

# 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, FEBRUARY 6, 1856.

VOL. 3, NO. 16.

## TERMS:

THE DEMOCRAT & SENTINEL, is published every Wednesday morning, in Ebenburg, Cambria Co., Pa., at \$1.50 per annum, in advance. If not so, it 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, .75  
" " " " " " " " " " .50  
" " " " " " " " " " .30  
" " " " " " " " " " .15  
" " " " " " " " " " .05  
Business Cards, .50  
27-Twelve lines constitute a square.

## RENOUNCING BLACK REPUBLICANISM.

We call the special attention of our readers to the following able, eloquent and logical letter of GEORGE A. COFFEY, Esq., to the President of the Republican Convention of Pennsylvania. Mr. COFFEY is a young man of fine abilities, and has for several years past been considered the most eloquent Orator in the Republican party of Pennsylvania. Since the passage of the Nebraska act, his philosophical mind has been busily engaged in determining how far his own views upon the subject of Government would square with the principles of that wholesome law of Congress—Gradually, he discovered that its provisions accorded with the theory which he had long entertained, and like an honest man and a patriotic citizen, he openly avowed the fact. The late meeting of the Republican Convention in Philadelphia, found him on the floor, during a stormy debate, logically sustaining the principles of the Nebraska bill, and eloquently depicting the consequences of the wild schemes of the Abolitionists. Mr. COFFEY has now severed all connection with the Republicans, and in exposing their errors, also takes occasion to pour liquid fire upon the head of Know-Nothingism. To a mind like his, action is necessary to its development, and we feel satisfied that he will henceforth prove an able champion of the individual rights of the States, and of their equality under the Constitution. He has always opposed the proscriptive tenets of the Secret Order, and will wage war against no man on account of his religious opinions. There is another eloquent gentleman who was conspicuous in the late Republican Convention, who should publicly renounce his connection with that organization, as we know that his views in relation to State rights are in direct opposition to those entertained by the Abolitionists. Will he have the courage to come out from among them, now that Mr. COFFEY has set the example. Let every Democrat read the letter of Mr. COFFEY. It will repay perusal.  
No. 50 SOUTH SIXTH ST., PHILA.,  
26th January, 1856.

*Miss K. A. Hutchinson, Esq., President of the Republican City Convention:*  
MY DEAR SIR:—I beg that I may be allowed to assign my reasons for resigning my place as a delegate in the Convention, over which you preside. I do this with the kindest feelings towards every member of the Republican party. My intercourse with all of them has been most pleasant to myself. They have all treated me with flattering courtesy. I bear cordial witness to their personal integrity—their honest patriotism, and their devotion to Liberty.  
But it is my humble opinion, that in opposing the admission into the Union of any more slave holding States, they fly in the face of the National Constitution. And here are my reasons for so thinking:  
Some cases may not be reached by the express letter of a law, which are nevertheless governed by it, because they are, as the lawyers say, "within its equity." Such cases, though not mentioned in terms, are yet within the mischief to be remedied, or the good to be effected, by the law, or within its intent and scope—its reason and spirit. No one hesitates in applying the law to such cases. Now, the Constitution is not a "dead letter." It is more than a string of "shalls," "shall nots," and "mays." It has intentions and purposes written upon its front—a pervading spirit—reasons for every clause and word; it has "its equities."  
Let it be granted, then, that if Congress refuse an applying Territory admission into the Union, such refusal cannot be appealed from, reversed, or redressed under the Constitution by any other power than Congress itself. Grant that such a Territory must stay out till Congress does admit it. Grant that Congress has a certain discretion in the premises, for the Constitution says "new States may be admitted." But it is just as true, that this discretion may be exercised in a spirit regardless of the Constitution, or hostile to it or parts of it.  
A refusal to admit a new State is constitutional or unconstitutional, according to the reasons on which it proceeds—as it advances or obstructs the purposes and intent of the Constitution, and harmonizes or is discordant with its spirit and "equities." To refuse a monarchical State would be an express duty. If a community situate far away from us, separated by the seas, differing from us in color, race and species, heathen, barbarous, and unused to practical republicanism, consisting of Africans, Chinese, Tartars, or Malays, should struggle for admission, Congress could well refuse, vindicated by obvious Constitutional prerogatives. For such an admission might endanger "domestic tranquility," and would form a less "perfect Union."  
But if Congress refuse to admit a "new

State" for the simple reason that she allows domestic Negro slavery, this is against the whole scope and spirit, and all the analogies and equities of that august instrument which binds the Union, and gives "form and pressure" to the nation.  
Congress has no power whatever to interfere with slavery in the States. Slavery, in each State, is under its sole and exclusive control. Philanthropy may shed her tears over the sorrows of the slave—Eloquence and Literature may expostulate with the master—but slavery itself is entrenched and hidden behind State sovereignty. It is beyond the sphere and scope of national action and policy. This Union, although most benign, fruitful, and perpetual, is yet not a Union to all intents and purposes. It is a limited partnership. It relates to common interests, common dangers, common institutions, and merely national matters. It has no jurisdiction over and cognizance of what is mere local and peculiar.  
Now the General Government is prohibited from touching the subjects of slavery in the States, for obvious reasons. Every one of those reasons apply with equal force to inchoate "new States." This prohibition, or rather disability, is a notable self-illustration and example of that habitual self-government, and self-development, and centrifugal anti-centralization, which amount to a characteristic instinct in the Anglo-Saxon race, and make the political religion of our individualizing Americans. And if this idea of unrestrained local self-government is the philosophy and rationale of the relations between the Union and the States, why not also of the relations between the States and inchoate States?  
Slavery in the States is essentially a "peculiar institution." That is, it exists, and can exist there, not by virtue of the law of God, or of Nature, or of Nations, or of Common Law, or of National Constitution, or of any law of the Union, or of any other State, but only by virtue of the local law of the particular State. But slavery is just as peculiar to any Territory, or inchoate State that permits it. God did not ordain there, nor does the National Constitution carry it there; nor is it established there by any Natural, International, Nation l or Common Law; in legal and political contemplation, it is the mere creature, and tenant at will of the local law. As Congress cannot interfere with slavery in a State, because slavery is so peculiar to that State, so, therefore, by a parity of reasoning, Congress ought not to interfere with this same peculiarity in a "new State."  
Be slavery fair or foul, it is in fact best managed, and disposed of by those who bear its responsibilities and its burdens, and who will have to undergo its obscure future. Any foreign, central, or external intermeddling with it, from even the best motives, is always delicate, impolite, dangerous, and exasperating. Is not this equally so with regard to a new State? She may be small and few in numbers, but her domestic institutions are also in embryo, and just as subject to her control as those of older and more indured States. She is just as keen-eyed to her own interests, and just as jealous of any interference.  
The refusal to admit any new slave-holding State draws an invidious distinction between the sovereign and equal States of the Union. It implies or rather expresses a national judgment of condemnation upon slavery, and a censure upon the States that tolerate it. It pours contempt upon their opinions and institutions, segregates them amid their sisters, and brands a shame upon their sunny brows. It shapes and directs the policy and power of the nation, as such, in favor of the peculiarities of some States, and against the peculiarities of others, who are sovereign peers. And this, although these peculiarities are allowed, implied, and recognized in the compact that constitutes the nation.  
Now, the alleged badness of slavery does not give the right to do all this. In the present regard, there is no question touching the moral character of slavery, or the evil of its extension. Our nation, for the purposes of this argument, exists only in and by virtue of its written Constitution. Individuals, may, on their own responsibility, obey "higher law." But our collective Nation, as such, cannot recognize a "higher" rule than its own organic law, without ipso facto lapsing into revolution or anarchy. As a political entity, it cannot have any higher conscience than devotion to its own Constitution.  
Our nation, therefore, on no account, has any right to sectionalize itself. It has no right to pry into the States, inspect their diverse social systems, and pronounce that some should be copied and others avoided. Much less, can it enter the lists, and use its force and policy to extend or restrict these systems;—especially such as are known to the Constitution and were taken, at the first, into the arms of the Union. In fact, to express the matter in its elements, stronger States, even if they do forbid slavery themselves, have no right to lay hold on national agencies and appliances, and make them the means of confining and repressing the social systems of the weaker ones.  
The Nation should never reduce itself to a discordant assemblage of struggling States. All this would be a sharp and astute perversion of the original partnership; it would be unfair to the States whose peculiarities were assailed and restricted. That Government which is the creature of all the States, forgets its place, when it frowns upon some of them, and says to them, "There shall be no more of such as you."  
The slave-holding States, being by the consent of all parties, integral, equal and sovereign partners in the Union, are fully entitled as joint-owners to all its fair and natural chances and resources for promoting their own interests; and by the whole theory of the Constitution, they are the sole and supreme judges, saving the rights of others, of what their own interests are. Now all those States believe, and give their reasons for it,

that to prevent them from emigrating Westward with their servants, and to confine slavery within their own limits, will be injurious to them, and, perhaps, ruinous. They consider it not only an interest, but a necessity, to allow their peculiar institution to shift into some of the Territory of the Union. As that Territory belongs to, and is for the use and benefit of all the States, indiscriminately, the Southern States, in Constitutional fairness, cannot be deprived of their unprejudiced access to it.  
Congress cannot do indirectly, what it cannot do directly. If an authority be not granted in the Constitution, it cannot be compassed by any dodging methods. The moment a State is in the Union, she is expressly protected from Congressional intermeddling. Congress, therefore, has no right to dictate her institutions, by any officious anticipation; by throttling her, at the threshold of the Union, and saying, "You may do as you please, an instant after this, when you are in, but now that you are just going in, you must do as we please."  
It may be suggested, that Congress has power to "make all needful rules and regulations" respecting the Territory of the United States. But this does not refer to the authority of Congress in relation to "new States," passing from the Territorial condition, into the Union. And only "needful" rules can be made. A rule not "needful" is not constitutional. The question is not what Congress can do, by stubborn force, or stubborn refusals, but what ought it to do. This slavery test is not "needful," in the sense of the Constitution; therefore, it is not allowable.  
A refusal to admit a "new State," on account of Slavery, would effect nothing. Such a State allows that system of labor, either because it already exists there, or because she is fully determined to introduce it. Let her admission be refused in either case, and the characteristic habit of local self-government, would fix the applicant in her preferences, and drive her to resist such central dictation. She would be strengthened by the certain sympathy and aid of every other slave-holding State and Territory. Then the alternative would be, not Slave Labor or Free Labor, but only a sovereign slave-holding State, or an angry, threatening, slave-holding Territory. The action of Congress would merely merge all other public topics into a fearful controversy respecting the status of an organized slave-holding community.  
As might be inferred from all that is advanced, the proposed test of admission is utterly unprecedented, and against precedent. The very origin of this Union was an admission of Slave States. The Free States formed a national partnership with their slave laborers, without a trace of objection, nay, with heartiness and affection. No State was catechised about her private affairs. Nay, the very existence of this Union, as an actual, historical fact, rendered the admission of Slave States necessary; for it required the ratification of nine States to "establish" the Constitution; and at that time, there were not nine Free States. The Fathers that framed and ratified the Constitution, with such wisdom and parity, did, in fact, under it, admit new slave-holding States, such as Kentucky and Tennessee. This novel test never occurred to them. Have their sons the right to invent it now? Can any current circumstances repeal or alter the supreme law of the land, impair its authority, or soften the granite basis of the Union into the wind-swept sands of popular opinion? Will any misconduct of the mariner justify us in cutting loose from the anchor that has steadied the ship for seventy years?  
There may be local exasperations; the North or the South may not have kept full faith; our fervent sisters may sometimes forget their proverbial courtesy; their dauntlessness may, now and then, lapse into "brusquerie," or swell into haughtiness; Northern citizens and Southern citizens may have said and done what is very censurable; Boston "fanaticism," "Border ruffianism," or Charleston "Nullification," may have raised most disproportionate flurries; but all this does not justify unconstitutional retaliations. Hate slavery, if you feel like it—denounce it; till you unpack your hearts with words—call it the foulest crime and wrong, and its diffusion an evil and a peril, yet all this does not give Congress a power which the Constitution never granted, or allow the creature of that Constitution to slight its letter or its equity. That Constitution is the fairest offspring of the gravest wisdom of all time; it is the most concentrated and expressed essence of patriotism, knowledge and judgment; it is in itself the rarest policy. No citizen can go far astray who keeps his eye on it, as his Polar Star. Any party will in the event be politic, and American, and Democratic, and victorious, that subordinates all prejudices and impulses to its calm restraints, and submits every sentiment and measure to the daylight of its lucid provisions.  
I have said nothing of danger of the Union. Heedlessness and excitement may apparently impair it for a moment, but I have a faith that "the stars fight for it in their courses." It will be safe while the Alleghenies and the Rocky Mountains stretch their summits along the Continent; while the Miami and the Arkansas, the Ohio and the Missouri unite and fraternize in the mighty Mississippi; while our valleys and prairies spread their fertile and flowery expanse from Lake Superior to the Gulf, and are alike steeped, here with northern showers, and there with southern suns; while common institutions, common laws, common civilization, common interests, common language, common religion, common ancestry and blood, and common memories, concur to mould and blend us into one; while iron rails and resonant engines are annihilating distance, and putting the cotton fields of Carolina, and the cotton factories of Massachusetts, within a few hours

of each other. This Union is protected by the common sense and eager patriotism of the American people. Millions of swords are ever ready to flash upwards in its defence; millions of votes, to fall like snow-flakes, into the ballot-box, for its peaceful support. As incident to popular institutions, there may be excitements, differences, heart-burnings, re-arrangements, threats, and fears; but as before, so again, sectionalism will expand into nationalism, impulsive sentiment will chasten itself by serene lessons from the past; disunion will be whipped back into its filthy retreat; Americans will join brotherly hands around the grave of Washington, and the majestic proportions of their national Constitution; and that hallowed Union, will prove to be, what patriotic foresight eagerly conjectures, a parental source of peace, greatness and liberty to all.  
But, sir, let me now advert to another topic. I had hoped that the Convention would take position, plainly, and squarely, against what is commonly called Know-Nothingism. It is not so easy to define this thing, precisely, for it is a secret organization, bound by secret obligations and oaths, and working in the dark. And this secrecy itself is a fatal objection to any association for political purposes. Such secrecy indicates a want of principles, or very bad principles. Such secrecy may have suited Byzantine despotism, Venetian Oligarchy, or the Jacobinism of the Reign of Terror. It is monstrous in our land of free speech, free presses, public meetings, avowed principles, and universal suffrage. Such secrecy is the resort of knavish demagogues and defeated tricksters. It implies a distrust of popular government. It degenerates our Democratic institutions into the mere tools of cabal, elections into a cowardly guerrilla skirmish, and politics into conspiracy. It aspires to rule us by hidden powers; and they of course will be irresponsible and therefore despotic.  
The Constitution of the Know-Nothing Order is, as far as is known, essentially oligarchic. Central Juntas, sitting with closed doors, and excluding the mass of their confederates, by secret signs and mysterious watch-words, conceal principles to be swallowed, and set forth candidates to be voted for, duped the devoted with sonorous pronouncements, and hector the rebellious with the terrors of excommunication.  
This secrecy has amounted to deceit. The faithful have heretofore been instructed to deny the very existence of the Order, and in the guise of Whigs or Democrats, to sacrifice the parties with which they professed to act to the demands of their veiled mistress. Avowing opposition to Jesuitism, they have organized under treacherous than were ever attributed to the followers of Loyola.  
The Know-Nothing party let us know that they seek to alter the present Naturalization Laws. They would either refuse Naturalization entirely, or largely protract the period of probation for it. Either proposal is most unwise. In no event will immigration cease. The currents of destiny, and the necessities of the race, drive the old world myriads hither. No narrow or exclusive policy can stop the march of historical events, or the multitudinous tread of the human race. To refuse citizenship to the strangers will not drive them back. It will simply create and increase, in our midst, a sullen, revolutionary, festering crowd of alien enemies. To adopt them as fellow-citizens, is obviously to attach them to us and our institutions. For men will love and defend what protects and exalts them. Nor is there any reason why naturalization should be long withheld. An accidentally born "Native" cannot vote till he is twenty years of age. During two-thirds of his minority he was a baby or a boy. To place an adult foreigner in the situation of a child, and give such talismanic virtue to an arbitrary number, is itself most childish.  
The Constitution makes it a power of Congress to pass laws for naturalization; that is, to settle a policy of naturalization, and obviously a policy of encouragement. Our fathers, few in numbers, confined in territory, limited in resources, and just entering upon the experiment of self-government, initiated a liberal and inviting policy towards immigrants. With that policy our free institutions have strengthened, expanded and improved; the experiment is a realized fact; and all history is outstripped by our progress, our prosperity, and our grandeur. Shall twenty millions of sturdy freemen now clutch or tremble at the poor pilgrims that seek homes with us? The vast immigration may be attended, here or there, now and then, with turbulence, or pauperism, or crime; but in the main it is peaceful, industrious, honest and loyal. The strangers are not royalists or oligarchs. They are not slaves or heathens. They come, indeed, from the bogs and huts of Ireland—the dark factories and mines of Britain—the crowded and smoky hamlets of Prussia or Bavaria; from the poverty, filth, injustice, oppression and despair of Europe; but they are attracted hither by the light, the ideas, and the visions that pour from us to them; they are lured over the waters by hopes of plenty, justice and freedom. They are all worshipers of Washington; they all teach his name to their children. They may be strange to our language, or our manners, or the detailed workings of our institutions; but they are the devotees of Liberty and equality. The poorest of them and the most ignorant are possessed with that divine thought of Democracy which once enshrined in the heart, "shines to the perfect day." Why the Irish are generally semi-fanatical in their devotion to the American flag, and the Germans in their devotion to Democratic freedom.  
Let ragged Pat come, and ruddy haired Sandy, and square John Bull, and solid Hans, and tripping Monsieur. They will not crowd or jostle us. There is room, and work, and plenty for all of them. There is a force in our institutions, and our ideas, and our character, and our enlarged surroundings, that will illuminate their ignorance, tone and ex-

alt them to the level of our Democracy, sober and shape their dim and enthusiastic ideals into energetic, prudent and self-reliant Americanism. Our gigantic Union will fold them to her bosom, broad as the Continent, feed them with the abundance of her forests, mountains, lakes, and plains, and share with them all her liberties and all her greatness.  
A foreigner never can be President. In the active competition for place, but few of such can ever reach the loftiest and most important offices. Therefore, to organize a great party for the purpose of keeping adopted citizens out of all offices, even petty municipal ones, is tossing ocean into tempest to drown flies; it is a giant giving gratuitous exhibitions of idiocy.  
But there's another fatal objection to Know-Nothingism, and that is, its religious intolerance. It would exclude from office every Roman Catholic citizen. This is grossly unconstitutional. No law can be passed refusing office to a citizen on account of his religion. And why? Because the mere establishment of the test is abhorrent to enlightenment and liberty. To render any right or privilege dependent on religious opinion, is in itself an inequality, and a despotism. It is just as unconstitutional in spirit and effect, to set up such a test by intercession, by partisan organization and obligation. If we cannot proscribe by law, can we proscribe without law?  
It is mournful that Americans should shut their eyes to the liberal and historic science, and benign ideas of the nineteenth century. It is mournful that they should gravely and eagerly revert to the foggy Toryism that opposed Catholic Emancipation in Great Britain and Ireland, to the pitiful grannismy of the Titus Oates panic—to the owl bigotry of exiled ages. Suppose the Roman Catholic religion to be ever so false—let old Pius be the Scarlet Woman in proper person—let Catholics believe in his infallibility and his authority—ever so devoutly—yet all this is no reason or excuse for foul and paltry intolerance. Let Mrs. Partington insist that every "Papist" is an arrogant vessel of an Italian Bishop—men of sense know that Gaston, Taney, Meagher, Chandler and Carroll, are as good Republicans as ever tried a white cravat or sung a psalm. Even ecclesiastics may have said and done a few absurd things—so may over-zealous converts—but should this frighten our big Nation from its propriety—from its sense and justice? We have not survived so many perils, and "grown so great" to be captured and tied up by this terrible gentleman—John Hughes.  
But it is to be hoped that this insane fit of intolerance is rapidly subsiding into that broad and liberal sense which is so "native" in the American people. Meanwhile, it is the duty of all who comprehend our liberty and our Constitution, to bear explicit testimony against a rampant bigotry. For one, I cannot feel satisfied to remain with any party that hesitates or fears to denounce it. By the blood of Montgomery, and the spotless heroism of Lafayette, and the sacred memory of Carroll, I protest against Know-Nothingism, or any alliance with it.  
Repeating my assurances of regard I remain yours, respectfully,  
GEORGE A. COFFEY.

### Roger Sherman.

One of the members of the American Congress for Connecticut, who signed the Declaration of Independence, had originally been a shoemaker. When his livelihood in this humble occupation, he happened to have a lawsuit with one of his neighbors; and on going to consult a lawyer on the subject, he presented him with a written statement of the case, which he had drawn up himself. The lawyer was a shrewd man, and at once discovered, on reading the statement, the shoemaker's forte which, he told him was not to make shoes, but to deal with matters of law. Mr. Sherman took the hint, and, having studied law, became in time not only one of the first lawyers, but one of the most eminent patriots and statesmen of his country. During the war of independence he happened to be the chairman of a committee of Congress, appointed to investigate certain charges of peculation in the commissariat department; and, in presenting the report of the committee, he stated that it would be observed, in pursuing it, that he had dwelt particularly on the article of shoes; the reason of this was simply, that, having been bred a shoemaker himself, it was the subject with which he might be supposed to be best acquainted. He had no idea of being ashamed of the gentle craft.

### A Remarkable Railroad Incident.

A correspondent of the Philadelphia Ledger, under date of Hamburg, Berks co., Pa., Nov. 20, gives an account of the death of Mr. Jeremiah Jacoby, who while walking upon the track of the Reading railroad, suddenly changed from track to avoid a train of cars, but was struck by the Philadelphia express train, upon the other, and instantly killed. A friend, named Philip D. Miller, helped to arrange the corpse and then proceeded to town, where he gave an account of the accident, charging the deceased with carelessness, and stating that no such accident could befall him as he exercised a proper precaution. We give the remainder of the story in the words of the correspondent: "Mr. Miller having finished his business in town, and proceeded homeward with his horse and wagon, and when arriving at the house of the unfortunate Jacoby, a number of individuals, (who were collected together on account of the accident,) beckoned and hallowed to him not to cross the railroad track; but he moved forward and gained the other side, when his horse backed his wagon on the track, he was caught by the cow-catcher, and was so much mutilated that he died shortly after."

### CASTING OF THE HORSE FOR THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT.—The London Builder gives the following account of the casting of the bronze horse at Munich, Bavaria, for the Washington Monument:

"Fifteen tons of bronze had to be kept in a state of fluidity. For several days and nights previously a large fire was kept at these huge masses, which required to be stirred at times. When the bronze was liquified, an intimate assay was made in a small trial cast, and to heighten the color some more copper was added. Successively all the chambers through which the metal had to flow in the form were cleared of the coal with which they had been kept warm, and the master examined all the air spiracles and issues of the metal; the props of the tubes were then placed, and every man had his duty and place assigned to him. Finally, the master, amid the intense expectation of the many art amateurs present, pronounced the words, 'In the name of God,' and then three mighty strokes opened the fiery gulf, out of which the glowing metal flowed in a circuit to the large form. The sight was magnificent, and in the little sea of fire stood the master, and gave his commands about the successive opening of the props. Hot vapor poured from the air spiracles; in the candles the metal boiled in waves; still no decision yet, as the influx of the bronze in the very veins of the figure could be but slow. At once flaming showers jumped out of the air conduits, and the master proclaimed the cast to have succeeded. A loud cheer followed, when the master approached Mr. Crawford, the artist of the Washington Monument, to congratulate him upon this success. Another cheer was given to M. de Miller, the chief of the Royal Foundry at Munich, who had personally conducted the work."

### DEATH FOR COURAGE.—A subordinate British officer was recently tried by a Court Martial, on a charge of cowardice, and sentenced to death. The accusation arose out of circumstances at the reduction of Kinburn. Mr. Donnelly, the unfortunate man, was sick at the time, and was not on deck when his services were required. In his defence, he adduced numerous certificates of character, but he did not attempt to refute the allegation of absence at the critical moment. The Court, according to the rules, had no alternative, and a verdict of guilty was rendered. It is hoped, however, that the penalty, that of death, will not be enforced.A SINGULAR FACT contained in the abstract of births in Massachusetts in 1854, is the great increase of children of foreign parents. Of the 32,000 born, but 26,450 were of American parents, while 5,550 were of parents, one or both foreigners—and the increase from foreign parents was more than twice what it was from native parents. If this is a correct statement, the Know-Nothingings of that State should take measures to remedy it at once!ELECTROTYPING.—The National Intelligencer states that some very important improvements and discoveries have recently been made at the Coast Survey Office, in the art of electrotyping. The production or multiplication of charts, which was once the work of years, is now accomplished in a few days, while the impression upon paper is quite as good as by the old method.