From the Raleigh Register.

Hillsboro', August 5, 1843.

Mr. Gales—A communication of the Hon. R. M. Saunders, in the Standard, referring to my letter to you on the 22d July, requires some notice from me.

In the Speech of that gentleman at Raleigh, he affirmed "the table of Post Office distances," to be the rule by which the mileage of members of Congress should be estimated, and having produced that document, he declared that Messrs. Rayner, Stanly, and many other members of Congress had received excessive allowances for mileage, and that any one would discover this who should compare the table of distances with the accounts of these members.

That the Post Office Table furnishes no rule on the subject of the mileage of members, I said in my letter to you; and the correctness of my position will be apparent from several considerations. First, from the language of the Act of Congress giving the mileage. It provides that each Senator and Representative shall receive "eight dollars for every twenty miles of estimated distance by the *most usual road*," &c. Most usual for what? for transporting the mail?—surely not—but most usual or travelling by the public conveyances. This is evident from a subsequent provision in the same law, in these words "and each member of the Senate shall be entitled to the same, &c., allowance for, &c., travelling to and from any meeting of the Senate," &c. It is an allowance for *travelling*, to be computed, not by the distance *actually* travelled, but by that usually travelled by the public conveyances.

Secondly—from the Retrenchment Bill, of Mr. Arnold, for supporting which Gen. Saunders seems to think himself entitled to special commendation; for one of the amendments proposed by that Bill was to make the Post office estimate, the rule for computing mileage in future—a provision useless, and indeed absurd, if it had been the rule already.

Thirdly—from the uniform action of the members and officers of the two Houses for more than twenty years, by none of whom (except General Saunders) is it believed that the Post Office Table was deemed to furnish the rule; but on the contrary, by all of them the usual route of travel was considered the only proper guide. But we now learn from Gen. Saunders, that the table, *per se*, is not the rule, but the table corrected by ascertaining the true distance of travel. The General it seems wrote to the Postmaster General, and learned that in his own case, the table and the fact did not agree, and he, in consequence of this information, charged not according to the table, but according to the supposed fact. Now when the General wrote to the Post Master as to his own case, did he consult him as to the proper distance of Messrs. Rayner, Stanly, and the other members referred to? If so, why did he not give the result of those inquiries? If, as I suppose he did not do this, then in the only case in which he consulted the Postmaster General, he found that the table was erroneous, and he himself disregarded it. Why, then, did he propose *that* as the rule for others, by which he had not governed himself—and why did he assume the estimates of a table to be right as against others, which by the only instance in which their correctness had been tested, he himself had found to be erroneous. This was bringing forward evidence to accuse others, which he knew was not worthy of trust; it was requiring them to submit to a rule by which he was not willing to govern himself—and it was more than this. As Gen. S. affirmed the Post Office table to be the true rule of calculation, and condemned others for exceeding its estimate, while he gave no intimation that he had rejected it in his own case, was it not the natural inference of all that heard him, that his own account had been settled by that rule which he had just declared to be the true one? Whether Gen. S. designed to produce this inference, which he knew was contrary to the truth, he only can determine. This much, however, is certain—he alleged the rule, condemned others for not adhering to it, and was at the same time perfectly silent as to the fact that he had disregarded it.

The table of Post Office distances being thus set aside as a governing rule, in the calculation of mileage, both by the confession and practice of Gen. Saunders himself, it is difficult to understand why a committee, consisting of the General and the Postmaster, should be a more appropriate medium of adjusting the mileage, than was furnished by the consultation of the Secretary of the Senate and myself. The Postmaster was not an Officer of Congress—neither the law nor the practice of that body gave him any power of interference; he had nothing to do with it; and the General might just as well have called to his assistance any Clerk in the General Post Office, as the head of that Department. The difference then between the General and myself is merely this—I resorted to the usual and proper mode of estimating the distance, and he to one which, though not improper, was certainly unusual. I see no reason to admit that the result in his case was accurate rather than in mine; but, if it were so, my error was as sincere as his, and a mistaken calculation, I presume even the General himself will admit, constitutes no offence.

The other charge made against me in the Standard and endorsed by Gen Saunders, he alleges that I have evaded—but this allegation like most others that he has introduced into his gratuitous and unprovoked attack upon me, is without foundation. That charge, as I understood it, was, that while paid for the whole extra Session, I came home to attend a Superior Court. Knowing that I did not come home to attend any Court during the extra Session, and that I had left Washington before the close of the Executive Session of the Senate in the Spring of 1841, and did attend a Court, I naturally supposed this absence was the subject of reference. I answered the charge supposed to have been made, by stating that I was present at the close of the extra Session, and though I left the Senate while in Executive Session in the Spring, yet my pay stopped with my departure. This the General considers but a small affair, and supposes I might have lost a day's pay. If he had been as careful to ascertain and to recollect facts, as he seems to have been intent on making charges, he might have learned that the Executive Session referred to continued from the 5th to the 15th of March, and that I left Washington a full week before its termination.

The charge, I now learn is, that I was absent on some other occasion, and without deduction of pay. I was absent once during the extra Session. I came home on an occasion of indisposition in my family of the deepest interest to me as a father and a husband. Finding, on reaching home, that the crisis was over, I took the very next Stage on my return to Washington. My absence lasted six days, of which period four days and nights were spent on the road. I consulted with a friend as to the propriety of deducting pay for these days of fatigue, expense and anxiety, but was told that under the circumstances, my absence was not voluntary, but compelled by a necessity which fell under the equity of that provision of law which allows pay to an absent member detained by sickness. This view struck me as correct, and I acted accordingly, and I very much doubt whether either for the absence or the pay, any honorable man in the United States will require an excuse required.

As Gen. Saunders seems to have made an investigation somewhat particular into my absence from Congress, it is not uncharitable to suppose that when he alluded to my hurried journey home, he was informed of the necessity which caused it. Why did he withhold that information from those to whom he made the charge of absence? Why, but because he knew that to have communicated that information, would have been to fasten attention upon the difference between a short absence, under the influence of considerations having the force of physical coercion, and a long and voluntary absence in the prosecution of a lucrative profession, and would thus have made his charge against me recoil upon himself.

As to Mr. Arnold's Bill, which the General seems a great admirer and advocate, and which he has drawn rather unnecessarily, as appears to me, into this discussion, I have but a few words to say. I was opposed to that Bill as a whole, because it proposed a very large deduction from the pay of all Officers, Civil and Military, which is within the control of Congress, and because it proposed *no* reduction of the pay of the Congress who were to pass it, but a large reduction of the pay of their successors. The first would have been a cruel injury to a large class of meritorious public servants, and the second provision made us to be generous to the country not at our own expense, but at the expense of those who should come after us. I thought besides, that the compensation of members was not excessive and ought not to be reduced, but I was very decidedly in favor of fixing a common criterion by which to determine mileage. Whether my views were correct or not, they were certainly adopted without the bias of interest, for it was then ascertained that I was not to be a member of the ensuing Congress, and the passage of the Bill would not have affected my own interests a penny.

But surely the self complacency of Gen. Saunders in the support he gave to this Bill rests on a slender foundation; for if the present rate of compensation be not excessive, why should it be reduced at all? And if it be, why should not the reduction be applied to those who judged it excessive?

One other remark, Sir, and I will encroach no farther on your columns. When Gen Saunders in his Raleigh Speech, at which I was present, produced the Post Office table—announced it to be *the* rule by which mileage should be estimated—accused several members of Congress by name who were absent, with overcharging, and referred his auditory to the book and accounts for proof—the inference was inevitable, that he had been engaged in the laudable business of making the examination, to which he invited others. When afterwards in another Address, at which I was not present, he added my name to those which he had before singled out for accusation, it was certainly not an overstrained inference, that I was in the first instance omitted because I was present, and in the second named because I was absent. That such conduct deserved to be called *unmanly*, none surely could doubt, and to some, might seem to merit a harsher epithet. But it seems the inference I so naturally drew was mistaken, and that the discovery as to myself was made after the Raleigh Speech was delivered. I am glad to learn that it is so, and desire to express my felicitations to the General; that the continual succession of his electioneering appointments yet left him leisure to pore over the table of Post Office distances—that each day of diligent inquiry added somewhat to his store of matter for vilification; and though I cannot praise the spirit which prompted his efforts, his industry is undeniably entitled to commendation.

And I think, Sir, I may congratulate myself, that after all his energy of inquisition, he has been able to produce but two charges—one supported by proof which he himself has discredited, and the other which, if he deems an offence, he is the only man in America who would.

Of the flourish about facing with which the General very appropriately and characteristically concludes his note I shall say nothing, because it deserves no reply which it would become me to make.

I am Sir, very respectfully,
Your ob't. serv't
WILL. A. GRAHAM.

From the National Intelligencer.

AN APPEAL TO N. CAROLINA.

On the 4th of October, 1777, the battle of Germantown was fought. General Francis Nash, of North Carolina, commanded the reserve guard, which was brought into action and distinguished itself at the close of the battle in covering the American retreat and resisting the attack of Gen. Grey. General Nash was mortally wounded, it is said, by the same shot which killed Major Witherspoon, of the New Jersey brigade. The point where the last and most severe struggle occurred is yet pointed out. General Nash was carried off the field and removed to the neighborhood of the American camp, where, in a few days, he died. General Washington, in his despatches, mentions his death with expressions of deep regret; and, on the 4th of November, 1777, Congress passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That his Excellency Governor Caswell, of North Carolina, be requested to erect a monument of five hundred dollars, at the expense of the United States, in honor of the memory of Brigadier General Nash, who fell in the battle of Germantown bravely contending for the independence of his country."

On the 3d of August, 1843, sixty-six years after this event, two gentlemen from Philadelphia, being in the neighborhood of the encampment held by the American army after the retreat from Germantown, and taking an active interest in such subjects, were induced to ascertain the place of interment of this gallant soldier of the Revolution. They had no difficulty in doing so. In the burial ground attached to the Methodist meeting house, about half a mile above Kulpsville, in Towemensing township, Montgomery county, there are four graves, (three in good preservation,) with head and foot stones, placed there by the neighbors, by whom the tradition of the place is affectionately cherished. The largest and most northwardly grave is that of General Nash; the others are those of Major White, of New Jersey, an aid of General Sullivan, Colonel Boyd, and the other is unknown. They were all officers of rank, who died of wounds received at Germantown. There are yet living more than one with whom we conversed who distinctly recollect General Nash's funeral, and are positive as to his grave.

The burial ground is entirely secluded, though quite accessible, at the distance of about twenty four miles from Philadelphia, and a spot of as much picturesque beauty as can be found in that neighborhood.

The object of this communication is respectfully to call the attention of North Carolina to the almost forgotten burial place of her heroic son. The resolution of Congress, passed when gratitude was fresh and active, has never been acted on. And how could it more appropriately be carried into effect than through the activity and liberality of North Carolinians, to build an appropriate monument on the spot where, almost within sound of the battle where his mortal wounds were received, the soldier of the Revolution lies?

It is not believed the neighbors will consent to part with these remains. The interest they, plain German farmers of another generation, seemed to take in them, was one of the most agreeable exhibitions which our inquirers observed.

The name of the writer of this communication, one of the gentlemen who made the examination, is left with the Editors of the Intelligencer. It is hoped this appeal will not be in vain. It is made to the surviving relatives of General Nash, and if to those it fails, then to his native State.

OLD MORTALITY.

NOTE BY THE EDITORS.

In a private letter to his brother, General Washington, speaking of the action at Germantown, observes, "Our loss in killed and wounded was about one thousand men. General Nash, of North Carolina, was wounded, and died two or three days after. Many valuable officers of ours were also wounded, and some killed. In a word, it was a bloody day. Would to Heaven I could add it had been a more fortunate one." *5th vol. Sparks' Washington*, 103.

General Sullivan, in his letter to the President of New Hampshire, (same vol. 466) says: We lost some valuable officers, among whom was the brave General Nash, and my two aids-de-camp, Majors Sherburne and White, whose singular bravery must ever do honor to their memories."

From the Raleigh Star.

"The leaders of the modern democracy have a candidate for the Presidency in every section of the country." *Raleigh Star*

"Is this true? The Editor of the Star is certainly deeper in the secrets of 'modern democracy' We should be obliged to him if he would inform us who these candidates are, and where they hail from." *North Carolina Standard.*

Not quite so "deep" as the new Editor is in the "mysteries of conundrum." We were not aware before that they wished to keep the fact stated in the above quotation from our paper a secret. It may, however, suit the purposes of those who desire to make Mr. Calhoun the "very head and front" of the modern democracy, to conceal from the people that there are other candidates for the Presidency held up by portions of the same party; and this may account for the haste with which the new Editor hauled down the name of Mr. *Van Buren* from the mast-head of the Standard as soon as he took charge of the helm. But it doesn't change the fact, which is notorious, that *there are other* candidates, any more than burying the head of the ostrich in the sand hides from view his beautiful tail. Will the Standard pay its own friends to the blush, by denying that the Democrats have *five* candidates for the Presidency? And does he really need to be informed "who these candidates are, and where they hail from?" We'll tell him; and if he is not satisfied that they cut the country into "sections" enough, he would certainly not desire to see the party split up into a greater number of factions. There, then, is Mr. Van Buren, of New York, who hails from the port of Kinderhook, where he was driven by stress of weather in the storm of popular indignation of 1840; there is Mr. Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, who hails from the ranks of the old Federal party; there is Col. Johnson, of Kentucky, who hails from the Great Crossings; there is Gen. Cass, who has scarcely had "a local habitation" in this country for some years past, who hails from somewhere about the frontiers of Democracy; and last, though not least, there is Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina, who hails so recently from the Whig ranks, that he don't "seem *to take so* well with" a large portion of the honest democracy. The word of command may be given, "1st, 2d, 3d and 4th sections!" and all the hosts of Democracy! to the right about face! into the ranks for John C. Calhoun!" But will the "sections" obey?

The U. S. Gazette compares the present condition of the Whig party with its condition in 1839.

Facts worthy of Note.—With reference to the election of 1844, the Whigs occupy the same relation, in regard to time, which they did in 1838 with reference to the Presidential election in 1840. And with the exception of the distracted state of the Locofoco party, in reference to their Presidential candidate, the circumstances, to almost every thing else, are nearly the same.

In 1838 the State of Pennsylvania elected Gov. Porter by a majority of 5496.

And yet in 1840 Pennsylvania cast her electoral vote against the Locofoco candidate for the Presidency.

In 1838 Delaware elected Mr. Robinson [Locofoco] her delegate in Congress by a majority of 50.

And yet in 1840 Delaware elected anti Locofoco electors by a majority of more than a thousand.

Georgia in 1838 elected McDonald [Locofoco] for Governor by a majority of 375.

But in 1840 Georgia gave a good round majority for the anti Locofoco candidate for President.

Ohio in the year 1838 gave Shannon [Locofoco] for Governor a majority of 5729.

Yet in 1840, Ohio gave the anti-Locofoco electoral ticket, a neat little majority of 23 000.

Maryland in 1838 gave to Grayson, the Locofoco candidate for Governor, a majority of 259.

Yet in 1840 this same Maryland gave a majority for the anti-Locofoco electoral ticket of 4,776.

In 1839 the State of Massachusetts elected Marcus Morton, the Locofoco candidate for Governor, by a majority of one.

Yet in 1840 good old Massachusetts gave to the anti Locofoco electoral ticket a majority of 29,930.

In 1838 New Jersey returned to Congress a Locofoco delegation, claiming a majority of 66. This claim was not allowed, but the Whig real majority was less than that.

And in 1840 New Jersey gave the Whig electoral ticket a majority of 2,347.

Maine in the year 1838 gave to Fairfield, the Locofoco candidate for Governor, a majority of 3,228.

But in 1840 Maine gave a majority for the Whig electoral ticket of 411.

Michigan in 1838 elected Stevens T. Mason, the Locofoco candidate for Governor, and the rest of the Locofoco State ticket.

Yet Michigan in 1840 gave for the Whig electoral ticket a majority of 1,802.

There was no election in Tennessee in 1838. But in 1837 the Locos carried their ticket by 18 800; and in 1839 they carried Polk [Locofoco] by a majority of 3,000.

Yet in 1840 the Whigs elected their electoral ticket by a majority of 12,102.

We take no notice of those States which went for the Whigs in 1838, and also of the Presidential election in 1840, such as N. Carolina, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and N. York, though every one of these States gave a majority for the Whig electoral ticket in 1840 vastly superior to that which they gave for the State officers in 1838: and that increase of majority goes to strengthen the confidence of the Whigs, that in 1844 the same result will be found!

A Patriotic Town.—The Boston Mercantile Journal gives the following statistics of the town of Marblehead, Massachusetts, which exhibit a high degree of courage and patriotism on the part of its population. What town of equal size can make so favorable a showing?

"The inhabitants of Marblehead have always been distinguished for their industry, power of enduring fatigue, physical courage, and patriotism. Most of them have been bred to the sea, and insured to the rough and tumble of life from their childhood, and have furnished, especially in time of war, many brave and gallant seamen for our ships. It is said that at the close of the Revolution, when the population was much less than at present, a statement made to the General Court of the sufferers by that war exhibited the following result:

Widows	458
Fatherless boys	364
Fatherless girls	502
Total	1324

"During the last war the little town of Marblehead furnished 1,400 men for the public service; and no ship of war, privateer, fleet, or flotilla, prison ship, or depot, was without a goodly number of representatives from this patriotic town. Nor were they all confined to the sea service—they composed one entire company of the 40th regiment of regular troops—almost another of the flying artillery, and many scattering recruits for other services were raised. Many of these brave men were killed while fighting nobly for their country, and others were imprisoned. At the close of the war, Dartmouth, the English prisonhouse, unfolded her gloomy prison gates upon five hundred gallant fellows who hailed from this obscure fishing town!"

From the Philadelphia Saturday Courier.

'IF MY HUSBAND WERE TO DO SO.'

A DOMESTIC INCIDENT.

"Poor woman! What a thousand pities it is for her!" said Mrs. Grimes, with feeling—"I wonder how she stands it. If my husband were to act so, it would kill me."

"I never could stand it in the world," added Mrs. Pitt. "It is a dreadful situation for a woman to be placed in. Mr. Larkins used to be one of the best men, took the best possible care of his family. For years there was not a happier woman in town than his wife. But now it makes one's heart ache to look at her. Oh! it must be one of the most heart-breaking things in the world to have a drunken husband!"

"Well, all I've got to say," spoke up Mrs. Peters, with warmth, "is, that I don't pity her much."

"Why, Mrs. Peters! How can you talk so?"

"Well, I don't! Any woman who will live with a drunken husband, don't deserve pity. Why don't she leave him?"

"That is easier said than done, Mrs. Peters."

"I should think it a great deal easier than to live with a drunken brute, and have her life tormented out of her. If my husband were to do so, I reckon him and I would part before twenty-four hours."

Now Mrs. Peters' husband was a most excellent man, and a sober man withal. And his wife was tenderly attached to him. In regard to his ever becoming a drunkard, she had as little fear of his running off and leaving her. Still when she made her last remark, she looked towards him, for he was present, with a stern and significant expression on her countenance. This was not really meant for him, but for the imaginary individual she had supposed as bearing the relation towards her of a drunken husband.

"You would! would you?" Mr. Peters replied to the warmly expressed resolution uttered by his wife.

"Yes, that I would!" half laughingly and half seriously retorted Mrs. Peters.

"You don't know what you are talking about," spoke up Mrs. Grimes.

"Indeed, then, I do! I consider any woman a fool who will live with a drunken husband. For my part, I have not a spunk of sympathy for the wives of drunkards—I mean those who live with the men who beggar and abuse them. Mere disgusting brutes—the very sight of whom ought to turn a decent woman's stomach."

After a while the subject was dropped, and at the close of the social evening, the friends separated and went to their own homes.

* * * * * *

It was perhaps, about two months from the period at which this conversation occurred, that Mr Peters left his home early in the evening to attend a political meeting—politics at the time running high, and hard cider flowing freely as water. He was in the habit of attending such meetings, and of partaking of his portion of the cider, and at times of something a little stronger; but as he was a sober man, and a man, too, of strong good sense and firm principles, the thought of his ever partaking too freely never crossed the mind of his wife.

Regular in his habits, he was rarely out after ten o'clock, on any occasion. But this time ten came, and eleven, but he was still away. This was a circumstance so unusual, that his wife could not help feeling a degree of uneasiness. She went to the door and listened for him after the clock had struck eleven, and stood there for some time, expecting every moment to hear the sound of his footsteps in the distance. But she waited in vain, and at last re-entered the house, with a troubled feeling.

At last the clock struck twelve, and almost at the same time, she heard her husband at the door endeavoring to open it with his dead-latch key. In this he was not successful from some cause, and thinking that she might have turned the key, Mrs Peters went quietly and opened the door for him. She found that she had not locked it.

As she lifted the latch, the door was thrown suddenly against her, and her husband came staggering in. As he passed her, he struck against the wall of the passage—rebounded—struck the other side, and then fell heavily on the floor.

The startled wife instantly flashed upon her. He was drunk. For a moment her heart ceased to beat, her head reeled, and she had to lean against the wall to keep from falling. Then all the tender emotions of her heart rushed freely into activity. It was her own husband who lay before her, by the mere spirit of strong drink. With almost super human strength she raised him up, although a large man, and supported him with her arm until she got him up stairs, and laid upon a bed.—By this time he seemed perfectly stupid, and only mumbled incoherent replies to the frequent, and tenderly urged importunities of his wife.

After some time she got him undressed and in bed. But he grew more and more stupid every moment.

"O, what if he should die!" the poor wife moaned anxiously, while the tears that had at first gushed out, still continued to flow freely. She then got camphor and chafed his temples with it. She also washed his face with cold water, and tried various means to arouse him from the lethargy of drunkenness. But all to no purpose.

At last, despairing of success, she lay down beside him, still in tears, drew her arms around his neck and laid her face tenderly against his. She had lain thus for about five minutes, when her husband called her name in a whisper.

Oh, how eagerly she did listen after her response to his call.

"*If my husband were to do so!*" As he said this, still in a whisper, but a very expressive one, he looked her steadily in the face with a roguish twinkle of the eyes, and a quivering of his lips, the muscle of which he could with difficulty restrain from wreathing those expressive organs into a merry smile.

Mrs. Peters understood the whole scene in a moment, and boxed her husband's ears soundly on the spot, for very joy, while he laughed until his sides ached as bad as his ears.

In all discussions upon the various unfortunate relations of man and wife, Mrs. Peters was very careful how she declared her course of action, were she placed in similar circumstances. If, in any case, she was led unthinkingly to do so, the remark of her husband with a peculiar inflection of the voice—

"Oh, yes! If my husband were to do so" had the happiest effect imaginable, and instantly put an end to the unprofitable discussion.

In a town some fifty miles from Boston, the members of a religious society were in the habit of holding conference meetings in the church, at which they made a kind of audible confession, technically called recounting one's "experience." A very pious member of the church, Mr. D——, was in the habit of inviting his neighbor, Mr. L——, who was not a member, to attend these meetings, at one of which Mr. D—— got up and stated to the congregation that he was a great sinner—that he sinned daily, and with his eyes open—that he wilfully and knowingly sinned—that goodness dwelt not in him—that he was absolutely and totally depraved—that nothing but the boundless mercy and infinite goodness of God could save him from eternal damnation. After this confession of Mr. D——, Mr.—— L., who had by accident been placed upon the "anxious seat," was called upon to recount his "experience." He arose, and with most imperturbable gravity, stated that he had very little to say of himself, but the brethren would remember that he had lived for five-and twenty years the nearest neighbor of Mr. D——, that he knew him well—more intimately so than any other man—and it gave him great pleasure, because he could do it with entire sincerity, *to confirm the truth of all brother D—— had confessed of himself.* When Mr. L. sat down, under the visible and audible smile of the whole congregation, the parson not excepted, Mr. D. went up to him and said, "You are a rascal and a liar, and I'll lick you when you get out of church." *Boston Post.*

The American Captain and the British Admiral.—When, during the late war, Admiral Warren was lying in the Chesapeake, Captain Smith was sent by Commodore Stewart, then at Norfolk, to negotiate an exchange of prisoners. The news had just arrived of the capture of the Java, and the Admiral, speaking of that event, asked Captain Smith how it happened that our frigates were so successful in taking theirs? Captain Smith answered that he knew no reason for it, unless that we fought better. "No," said the Admiral, "that cannot be; but the reason is, that two thirds of your crews are British seamen." "Then," replied Captain Smith, "the other third being Americans makes the whole difference." The Admiral attempted no further explanation or argument on the knotty subject.

Commodore Tucker.—We remember well hearing this venerable man relate his receiving his first commission, in our navy. He was at Marblehead, soon after his return from England, and at the time Washington was at Cambridge. Tucker, then a young man, was cutting wood before his mother's door, when a gaily dressed officer rode down the street. It was in the dark of evening, and the officer, seeing Tucker thus employed, rode up to him and asked him if he could inform him where the *honorable* Samuel Tucker resided. Tucker, astonished, answered him in the negative, saying there is no such man resides here; there is no other Sam Tucker in this town but myself. Immediately on hearing this, the officer raised his beaver, and bowing low, presented him his commission in the navy.