. Louis Anzeiger, Aug. 26

Life and Death—A Short and True Story.

One day last week, early in the morning, that miserable conveyance which takes the poor and friendless dead to the City Cemetery at the city's expense, halted in front of a house in a street of the southern part of the city. The driver alighted from the wagon, entered the house, but appeared again soon after, carrying, in company with another alike disinterested looking man, a coffin made of rough boards. The coffin was placed on the wagon and it made speed over the deserted streets towards the cemetery.

Not one followed the wagon with a sorry look—not one stood at her grave with a feeling heart, when the earth fell upon the coffin; and yet, this coffin contained the corpse of a lady who once was sincerely adored by hundreds—who once was honored, extolled, envied in society—who could command riches, and who, but a few years ago, before she trod the shores of this continent, could expect a happy and contended old age.

This Lady was Rosa Neschemi, the daughter of an immensely wealthy Polish nobleman. In early youth she was taken to the Imperial Court of Austria, where, in her eighteenth year, she was married to a French nobleman, who was also very rich Rosa Neschemi lived many long and happy years, partly upon the possession of her husband partly traveling through Germany, Spain, Italy, and England, and gave birth to three sons, who received the best education, and upon whom the eyes of the parents rested with with great pride.

Of the sons, the eldest one, an exceedingly gifted young man, was surpassingly successful in Spain, and was at that time, private secretary to King Ferdinand. After the King's death he removed to a villa in the neighborhood of Valencia where, as is believed, he fell a prey to the dagger of an assassin.

The second son, who had joined himself to the ministers of the church, was an especial favorite of the Pope Gregory. He died also soon after that event.

The third son, yet very young, remained with his mother, who found an asylum in Switzerland, whither she carried the remnants of her ruined fortune. In his sixteenth year, he left his mother and came to America. In New Orleans he soon found employment and earned much money. Bad associations, and his own inclination to dissipation caused him to deviate from the proper path, and some five years ago he grasped at the last and most contemptible means to save his credit—he persuaded his old mother to cross the ocean. She could not refuse the prayer of her only son. She succeeded in bringing with her six thousand dollars, which was spent by her son in a short time. About a year ago, he ended his career in New Orleans—being employed as deputy sheriff, he killed a Creole by stabbing him He escaped to California, and his old mother, to whom New Orleans naturally became a place of extreme hatred turned her steps towards St Louis.

One day last week, early in the morning, the miserably city hearse conveyed the remains of Rosa Neschemi, to the last unwept for resting place. Such is life.

☞ A young man of good standing recently proposed honorable marriage to a young lady of the West, when he recieved for an answer: "Get out yot feller! Do you think I would sleep with a man? I'll tell your mother!"

☞ DECIDEDLY IGNORANT.—A man who professes to be a *Know Nothing*.

☞ An old man speaking of his great knowledge of the western country, the other day, said he had known the Mississippi river since it was a small creek.