COMMUNICATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN ORGAN.

RALEIGH, N. C., Aug., 31st, 1855.

You will please publish the following letter from myself to Hon. D. M. Barringer. The letter was forwarded to Mr. B. at Saratoga nineteen days ago, with a request to the Postmaster at that place to forward it to Mr. B. in case he had left there. I have waited till this time, in the hope that I might be able to have Mr. B.'s letter published at the same time with my letter to him. But inasmuch as there seems to be some doubt whether my letter to him, or his in reply, may not have miscarried—and inasmuch as there is a systematic attempt being made to pervert and misrepresent this whole matter, I feel that in justice to myself and to the cause of truth, I ought not to withhold my letter any longer from publication. My letter will probably reach Mr. Barringer through the press, sooner than through the mail. It is to be hoped Mr. Barringer will reply, as he can and probably will, through the public press. His answer will, he as anxiously waited for by me, as it will be looked for by those who feel any interest in this matter.

I, at one time, intended to have made a publication over my own name, reviewing all the facts, and reasonable inferences growing out of this affair. I may do so hereafter. For the present, on this letter I rest the vindication of my *opinion*, often expressed in public, that there was an understanding between the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in this country and some of Mr. Pierce's leading friends, that the Roman Catholic vote should be given to Mr. Pierce on condition that some member of that church should have a seat in his Cabinet.

There has been made an unworthy attempt on the part of a portion of the anti-American press and the anti-American advocates to evade the force and effect of Mr. Barringer's statement, in his letters to both Mr. Ellis and myself: by *pretending* to discover an issue of veracity between Mr. Barringer and myself—and some of them have been base and mendacious enough to *pretend* that I had been exposed in misrepresentation. All this is designed to divert the public attention from the real question at issue. It is to screen from public indignation, the parties to the bargain, by trying to get up a new issue. *No one* who has read all that has been published on the subject, believes that there is the slightest ground for impugning my veracity, or that there is the color of an issue of veracity between Mr. Barringer and myself. Some will no doubt, try to believe it—but all such I leave to the self condemnation of their own consciences, for *denying* with their lips the conviction of their hearts.

Respectfully,
K. RAYNER.

RALEIGH, N. C., Aug. 7, 1855.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just reached Raleigh, after an absence of more than two weeks, and on my return I find your letter of July 20th. In this letter you request me to publish your letter of the 6th July. Had I been here when your last letter arrived, I might have published the first as requested—but since the appearance of your entire letter to Mr. Ellis, I can hardly suppose you desire the publication of your entire letter to me. If you do, however, you herein find a copy of it, which you can have published if you desire its publication.

I must confess I feel surprised at the *turn* this matter has taken. And you must pardon me, for my review of all the facts and incidents connected with it, and for trying to recall the same to your recollection.

'Tis true, there is no issue between us, in regard to any matter of *fact*. Your statement to both Mr. Ellis and myself confirms my account given of the conversation between us on the subject alluded to. But in regard to the inference to be deduced from your statement, the impression made on your mind by the communication of the Pope's Nuncio, *at the time*, as stated in your letter to Mr. Ellis, is entirely different from what mine is *now*—and entirely different from what I understood yours to be, at the time of the conversation between us.

Allow me to call to your recollection, the circumstances under which this conversation occurred between you and me. I called to see you at Yarboro's Hotel sometime about Christmas, I think. After talking on various subjects, the subject of the *American* movement was introduced, I forget whether by you or myself. I stated to you that I really felt alarmed at the progress and grasping policy of the Roman Catholic church in this country. You replied that our people here knew nothing of the Roman Catholic church, as you did, who had witnessed its action in Spain, where it had full power. You then went on to speak of the sale of indulgences, which was still practiced in Spain—that on certain festivals of saints-days in the year, you had often seen large placards put up at prominent places along the streets of Madrid, containing a regular tariff of prices, at which indulgences would be granted for the commission of sins—among other things, I recollect you mentioned the item of release from the obligation of an oath, to be obtained by paying a certain sum, &c., &c. At this I recollect I expressed my surprise—and said, that badly as I thought of the Romish church, I did not suppose this sale of indulgences was practiced by that church any where in this age. You replied, "Oh yes, it is still kept up in Spain." You then went on to speak of the denial by the Spanish Government of the right of decent burial to any Protestant who might die in Spain—that no religious service was allowed to be had at his burial—that not more than three persons were allowed to attend his body to the grave—that they were not allowed to take the body to the grave in any vehicle more respectable than a common cart—that they were required to take the body out of the city along some obscure way and bury it in the fields—and that most of the bodies of Protestants thus buried, were supposed to be disinterred by the anatomists. You mentioned some instances of Protestants of high social position, that had died in Spain, whose bodies had thus been disposed of, and whose graves could not be afterwards found by their friends. I asked you, how it would have been with yourself, if you had died when there. You stated that you had your arrangements provided, that in case of your death, your body was to be embalmed and brought home to the United States. You spoke further, of the intolerance of the Romish church in Spain—that there was not a single Protestant place of worship allowed in the whole Kingdom. Here I again expressed my surprise, and asked you if it was possible that the English Government, with all its well known influence in Spain, did not exact from the Spanish Government, the privilege of a Protestant chapel connected with the English embassy in Madrid. You replied no, it was not allowed even to England, although the British Government had long been endeavoring to obtain the privilege. You spoke of many other enormities and oppressions of the Romish church. In the course of the conversation, I said that I considered the Romish religion to be utterly incompatible with the existence of free government—that their assumptions of power in this country began to be alarming—that as you were not in the country at the last Presidential election, you were probably not well acquainted with the influences which prevailed in deciding it—but that there was very little doubt, but the Roman Catholic vote in the North was given to Mr. Pierce, in pursuance of an arrangement with Archbishop Hughes to that effect. You replied "You have no idea how well posted they are in Europe in regard to what is going on in this country." "Why Sir," (said you) "the Pope's Nuncio at Madrid told me of Campbell, of Pennsylvania, being a member of the Cabinet before I had ever heard of it, and before it was known in Madrid." I remarked, that was proof there had been a bargain, that the Roman Catholic vote should be given to Mr. Pierce, and that church should have a seat in the Cabinet, &c. You then went on to state the incidents connected with the Nuncio's conversation with you—that it was at a party given by one of the members of the Cabinet in Madrid—that the Nuncio came up to you, stated to you the fact of Mr. Campbell, a Catholic, being a member of Mr. Pierce's Cabinet, and expressed his gratification, that his church was so strong and influential in the United States, as to obtain such an honor.

I did not consider this conversation between you and me as confidential, or as *quasi*-confidential. I spoke of it often in the course of conversation with many persons—and I spoke of it publicly in a speech in Richmond. On my return from Philadelphia in June, I saw you in Baltimore, at Barnum's Hotel. I then said to you that I had spoken publicly of what you had said to me, in regard to the remarks of the Pope's Nuncio, about the appointment of Mr. Campbell in Mr. Pierce's Cabinet—as I did not consider it at all private or confidential. You replied certainly it was not. And I then went on to state the terms in which I had related it; and said to you I wished to be correct about it, as I should probably speak of it again. You said I had given it correctly—and then repeated the circumstances, under which the conversation with the Nuncio occurred—and what he had said to you viz: that before you had received any information in regard to Mr. Pierce's Cabinet, before it was known in Madrid, and was a matter of doubt and conjecture, he (the Nuncio) stated to you that Campbell of Pennsylvania, a Catholic, was a member of it. You said nothing of the date of this conversation, whether it was before the 4th of March, 1853, or after that time. True, the impression left on my mind, by the conversation with you, was that it was before the 4th of March; but I never so stated in any public speech I have made—for I did not then, nor do I now, think that makes any sort of difference. Whether before or after the 4th of March, mattered not with me; for the point which I always made in alluding to it was, that the Pope's Nuncio being put in possession of the information, before the United States Minister had heard of it, and before the public in Madrid had received the news, was a humiliating reflection to every patriotic American: and afforded proof that the bargain had been agreed on before the election, and that the bargain had been fulfilled.

In your letter to Mr. Ellis and myself, you confirm the statement as I had given it. In your letter to me of July 9th you say—"before I had any authentic and certain news of the formation of the Cabinet, and while it was still a subject of conjecture at the court of Madrid, he (the Pope's Nuncio) told me that Judge Campbell, of Pennsylvania, was appointed, and that he was a Catholic, which was the first information I had either of his appointment or his religion."

In your letter to Mr. Ellis of July 23rd, you say—"Before I had any certain news of the formation of the Cabinet, and while its constitution was still in doubt and the subject of conjecture in the public mind, at Madrid, he (the Pope's Nuncio) told me that Mr. Campbell was appointed and that he was a Catholic, which was the first information I had of either."

I do not know in what exact words I was reported in the newspapers, as having referred to this matter in my speech in Washington: to which report I presume Mr. Ellis referred, when alluding to in his 4th of July oration. Of the several public addresses I delivered at the North I never saw the reporters notes of one, before going to the press—and they were so badly reported (as must I suppose necessarily be the case, in the confusion attending these mass meetings and the hurry of getting them to press) that I soon ceased giving myself any concern about them.

Inasmuch as the Anti-American press has endeavored to evade the force of this statement of mine (fully confirmed and sustained by you) by a contemptible quibble, as to whether the Nuncio's communication to you was before or after the 4th of March,—and inasmuch as you differ with Mr. Ellis and myself, in regard to the *impression* you had, *at the time* of the Nuncio's communication, and the impression we have *now*,—the duty I owe myself, as well as the duty I owe the American cause and to Mr. Ellis, my personal friend, requires that I should appeal to you, to your sense of justice as well as of generosity, to calmly review with me the circumstances, the history, of this matter—to request of you, that you will refresh your memory in regard to the minute details—and let us see, if we cannot by a process of fair logical deduction, arrive at a conclusion a little different from that which in the unwillingness of your kind nature, to judge harshly in any quarter, you may have arrived, *at the time* of your conversation with the Nuncio.

In the first place, you say the communication was made to you by the Pope's Nuncio, "before you had any certain news of the formation of the Cabinet, and while its constitution was still in doubt, and the subject of conjecture in the public mind at Madrid." Let it be recollected there is no telegraphic communication between the United States and Europe—consequently, the news could not have been transmitted in that way. It could not have been first carried by a sailing vessel, for the steamers far surpass them in speed. There is no steamers plying across the Atlantic, but the regular Ocean mail steamers—therefore, the news must have been carried by some one of them. Is it reasonable to suppose, that after the formation of the cabinet the first steamer that left the country, should have carried but one newspaper, containing so important a piece of news as this—and this one letter or newspaper should have been sent to the Pope's Nuncio, alone? I suppose no sane man would contend for such an explanation as this. We must take it for granted then, that the news of the construction of Mr. Pierce's Cabinet was first carried to Europe, by one of the regular Ocean mail Steamers,—and that the steamer that carried out the news took the information in divers letters and newspapers, and to divers persons, yourself (the minister representing our country) among others. In the nature of things then, in the name of reason I ask how could the Pope's Nuncio have stated it as a fact, when as you admit, "it was still in doubt and the subject of conjecture in the public mind?"—unless the knowledge had been communicated to him before the Cabinet was formed? There is but one possible state of facts, by which such conclusion may be avoided. If the mails containing the news happened to reach Madrid on the very evening the Nuncio made the communication to you—and he happened to open his mail and read, before going to the minister's party, and you did not—why then on meeting at the said party, an hour or so afterwards, he might be before you in having the information. And it is on this point, that I request you to try and refresh your memory. Did the news reach Madrid that night and was it known there publicly the next morning? and no longer "in doubt, and the subject of conjecture?" But again—did the Nuncio mention to you the names of any other members of the Cabinet? I take it for granted, you enquired of him, supposed he was speaking from authentic information. If he did not, it proves that he knew nothing of the names of the other members; for if his object was simply to give you a piece of information in regard to your own country, which he had the good fortune to get hold of before you, he would certainly, as an act of social courtesy, have given you the names of all the Cabinet. If he did not know who they were, then it proves that he did not get his information by the channel that carried the information to others, but must have gotten it *beforehand*. But please try and recollect, whether you enquired of him, who were the other members of the Cabinet. If you did not (anxious as you must have been to learn this news) it only proves, that from the manner, circumstances, and incidents, you did not regard him at the time, as speaking from authentic information transmitted after the formation of the Cabinet; but on private data based on some other source of information. But did the Pope's Nuncio tell you that Mr. Campbell was "a member of the Cabinet"—or did he say he was appointed *Post Master General?* If he had said he was appointed Post Master General, that even would have been no evidence that his information was based on the official announcement of the Cabinet, after its construction was made public—for if there was a bargain, it may have been for this very place that he bargained. But his *not* naming the position in the Cabinet which Campbell held, and merely stating that "he was appointed," in the Cabinet—shows that his information was based on conjecture resulting from prior knowledge.

Now, my dear Sir, you will please allow me to advert to the circumstances of our first conversation on the subject in Raleigh—the connexion of words—the sequence of ideas. I was speaking of the grasping policy of the Romish church in our country—its interference in politics, and controlling influence in the last Presidential election. It was in reply to this, you remarked, how well posted the church in Europe was in regard to our country; and that the Pope's Nuncio had given you this information, about Campbell being in the Cabinet, before you had heard of it, or it was known in Madrid.

I need hardly say to you, that in a rational conversation between two intelligent men on any given subject, every remark, suggestion, or reply, made by one to the other, must have some *point* about it—some *object* in it—the purport of which can be best understood by reference to the context, the association of thought or word in which it is used—the preceding idea to which is a response, either affirmatively or negatively. You will recollect, I was speaking of the danger from the Romish church in this country—its interference in our politics,—its having decided the Presidential election, &c.

Your remark in reply was by way of affirmation, as I understood it, viz: that that church was well posted as to our affairs in this country—that the Pope's Nuncio at Madrid gave you the first information you had of Mr. Campbell's being a member of Mr. Pierce's Cabinet; before you had received the news, and while the construction of the Cabinet was in doubt, and a subject of conjecture in the public mind there. You will please allow me to ask of you, what was your object in making that remark to me in immediate response to my suggestion, that the election had been carried by the Roman Catholic vote, in pursuance of an understanding that that church should be rewarded in return—if it was not, corroborating my suggestion, and confirming me in my impression? Why have mentioned it at all, if your view of the matter *was* (I mean your view *at the time of our* conversation) that the Nuncio had received his information through the ordinary channel of the mail? and that was the only way he could have derived at it (in the absence of previous knowledge) unless we resort to the still more strained supposition, that an express was forwarded to him, after the arrival of the steamer at some European port, in advance of the mail.

I assure you, my dear Sir, I am by no means disposed to criticise your letter to Mr. Ellis, as a matter of choice. Your reply to him as well as to me, fully confirms my version of your conversation. But inasmuch as you have gone out of the record (you will please pardon me for saying so) to controvert and destroy the force of the *inference* drawn by both of us—that this communication to you by the Nuncio was confirmatory of the charge of previous bargain which had been made—you cannot, I hope, find fault with my attempt, in self vindication, to show that *our* inference *now* is correct, and *your* inference *then* was incorrect. You say in your letter to Mr. Ellis, you "*did* not at all suppose that he (the Pope's Nuncio) had any previous knowledge of an intention to appoint this gentleman to office, or that he knew, or had any reason to believe it was done in pursuance of any bargain or intrigue to this effect on the part of any persons whatever." This I can well understand—and this remark, I do not conceive, involves any issue between us, in regard to *opinion* even. You say you "*did*" not suppose so; meaning, of course, *at the time* the Pope's Nuncio gave you the information.—It is reasonable you might not have attributed his prior knowledge, to the consummation of "any bargain or intrigue to this effect." As you had been for years out of the country, and were not thoroughly conversant with all the charges, issues, and undercurrents involved in the Presidential election—it is not probable that you should have suspected foul play. In the next sentence of your letter to Mr. Ellis, you say—"the inference I *made*, was (referring, of course, *to the time* the communication was first made to you by the Nuncio) that the appointment of a Catholic to this high office, being naturally a cause of much interest and satisfaction to the church of that faith, especial pains had been taken in some quarter to communicate the earliest intelligence of that fact, to the leading members of the Catholic Priesthood." It is natural that such should have been, *at the time*, the inference drawn by an unsuspecting mind. But here, you will please allow me to request of you again, to try and refresh your memory. Of course you must have been surprised—having heard nothing of it yourself—and will you be so good as to try and recollect, whether you enquired of him for the source of his information, and what was his reply—whether there was then any telegraphic communication to Madrid, from Havre or Paris—whether the mails by the steamer had arrived at Madrid on that evening. And in case there was no telegraphic communication, and the mails had not arrived that evening—will you suggest what other *possible* means there could have been by which "especial pains to communicate the earliest intelligence of that fact," could have secured its transmission to Madrid—unless we suppose an express in advance of the mails, had been despatched to Madrid, immediately on the arrival of the steamer.

You will pardon me for requesting you to be as explicit as possible, for this reason:—The presses and advocates of the Anti-American party are attempting to deduce a strained inference from your letter. They are trying to pervert your language into testimony in their behalf. They are trying to use you, to combat and disprove the reasonable inference *now* to be drawn, from the communication of the Nuncio to you. They are endeavoring to represent you as saying, that you *now* entertain the impressions which you say you had *at that time*, as the only way of accounting for the Nuncio's getting the information before you or the public in Madrid received it. Some of the more malicious and slanderous of the Anti-American presses and partizans *affect* to rely on your letter as impugning my veracity, even. Hoping and believing that you are not willing that your name or your letter should be perverted to any such ends, I think I may appeal to your *justice* as well as to your generosity to speak out, and forbid any such unfair use to be made of what you have written. May I ask of you—do you intend in your letter to say, that *your opinion now is*, that there was no such understanding as that referred to, in regard to the Roman Catholic vote being given to Mr Pierce? Do you intend to say, *your opinion now is*, that the Pope's Nuncio had "no previous knowledge of an intention to appoint Mr. Campbell to office"—before the authentic account reached Madrid? I should not ask you for your *present* views on these points, but for the fact, that the attempt is being made to represent you as entertaining opinions *now* similar to the impressions you were under, for the moment, when the communication was first made to you. You will observe the cause of truth, and be doing an act of justice to those who are attempted to be wronged by speaking out plainly and unequivocally on these points.

In the concluding sentence of your letter to Mr. Ellis, you say, in allusion to an "imperfect report of my speech in Washington"—you "wrote me a note for the purpose of correcting the erroneous impressions which might so readily be made on the public mind however unintentionally, from such a reference to a casual conversation in social intercourse, without a written statement of the facts." False deductions have been drawn from this part of your letter. The impression is attempted to be made, that you requested me to publish the entire letter, and that I had nevertheless *suppressed* all but one sentence of it. You will bear me witness, you made no request of me, in your first letter to publish the same. You then go on to repeat what you had said to me. You then state what were your impressions "*at the time*" the Nuncio made the communication, very nearly identical with what you said in your letter to Mr. Ellis. You conclude by saying "if this subject is to be referred to at all again in public, although it was not originally so intended by me, it is but just to all the parties concerned, that it should be properly understood, and that this correction should be made." It so happened that there was no correction to make. I had spoken of the matter not as *inexactly reported*, but as you gave the statement to me; and after I received your letter, when alluding to it in my public speeches, I generally read from the letter itself. As to its being "a casual conversation in social intercourse"—you will recollect that I told you in Baltimore, I had spoken of it publicly, not considering it at all confidential, and you said it was not so intended.

You will please allow me to call your attention to an editorial in the "Semi Weekly Union" of the 28th July—in which the following language is used in reference to yourself: "He is at present at Saratoga Springs, in the State of New York, and he has stated to a gentleman in this city, of unquestioned intelligence and integrity, that the conversation with the Nuncio of the Pope, concerning the Cabinet of President Pierce, which has been made the foundation of so much falsehood and calumniation, transpired subsequently to the 4th of March, 1853, and to the reception of the intelligence thereof, and of the names of President Pierce's Cabinet in Madrid. Mr. Barringer also stated that he had addressed two letters to Mr. Rayner of North Carolina, stating the time of the conversation and its circumstances and purport, and asking that gentleman to do all parties the justice to state the *facts* in the case, but that Mr. R. had suppressed both letters, and had wholly refused to correct the falsehoods in the premises." This statement, on first reading it I knew to be a foul and malignant slander. It was not only entirely unlike you, but I knew it was impossible you could have said to any one, that this conversation with the Nuncio was "subsequently to the reception of the intelligence of the inauguration and of the names of President Pierce's Cabinet"—for at that time I had your letter, stating that the time of the conversation was "*before* you had any authentic and certain news of the formation of the Cabinet, and while it was still a subject of conjecture at the Court of Madrid." I knew it was impossible you could have told any one I "had *suppressed* your two letters, and had wholly refused to correct the falsehoods in the premises"—for at that time I had your letter, in which you state that variance between your statement to me, and my remarks at the meeting in Washington, as *reported* was "an error doubtless of the reporter." This article in the Union is a slander on you as well as myself. It represents you as saying to some one at Saratoga, the very opposite of what you had said to me in your letter. I confess I have been looking for an authoritative denial by you of the slander in the *Union*.—To say nothing of what is due to yourself, I think it due to me. I have not seen or heard of any retraction of this slander, by the Union. If any one ever gave this information to the Union, it is due to the cause of truth—it is due to society—that his name be given up to exposure. It is not necessary to my vindication however. He *charges* me with falsehood. In publishing the extract from your letter, I have *proven* falsehood on him.

I hope, my dear sir, you will pardon this long and I fear tiresome and disagreeable letter.—You have yourself in times past, been assailed, and had your conduct and your motives aspersed. You can make allowance then, for my anxiety that this matter may be properly examined, and the truth elicited. I ask for nothing but justice, and am willing to leave the public to the rational interpretation every fair-minded man must place on the facts disclosed. Your unwillingness that you should be misunderstood to the injury of Mr. Pierce or the Pope's Nuncio, will, I am sure, operate to prevent your allowing your name to be used, or your opinions perverted, to the injury of me.

Please answer at your earliest convenience—as I am anxious the vindication of my *opinions* even, shall be speedy and complete.

August 12. 1855.

This letter was commenced five days since, but owing to indisposition for the last four days, has not been concluded till to-day.

Yours very truly and respectfully,
K. RAYNER.

P. S. Are there any data in your possession, by which you can identify the date of the party given by the Spanish Minister, at which the conversation took place, between the Nunico and yourself.
K. R.

Hon. DANIEL M. BARRINGER, Saratoga, N. Y.

Proscription pre-supposes existing rights of which the proscribed party is deprived. What rights have the European, Asiatic, or African, who is now residing in his native country, in the political affairs of this? None, most unquestionably. Should laws be passed circumscribing his action should he come here, and he should come in the very face of those laws, can he complain, or his friends for him, of injustice or deprivation of rights? Every right and privilege he acquires, is acquired under the law, and it is the greatest presumption for a pensioner on the bounties of a law to curse that, on which he is so dependent. In depriving a foreigner of the rights of suffrage and naturalization, until he is prepared to appreciate their exercise and enjoyment, we do him no wrong. We throw around him the protecting influences of our laws, but say, executing an imperative obligation of self protection, you cannot assist in the administration of our affairs until you are fully and properly instructed in our political system, and thoroughly understand our institutions.

We do not put them out of the protection of the law, but, on the contrary, promise it to them, and think they should be content with that much generosity for a season. We do not utterly reject them, but say, when it is prudent and safe to do so, we will admit you to rights of citizenship. We do not censure and condemn them because they are simple foreigners, but regret their childhood associations, and manhood proclivities, prevent their immediate reception to our every confidence.

Our policy towards the Catholics is condemned, and why? Our enemies say, we are making religion a test of qualification. We deny it. We say the political power claimed by the Pope, and endorsed by bishops and laity, and practiced for centuries past, is dangerous to Republican institutions; and, in view of it, we oppose the elevation to offices of great trust all who admit his claims. Their duties, under such circumstances, would be regarded as paramount to any allegiance they might owe this Republic, and because of it, we cannot possibly regard them as trusty citizens when the well being of this government was opposed to the arrogance of their Pontifical head.

History is fruitful of their crimes and persecutions, and if their tenets in times past resulted in, or prompted them to commit deeds at which the heart shudders and revolts, the same atrocities may be enacted in future. In view of their past history and action, it behooves a free people to watch and guard well their liberties. Who can object to the American party under these circumstances? We confidently believe that all good Americans must sooner or later subscribe heartily to our Platform, and make it a rule of action.—*Georgia Courier.*

TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE.—The Nashville Banner publishes a complete list of members elect to the Legislature, and says the Senate stands fourteen "Americans" to eleven Antis; the House, thirty-eight "Americans" to thirty seven Antis.

To plunge a young lady six fathoms deep in happiness, give her two canary birds, half a dozen moonbeams, twelve yards of silk, an ice cream, several rose buds, a squeeze of the hand, and the promise of a new bonnet. If she don't melt it will be because she can't.

"I like you," said a girl to her suitor, "but I can't leave home; I am a widow's only darling; no husband can equal my parent in kindness."

"She is kind," replied the wooer, "but be my wife, we will all live together, and see if I don't BEAT YOUR MOTHER!"

DESTRUCTION OF THE INQUISITION AT MADRID.

Col. Lemanouski, formerly an officer under Napoleon, now a minister of the Lutheran Church, gives the following vivid sketch of a scene, of which he was an eye-witness:

In the year 1809, being at Madrid, my attention was directed to a Roman Catholic Inquisition in the neighborhood of that city. Napoleon had previously issued a decree for the suppression of this institution wherever his victorious troops should extend their arms. I reminded Marshal Soult then Governor of Madrid, of his decree, who directed me to proceed to its execution on this far-famed establishment. With my regiment, the 9th of the Polish lancers, he gave me two others, one of which, the 117th, was under the command of Col. de Lile, who is now, like myself, a minister of the Gospel.

With these troops I proceeded to the Inquisition, which was about five miles from the city. It was surrounded by a wall of great strength, and defended by about four hundred soldiers. When we arrived at the walls, I addressed one of the sentinels, and summoned the holy fathers to surrender to the imperial army, and open the gate of the Inquisition. The sentinel, who was standing on the wall, appeared to enter into conversation for a few moments with some one within, at the close of which he presented his musket and shot one of my men. This was a signal for attack, and I ordered my troops to fire upon those who appeared on the wall.

It was soon obvious that it was an unequal warfare. Our troops were in the open plain, and exposed to a destructive fire. We had no cannon, nor could we scale the walls, and the gates successfully resisted all attemps at forcing them. I saw that it was necessary to change the mode of attack, and directed some trees to be cut down and trimmed and brought on the ground to be used as battering-rams. Presently the walls began to tremble, and, under the well-directed and persevering application of the ram, a breach was made, and the imperial troops rushed into the Inquisition.

Here we met with an incident which nothing but Jusuitical effrontery is equal to. The Inquisitor General, followed by the father confessors in their priestly robes, all came out of their rooms as we were making our way into the interior of the Inquisition, and with long faces and their arms crossed over their breasts, as though they had been deaf to all the noise of the attack and defence, and had just learned what was going on, addressed themselves in the language of rebuke to their own soldiers, saying, "Why do you fight our friends, the French?"

Their intention, apparently was to make us think that this defence was wholly unauthorized by them, hoping they should thus have a better opportunity in the confusion and plunder of the Inquisition to escape. Their artifice was too shallow. I caused them to be placed under guard, and all the soldiers of the Inquisition to be secured as prisoners.

We then proceeded through room after room—found altars and crucifixes, and wax-candles in abundance—the proportions of the architecture were perfect—the ceiling and floors were secured and highly polished—there was everything to please the eye and gratify a cultivated taste; but where were those horrid instruments of torture of which we had been told, and where those dungeons in which human beings were said to be buried alive? We searched in vain. The holy fathers assured us that they had been belied—*that we had seen all*: and I was prepared to believe it.

But Col. De Lile was not so ready to give up the search. At his instance, water was brought in and poured over the marble floor, the slabe of which were large and beautifully polished.—Presently an opening was discovered, and as all bands were at work for further discovery, a soldier with the but of his musket struck a spring, when the marble slab flew up. Then the faces of the inquisitors grew pale, and, as Belshazzar, when the hand writing appeared on the wall, so did these men of Belial shake and quake in every bone, joint, and sinew. We saw a staircaise. I stepped to a table and took one of the candles, four feet in length, which was burning, that I might explore what was before us; as I was doing this, I was arrested by one of the Inquisitors, who laid his hand gently on my arm, and with a very demure and holy look, said, "My son, you must not take that with your profane and bloody hand; it is holy." "Well, well," I said, "I want something that is holy, to see if it will not shed light on iniquity: I will bear the responsibility."

I took the candle, and proceeded down the staircase, when we entered a large room, called the Hall of Judgment. In the centre of it was a large block, and a chain fastened to it. On this they had been accustomed to place the accused, chained to his seat. On one side of the room was an elevated seat, called the Throne of Judgment. This the inquisitor-general occupied, and on either side were seats less elevated, for the holy fathers when engaged in the solemn business of the Holy Inquisition. From this room we proceeded to the right, and obtained access to small cells extending the entire length of the edifice; and here, what a sight met our eyes? How has the benevolent religion of Jesus been abused and slandered by its professed friends!

These cells were places of solitary confinement, where the wretched objects of inquisitorial hate were confined year after year, till death released them from their sufferings, and there their bodies were suffered to remain until they were entirely decayed, and the rooms had become fit for others to occupy. To prevent this practice being offensive to those who occupied the Inquisition, there were flues or tubes extending to the open air, sufficiently capacious to carry off the odor from those decaying bodies. In these cells we found the remains of some who had paid the debt of nature; some of them had been dead apparently but a short time, while of others nothing remained but their bones, still chained to the floor of their dungeon. In others we found the living sufferer of every age and of both sexes, from the young man and maiden to those of three-score and ten years, all as naked as when they were born into the world. Our soldiers immediately applied themselves to releasing these captives from their chains, stripped themselves in part of their own clothing to cover these wretched beings, and were exceedingly anxious to bring them up to the light of day. But, aware of the danger, I insisted of their wants being supplied, and that they should be brought gradually to the light, as they could bear it.

When we had explored these cells, and opened the prison doors of those who yet survived, we proceeded to explore another room on the left. Here we found the instruments of torture, of every kind which the ingenuity of men or devils could invent. At the sight of them the fury of our soldiers of the establishment deserved to be put to the torture. We did not attempt any longer to restrain them. They commenced at once the work of torture with the holy fathers. I remained till I saw four different kinds of torture applied, and then retired from the awful scene, which terminated not while one individual remained of the former guilty inmates of this ante chamber of hell, on whom they could wreak revenge. As soon as the poor sufferers from the cells of the Inquisition could with safety be brought out of their prison to the light of day, news having been spread far and near that numbers had been deprived of friends by the holy office, came to inquire if theirs were among the number.

O, what a meeting was there! about a hundred who had been buried alive for many years, were now restored to the active world, and many of them found here a son and there a daughter, here a sister and there a brother, and some, alas, could recognise no friends. The scene was such a one as no tongue can describe. When this work of recognition was over, to complete the business in which I had engaged, I went to Madrid and obtained a large quantity of gunpowder, which I placed underneath the edifice and its vaults, and as we applied the slow-match there was a joyful sight to thousands of admiring eyes. O, it would have done your heart good to see it; the walls and massive turrets of that proud edifice were raised towards the heavens, and the Inquisition of Madrid was no more.

A CONTRAST.

We have rarely read (says a late English writer) anything more simple and touching than the following contrasted poems. We cannot ascertain the name of the writer. They were cut from an old newspaper, in which they were published anonymously. They will please every reader, even those who can see no beauty in really fine poetry. And we are free to confess, however, humbling to our sex, that the pictures are true:

MAN'S LOVE.

When women's eye grows dull,
And her cheek paleth,
When fades the beautiful,
The man's love fadeth!
He sits not beside her chair,
Clapse not her fingers,
Twines not the damp hair
That o'er her brow lingers.

He comes but a moment in,
Through her eye lightens,
Through her cheek, pale and thin,
Fevereshly brightens:
He stays but a moment near,
While that flush mideth,
Though true affection's tear
Her cheek reveal shudeth.

He goes from her chamber straight
Into life's jostle:
He meets at the very gate
Business and bustle:
He thinks not of her within,
Silently sighing;
He forgets, in that noisy din,
That she is dying!

And when her heart is still,
What though he mourneth,
Soon from his sorrow chill
Wearied he turneth,
Soon o'er her buried head
Memory's light setteth,
And the true-hearted dead
Thus man forgetteth!

WOMAN'S LOVE.

When man is waxing frail,
And his hand is thin and weak,
And his lips are parched and pale,
And wan and white his cheek,
Oh! then doth woman prove
Her constancy and love!

She sitteth by his chair,
And holds his feeble hand:
She watcheth ever there,
His wants to understand;
His yet unspoken will
She hasteneth to fulfil.

She heads him, when the moon
Is bright over dale and hill,
And all things, save the time
Of the honey-bees are still,
Into the garden's bowers,
To sit 'midst herbs and flowers.

And when he goes not there,
To feed on breath and bloom,
She brings the posy rare
Into his darkened room;
And 'neath his weary head
The pillow smooth doth spread.

Until the death hour when
His lamp of life doth dim,
She never wearieth,
She never leaveth him,
Still near him night and day,
She meets his eye alway.

And when his trial's o'er,
And the turf is on his breast,
Deep in her bosom's core
Lie sorrows unexprest;
Her tears, her sighs, are weak,
Her settled grief to speak.

And though there may arise
Balm for her spirit's pain;
And though her quiet eyes
May sometimes smile again,
Still, still, she must regret—
Sh never can forget!

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, GRANVILLE COUNTY.—Superior Court of Law, Spring Term, A. D. 1855.

John West vs Susan West,—Petition for Divorce.

It appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that Susan West, the Defendant in this cause, resides beyond the limits of this State: It is therefore ordered by the Court, that advertisement be made, for six weeks successively, at the Court House in Oxford, and also in the *Raleigh Register and North Carolina Standard*, notifying the said Defendant of the filing of this petition, and that unless she appear at the next Term of this Court, to be held for the County aforesaid, at the Court House in Oxford, on the first Monday of September next, and answer said petition, the same will be taken *pro confesso* and heard *ex parte* as to her.

Witness, Eugene Grissom, Clerk of our said Court, at office in Oxford, the first Monday of March, A. D., 1855.

E. GRISSOM, C. S. C.

July 12, 1855. Pr. Adv. $5,62½. 56 w6w.

Hopkins, Hull & Co.,

WHOLESALE DRY GOODS MERCHANTS,
258 Balt. St., Baltimore.

We take this method of calling the attention of the Southern trade to our Stock of FALL & WINTER DRY GOODS. The encouragement we have met with in our endeavors to get up a better stock than has usually been kept in this market has stimulated us to improve it both in extent and variety.

Besides a full assortment of *Foreign and Domestic Staple Dry Goods*, we shall offer a large and elegant Stock of LADIES' DRESS GOODS. We shall sell at short profits, as we wish to secure the best class of trade that comes to market. Orders for goods solicited, which shall have prompt attention.

B. B. HOPKINS,
R. HULL,
WM. H. RYAN,
THO'S W. ATKINSON.

Baltimore, Aug 4, '55. 63 3m

---

100 Dollars Reward.

RANAWAY from the subscriber, on the 14th of May last, a negro man named TYRREL. He is about 19 years old, weighs 160 or 170 pounds, has rather a down look, when spoken to, and is a dark mulatto. He was raised in Chatham county, on Deep River, near the Gulf, and was purchased at the sale of Robert Parmer, deceased, by Jollee, Hanks & Co., and from them by me.

Also, on the 27th of June, a negro man BURKE, 25 years old, stout built and weighs about 180 pounds, a bright mulatto with a very freckled face and hair inclined to be red. I will give FIFTY DOLLARS, for the apprehension and confinement of either of them, or ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS for both, in any jail in the State so that I can get them.

L. H. SANDERS.

Smithfield, July 6th, 1855. 54 tf.

Wanted.

SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS, on time, secured by Mortgage on a valuable Manufacturing Mill and land adjacent, worth $18,000. Interest on the loan will be paid promptly every six months, at either Bank in the City. Apply at this office or to W. H. Jones.

Raleigh, July 3d, 1855. 53 tf.

Medical Institution of Yale College.

THE Course of Lectures for 1855-'56 will commence on Thursday, September 13th, and continue four months.

BENJAMIN SILLIMAN, M. D, LL. D. Prof. Emeritus of Chemistry and Pharmacy.

ELI IVES, M. D., Prof Emeritus of Materia Medica and Therapeutics.

JONATHAN KNIGHT, M. D., Prof of the Principles and Practice of Surgery.

TIMOTHY P. BEERS, M. D., Prof. of Obstetrics.

CHARLES HOOKER, M. D., Prof of Anatomy and Physiology.

HENRY BRONSON, M. D., Prof. of Materia Medica and Therapeutics.

WORTHINTON HOOKER, M. D., Prof. of the Theory and Practice of Physic.

BENJAMIN SILLIMAN, JR, M. D., Prof. of Chemistry and Pharmacy.

Lecture fees, $68,50. Matriculation $5. Graduation, $15.

CHAS. HOOKER, *Dean of the Faculty.*

New Haven, Aug. 9th, 1855. 64 4tpd:

WHITE BRANDY.

JUST received at No. 13 Fayetteville St., two casks of 4th proof White Brandy, for preserving fruit.

JOS. B. G. ROULHAC.

Raleigh, Aug. 6th, 1855. 63.

100,000 Copies!

Steamboat Disasters on the Western Waters, and Steamboat Directory.

THE undersigned have now in course of preparation a NEW STEAMBOAT DIRECTORY which will be issued in October next; the book will contain over two hundred pages, illustrated in the best style, and neatly bound in a durable manner. It will be one of the most interesting books ever published, and will be a book that will be interesting to all classes of people. The Steamboat Directory will contain a complete list and description of all the steamboats now afloat on the Western and Southern waters. The length, model, speed, power, and tonnage of each Boat, where and by whom built, the name of the boat with the trade she is in. Also, the Directory will contain a history of Steamboats and Steamboating on the Western waters, since the application of steam: also, a sketch of the first boat built for the Ohio river, with the name of the builder, commander, and owner.

The River Directory will contain a list and description of all the Steamboat Disasters that have occurred on the Western and Southern waters, beautifully illustrated, with a list of all those who have perished by their burning