

all? Out, sceptic! The tradition goes far back. The dull Veronese themselves do not question it! Why should we? We all bear about us the prototype of that secret. That which made the passion and the glory of our youth, the Juliet of the heart, when once it has died and left us, lies not its tomb within us, forgotten and unregarded—surrounded by the lumber of base cares, polluted by strange and indifferently passed—by the wishes and desires of more vulgar life, unheeded, unremembered—the sole ornament which sanctifies the rude and commonplace abode in which it moulders silently away?



## Democrat & Sentinel.

C. D. MURRAY, Editor and Publisher.  
EBENSBURG.

WEDNESDAY MORNING FEBRUARY 24

### AN IMPORTANT INQUIRY.

Who is the Ebensburg Correspondent of the "Pittsburg Dispatch"?

In looking over a late number of the "Pittsburg Dispatch," our attention was arrested by the following paragraph in the editorial column:

"The Democracy of Cambria, as we learn from a reliable correspondent and member of the party, were misrepresented (unintentionally) in our statement of Monday's issue, that they had endorsed Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Bigler's course on the Kansas question. Our correspondent says, under date of Ebensburg, Feb. 16th:

"The Democracy of Cambria are opposed to the admission of Kansas under the Leocompton Constitution, because they regard it as a fraud, and they will defend their position in terms not to be mistaken at a County meeting to be held at the March Court."

"The majority of our readers are doubtless aware, that the "Dispatch" is a Know Nothing and Black Republican paper. It has for years been almost daily filled with the lowest and vilest calumnies against the men and principles of the Democratic party. Its editors are not mere freeloaders but ranting abolitionists of the Lloyd Garrison and Fred Douglas school. And yet it would seem that this Abolition sheet has a Democratic (?) correspondent in Ebensburg, who, under date of February 16th, is graciously pleased to inform us Abolition Know Nothing editors, that the Democracy of Cambria are opposed to the admission of Kansas under the Leocompton Constitution, "because they regard it as a fraud, and they will defend their position in terms not to be mistaken at a County meeting to be held at the March Court."

It would appear from the above, that it had been stated in the "Dispatch" sometime previous to the 16th inst., that the Democracy of Cambria were in favor of the admission of Kansas under the Leocompton Constitution. This statement excited the indignation of an Ebensburg Democrat. He doubtless feared that it might be noised abroad, that the Democracy of Cambria, so far from being willing to become the allies of the Black Republican party, were determined to stand by their principles and the President of their choice. He at once informs these Know Nothing editors, to their infinite edification no doubt, that the "Mountaineers" are opposed to the administration of James Buchanan, and winds up by announcing a meeting during March Court, to denounce the Leocompton Constitution as a fraud. Now, we are exceedingly anxious to know who this "reliable" Ebensburg Democrat is, and we are equally anxious to know on what authority he bases the statement, that there will be a meeting in this place next week, for the purpose of denouncing the Leocompton Constitution as a fraud. We are anxious to know whether he is merely some aspiring young man, who writes for the purpose of seeing his "scribbles" in print, or a bona fide gentleman of the "Inner Temple," one of "The few, the happy few," "The band of brothers,"

who are constantly devising "ways and means" to control the political affairs of Cambria county, which it is not meet outsiders should forthwith know. If he belongs to the "fraternity," it is highly probable he speaks by authority, and that an effort will be made next week, to transfer the Democracy of Cambria county to the Black Republicans, body and breeches. Under these circumstances, we regard it as our duty to call the attention of the Mountain Democracy to the matter, and to warn them to beware of the wiles of the opposition.

If it is really the intention of the enemies of James Buchanan, to hold a meeting in this place, during the March Court, it is very strange that a Know Nothing and Black Republican paper published in Pittsburg should be selected as the medium for first announcing the fact to the world. All the papers published in this county have appeared since the 16th of February, but in none of them do we find even a hint that any such meeting will be held while the Court is in session during the next two weeks. We think as a matter of courtesy, the "getter up" of the meeting should have announced the important fact through the columns of the papers published in this county, or if they were determined to sustain their Pittsburg organ, they should at least have had handbills struck

at the "Dispatch" office and circulated throughout the county.

We think there is enough in the above extract from the Dispatch to warrant more than a suspicion, that an effort will be made during Court, to get up a meeting, for the purpose of denouncing the National Administration. The meeting if the arrangement can be carried out, will be controlled by a few dissatisfied Democrats, backed and sustained by Know Nothing and Black Republicans, who endorse the principles promulgated daily through the columns of the "Dispatch," and who are exceedingly anxious to break up and disorganize the Democratic Party.

And now Democrats of Cambria, we ask, are you willing that the boast of this Democratic (?) Correspondent, of a Black Republican Newspaper, shall be carried out! Are you willing that it shall be proclaimed to the world, that the Democracy of Cambria are the enemies of James Buchanan, that they regard him as a "Swindler," guilty of attempting to force a fraud on the people of Kansas? You have always been the friends of James Buchanan, and we are confident you will not now abandon him, for the purpose of gratifying a few disappointed office-seekers.— If a Democratic meeting is called during Court, attend it, and secure the passage of resolutions sustaining the national Administration.

### The Democratic County Committee.

The last number of the "Mountaineer" contains a "leader" concerning the meeting of the Democratic County Committee on the 9th inst., which we cannot in justice to the members of the Committee who attended that meeting, pass over in silence. We are extremely reluctant to enter into any controversy at the present time with regard to the local politics of this county; being well aware that such discussions have generally a tendency to produce dissensions in the Democratic ranks. This controversy is forced on us, by the uncalculated attack of the "Mountaineer" on a portion of the members of the County Committee.

The editor of the "Mountaineer" having stated in his paper two weeks ago, "that the Committee met at the Court House; there were but four members present. As there was not a quorum, there of course could not be anything done," we were not a little surprised at the appearance of the article we have now under consideration. In the space of one short week, a change appears to have come over the spirit of the dream of the editor of the "Mountaineer." He has suddenly discovered that a great many things were "done" by the Committee, and occupies more than a column of the last number of his paper in informing the people what those things were. Which of these statements are we to believe; the first or the last?

After the usual flourish of trumpets in the "bleeding Kansas" style, consisting of talk about "Leocompton," "fraud," "contamination," &c. the editor of the "Mountaineer" proceeds to set forth in dreadful array, the wrongful acts of the County Committee. The first charge of any importance is, that Gen. White and H. A. Boggs, Esq. were admitted to seats in the meeting, the first as the substitute of John Kelly, of Washington township, the second as the substitute of Charles Zimmerman, of Johnstown, while Col. William K. Piper, who presented a deputation from Thomas Callin, of Conemaugh borough, was rejected. A few words will suffice to explain this. No candid man will deny, that where substitutes are admitted into our County Conventions, or meetings of the County Committee, they should be citizens and voters of the same district as the persons from whom they receive the deputations. Should the contrary practice be adopted, our County Conventions, &c., will hereafter be filled by substitutes, the majority of whom will be residents of Ebensburg borough—an excellent arrangement doubtless, for aspiring demagogues and "tadpole politicians," but a very bad one for the Democratic party. Mr. Callin was appointed to represent the citizens of Conemaugh borough in the County Committee, and he had no right to appoint a resident of Johnstown to represent them in his stead. This is the reason which induced the Committee to "reject" Col. Piper. Messrs. Boggs and White were citizens of the districts which the gentlemen who substituted them were appointed to represent, and were, therefore, properly admitted.

The charge that Messrs. Boggs Riddle and Reusch were not fairly elected Conferees, that they did not receive a majority of the votes cast, we unhesitatingly pronounce incorrect. The Editor of the "Mountaineer" is certainly a man of might and power, and his word will doubtless carry weight with the people, but we doubt very much whether, even he, can succeed in convincing the citizens of Cambria County, that Augustin Durbin and H. A. Boggs who signed the credentials of Messrs. Riddle Boggs and Reusch would certify to a falsehood. It is impossible to know and not esteem Mr. Boggs. He has always enjoyed the reputation of being an honest man, and reliable Democrat. He has always been the devoted friend of James Buchanan, through good and evil report, in sunshine and in storm. Mr. Durbin is too well known to the Democracy of Cambria, to require any eulogium at our hands. The sterling of his honest worth, and his attachment to the principles of the Democratic party, are alike unquestioned. The Editor of the "Mountaineer" will have good reason to rejoice, if "keeping his eye on

the political horizon of this county" he ever attains to the place in the confidence and esteem of the people of Cambria, that Augustin Durbin now occupies. With regard to the resolutions, we have only to say, that we have good authority for stating that no resolution sustaining Governor Packer, was passed by the Committee. Had such a resolution been offered, it would doubtless have received the vote of every member of the Committee present, with the exception of G. M. Riddle Esq. We presume Mr. Riddle would have voted against it, because he recorded his vote against a resolution sustaining Governor Packer, in the conferee meeting at Tyrone on the 12th, ult.

The Editor of the "Mountaineer" will probably deny that the article we have now under consideration, contains either a direct or indirect charge of fraud, against the Committee. Why, in the very first sentence of the article he says, "It appears that the mere touch of the Leocompton Constitution is contamination; and that those who attempt to sustain that fraud, must do so by reenacting the base scenes, which occurred in the Convention that framed it. This fact was most glaringly illustrated in our town last week." This is the preface to his comments on the proceedings of the committee. He charges the members of the committee who sustained the National Administration, with being "contaminated" with reenacting the base scenes of the Leocompton Convention, a Convention which he has again and again denounced as a fraud, a cheat and a swindle. If this does not clearly imply a charge of fraud and bad faith against the majority of the Committee in attendance then words have no meaning.

The Borough Election last Friday passed off very quietly. The contest for Constable and School Directors was quite animated, but no unkind feelings were manifested by either party, and good humor appeared to be the order of the day. Annexed is the Return of the Election. It will be perceived that the Democracy have succeeded in electing their candidates for School Directors, three of their candidates for Town Council and their candidates for Assistant Assessors.

Constable—M. S. Harr, R., 106. T. J. Williams, D., 84.  
Judge of Election—Evan D. Evans, R., 95. A. Lewis, D., 93.  
Burgess—D. H. Roberts, R., 102. I. Crawford, D., 74.  
Town Council—R. H. Tador, R., 91. Edward Shoemaker, R., 85. Daniel Howells, R., 85. Edward Mills, R., 95. Evan Griffith, R., 86. T. B. Moore, D., 78. Geo. J. Rodgers, D., 91. John L. Stough, D., 91. Harrison Kinkead, D., 92. Josue D. Parrish, D., 87.  
School Directors—M. C. McCague, D., 105. E. Glass, D., 111. D. W. Lewis, R., 99. R. S. Lloyd, R., 95.  
Assistant Assessors—R. T. Davis, D., 95. L. Rodgers, D., 95. A. Yenner, R., 92. David J. Evans, R., 92.  
Assessor—John Lloyd, D., 92. John J. Evans, R., 94.  
Inspector—John S. Rhey, D., 94. Thos. Todd, R., 84.  
Auditors—E. E. Evans, R., 96. C. T. Roberts, R., 94. D. E. Evans, D., 90. J. C. Noon, D., 87.

**PUBLIC SENTIMENT.**—In order to show that the Democracy of Pennsylvania are determined to sustain their illustrious fellow citizen and Chief Magistrate, James Buchanan, it may not be out of place to state, that the Democracy of Philadelphia have already twice endorsed his Kansas policy. He has also been sustained in either County Conventions, or Mass Meetings, in the following Counties, viz. Alleghany, Clearfield, Clarion, Carbon, Erie, Bedford, Venango, Wayne and Susquehanna. Our readers are already aware that the Democratic County Committee of this county, passed resolutions sustaining him, and that similar resolutions were passed at the meeting of Conferees from Cambria, Clearfield and Blair on the 12th ult.

His Honor Judge Taylor at December Court, ordered a Special Court to commence last Monday, for the purpose of trying the celebrated case of Chancellor vs Kibbler et al, the determination of which will affect the title of upwards of 20,000 acres of land, in the northern section of this County. The case was continued sometime since by the consent of the parties interested. Judge Taylor and Hon. Henry D. Foster, one of the Counsel for the plaintiff, not having been apprised of the continuance, arrived here on Monday for the purpose of entering on the discharge of their respective duties. They both looked remarkably well, and we can truly say that it is not often that two better men honor our town with a visit.

The Revd. P. H. Lemko, returned last week from Kansas where he has been residing for some time. We have not learned whether this is a mere visit or whether he intends taking up his residence among the mountaineers' once more. The Revd. gentleman has hosts of friends in this County who will rejoice at this opportunity of once more taking him by the hand.

We regret to announce that Mr. T. Brophy, has removed from this place to Blairsville. Mr. Brophy is one of the best, if not the very best professional teacher in the State. Success and prosperity attend him in his new home.

Hon. J. K. Kane, died at his residence near Philadelphia, on Monday evening. He was one of the first legal men of this country, and father of the illustrious navigator, Elisha K. Kane.

We invite the attention of our readers to the following article, which we clip from the Philadelphia "Pennysonian." It may not be out of place to state that Thomas D. Smith is a brother of that sterling democrat, Dr. Wm. A. Smith, who although absent, still occupies a place in the hearts of the true Democracy of little Cambria;

### The Anti-Leocompton Meeting.

The leaders of the Anti-Leocompton, Black Republican movement, in this city and State, are in the habit of characterizing the Leocompton Convention as a "swindle and cheat." What can be said of their own honesty, when it is daily being demonstrated that, in order to give a color of Democracy to the recent "swindle and cheat," attempted to be palmed off upon the Democracy of the nation, these very men have used the names of prominent Democrats who are opposed to their whole movement, and heartily agree with the President and his Kansas policy. We have before published the declarations of several Democrats who were insulted by being associated with the men who are aiding and abetting the Black Republicans, and we now insert that of Thomas D. Smith, Deputy Sheriff of the city and county of Philadelphia:

To the Editor of the Pennsylvaniaian:  
My attention having been called to the appearance of my name as one of the Vice Presidents of the Anti-Leocompton meeting, at National Hall, on the 8th inst. I beg leave to state, that I was not present at the meeting, and that my name was used without my knowledge or consent.

THOMAS D. SMITH,  
Sheriff's Office, Phila., Feb. 16, 1858.

### The Leocompton Committee and Speaker Orr.

The opposition newspapers, more especially the Philadelphia Press and New York Times, are assailing Mr. Orr with great bitterness of invective for the manner in which he thought fit to constitute the Harris Committee on the Leocompton Constitution. It is pretended that some ancient and inviolable parliamentary rule has been disregarded in the selection of this Committee.

We are at a loss to know what rule is relied on for this assertion, in what manual of parliamentary practice it is to be found, and on what ground of reason it rests.

There is a parliamentary rule which requires that when any bill or measure or matter is referred to a committee, it shall be referred to a majority of friends; it being a parliamentary maxim that, "as a child is not to be put to a nurse that cares not for it, so no man is to be employed in any matter who has declared himself against it." But this rule does not apply to the Committee in question by the roots; for, as the Leocompton Constitution is the subject-matter referred to this Committee, for inquiry into the whole facts of its origin and history, this very rule rendered it imperative upon the Speaker to constitute the Committee so that it would contain a majority friendly to this Constitution.

The regular course of proceeding with this instrument and the special message of the President, would have been, to refer them to the standing Committee on Territories of the House, which might have been presumed fully as competent to deal with the subject-matter they taboos as any special committee that could be raised. We can conceive of but one objection that could have been legitimately urged against giving the Leocompton constitution this reference—and that is that the committee was opposed to the matter referred, and, that the reference would be like committing a child to an unkind nurse. This objection did not exist, however, in fact; and, not existing, there was no sufficient excuse for raising a special committee. A committee, however, having been raised, it was not only, as we conceive, incumbent upon the Speaker to so constitute it as to give the friends of the special message and the Leocompton Constitution a majority of its members, in pursuance of the just parliamentary rule we have cited, but it would have been monstrous to have referred those papers to a hostile Committee. In the opinion of a great many, the House did violence to a parliamentary usage or courtesy in refusing to refer this subject to its own appropriate Standing Committee; it was expecting too much of the House, as a parliamentary body, to refer the matter to a Committee positively hostile—far too much to expect of the dominant political party in the House to commit a leading measure of policy to the hostile nursing of an implacable enemy. The outcry against Speaker Orr is, therefore, not only unreasonable, puerile, and petulant, but it is at war with a common sense and just canon of parliamentary practice.

A glance at the composition of the Committee in its relations to parties and sections, will suffice to vindicate the impartiality of the Speaker. The rule to which we have alluded required him to constitute a majority of the Committee of the friends to the matter referred. That requirement being satisfied, let us scan the Committee with reference to its sectional and party relations. It consists of the following named gentlemen, from the localities and of the political affinities indicated:

Thos. L. Harris, Ch'n, Illinois, Douglas;  
Alexander H. Stephens, Georgia, Democrat.  
Austin S. Morrill, Vermont, Bl'k Rep.  
John Letcher, Virginia, Democrat.  
Edward Wade, Ohio, Bl'k Rep.  
John A. Quitman, Miss. Democrat.  
Warren Winslow, N. Car. Democrat.  
Henry Bennett, New York, Bl'k Rep.  
Allison White, Penna. Democrat.  
David S. Walbridge, Michigan, Bl'k Rep.  
Thomas L. Anderson, Missouri, American.  
John W. Stevenson, Kentucky, Democrat.  
Garnet B. Adrian, New Jersey, Douglas.  
James Buffinton, Mass. Bl'k Rep.  
William F. Russell, New York, Democrat.

The mover of the resolution for the Special Committee was made Chairman, of course, in accordance with parliamentary usage. The Speaker being himself from the Southern section of the Union, the Northern section was liberally allowed nine members against six allotted to the South. The dominant political party in the House was allowed but seven members; while the deserting Democrats were allowed two. The Black Republican party were given five members; which, with the two deserting Democrats, gave the coalition seven, and put them even in number with the dominant democracy of the House. The casting vote and balance power of the Committee was given, not to the dominant party in the House, who were the especial cham-

ions of the Leocompton measure, but to a member of the American party, who was favorable to the subject matter referred.

Upon this statement of the facts of the case, we are perfectly willing to submit the fairness and fidelity of Speaker Orr's conduct to the candid judgment of the country. He has done his duty, in the letter and in the spirit, in his appointment of this Committee; and it is precisely by having done so that he has excited the rage and extorted the howls of so many factious demagogues against him.

### The Reports of the Territorial Committee of the Senate.

The Committee on Territories, of the Senate have presented their reports to that body on the Kansas question, and also a bill for the admission of Kansas into the Union, as a State, under the Leocompton Constitution.— The majority Report was submitted by Senator GREEN, from Missouri. The reasons given in that paper for the admission of Kansas are of the most powerful and conclusive character. The Majority of the Committee do not rely upon the idle rumors of the day with reference to Kansas affairs; they eschew all mere manufactured evidence, and draw their facts from the official evidence on file at Washington, and base their conclusions upon the most undisputed proofs. Proceeding upon such safe and practical rules, the majority have placed upon record a concise and telling narrative of the whole Kansas imbroglio, from the first entrance of the hired tools of the Eastern Abolition Societies into that Territory to the present hour, when JIM LANE and his gang of desperadoes are contending against law and order, and marshalling the lawless spirits of that locality in open rebellion, not only towards Territorial authority, but also towards that of the General Government.— This has been and is the position of that portion of the people of Kansas who oppose the Leocompton Constitution. On the contrary, the Majority Report establishes anew the fact that the regular legal Convention of Kansas, in pursuance of law, assembled and adopted the Leocompton Constitution, which is thoroughly republican in form, submitted that Constitution of the people in their own way, and now claim admission into the Union with that instrument. Under these circumstances the Committee very properly report in favor of admitting Kansas into the Union, and clothing her with all the powers and privileges of a sovereign State. This decision of the majority is recommended to the consideration of the Senate and country from all those high and holy considerations which should influence Statesmen and Patriots in the discharge of their duty. All the just, legal and requisite forms have been complied with by the peaceable citizens of Kansas. It is only the turbulent and unruly who have been and are opposing the admission of Kansas for their own wicked and base purposes. To put a stop to this selfish foray upon the peace and quiet of the Union, the majority report a bill for the speedy admission of Kansas, which will legalize the slavery question, restore order to the young State, and thus be productive of good to all concerned.

Senator DOUGLAS, from the same Committee, presented a written report, in which are embodied his views on the matter under consideration. He takes the ground that "the Leocompton Convention was not clothed with competent authority to establish a Constitution," though the Kansas-Nebraska bill was intended to, and did give to the people of Kansas this very authority, or it is a farce. The people of Kansas did form a Constitution, they did send it to Congress, and yet Senator Douglas rejects all these evidences of the "popular will" and acts with those who refuse Kansas admission into the Union. The objection is not well taken—the Senator's acts do not carry out his professions, and hence his report will not have much weight with those who examine the subject in the light of truth, reason, and patriotism.

The Black Republican members of the committee reported the old state story with reference to the frauds in Kansas, and unfairness and illegality in conducting the election.— The Senate will not be startled by these assertions, as they have heard the same repeated for the past two years.

The bill for the admission of Kansas, as reported by the majority of the Committee on Territories, will be found in another part of this paper. The Senate will take up the same for consideration at an early day, and admit Kansas under its provisions. Of this result there is no doubt. In the House the contest will be more fierce in its character; still the result will be the same when the final vote comes. Kansas will be admitted under the Leocompton Constitution, Mr. BUCHANAN's policy will be endorsed, the unity of the Democratic party will be preserved, and the Union saved from the machinations of the Black Republicans and their allies—Pennsylvanian.

**Personal.**  
Senator Pugh, in a recent letter to the New York Herald, thus defines his position on Leocompton:  
"My own opinion is, that Kansas ought to be admitted immediately upon the Leocompton Convention, with a declaration of the right of amendment as therein prescribed, at any time. The bill which I introduced on the fourth of January was to that effect."

The Press, a few days since undertook to read a lecture to Hon. Messrs. White and Phillips, members of Congress, on their votes on Leocompton. The absurdity of this, on the part of a paper which has left the party, is quite apparent. The Argus, in noticing the attack on Mr. White, mentions this fact:  
"We know not when we have heard a declaration more honorable, high-minded, and patriotic, than was recently made by this gentleman to one who was endeavoring to persuade him to turn traitor to his principles and his party. He said—'If I cannot support a Pennsylvania President, whom I helped to elect, I will resign and go home.'"

It also in commenting on the other assault suggests a matter that proves that Col. Forsyth has no longer any sympathies with the Democracy. It says:  
"A QUERY? Is the Hon. H. M. Phillips one of the Representatives from our city, whom the nominal editor of the Press has avowed a determination to defeat, even by the elevation of a Black Republican? 'Who-so readeth let him understand.'"

The same paper had previously noticed a rumor to the effect that this gentleman has aspirations for the Philadelphia Mayoralty. It is preparing to run as a citizen's candidate under the auspices of the opposition?

## COMMUNICATION.

### A CARD.

To Mr. P. S. Neos, Editor of the Mountaineer.  
Sir:—Your paper published on February 19th contains an editorial article, for which, if you did not write it, you will at least be held responsible. In that article, it has pleased you to turn aside from the path of your duties, and make an attack upon myself.

The greater portion of your article is mere newspaper trash, and will only excite a quarrel which it evidently has been prompted, will injure yourself more than any one else in this community, where you and myself are well known, it is not possible for you to injure me; and thus far the article might have been passed by without notice; knowing that among the Mountain Democracy, it will be received with the contempt which it merits. But as your paper has been published to the world, and contains one specific and direct charge, the feeling of duty which stimulates every man to guard his good name, compels me to make a public reply to it.

You say that "for a consideration," I have "attempted to barter away the freedom and independence of the 'Mountain Democracy.'" This charge is direct and specific. Let us for a moment examine into it. When a man barter, he transfers an object, that to which he has a right and a title, and which must be in his possession. When did I get into my hands the freedom and independence of the Mountain Democracy? When did they execute a deed of sale or of trust to me? It was the impression that they were their own masters, and "free as the mountain breeze," until the appearance of your article, I knew that I was responsible for their destinies. It is news to me, and it will be to them. Not much credence will be attached to it, because, my dear young friend, if it were should be your good fortune to be intimately acquainted with these same "Mountain Democrats," you will arrive at the conclusion long since reached by many of your illustrious predecessors, "that the selling of them is an undertaking too extensive for any one man."

You further say: "It was in fulfillment of that agreement, that the meeting in December was adjourned." Now here you speak of an "agreement." Where was that agreement made, and when? Who are the parties to it? Who required it? If the "Mountain Democracy" have been sold, who bought them? Who is now their owner? Do enlighten them upon these points; they may like to know who is now their boss.

In regard to the adjournment of that meeting, "mark how plain a tale shall put you down." The motion on which the meeting adjourned, was made by James C. Noon Esq. of Ebensburg, a gentleman of character and integrity, with whom you may be presumed to be acquainted. Did he make that motion and adjourn the meeting "in fulfillment of the agreement of which you speak?" Was he a party to it?

You say: "It was for that purpose he was a substitute to the County Committee." I went there at the request of Mr. Kelly, my personal and political friend, who as business occupation compelled him to be absent from the county on the day of the meeting.

You say: "It was with that object he opposed the admission of Mr. Piper." I voted against his admission, because the practice of the Democracy here and elsewhere require that a substitute must be a citizen and a voter residing in the same district for which the principal was elected or appointed. Thomas Callin was appointed for Conemaugh Borough. The substitute, Mr. Piper, resides in Johnstown.

Thus sir, an examination into your charge shows that it is without foundation, and in plain English, an unmitigated lie.

You speak of having been advised to let myself and acts pass unnoticed. That was a very common sense advice, and almost any common man would have taken it; but we cannot expect a genius to be subject to the rules which govern every day life and every day people, for

"Great wits to madness sure are near allied,  
And thin partitions do their bounds divide."  
You talk of power, money, influence, being crushed &c. This dodge is pretty smart. Would you not like to be persecuted a little? Would it not be a great card if you could stand before the public a martyr, and display a few gaping wounds? You are trying to humbug people into the belief that I wish to crush you. How stands the case in this regard. Until this time I have always been your friend, I have never done you any injury, have never harbored an unkind feeling towards you, and you know that whenever you have come in contact, my conduct toward you has been uniformly kind.

On the other hand, you, the conductor of a public Journal, have seen fit without any provocation, without right and without reason, to commence a warfare upon a private citizen. I am not an office holder, nor am I a candidate for any office.

The tenor of your article indicates that you are not satisfied with the political opinions which I entertain. If ever you should become capable of understanding the political institutions of this Republic, you will learn, that freedom of opinion is guaranteed to all its citizens. I intend to avail myself of this right, and think as I please, without asking your direction or permission.

Your attempt to mix the "Mountain Democracy" in this quarrel is weak and cowardly. It will not succeed. It would be rather too much presumption to ask them to divide into hostile camps under your flag and mine. This matter is private and personal to you and myself. You have commenced to libel and slander a private citizen, who intends to fight his own battles.

Permit me to express the hope that you will not get hurt much in the numerous free fights which you have undertaken, and to subscribe myself

Yours affectionately,  
RICHARD WHITE.

Ebensburg, February 24, 1858.

Our columns this week are rather crowded with Advertisements owing to the length of the Sheriff's Sales, Receipts and Expenditures, &c They will have "out" next week and we then will be more usual variety.

Mr. Moore Stewart has been pardoned.