

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, JULY 23, 1856.

VOL. 3. NO. 39.

TERMS.

THE DEMOCRAT & SENTINEL, is published every Wednesday morning, in Ebensburg, Cambria Co., Pa., at \$1.50 per annum, in advance, if not \$2.00 will be charged. ADVERTISEMENTS will be charged on inserted at the following rates, viz:

1 square 3 insertions,	\$1.00
Every subsequent insertion,	.25
1 square 3 months,	3.00
1 " 6 " "	5.00
1 " 1 year,	12.00
1 " 2 " "	20.00
1 " 3 " "	30.00
Business Cards,	6.00

Three lines constitute a square.

THE WEST BRANCH INSURANCE CO.

OF LOCK HAVEN, PA.

INSURES Detached Buildings, Stores, Merchandise, Farm Property, and other Buildings, and their contents.

CAPITAL \$300,000.

DIRECTORS.

HON. JOHN J. PEARCE, HON. G. C. HARVEY,
JOHN B. HALL, T. T. ABRAMS,
CHARLES A. MAYER, D. K. JACKMAN,
CHARLES CRIST, W. WHITE,
PETER DEUSCH, PHOS. KITCHEN,
HON. G. C. HARVEY, Pres.
T. T. ABRAMS, Vice Pres.
THOS. KITCHEN, Secy.

REFERENCES.

Samuel H. Lloyd, Thos. Bowman, M. D.
A. A. Winegardner, Wm. Underhill,
L. A. Mackey, Wm. Faxon,
L. White, Dr. J. S. Crawford,
James Quiggle, A. Updegraff,
John W. Maynard, James Armstrong,
Hon. Simon Cameron, Hon. Wm. B. De-
J. C. NOON, Agent.
Ebensburg, April 9, 1856.

Ho! this way for Bargains!

NEW GOODS, AND AT FAIR PRICES.

The undersigned would respectfully inform the good citizens of Ebensburg and the surrounding vicinity, that he has just received from the East one of the most choice stocks of goods ever brought to this place. The stock is varied, and selected with an eye to the immediate wants of the public. His stock consists of the following:

A general assortment of New Styles of Spring and Summer Goods, comprising a variety of Ladies' Dress Goods, among which will be found

Lawn,	Cassimere,
Delaine,	Fancy do.
Alpacas,	Towels,
Black Silks,	Kentucky Jeans,
Fancy do.	Fancy Vestings,
Bleached Muslin,	Shirts of all kinds,
Unbleached do.	Cravats,
Calicoes,	Plain shirtings,
Flannels,	Fancy do.
Cloths,	

Together with an innumerable assortment of articles not mentioned, neatly kept in a country store. These goods will be sold at fair prices. Call and examine, even if you do not wish to purchase.

MILLINERY GOODS.

CONNECTED with the store is a large stock of MILLINERY GOODS. Every article in this branch is made to order, and will be constantly in receipt of the latest styles of BONNETS, for all ages, RIBBONS of every pattern and color, LACES, EDGING, &c., &c.

A beautiful assortment of MOURNING Goods now on hand, and at prices to suit the times. Ladies are respectfully invited to call and examine this stock which is far ahead of any goods of a similar kind brought to this place.

GEORGE McCANN,
Ebensburg, April 23, 1856.

New Firm.

TAYLOR & JONES,

TAILORS.

The subscribers would respectfully inform the citizens of Ebensburg and the surrounding vicinity, that they have entered into partnership for the purpose of giving full satisfaction to mankind and in the way of giving fits, they may be found at the old establishment formerly occupied by Byrson and Jones, immediately opposite the store of Geo. McCann. The public may rest assured, that all work entrusted to their care will be made in a workmanlike manner, and at the time promised. Garments will be cut according to the latest fashion.

A. H. TAYLOR,
JOHN JONES,
Ebensburg, March 5th 1856.

Farmer's Look to your Interests!

I come with Goods to Clothe you!

The undersigned would respectfully inform the citizens of Ebensburg, and farmers of the surrounding country, that he has arrived with a large STOCK OF DOMESTIC DRY GOODS, consisting of plain and fancy Cassimere—a large variety of Jeans, Linseys, Barred and Plain Flannels, Blankets, Coverlets and Buzze. The above goods will be exchanged for wool on low terms, and if the goods are not desirable the market price will be paid in Cash.

April 23, 1856. JOS. GWINNER.

GEORGE HUNTLEY,

Wholesale and Retail,

Tin, Copper, and Sheet-Iron Ware Manufacturer.

RESPECTFULLY informs the citizens of Ebensburg and the public generally, that he has purchased the Tin Shop, formerly carried on by Messrs. Davis, Evans & Co., and will continue to carry on the business in all its various branches, wholesale and retail. His wares will be made of the very best material, and in the most workmanlike manner. Repairing of all kinds done on the shortest notice, for cash.

Also—House Spouting made and put up to order on the lowest terms, for cash.

Also on hand and for sale, a large assortment of Cook and Parlor stoves, for coal or wood. Dining room stoves, Egg stoves, &c.

Also a large assortment of grates and fire brick, for cooking stoves, Coal buckets, Shovel, pokers, smothering irons, &c., &c., all of which will be sold low for cash.

Tin-shop and warehouse in part of the building formerly occupied by Stephen Lloyd as a cabinet warehouse, and opposite Geo. McCann's store. All orders promptly attended to.

Ebensburg, May 7, 1856.—281y

FASHIONABLE CLOTHINGemporium.

SPRING & SUMMER CLOTHING.

GREAT ATTRACTION at the New Store of Evans and Hughes, one door above the Store room of Shoemaker & Clark, where the subscribers are at present receiving and opening a large and excellent assortment of fashionable

Ready Made Clothing

of the latest and most approved styles, which for cheapness and durability can not be excelled by any similar establishment in the county—not wishing to brag, but what we say we will make good or take the water. Every article in the clothing line will be kept on hand, viz—summer Coats, Sack Coats, Drop-collared Pants, Vests, Cloaks, &c., all of the latest styles.

Cloths, Cassimere, Satinets, Vestings, of all colours and styles.

Our Department of BOYS CLOTHING promises a much more extensive selection than usual.

We flatter ourselves that we shall be able to furnish garments suitable for all classes, fitted up in such a manner, and on such terms, that shall disarm all competition; we therefore ask a liberal share of the public patronage.

EVANS & HUGHES,
June 4, 1856.

A Human Life Saved.

Dowagiac, Mich., March 11, 1856.

J. A. RHODES, Esq.: Dear Sir—As I took your medicine to sell on consignment, "no cure no pay," I take pleasure in stating its effects as reported to me by three brothers, who live in this place, and their testimony is a fair specimen of all I have received:

W. S. CONKLIN told me—"I had taken nine bottles of Christie's Ague Balsam, and continually run down while using it until my lungs and liver were congested to that degree that blood discharged from my mouth and bowels, so that all thought it impossible for me to live through another chill. The doctors to did all they could for me, but thought I must die. Nothing did me any good until I got Rhodes' Fever and Ague Cure which at once relieved me of the distress and nausea at my stomach and pain in my head and bowels, and produced a permanent cure in a short time."

H. M. CONKLIN says: "I had been taking medicine of a good doctor as we have in our county, and taken any quantity of quinine and specifics without any good result, from 25th August to 17th December. But seeing how nicely it operated on my brother, I got a bottle of RHODES' FEVER AND AGUE CURE, which effected a permanent cure by using two thirds of a bottle."

S. M. CONKLIN was not here, but both the other brothers say his case was the same as H. M.'s, and the medicine to both the same day, and the cure was as speedy from the same small quantity and I might so specify. Yours with respect,

A. HUNTINGTON.

The above speaks for itself. Good proof as it is, it is of no better tenor than the vast number of like certificates I have already published, and the still greater amount that is continually pouring in to me.

One thing more. Last year I had occasion to caution the Public in these words:—

"I notice one firm who have taken one of my general circulars, substituted the name of their nostrum for my medicine, and then with brazen impudence end their pamphlet with the exclamation, 'Let the proprietor of any other medicine say as much as I do.'"

Now I take pleasure in saying that the caution referred to the same "Dr. Christie's Ague Balsam" that is mentioned in the above certificate.

There are several other industrious people who are applying to their poisonous trash all that I publish about my fever and Ague Cure, or Anti-venereal Medicine, except the Certificates of Cures, and the Certificate of the celebrated Chemist Dr. James R. Chilton of N. Y., in favor of its perfectly HARMLESS CHARACTER, which is attached to every bottle. These will always serve to distinguish my medicine from imitations.

JAS. A. RHODES, Proprietor,
April 23, 1856. 3m. Providence, R. I.
For sale by Druggists generally.

IMPORTANT TO EVERYBODY.

FOR the last two or three years, I have been engaged in a business known only to myself, and comparatively a few others, whom I have instructed for the sum of \$200 each, which has averaged me at the rate of from \$1,000 to \$5,000 per annum; and having made arrangements to go to Europe in the month of August next, to engage in the same business, I am willing to give full instructions in the art to any person in the United States or Canada, who will remit me the sum of \$1. I am induced, from the success I have been favored with, and the many thankful acknowledgments I have received from those whom I have instructed, and who are making from \$5 to \$15 per day at it, to every person an opportunity to engage in this business, which is easy, pleasant, and very profitable, at a small cost. There is positively NO HAZARD in the matter. References of the best class can be given as regards its character, and I can refer to persons whom I have instructed, who will testify that they are making from \$5 to \$15 per day at the same. It is a business in which either LADIES or GENTLEMEN can engage, and with perfect ease, and a very handsome income. Several ladies in various parts of New York State, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, whom I have instructed, are now making from \$3 to \$6 per day at it. It is a GENTLE BUSINESS, and but a FEW SHILLINGS are required to start it. Upon receipt of \$1, I will immediately send to the applicant a printed circular containing full instructions in the art, which can be perfectly understood at once.

Address, A. T. PARSONS, Office, No. 335 Broadway New York.
April 23, 1856.—2 m.

NEW BLACK SMITH SHOP.

THE subscriber would respectfully inform the citizens of Ebensburg and the vicinity that he has rented the SMITH SHOP formerly occupied by Michael McCague, where he intends to carry on the BLACKSMITHING in all its branches. Persons entrusting work to his care can rest assured that it will be promptly attended to and at moderate rates. He would also, inform the citizens that the business of HORSE SHOENING will be superintended by himself personally. Owners of valuable horses will not be under the necessity of sending their stock to a neighboring village, as his experience in this line is widely known.

ISAAC SINGER,
Ebensburg, April 9, 1856.

GROCERIES, Candies Nuts and Crackers

J. M. Derrait's,
Ebensburg, Pa.

GOLD Rings and Breastpins—Combs, Portemonies, and Toys, &c.

J. M. Derrait's,
Ebensburg, Pa.

Choice Poetry.

From the "Baltimore Clipper."

The Fourth of July—A Patriotic Ode.

BY C. HUNTINGTON.

Hail to the morn, the glorious morn,
On which our sires,
Their lives, their all, to freedom sworn,
Their souls by her great love upborne,
Repelled a tyrant's rage with scorn;
Lighting the fires,
Which still on Freedom's altar burn,
A light to which the nations turn,
With strong desires.

Hail to the band, the patriot band!
Who wrote in blood
On history's page, with steady hand,
Those names, which shall forever stand,
The boast and glory of the land
On which they stood;
Unmoved, when Britain's Lion roared;
And Britain's hosts upon them poured,
Like Ocean's flood.

From Hampshire's mountains crowned with snow,
Those veterans came—
And Georgia's sands of golden glow,
On Yorktown's plains to strike the blow;
Nor North, nor South they wished to know,
One kindred flame
Burned in their souls, and side by side
They fought, and left when thus they died,
A common fame.

Say, shall their blood, for freedom shed,
Cry from the ground
To slame their sons, who o'er their head
Dissolve the ties for which they bled?
No! by your graves heroic dead,
With awe profound
We swear no fratricidal hand
Shall cast disunion's fatal brand
In hate around.

Whose then would be each blood-stained field,
Where now they lie—
On which their foes were forced to yield,
If that great covenant which they sealed,
Should by their children be repealed?
What battle cry
Could rouse their sons—! tyrant hosts
Should pour on our divided coast—
To victory?

Lo! let the stary banner wave
In glory still,
Upon each Patriot's hallowed grave;
O'er all the land they died to save,
To North, to South, their all they gave,
And so we will
Stand by the Union, South and North;
And shout to day our purpose forth
On every hill.

ELLIOTT'S MILLS, July 4, 1856.

Religion in Politics.

We have published a letter this morning taken from the New York Express, a Know-Nothing paper, in relation to the marriage of Col. Fremont. We have inserted it not because we think it is material to the present controversy whether Col. Fremont was married by a Justice of the Peace or a Catholic priest, for we have uniformly deprecated the introduction of such elements as this into political discussions; but because we wish it to appear clearly, that the issue has been raised by the Know Nothing party, and is a legitimate and natural result of Know Nothing principles. It has been alleged by the opposition press, that the Democratic party has charged Col. Fremont with being a Catholic. The Democratic party has done no such thing. The Democratic party does not care a fig whether Fremont was married by a churchman or civil magistrate, whether he knelt down or stood up during the ceremony, or whether he sent a daughter to a convent to acquire her education. The investigation of private matters of this nature, was never considered a legitimate part of a political canvass until Know Nothingism first sought to establish a religious test as a qualification for office. And now we are glad to see that a Know Nothing journal, and not an organ of the Democratic party is responsible for the introduction of this religious element into the campaign of 1856. We agree with the mass of the Fremont papers, that such an issue is improper. We condemn as much as they do, the employment of arguments derived from such a source; but who is to blame for it? The same party—the same men—the same political journals that now deprecate the attack on Fremont. Two years ago, if a man had a Catholic wife, a Catholic father, or had even been seen in a Catholic church or procession, he was ostracised by the dark lantern party, which now considers it entirely unwarrantable to discuss the apparent religious proclivities of Fremont and his family. If a candidate was announced for any office, even so lately as 1854, the inquiry was at once started by the keen scented pointers of the American press, whether some female in his family hid not commune in the Catholic church. If any such communicant was discovered within even a remote degree of consanguinity or affinity, the candidate was reported to the Know-Nothing

councils as an improper subject for their suffrages. We said then, and say now, that this course was anti-republican, absurd and dangerous. We denounced it as contrary to the Constitutional guaranty of liberty of conscience. We condemned it as establishing a secret jurisdiction worse than even the inquisition; but how much sympathy did we obtain in our course from the present Republican press? The Gazette, although not an organ of the American party at any time, supported a Know Nothing for Governor in 1854, and rivalled the most virulent American newspapers in denunciation of the Catholic church. The polite and accomplished editor of the Journal was a member of the American or Know Nothing party, acted as a member of the Executive Committee of Allegheny county, and is still connected with the organization. It is true, like Governor Johnston and his followers, he belongs to the anti-slavery wing of the American party. He has dissented from the doctrines of the party on one point—the question of slavery, but when has Mr. Riddle, when has Gov. Johnson,—when has the Commercial Journal, or any other organ of the Know Nothing party ever evinced the slightest dissatisfaction with that feature in the American or Know Nothing creed which avows hostility to Catholics?

We have seen abundant documents, speeches and letters from dissenting Know Nothings—from Know Nothings who seceded from the Fillmore Convention, but we have yet to see the first one denouncing the odious religious test which was one of the fundamental principles of the American organization.

We are, therefore, permitted to infer that the whole American press of Pennsylvania, now bearing the names of Fremont and Johnston at its editorial head, maintains precisely the same illiberal doctrines, that it formerly did on the Catholic test. It has never disavowed them. It has never retracted a single sentiment; and yet it now occupies the absurd, inconsistent and ludicrous position of supporting a man who married an Episcopalian lady, and yet who, from his own choice, not hers, selected a Catholic priest to perform the ceremony. Two years ago this same press would have heralded such a fact against a Democrat, as being a sufficient ground of exclusion from office. Two years ago it would have announced it in glowing capitals and declaimed against the dangers of papal supremacy. We have no words to express our contempt for such inconsistency. It is "almost as bad as kill a king and marry with his brother."

We have said, and repeat it, that the charge against Col. Fremont is not ours. Whatever may be or may have been his religious views, they are nothing to us. They would not weigh a feather in our estimate of his qualifications for the Presidency. But they do affect our estimation of the party that selects him for its standard bearer. They show its utter destitution of principle, and display the most contemptible servility. They prove either that the past professions of the American party have been false, or that whatever regard it may have for its avowed doctrines, their value is considered insignificant when weighed against considerations of temporary expediency.

Under any other circumstances, at any other time, and coming from any other source, the facts connected with Col. Fremont's marriage would have been stale and unprofitable. But it seems like a blow of retributive justice that they should be furnished by a Know Nothing organ against the nominee of the largest section of the Know Nothing party. We have not even taken the trouble to investigate the allegations. The main fact of the marriage however, seem to be undisputed. The fact that Mrs. Fremont was not a Catholic appears to be equally certain. It was a sort of runaway match. The pair had been driven out of the paradise of Col. Benton's approbation. They wanted some person to perform the interesting matrimonial ceremony. "The world was all before them where to choose" If neither of them belonged to the Catholic church why select a Catholic priest? If neither of them professed to belong to that church, why would the priest officiate? These are questions which we would be satisfied to answer by frankly admitting that it was none of our business. But the Know Nothing party has made these matters the subject of political discussion. It has dragged the most delicate relations of private life, the most exclusive matters of private judgement into the political arena. It was undertaken to explore the secrets of the fireside, and to rake up the facts that to condemn a public man from the ashes of his own hearth. Such are the means which it has secretly employed to destroy candidates who have been otherwise unassailable. We scorn to resort to the same species of warfare; but we must nevertheless commend to the American party a careful consideration of the questions propounded by the New York Express. They are exclusively of Know Nothing jurisdiction.—Pitts Union.

From the New York Express.

Know Nothing Manifesto against Colonel Fremont.

Colonel Fremont's Marriage—He must have been a Roman Catholic.

There is a point now made one of great importance in the Presidential election—by the denial on the part of Colonel Fremont's friends and by authority, as we understand it, from him—that he is, or ever has been, a Roman Catholic. The point is one of this importance, in a political view, first, because many Americans who support him in New England, especially support him upon the ground that he is anti-Roman Catholic—and second, because if he ever has been a Roman Catholic, he denies the fact, and has ostensibly changed his religion. The Rev. Mr. Beecher says, in his Independence, apparently by authority:—

"Until he was fourteen, Col. Fremont was educated in the hope and expectation that he would become an Episcopalian minister. At sixteen, he was confirmed in the Episcopal church, and has, ever since, when within reach of the church, been an attendant and communicant. And since his temporary sojourn in New York, he has been an attendant at Dr. Anthon's church until recently; and now he worships at Grace Church. Mrs. Fremont was reared strictly in the Presbyterian Church, and united with the Episcopal Church upon her marriage with Colonel Fremont. Their children have been baptized in the Episcopal Church, &c., &c."

These are strong statements—there is prodigious wrong somewhere, and we propose to find out where.

There are two periods in a man's life when his religion, or the feeling for the religion he was educated in, first discloses itself—the first, when he marries for life; and second, when on his death-bed. It is admitted—and nowhere denied—that when Lieutenant Fremont married Miss Benton of Washington, a Roman Catholic priest, of character and standing in his church there, married them. No body compelled Mr. Fremont thus to go to a Roman Catholic priest. He went there of his own free will and choice. True, it is said, that in consequence of the social influence of Senator Benton, in Washington, no other than a Roman Catholic priest could marry the runaway pair; but it is not proven, and it is does not vitiate the fact that a Roman Catholic priest cannot under the ordinances and councils of his church, unite parties "in the holy sacrament of matrimony" unless one of them, at least, professes to be of that church.

To understand the laws and the councils, and the customs of the Romish church, we must take our readers a little way into the theology of that church.

Marriage is with the Roman Catholic a sacrament. The Protestants have but two sacraments; the Roman Catholics have seven, and among them is matrimony. Hence, a Roman Catholic priest would no more administer the sacrament of matrimony to a party not of his church, than he would the Lord's Supper or confirmation, or baptism, for matrimony is, in the Romish Church, just as much a sacrament as the Lord's Supper. The highest authority of the Romish Church is the famous Council of Trent, and there it is decreed:—

DECEAL

3d. Whosoever shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less in number than seven; that is to say, baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be accursed.

Marriage among most Protestants—not all, however—is but a civil contract, but in the Romish Church it is an obligation, to be taken only before priests—it is a sacrament. The Romish Church is rigid, and stricter in its rule of marriage than any other religious denomination. Marriage in that church is an indissoluble tie, and never to be loosed, even by the civil law of divorce. The marriage of heretics by a priest is a crime, except under some special Papal dispensation—just as much of a crime as it would be to administer the Lord's Supper to heretics. When Colonel Fremont, therefore, went before Father Van Horsburgh and asked him, as a Priest of Rome, to marry him to a Protestant woman, he must have been, or pretended to be, a Roman Catholic, and he must have promised to bring up the offspring, if any, in the Romish Church.—That promise Col. Fremont fulfilled in an adopted daughter, now a grown woman, for he educated her in the convent, on the heights of Georgetown, D. C., and he cannot deny, or authorize any one to deny the fact. The sacramental obligations of the marriage have been fulfilled till a late period; and if they are not fulfilled now, it is because of late a change has taken place in Col. Fremont's profession of religion—it may be for the purpose of obtaining the Protestant vote for President.

The Roman Catholic celebration of the matrimonial sacrament (*Ritus celebrandi matrimonii Sacramentum*) is one of the august ceremonies of that church. The priest puts on his cassock and white stole, and he brings out his missal, and holy water to sprinkle the marrying parties, and he then unites the parties according to the rules of the Holy Mother Church, and the priest sprinkles the marriage ring with holy water, in the sign of the cross

THE PREPARATION FOR MARRIAGE.

From the Roman Catholic Catechism of the Christian Religion, chap. 9, sec. 5, page 378.—Donahoe's edition.

Question. How should we prepare ourselves for marriage?

Answer. By prayer, good works, and the reception of the sacrament.

Other authorities say by "confession," and through the confessional.

WHO CAN TAKE THE SACRAMENT.

From the Catechism of the Christian Religion.

From the Golden Manual, published in London with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster;" and in New York (Sadler & Co.) with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, N. Y.; with the approbation of the Right Rev. Archbishop Hughes. Page 582:—

THE RITUAL FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.

From the Golden Manual, published in London with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster;" and in New York (Sadler & Co.) with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, N. Y.; with the approbation of the Right Rev. Archbishop Hughes. Page 582:—

The priest, vested in a surplice and white stole, accompanied by at least one clerk, to carry the book and a vessel of holy water, and by two or three witnesses, asks the man and the woman, separately, as follows, in the vulgar tongue, concerning their consent.

And first he asks the bridegroom, who most stand at the right hand of the woman:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful wife, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the priest asks the bride:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful husband, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the woman is given away by her father or friend; and if she has never been married before, she has her hand uncovered; but if she is a widow, she has it covered. The man receives her to keep in God's faith and his own; and holding her by the right hand in his own right hand, plight her his troth, saying after the priest as follows:—

I, N., take thee, N., to my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health; till death do us part, if holy church will it permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth.

Then they loose their hands; and joining them again, the woman says, after the priest:—

I, N., take thee, N., to my wedded husband, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, &c., if holy church will it permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth.

Their troth being thus plighted to each other on both sides, and their right hands joined, the priest says:—

Ego conjungo vos inhi. I join you together in matrimony, in non-jin marriage, in the (in Latin, et in Illi, et in name of the Father, et Spiritus Sancti. A-land of the Son, and of men.

Then he sprinkles them with holy water.

This done, the bridegroom places upon the book gold and silver, (which are presently to be delivered into the hands of the bride,) and also a ring which the priest blesses.

[The nuptial benediction, which here follows, is omitted in mixed marriage. Vide "Ritualli Romani."

Then the priest sprinkles the ring with holy water, in the form of a cross; and the bridegroom having received the ring from the hand of the priest, gives gold and silver to the bride, and says:—

"With this ring I thee wed," &c.

Then the bridegroom places the ring on the thumb of the left hand of the bride, saying:—"In the name of the Father," then on the second finger, saying, "and of the Son;" then on the third finger, saying, "and the Holy Ghost;" lastly, on the fourth finger, saying, "Amen," and there he leaves the ring.

[The service is continued in regular marriages with benediction, prayer, and sometimes the singing of mass.]

From these documents and facts, thus authenticated, the following conclusions follow:

1st. That the council of Trent makes matrimony a sacrament in the Romish Church.

2d. That a Roman priest cannot administer a sacrament but to a Roman Catholic.

3d. That Col. Fremont, therefore at the time of his marriage, must, or at least, have professed to be a Roman Catholic; and was, therefore, sprinkled with holy water, and accepted other forms and rites of the Roman Catholic Church, as such a Catholic.

4th. That then he must have taken all the obligations of that sacrament, with the pledge to educate his offspring in Romanism.

5th. That in educating an adopted daughter in the convent at Georgetown he carried out the obligation of the sacrament.

But says the "Independent"—

"It is said that a daughter has been sent to a Catholic institution for education. So far from it she has never been sent away from home at all, but has been educated by her own mother."

This is a quibble. The statement was that his adopted daughter was educated at the convent on the heights of Georgetown, and we dare a denial from Col. Fremont.

If Col. Fremont, in view of the Presidency has recently changed his religion, and only with a view to that office, so much the worse, but the fact is undeniable, overwhelming and crushing, that to be married by the Roman priest, Father Van Horsburgh, Mr. Fremont must have professed the Romish Catholic religion, and hence accepted all the rules and rituals of the Roman Catholic Church! He may have broken the sacrament of his marriage within a few weeks past; and he may have become a convert to Protestantism in good faith, in order to win the American vote but, there is record of Romanism, in the most solemn act of his life; and it cannot be got over or got under; it cannot be tied down or covered up, and we, as journalists, but do our duty in publishing truths, no matter how much some may follow.

From the New York Express.

Know Nothing Manifesto against Colonel Fremont.

Colonel Fremont's Marriage—He must have been a Roman Catholic.

There is a point now made one of great importance in the Presidential election—by the denial on the part of Colonel Fremont's friends and by authority, as we understand it, from him—that he is, or ever has been, a Roman Catholic. The point is one of this importance, in a political view, first, because many Americans who support him in New England, especially support him upon the ground that he is anti-Roman Catholic—and second, because if he ever has been a Roman Catholic, he denies the fact, and has ostensibly changed his religion. The Rev. Mr. Beecher says, in his Independence, apparently by authority:—

"Until he was fourteen, Col. Fremont was educated in the hope and expectation that he would become an Episcopalian minister. At sixteen, he was confirmed in the Episcopal church, and has, ever since, when within reach of the church, been an attendant and communicant. And since his temporary sojourn in New York, he has been an attendant at Dr. Anthon's church until recently; and now he worships at Grace Church. Mrs. Fremont was reared strictly in the Presbyterian Church, and united with the Episcopal Church upon her marriage with Colonel Fremont. Their children have been baptized in the Episcopal Church, &c., &c."

These are strong statements—there is prodigious wrong somewhere, and we propose to find out where.

There are two periods in a man's life when his religion, or the feeling for the religion he was educated in, first discloses itself—the first, when he marries for life; and second, when on his death-bed. It is admitted—and nowhere denied—that when Lieutenant Fremont married Miss Benton of Washington, a Roman Catholic priest, of character and standing in his church there, married them. No body compelled Mr. Fremont thus to go to a Roman Catholic priest. He went there of his own free will and choice. True, it is said, that in consequence of the social influence of Senator Benton, in Washington, no other than a Roman Catholic priest could marry the runaway pair; but it is not proven, and it is does not vitiate the fact that a Roman Catholic priest cannot under the ordinances and councils of his church, unite parties "in the holy sacrament of matrimony" unless one of them, at least, professes to be of that church.

To understand the laws and the councils, and the customs of the Romish church, we must take our readers a little way into the theology of that church.

Marriage is with the Roman Catholic a sacrament. The Protestants have but two sacraments; the Roman Catholics have seven, and among them is matrimony. Hence, a Roman Catholic priest would no more administer the sacrament of matrimony to a party not of his church, than he would the Lord's Supper or confirmation, or baptism, for matrimony is, in the Romish Church, just as much a sacrament as the Lord's Supper. The highest authority of the Romish Church is the famous Council of Trent, and there it is decreed:—

DECEAL

3d. Whosoever shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or less in number than seven; that is to say, baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; or that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be accursed.

Marriage among most Protestants—not all, however—is but a civil contract, but in the Romish Church it is an obligation, to be taken only before priests—it is a sacrament. The Romish Church is rigid, and stricter in its rule of marriage than any other religious denomination. Marriage in that church is an indissoluble tie, and never to be loosed, even by the civil law of divorce. The marriage of heretics by a priest is a crime, except under some special Papal dispensation—just as much of a crime as it would be to administer the Lord's Supper to heretics. When Colonel Fremont, therefore, went before Father Van Horsburgh and asked him, as a Priest of Rome, to marry him to a Protestant woman, he must have been, or pretended to be, a Roman Catholic, and he must have promised to bring up the offspring, if any, in the Romish Church.—That promise Col. Fremont fulfilled in an adopted daughter, now a grown woman, for he educated her in the convent, on the heights of Georgetown, D. C., and he cannot deny, or authorize any one to deny the fact. The sacramental obligations of the marriage have been fulfilled till a late period; and if they are not fulfilled now, it is because of late a change has taken place in Col. Fremont's profession of religion—it may be for the purpose of obtaining the Protestant vote for President.

The Roman Catholic celebration of the matrimonial sacrament (*Ritus celebrandi matrimonii Sacramentum*) is one of the august ceremonies of that church. The priest puts on his cassock and white stole, and he brings out his missal, and holy water to sprinkle the marrying parties, and he then unites the parties according to the rules of the Holy Mother Church, and the priest sprinkles the marriage ring with holy water, in the sign of the cross

THE PREPARATION FOR MARRIAGE.

From the Roman Catholic Catechism of the Christian Religion, chap. 9, sec. 5, page 378.—Donahoe's edition.

Question. How should we prepare ourselves for marriage?

Answer. By prayer, good works, and the reception of the sacrament.

Other authorities say by "confession," and through the confessional.

WHO CAN TAKE THE SACRAMENT.

From the Catechism of the Christian Religion.

From the Golden Manual, published in London with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster;" and in New York (Sadler & Co.) with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, N. Y.; with the approbation of the Right Rev. Archbishop Hughes. Page 582:—

THE RITUAL FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.

From the Golden Manual, published in London with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster;" and in New York (Sadler & Co.) with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, N. Y.; with the approbation of the Right Rev. Archbishop Hughes. Page 582:—

The priest, vested in a surplice and white stole, accompanied by at least one clerk, to carry the book and a vessel of holy water, and by two or three witnesses, asks the man and the woman, separately, as follows, in the vulgar tongue, concerning their consent.

And first he asks the bridegroom, who most stand at the right hand of the woman:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful wife, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the priest asks the bride:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful husband, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.

Then the woman is given away by her father or friend; and if she has never been married before, she has her hand uncovered; but if she is a widow, she has it covered. The man receives her to keep in God's faith and his own; and holding her by the right hand in his own right hand, plight her his troth, saying after the priest as follows:—

I, N., take thee, N., to my wedded wife, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health; till death do us part, if holy church will it permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth.

Then they loose their hands; and joining them again, the woman says, after the priest:—

I, N., take thee, N., to my wedded husband, to have and to hold, from this day forward, for better, for worse, &c., if holy church will it permit, and thereto I plight thee my troth.

Their troth being thus plighted to each other on both sides, and their right hands joined, the priest says:—

Ego conjungo vos inhi. I join you together in matrimony, in non-jin marriage, in the (in Latin, et in Illi, et in name of the Father, et Spiritus Sancti. A-land of the Son, and of men.

Then he sprinkles them with holy water.

This done, the bridegroom places upon the book gold and silver, (which are presently to be delivered into the hands of the bride,) and also a ring which the priest blesses.

[The nuptial benediction, which here follows, is omitted in mixed marriage. Vide "Ritualli Romani."

Then the priest sprinkles the ring with holy water, in the form of a cross; and the bridegroom having received the ring from the hand of the priest, gives gold and silver to the bride, and says:—

"With this ring I thee wed," &c.

Then the bridegroom places the ring on the thumb of the left hand of the bride, saying:—"In the name of the Father," then on the second finger, saying, "and of the Son;" then on the third finger, saying, "and the Holy Ghost;" lastly, on the fourth finger, saying, "Amen," and there he leaves the ring.

[The service is continued in regular marriages with benediction, prayer, and sometimes the singing of mass.]

From these documents and facts, thus authenticated, the following conclusions follow:

1st. That the council of Trent makes matrimony a sacrament in the Romish Church.

2d. That a Roman priest cannot administer a sacrament but to a Roman Catholic.

3d. That Col. Fremont, therefore at the time of his marriage, must, or at least, have professed to be a Roman Catholic; and was, therefore, sprinkled with holy water, and accepted other forms and rites of the Roman Catholic Church, as such a Catholic.

4th. That then he must have taken all the obligations of that sacrament, with the pledge to educate his offspring in Romanism.

5th. That in educating an adopted daughter in the convent at Georgetown he carried out the obligation of the sacrament.

But says the "Independent"—

"It is said that a daughter has been sent to a Catholic institution for education. So far from it she has never been sent away from home at all, but has been educated by her own mother."

This is a quibble. The statement was that his adopted daughter was educated at the convent on the heights of Georgetown, and we dare a denial from Col. Fremont.

If Col. Fremont, in view of the Presidency has recently changed his religion, and only with a view to that office, so much the worse, but the fact is undeniable, overwhelming and crushing, that to be married by the Roman priest, Father Van Horsburgh, Mr. Fremont must have professed the Romish Catholic religion, and hence accepted all the rules and rituals of the Roman Catholic Church! He may have broken the sacrament of his marriage within a few weeks past; and he may have become a convert to Protestantism in good faith, in order to win the American vote but, there is record of Romanism, in the most solemn act of his life; and it cannot be got over or got under; it cannot be tied down or covered up, and we, as journalists, but do our duty in publishing truths, no matter how much some may follow.

From the Golden Manual, published in London with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster;" and in New York (Sadler & Co.) with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, N. Y.; with the approbation of the Right Rev. Archbishop Hughes. Page 582:—

THE RITUAL FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY.

From the Golden Manual, published in London with the approval of "Nicholas, Archbishop of Westminster;" and in New York (Sadler & Co.) with the approbation of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop, N. Y.; with the approbation of the Right Rev. Archbishop Hughes. Page 582:—

The priest, vested in a surplice and white stole, accompanied by at least one clerk, to carry the book and a vessel of holy water, and by two or three witnesses, asks the man and the woman, separately, as follows, in the vulgar tongue, concerning their consent.

And first he asks the bridegroom, who most stand at the right hand of the woman:—

N., wilt thou take N., here present, for thy lawful wife, according to the rite of our holy Mother Church?

Response—I will.