

Topics of the Week.

One of the leading topics of the week is the veto of the French Spoils bill. All lobbydom about Washington hoped for a different result, but all lobbydom is disappointed; therefore the cool millions all lobbydom expected to pocket have vanished into thin air; therefore, again, all lobbydom swears more than that celebrated army in Flanders. But when these disinterested gentlemen swear, there need be no fears that the interests of the people suffer, when, however, they smile—when they pat the Executive on the back, and call him "good fellow,"—then look out, Uncle Sam's treasury is going to be robbed! And this very French Spoils bill was one of the pet schemes of all lobbydom about Washington to bleed Uncle Sam. That glorious old goose, which every rogue thinks he has a right to pluck, has too much money, consequently rogees flock around his strong box as thick as flies around a molasses hoghead in Summer. And it requires a blow, like this veto of the French Spoils bill, occasionally to keep the swarm at a distance. In our brief notice, under this head, we have not room to follow the President through his long and arduous review of the Claims proposed to be liquidated by the vetoed bill; "If," says the President, "new facts, not known or not accessible during the administration of Mr. Jefferson," Mr. Madison, or Mr. Monroe, had since been brought to light, or new sources of information discovered, this would greatly relieve the subject of embarrassment. But nothing of this nature has occurred. That those eminent statesmen had the best means of arriving at a correct conclusion, no one will deny. That they never recognized the alleged obligation on the part of the government is shown by the history of their respective administrations. Indeed, it stands, not for a matter of controlling authority, but as a fact of history, that these claims have never since our existence as a nation been deemed by any President worthy of recommendation to Congress.

By reference to our Philadelphia letter, it will be seen that the time for the removal of the Erie and North East road has again been extended by the Supreme Court. There were but three Judges upon the Bench—Lewis, Black and Knox—the latter dissenting. We apprehend it makes very little difference with the ultimate result of the controversy; still there is a principle involved, and upon that account we look upon the course of Judge Black as most extraordinary. Of Judge Lewis we expected nothing, because his opinions are well known, and in the decree last Saturday he is consistent and honest! But how stands the other? On the 7th day of last September Judge Black said, in speaking of the location of the Erie and North East road within the city of Erie, that "the directors must have thought that they could gain a point of great value in locating their road where it now is, for else they would not have ventured upon it in the teeth of the law." Now Judge Black says they may keep this "point of great value" ninety days he gets this power? He himself says, "we cannot widen the limits set to their (the Company's) privileges, because they have found them unconventionally narrow. We have no more right and authority to stretch an old act of incorporation than we have to make a new one." And the decree of last Saturday is giving this same company a "new act of incorporation" for ninety days, and that too, "in the teeth" of the declarations of Judge Black, or there is no meaning to the English language. "In either case," continues the Judge on that memorable 7th of September, "we would be usurping legislative power, and granting away from the State privileges which she has never properly withdrawn." And yet on Saturday last this same Judge Black "urged legislative power and granted away from the State," for the period of ninety days, "privileges which" Judge Black himself says "the State had been proper to withhold." But again, this consistent Jurist declared that "When a railroad authorized to be located in one place, is made in another, it is a mere nuisance on every highway it touches in its illegal course. The streets in question, not being on any route which the defendants were authorized to take, they are in them in disobedience of their charter, and all they have done there is without a shadow of authority." This being so, what authority has Judge Black, or the Supreme Court, to keep them there? Again, "It is enough," continues the Court, "to say that the railroad has no business where it is." Having "no business" where it is, by what law, or construction of law, did its Honor, on Saturday last, concur in a decree to keep it there "if it has no business" for ninety days? But we waste words; the course of Judge Black has been so inconsistent with his own opinion that the most obtuse cannot fail to see it. In former years we have fought many good fights, "politically," for Judge Black; we have been his admirer of him, not only as a man but as a Jurist; but we say now that if the People, whom we have unwittingly deceived in regard to him, will forgive us we will never ask them to do so again. We can stand a vacillating politician, or a vacillating statesman; but a vacillating expediency Judge, enough!

The election of Ex-Gov. Bigler to the Presidency of the Sanitary and Erie road appears to give universal satisfaction in Philadelphia. We have this, not only by private advices, but it is also manifest from the tone of the press. The Spectator, one of the most steady and reliable of the public journals of that city, says: "His election is an angry that the troubles which have so long impeded the prosecution of the work will now cease, and that it will receive the support from the community and city Councils due alike to its importance and to the character of the gentleman who accepts the difficult function of reconciling adverse factions and establishing the credit of the Company, and carrying its work forward to an early and prosperous issue." The North American says it "quite sure Gov. Bigler will enter upon the duties of his new position with the good wishes of the community. Whatever political differences may have existed between him and them, the people of Philadelphia, generally, regard him with sentiments of esteem, and they will be glad to give his administration of the affairs of the railroad every proper encouragement and support." The News, the special organ of Mr. Cooper, and the Pennsylvaniaist, and the Argus—in fact the entire press of the city—also speak in the most encouraging and hopeful terms of the road now. We are glad the right

man has at last been found, and that there is a prospect of satisfying Philadelphia. — We have waded through the dry details of the two branches of the Legislature this week in hopes of finding something of a local interest, but we have found nothing, except the passage of a bill to prevent the drawing of seina, or drag nets for fish, within our Bay. What the object of this is, we are not philosopher enough to tell, unless it is to protect "old Ben" and his canoe, and prevent those "dangerous people," the Germans, from catching fish. Verily, our Know Nothing Legislators are not only "raining things into the ground" but into the water too. The election of a United States Senator, which is to take place next Tuesday, is the all-absorbing topic at Harrisburg, and but little business will be disposed of by the Legislature until "this event" is accomplished. The strife among the Hindoes still rages fiercely, and opinions are about equally divided as to the probable result. — The Know Nothings of New York are apparently carrying things with a high hand. The election of Wm. H. Seward has madened them, and they are ready to commit almost any act of violence. In proof of this, a letter has been published from Moses Eames, a member of the New York Legislature, detailing the reception he met with among the "Hindoes" at their State Convention at Syracuse. Mr. E. was a delegate from a "Hindoo" Council in St. Lawrence, and is one of those who voted for Seward. Mr. E.'s "experience" at Syracuse is thus detailed: "I being a member of the Legislature, was invited upon the platform with the officers of the meeting, and introduced by Mr. Barker, who informed the foremost of my colleagues, but by the explanation in relation to my vote cast at the last election. While I was proceeding to do so, one of the members asked me for whom I voted for United States? When I replied, William H. Seward, it created a great excitement in all parts of the hall. Some twenty or thirty, more vehement than the rest, rushed forward to the platform, hissing, stamping their feet, gnashing their teeth, extending their arms with clenched fists, crying out with countenances flushed with excitement, "Traitor," "Pariah," "Liar," "Villain," and other epithets, accompanied with the exclamation, "hustle him out," "down stairs with him," "throw him out of the window," &c., &c.

By this time, the meeting was in a complete uproar. The presiding officer could not control those present, and declared the meeting adjourned for one hour. There was then a general rush for the platform where I was standing. Some of the foremost seized my collar, but by the exertion of a few personal friends, I was saved from further violence by being, with great haste, escorted down a private stair-way, while others closed the doors and kept back the mob. When I reached the street, Mr. Barker advised me to go to my hotel, and not to show myself about the place, but leave the city in the first conveyance. Having no other business to attend to, I took his advice and left Syracuse in the first train. When Mr. E. took "the first train" he doubted less to a wiser, if not a better, man. We have no sympathy for him! — The Washington Star says the Lieutenant-General Bill gives General Scott the power to add four additional Lieutenant-Colonels and four military secretaries to the army of the United States, with full pay, emoluments, &c. This being the fact, and it being well known that there could not be a particle of duty of any kind whatever devolved on the proposed Lieutenant-Colonels, or on any of the additional officers in the army, it is thought the President, in order to give Congress an opportunity to correct what they are supposed to have done by mistake in enacting this bill, will veto it.

It will be remembered that when the news of the death of Hon. Moses Norris, Senator from New Hampshire, reached New York, the Tribune indulged in a tirade of abuse of the deceased that disgusted all right minded readers of that sheet. The crime of the deceased Senator was that he was a Democrat, and not an abolition agitator—that he believed in the constitutional guarantees of the States, and that hence the rights of the people south of Mason and Dixon's line should be respected and sustained. This, we say, was his offense, in the eyes of the Tribune. Now see what Fred Douglass, a black man, says in reply to Greeley: "I was in Pittsfield, N. H., twelve years ago, a stranger—detested, blasphemed by saint and sinner, with no one to defend me—the hotel closed against me, no house to shelter me—homeless and breadless; and in this condition the late Hon. Moses Norris found me walking among the tombstones in the graveyard behind the town house of Pittsfield. He spoke to me, and invited me to his house, and treated me like a man and a brother. Let no man say that a man is always sunk in the politician." This Frederick Douglass was a fugitive slave at the time he refers to; and not a man of the ranting abolition Greeley faction would give him either food or shelter. But the man Greeley denounced while living, and who he pursues with fiend-like malignity even beyond the grave, took the poor slave and treated him "like a man and a brother."

The self-complacency of the Gazette is amusing. As an instance, it talks this week as though the Whig party in the State—represented by right members in the Legislature—had swallowed the entire Know Nothing organization; whereas it is a well known fact that the Know Nothings are the swallowers, and the Whigs the swallowed. Our neighbor will awake some morning, and find himself a second Jonah! — We notice that G. J. BALL, Esq., the Whig member from this county, ranges himself among the Know Nothings at Harrisburg. — As Mr. B. was elected in opposition to the efforts of that secret combination in Erie County, and that too mainly by Democratic votes, it is pretty evident he has fallen in love with the new party since he left home.

GEN. CASE AND THE ALLIES.—The veteran statesman, Gen. Case, was to have addressed the Senate on Tuesday last, in review of the recent declaration of Lord Clarendon, that the alliance with France not only relates to the present aspect of affairs in Europe, but is perfect with reference to affairs on both hemispheres. The meaning of this is manifest, and Gen. Case, we have little doubt, will treat the subject with boldness and independence, and expose with clear-sighted wisdom the acts and designs of the allies with reference to this country. Solicit as they will, our sympathy, England at least, regards every step of our progress with jealousy, and would make any sacrifice to check it.

N. C. Bae, sole owner of the defunct Phoenix Bank of Chicago, has been indicted for forgery, but when an officer went to take him into custody for the purpose of giving bail, it was found he had already performed that operation. It was by bail, the Times says, he was released on that occasion.

Protests and Protestors. In politics, as in business, it generally happens that those who go out to cheer, stand a pretty good chance of coming back shorn. A notable instance of the truth of this may be found in the present state of the Senatorial contest at Harrisburg. To secure a Governor and a United States Senator, and the political "appurtenances thereto annexed," the Whig party secured a pair of "Know Nothings" shears, and went out to cheer the Democratic party; and with the wool thus gathered and pulled over the eyes of the people, they are now endeavoring to stuff a seat in the U. S. Senate for Andy Curtin. How they will succeed in the end is not yet decided; but the indications are that the crop will prove too short, and that Andy will have to run a few years longer over the bleak hills of Center county.

Our readers already know the result of the Know Nothing caucus to nominate a candidate for Senator; how, when he came to count noses, Andy was a little short; and how, on becoming thus disgusted at the adroit manner Simon played the game of "wriggle, wriggle," his friends withdrew and set up for themselves and then sent forth a Protest to the world justifying themselves for their conduct. And a right nice document is this same protest. We have read it with a good deal of satisfaction; first, because it is a complete exposure of the hypocrisy of the whig managers of Know Nothingism. It shows the cloven foot of that party to a demonstration; and proves, if proof were wanting, that Dr. Johnson was right when he said "the last resort of every scoundrel is patriotism." Secondly, every word, every letter, every comma, it contains is a scathing commentary upon the rascality that carried Pollock into the gubernatorial chair, and delivered over our good old Commonwealth to the hands of the political quacks who now control her destinies. Thirdly, it is a refreshing evidence of the brazen impudence, the cool effrontery, and the political degradation of its signers. And lastly, it shows that when politicians cry out, there is some hope that honest politicians will get their due!

Why did these twenty-eight imbecile signers of the Protest bolt? What reason can they give, but that their political antecedents were either whig or abolition, whereas the antecedents of Cameron, who could "wriggle wriggle" better than they, were Democratic? He was as good an "American" as they; he hated the Pope as bad as they; and he was as much entitled to the support of Know Nothings, as such, as Andy Curtin! Then why did these twenty-eight bolters run when they found that Simon and not Andy was going to win? Simply, as we said before, because Know Nothingism was a whig trap, and to catch any thing else in it was not a part of the specification "in the bond." O, but, says these protesting gentlemen, the majority resolved to vote by ballot, and thus those who wanted to vote as they pleased could do so without fear of their constituents. A most lame and impotent complaint, to come from Know Nothings truly! Why, don't these gentlemen know that secrecy in the Alpha and Omega of their order—the very foundation stone upon which their political superstructure and its success rests? Then how possible to complain because a majority of their own party—their brethren in secrecy and political rascality—chose the secret ballot instead of the viva voce vote? But we cannot do our readers a greater favor than by giving the Protesters an impartial and fair faith. Here it is: "There were in that caucus those who were not members of the party, but who were present under these circumstances it seems scarcely possible that they could be nominated. He was openly rejected by a large majority of the members of the party, and it is with this open avowal of fact, for almost any other of the many names before us would have been as eligible. It is true they did make themselves by the secret ballot, but to this we are entitled to consider that of party. We could not believe that all who voted for the secret ballot did so to hide themselves from their constituents, or to betray us to the support of a man despised and disowned by every political organization in Pennsylvania. But what we began to suspect, that our loyal brethren made it their business to discover the treachery that was proceeding to oppose Cameron, and yet hypocritically and secretly voting for his nomination."

Now in the name of all the Know Nothings saints at once, what are these crimes complaining about, but virtue according to Know Nothing ethics? If we are not mistaken, during the canvass last fall, to "openly repudiate" Know Nothingism, but to secretly hug it to their bosoms was a part of the "sharp practice" resorted to by some of the very gentlemen who sign this protest. And while they complain in language that sounds like the last will of a dying criminal about their companions in pure "Americanism" "masking themselves behind the secret ballot," did it never occur to them that they fought the campaign last Fall "masked behind the secret" and "abhorrent oaths of a midnight lodge? Pretty men these to complain about others "masking themselves." When they throw off their own "mask," they will then give more evidence of consistency and less of "cowardice." But we leave the Protest and the Protestors with the following scathing commentary from the Pittsburgh Courier: "But again the Seceders justify their withdrawal because the candidate was a renegade politician. And what were the Seceders? Was there one of them who had not turned his back upon the party? Was there one of them who had not voted for the secret ballot, but to hide themselves from their constituents, or to betray us to the support of a man despised and disowned by every political organization in Pennsylvania. But what we began to suspect, that our loyal brethren made it their business to discover the treachery that was proceeding to oppose Cameron, and yet hypocritically and secretly voting for his nomination."

A BIT OF ROMANCE.—Some years ago, says the St. Louis Intelligencer, a very beautiful young lady was the wife of a person in Louisiana, who defrauded her out of quite a large fortune. This lady came to St. Louis, where she married, but not living on good terms with her husband, finally obtained a divorce from him and retired to a convent. Whilst she was there she received a letter from the son of her former guardian, informing her of his father's death, and that himself had inherited all his vast estate, but that he could not consent to retain that which had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with the heir, and received back, both principal and interest, all that she had been wronged out of. The strangest part of the story remains behind. No sooner had she got possession of her fortune, than she returned to St. Louis, sought out her former husband, and in a few days was re-married to him. The lady of whom we speak is understood to be the late Mrs. Buckner, who had been treacherously taken from another, and offering to make restitution. The lady immediately proceeded to Louisiana, had an interview with