

# THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES,  
Editors & Proprietors.

"KEEP A CHECK UPON ALL YOUR  
RULES."



"DO THIS, AND LIBERTY IS SAFE."  
Genl Harrison.

NEW SERIES.  
VOLUME VI—NUMBER 22.

SALISBURY, N. C., THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1849.

## OFFICIAL PAPERS RELATING TO THE DIPLOMATIC MISUN- DERSTANDING BETWEEN THE GOVERN- MENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE MINISTER OF FRANCE TO THIS COUNTRY.

Translation of a note from the Minister Plenipotentiary of France.

LEGATION OF FRANCE IN THE U. STATES,  
WASHINGTON, February 7, 1849.

SIR: The Minister of Foreign Affairs has submitted to me a claim, brought by a Frenchman, established in Mexico, named M. A. Port, for indemnification for damages sustained by him from the acts of certain agents of the Army of the United States, in consequence of the sale of five hundred bales of tobacco, which had been adjudged to him. A Court of Equity assembled at Puebla, has already pronounced upon this affair, and the decision of this court has been approved and considered as definitive by General Scott. General Butler, who succeeded the latter in the command, did, not, however, wish to deprive Mr. Port of the faculty of appealing to higher authority, and he gave orders to Colonel Childs, the Commandant of the city of Puebla, to lay all the circumstances of his claim immediately before the Secretary of War of the United States.

From what has been said above, it appears that the Government of the United States has already taken up the matter, which I am charged to prosecute here. I pray you, sir, to do me the favor to inform me what issue your Government intends to give to the claim of Mr. Port.

I embrace this occasion to assure you, sir, of my high consideration.

GUILLEAUME TELL POUSSIN.  
To the Hon. J. M. CLAYTON, Sec. of State.

Note from M. Poussin to the Secretary of State.  
WASHINGTON, March 23, 1849.

M. Poussin presents his compliments to Mr. Clayton, and would be happy to know of a favorable decision on M. J. A. Port's claims submitted to the honorable the Secretary on Saturday, the 17th.

M. A. Port is waiting anxiously for the issue of his just claim previous to leaving for Puebla, in Mexico, where he is established.

Note from M. Poussin, to Mr. Clayton.  
WASHINGTON, March 28, 1849.

The undersigned presents his compliments to Mr. Clayton, and respectfully begs to be informed whether, as it was promised, M. Port's claim is under his consideration; this gentleman's presence at Washington, to the great disadvantage of his business at Mexico, being entirely depending upon the issue of his claim.

The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity to renew to Mr. Clayton the expression of his high consideration.

GUILLEAUME TELL POUSSIN.  
Hon. J. M. CLAYTON.

Letter from Mr. Clayton, Secretary of State, to Mr. Poussin.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, March 28, 1849.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 7th ultimo upon the subject of the claim of Mr. A. Port, a French citizen domiciled in Mexico, arising from his having been deprived by orders of the United States General in command at Puebla of 500 bales of tobacco which he had purchased at a public sale under the authority of Colonel Childs, who previously commanded at the same place. Your note having been referred to the Secretary of War for information, I have the honor to communicate a copy of his reply under date of the 1st instant, of the documents by which it was accompanied.

After a careful consideration of these papers in connection with those which accompanied your note, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Port had no just cause to be dissatisfied with the award of the Military Court of Inquiry which was convened at Puebla for the purpose of examining the conflicting claims to the tobacco in controversy. Under these circumstances no sufficient reason is perceived for disturbing the decision of that Court.

I avail myself of this occasion to offer to you renewed assurances of my very distinguished consideration.

JOHN M. CLAYTON.

Translation of a note from the Minister Plenipotentiary of France.

LEGATION OF FRANCE,  
WASHINGTON, March 30, 1849.

To the Hon. J. M. CLAYTON, Sec. of State.

SIR: I received on the 28th instant the letter with which you honored me, in answer to mine, requesting your attention to the demand of Mr. A. Port, a French citizen, residing in Mexico, in appeal from a decision, given at Puebla on the 20th of November, 1847, by a military court. The claimant does not now attack the whole effect of this decision; five hundred bales of tobacco, which had been sold to him by the American authorities, have been taken from him by those same authorities. Mr. Port does not ask that these orders, long since executed, should be declared void; but as, in consequence of the annulment of the sale thus made to him, his interests have been really damaged, he claims a fair indemnification for his losses.

In support of this claim, I shall present the following summary of the circumstances on which it is founded.

On the 16th of October, 1847, Captain Webster caused a notice, to the following effect, to be posted up in the principal streets and squares of the city of Puebla:

"NOTICE.  
"OCTOBER 16, 1847.—On the 19th instant, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, will be sold at auction, at the Barracks of San Jose, 500 bales of tobacco."

Mr. Port appeared as a bidder; and the tobacco was assigned to him, as the purchaser offering the highest price. Mr. Port bought it at twenty-four dollars the bale; on the 27th of October he sold it to M. Abadie at thirty-three dollars; and on the 13th of November M. Ab-

adie sold it to Musquis, the agent of Messrs. Gamio & Co. Meanwhile Mr. Port received from Captain Webster a letter, dated October 30th, in the following terms:

"SIR: Be so kind as to suspend for a moment the sale of the tobacco which you purchased from me; you perhaps know that it is all claimed by Mr. Domercq."

Mr. Port was in fact not ignorant that M. Domercq had said he was the owner of the tobacco on the day before; but as he had already sold the merchandise, and considered himself entitled to regard the sale made to him by the American authorities good and solid, he answered as follows on the 31st of October:

"To Captain WEBSTER. SIR: I have the honor to answer your letter of the 30th instant; and I inform you that I sold the five hundred bales of tobacco to M. Abadie on the 27th of this month."

It was not until the 29th of October that M. Domercq addressed his claim to Brigadier General Lane; he established his title to the ownership of the tobacco; he proved that the tobacco had been sold to him on the 6th of June, by the orders of Major General Worth; and on the 30th of November a military court decreed that the merchandise should be restored to him in despite of the construct afterwards made with M. Port. On the 30th November an officer and eight soldiers of the American army, charged with effecting the restoration, broke open the doors of the store house, where M. Port had deposited the tobacco, and he was deprived of it.

M. Port had in the interval resold the merchandise of which he was thus stripped, and had cleared \$4,500 nett upon the operation; he bought at \$12,000 and sold at \$16,500. This sum was paid to him at Puebla on the 5th of November, 1847; and he was thus forced to give it back, as the annulment of the sale which had been made to him involved the annulment of the sale which he himself had made; and he thereby lost \$4,500, which, after entering legitimately and positively into his possession, was to be taken from him by the act of the American authorities. This is not all. M. Abadie, on his part, had realized a profit of \$1,000 on the tobacco, as he had sold for \$17,500 what he had bought at \$16,500. This profit he lost in consequence of the annulment of the sale; and, availing himself of his remedy against the seller, he summoned M. Port to restore to him the sum of \$1,000, which added to the \$4,500 already lost by M. Port raised the entire loss of the latter to \$5,500.—This is the amount now claimed by M. Port.

These facts speak clearly enough of themselves; too clearly to require any long observations upon them. What, then, are the objections made to them?

Here, sir, I am led to examine the documents which accompanied your answer of the 28th instant. You there inform me, very briefly, and without even indicating the reasons on which your decision rests, that, after comparing the documents sent to me with those which I had presented to you, you have been led to the conclusion that M. Port has no right to be dissatisfied with the decision given against him.

What are these documents which, when compared with those furnished by M. Port, are in your opinion calculated to invalidate our claim? Allow me, sir, to examine them in an order different from that in which you present them to me.

I find, in the first place, a letter from Capt. Webster to the Secretary of War, dated February 25, 1849; and, after attentively reading it so far from finding any new facts, it only corroborates, in my judgement, the statements of M. Port. It is therefore not this letter which could have dictated your decision.

I find, in the second place, two letters, dated the 7th of March, 1848, one from Major General Butler to the Secretary of War, the other from Mr. Lay to Col. Childs. The first letter informs the Government of the United States that Col. Childs has received orders to address directly to Washington a detailed report of the affair of M. Port; the second letter contains this order, sent to Col. Childs by Mr. Lay on the name of Major General Butler.—The order seems to have been entirely forgotten by Col. Childs. Without insisting upon this, however, I merely establish here that those letters do not in any way affect the affirmations of M. Port.

I will say the same of a voluminous paper containing the details of proceedings before a military court assembled at Puebla on the 9th of May, 1848. The decision of this court, which establishes the ownership of M. Domercq, is utterly foreign to our claim, as our claim is not against the right of M. Domercq to the ownership of the tobacco, but it is simply a demand for indemnification for the losses sustained by M. Port in consequence of the violent seizure of that property from him.

I come at last, Mr. Secretary of State, to two documents, the only ones which could have led you to refuse to admit the claim presented to you by me. These are two letters from Col. Childs to the Secretary of War, the one dated February 23, 1848, the other February 23, 1849. These two letters agree well enough with each other; they both impute fraudulent manoeuvres to M. Port, and accuse him of collusion with M. Wengierski, the secretary and interpreter of Col. Childs.

This accusation, sir, is one of such a character that it should not be made on light grounds. If Col. Childs can furnish the proof of what he advances as a fact, he ought to do so; or, rather, he should have done so on the day when he ventured to appear as an accuser. The very words of the deposition made by Col. Childs on the 19th of November, 1847, before the military court at Puebla desire to be here quoted.—"The witness is of opinion," says the deposition, "that M. Port was in collusion with his secretary; that they had a criminal understanding with each other to speculate in the tobacco; to the injury of the first purchaser, Domercq. His reason for this opinion is, that so large a quantity of tobacco could not have been sold in Puebla without the fact being known to all the tobacco dealers. Col. Childs's secretary died a short time after the sale made by the Quartermaster. Col. Childs has every reason to believe that his secretary was to receive two

dollars per bale from the last purchaser, M. Port, and he has been informed that one thousand dollars were due to the estate of Wengierski by M. Port, which he had not thought proper to collect before the termination of the case at Puebla."

Now, what do we find in this evidence?—1. That M. Port has been guilty of collusion with the secretary of Col. Childs; 2. that, in consequence of speculations made in concert with M. Wengierski, Mr. Port owes the latter person \$1,000.

In order to establish the fact of collusion Col. Childs reasons thus: The sale made to M. Domercq was public, and it is, therefore, impossible that all the tobacco dealers at Puebla should not have been informed of it.

To this reasoning I have five objections to offer: 1. M. Port is not a tobacco dealer; 2. M. Port was absent from Puebla on the 20th of May, 1847, the day on which the sale of the tobacco was ordered to Major Gen. Worth; he was also absent on the 25th of May, when the sale was made by Capt. Allen to Mr. Hargous; and he was moreover absent on the 12th of June, when the tobacco was sold and delivered to M. Domercq. M. Port thus might well have been ignorant of the two sales made by order of Gen. Worth. 3. M. Port affirms that he never had any private relations with M. Wengierski, nor any proof is brought against this affirmation; 4. M. Port who returned to Puebla in the beginning of August, and who, since that time, rendered more than one service to the American army, quitted Puebla again on the 10th of September, 1847, and did not return until the 15th of October, 1847. The sale of the tobacco was advertised on the 16th of October, the day after M. Port's return, and he could, therefore, have had only a few hours to enter into any arrangements as to this sale with Col. Childs's secretary. 5. One of the documents which you, sir, sent to me on the 28th of March, the letter from Capt. Webster to the Secretary of War, dated February 25, 1849, proves that Col. Childs's secretary, M. Wengierski, addressed Capt. Webster, and declared to him that he would himself purchase the tobacco at \$24 the bale. M. Port bought it at \$24; and there could, in consequence, have been no collusion between M. Port and Col. Childs's secretary, because they were both bidders, and the one overbid the other. It is not easy to discover what could have been the object of such a manoeuvre in the case in question.

To Colonel Childs's second allegation, that M. Port owed \$1,000 to M. Wengierski at the time of the death of the latter, I answer, in M. Port's name, by a formal denial; and Col. Childs is summoned to demand that sum of M. Port, provided that he can establish the indebtedness of M. Port to M. Wengierski.

Such, Mr. Secretary, are, on the one hand, the allegations of Col. Childs, and on the other, the answers which we make to them.

Allow me, sir, in concluding, to remark upon the strangeness of the position assumed by Col. Childs. The Legation of France cannot and will not make itself the echo of the reports, more or less well founded, which have been current with regard to Col. Childs's conduct in this affair; nor will it press certain facts imputed against him, which it would be perhaps easier to prove than he could prove the charges brought by himself. The Legation of France has no concern with these allegations, divested of proof, against the honor of a man whose good faith should not be questioned. It would, however, be very easy at any time to get rid of a contract and to put down just claims if nothing more were necessary for the purpose than to reply to the claimant by insult and defamation.

I venture, Mr. Secretary of State, to hope, while I pray you again to examine this case, that you obtain from the Government of the U. States a determination more favorable than that which you have announced in your letter of the 28th of March, 1849.

Accept, sir, I pray you, the assurances of my very high consideration.

GUILLEAUME TELL POUSSIN.

The Secretary of State to M. Poussin.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
WASHINGTON, April 10, 1849.

SIR: I have had the honor to receive your note of the 30th ultimo, in reply to that of the 28th, addressed to you by this Department, on the subject of the claim of Mr. A. Port, a French citizen, against the Government of the United States. You are correct in saying that I did not set forth at length the reasons which led me to the conclusion communicated in that note. This, however, must be imputed to no doubt on my part as to the adequacy of those reasons, but to a presumption that you would necessarily arrive at the same conclusion if you bestowed upon the documents a full examination. In the correctness of most of the facts stated in your brief note of the case I entirely concur, but you mention one which I can nowhere find substantiated by the evidence, and to which it is important I should at the outset invite your attention. You observe, "Mr. Port was in fact not ignorant that M. Domercq had said that he was the owner of the tobacco on the day before," [20th October.] Not being able to find any proof of this statement, I must be allowed to ascribe it either to an oversight on your part, or to a design to convey an impression that Mr. Port was not aware that Mr. Domercq was the owner of the tobacco until that time. No such impression is warranted by the testimony. On the trial of the case before the military court at Puebla, Mr. Domercq, at Mr. Port's own request, was examined as a witness in his behalf. The following is a material part of his examination:

"Question. Did I not, on several occasions, inform you that I intended to buy the tobacco. Answer. The first time I ever heard any thing on the subject was one day when Port called on my hearing on the son of the Spanish Consul and asked him if he did not wish to join him in the purchase of the tobacco? The reply to which was, No; for it is the property of a friend, and you will make yourself liable to a claimant. Some day or two after Port told witness he had purchased 500 bales of the tobacco, and asked him if he did not wish to join

him in the purchase, to which he replied in the negative, for he did not wish to buy his own property. Port answered, that made no difference, that he could always interpose his claims."

Now, it seems to me, sir, that this establishment in the most positive and irrefragable manner the fact that, prior to the sale of the tobacco to him, under the authority of the United States, Mr. Port was aware that the tobacco was private property, and that the sale was about to be made in ignorance of that fact.—This testimony is confirmed by circumstances mentioned in the testimony of Colonel Childs in his examination before the same court.—Sensible, apparently, of the importance of showing that Mr. Port, when the tobacco was sold to him, did not know that the United States were without title to it, you endeavor to invalidate the testimony of Colonel Childs, by asserting that Mr. Port could have had no knowledge of the previous sale of the tobacco, because he was not in Puebla at the time of the sale to Mr. Hargous or to Mr. Domercq; that he left that city on the 10th of September, 1847, and did not return until the 15th of October, the day before the advertisement of the sale at which he purchased. Supposing these allegations to be true, (and I do not question that you believe them,) it is strange that no proof of them was adduced before the military court at Puebla. Had this been done, it cannot be doubted that the weight would have been allowed to them. Inasmuch, however, as they rest on the statement of no witness, in considering the testimony I am under the necessity of rejecting them entirely."

You also deny the assertion of Col. Childs that Mr. Port was a tobacco dealer. By this you doubtless intend to repel the presumption that he could not have taken such an interest in the transactions in that article at Puebla as must necessarily have led to a knowledge of the previous sales of the tobacco. It may be that business in tobacco was not Mr. Port's sole business, but the very fact of his purchase and sale in this instance is a sufficient answer to the unqualified statement that he was not a tobacco dealer.

If, therefore, the legal testimony only in the case as it stands be regarded, I must deem it incontestable that Mr. Port, at the time he made the purchase, was privy to the fact that the tobacco was private property. Now, it is presumed that you would not claim on his behalf from the United States more than the Mexican courts would have awarded to him, supposing that he had knowingly bought the property of an individual which the seller, also an individual, had sold without being aware of the true owner, and which property was subsequently restored to the true owner by process of law. If I am correctly informed, the Mexican law declares that in such a case the purchaser shall not only not recover damages of the seller, but shall not even be entitled to a return of the purchase money.

These, sir, are the grounds for my opinion that the military court at Puebla, in decreeing to Mr. Port a restitution of the money which he had paid for the tobacco with interest thereon, had rendered him substantial justice, and that it was no part of their duty, nor is it now the duty of this Government, to guaranty the speculations made by him in an article purchased under such circumstances. This opinion is not, in my judgment, shaken by the remarks contained in your note.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, sir, the assurance of my high consideration.

J. M. CLAYTON.

To WM. TELL POUSSIN, &c.

Translation of a Note from the Minister Plenipotentiary of France.

LEGATION OF FRANCE,  
WASHINGTON, April 11, 1849.

To the Hon. J. M. CLAYTON, Secretary.

SIR: I received on the 10th instant the letter which you did me the honor to address to me, in answer to one wherein I presented the principal reasons which should, in my opinion, induce you to admit the claim of M. A. Port.

You endeavor to establish in that letter that M. Port knew, at the moment when he became the purchaser of the tobacco, that it was the property of M. Domercq, and not of the United States; then, proceeding upon this hypothesis, you go on to say that M. Port, so far from being entitled to reimbursement of the sums lost by him in consequence of the annulment of the sale made by him to M. Abadie, did not even deserve to have restored to him the sums which he had paid into the hands of Quartermaster Webster as the price of what he had bought from the United States.

Permit me, Mr. Secretary of State, to observe to you that, in reasoning thus, you go, rather singularly, beyond the decision of the court martial held at Puebla on the 17th of November, 1847.

This military court, which permitted Colonel Childs to carry out, without interruption, his string of calumnies incredible, was certainly by no means over favorable to M. Port, yet it refused to recognize in M. Port that bad faith which, in your opinion, might relieve the United States Government from the charge of returning to this Frenchman the sums paid by him into the American coffers, and employed for the support of the army.

It is among the evidence given before this court, which did not admit the charge of bad faith, that you seek for proofs of that bad faith. You cite with this object the questions addressed by M. Port to M. Domercq, and the answers given by the latter. It would be easy, Mr. Secretary of State, for me, by examining each word of this portion of the inquiries, to establish beyond question that, so far from its being against us, it serves effectually to overthrow the allegations of Col. Childs; but I shall limit myself to an account of the explanations given on this subject by M. Domercq himself to the Legation of France, on the 12th of April, 1849. M. Domercq then declared—

"In fact, however, the sale did not take place until the 21st October, which afforded Mr. Port ample leisure to make such arrangements and acquire such information as he might have deemed necessary for his interests."

1. That, while in Puebla, he gave no notice whatsoever, in a direct manner, to M. Port, before the day of the sale of the five hundred bales of tobacco.

2. That, while at Puebla, he did not, except on the 19th of October, address to Col. Childs a secretary his claims, which, from reasons that we do not and we wish not to learn, remained without effect.

3. That the conversation between M. Port and the son of the Spanish Consul, to which allusion was made in the court at Puebla, may have related, not to the five hundred bales of tobacco already bought by M. Port, but to the other lots of the same tobacco which were afterwards to be sold at the same place.

These declarations, sir, are in support of those of M. Port. I do not, therefore, hesitate to believe that, taking into consideration the different proofs which favor M. Port, and admitting, on the other hand, that a man should always be considered as acting in good faith until the contrary be proved, you will acknowledge the good faith of M. Port.

I have yet, sir, to answer two objections which you have made to the reasoning contained in my letter of the 30th.

When I told you that M. Port is not a tobacco dealer, I meant this in answer to the deposition of Col. Childs, where he uses these words: "Witness is of opinion that M. Port has rendered himself guilty of collusion with his secretary; that they had a criminal understanding with each other, to speculate in the tobacco, to the injury of the first purchaser, Domercq. His reason for this opinion is, that so large a quantity of tobacco could not have been sold in Puebla without the fact being known to all the tobacco dealers."

My reasoning was this: a man not habitually engaged in the tobacco trade, but who entered into it once only when seduced by opportunity, may very fairly be supposed to be ignorant of the special operations of that business, which tobacco dealers alone are interested in learning; but, even if M. Port were a tobacco dealer, does it not necessarily follow, as Col. Childs concludes, that he must have engaged in a criminal understanding with M. Wengierski, and have rendered himself guilty of collusion? Really, sir, if there is in all this an unqualified assertion, it is mine, but that of Col. Childs, which you have not hesitated to endorse.

Finally, Mr. Secretary of State, I said, in my note of the 30th, that M. Port quitted Puebla on the 10th of September, and did not return until the 15th of October, 1847. You answer, that this assertion of mine is not supported by any evidence, and you therefore consider yourself justified in rejecting it entirely. I shall therefore annex to this letter some documents, the mere reading of which should convince you of the reality of the statement made by me; and you will also see that that the Legation of France, which would never consent to become the organ of a criminal accusation without proofs, does not venture, without proofs, to advance an assertion of a fact of the most innocent nature.

Allow me to hope, Mr. Secretary of State, that this letter may be the last of a correspondence which has been already too long, on an affair so clear. [The Government of the United States must be convinced that it is more honorable to acquit fairly a debt contracted during war, under the pressure of necessity, than to avoid its payment by endeavoring to brand the character of an honest man.]

Accept, I pray you, sir, the assurance of my high consideration.

GUILLEAUME TELL POUSSIN.

[This passage in the above letter included within brackets is that which was subsequently withdrawn by Mr. Poussin.]

Documents accompanying the letter from the French Minister of April—, 1849.

No. 1.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE COM. GENERAL OF THE FREE STATE OF PUEBLA, ATLIXCO, October 13, 1847.

I, the Commandant General of Division, commanding the State of Puebla, grant a safe conduct to the French citizen Alexis Port, who goes to Puebla on private business. In virtue thereof, the men under my command are forbidden to oppose his passage, or to interrupt or injure him in any way.

JUAN ALVAREZ.  
MEXICAN LEGATION,  
WASHINGTON, April 18, 1849.

I certify that the above is the signature of the Commandant General of the State of Puebla.

LUIS DE LA ROSA.

No. 2.

ATLIXCO, May 30, 1847.

T. M. ALEXIS PORT, At the Mills of Chietla.  
MY DEAR FRIEND: M. Santiago Lorea does me the favor to allow his son, Don Juanito, to go and assist you at the Mill, whilst I am kept in bed.

I cannot be at the Mill for eight days. Compliments to our friends, &c.

FUENTES DE MARIA.

No. 3.

PUEBLA, October 3, 1847.

To M. ALEXIS PORT, At Atlixco.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just received a letter from Abadie, in which I find enclosed another for you, (addressed to Puebla,) which I hasten to send you.

I hope to see you on Tuesday or Wednesday next. Meanwhile I send you my compliments, &c. Your friend,

A. LATAPPE.

No. 4.

CHIETLA, October 12, 1847.

To M. ALEXIS PORT, At Atlixco.  
MY DEAR FRIEND: It is only from forgetfulness that I have not before answered your letter of the 1st of September last, containing your account. On this subject I must observe to you.

Do not fail to write me all the news, which you may hear from certain sources. I am, &c.,

J. FUENTES DE MORIA.  
(Concluded next week.)

Attempt at Suicide.—George Riley, Bricklayer, attempted to kill himself on Monday morning, by cutting his throat, but was not quite successful, and still lives. The cause of his attempt is not known. Wilmington Chronicle.

Shot in a row.—John Wright, a free man of color, was shot in the head with a gun on Monday morning, by James Franklin, another man of the same class, the two being engaged in a quarrel at the time in the Northeastern part of the town.

16.

Terms of the Watchman.—Subscription, per year, Two DOLLARS—monthly in advance. Two dollars for each subsequent insertion. Court orders charged 25 per cent. higher than these rates. A liberal deduction to those who advertise by the year. To the Editors must be post paid.

WHAT HAS HE BEEN?  
What is that to you? It is of no consequence to you. He has been one of the most abandoned of men. He is not so now. We care not what a man has done, provided he has heartily repented and now strives to live an upright, consistent life. Instead of looking back a dozen or twenty years to know what a person is, you should inquire, "What is he now?" What is his present character? If you find that his reformation is sincere, and that he laments his past errors, take him cordially by the hand and assist him in his noble pursuit. We will aid him God-speed in his noble pursuit. We will have no friends to those who would rake up past sins and vices, to condemn one who is resolved to be upright and virtuous. Many a person is driven back to the paths of vice, who might have become an ornament to society, but for the disposition, too common among men, to rake up and drag to the light, long-forgotten iniquities. We always admired the reply of a daughter to her father, who was asked respecting a man of her acquaintance, "Do you know where he comes from?" "No," replied the girl, "I do not know where he comes from, but I know where he is going, and I wish to go with him." This is right. If we see a person on the right track—exerting a good influence; if we see a man, without inquiring what has been his character heretofore. If he has reformed, let us more than desire?—and what benefit will it be to us to uncover and expose to the world the deeds of which he is heartily ashamed, and of which he has repented in dust and ashes? Wright's Casket.

THE WASP.  
The manufacture of paper, the secret of which was not discovered for centuries, has been carried on by the wasp ever since the creation. They make it in the same way and of the same materials employed for the present day. In selecting the appropriate materials, the insect is peculiarly fastidious and is cautious to take nothing which is not of filamentary nature, as the pulp of linen rags. It consequently rejects sawdust and everything of that kind, and resorts to the filaments of wet wood and decayed vegetable, which have rotted in the rain. These are worked up by means of a glutinous secretion, converted into waste and rolled into a ball, which is easily covered to the spot where it is required.—The substance of this ball is then rolled off in threads, and these, by the constant passing and passing of the animal over them, are consolidated into sheets of sufficient strength and hardness to resist the rain. With all the aids of chemistry and machinery, men are now manufacturing paper in substantially the same way this insignificant insect has done for thousands of years.—Y. Y. Sun.

TWO IN A BED.  
Ned and Charley were two room mates, but they occupied different beds. Ned's sleeping apparatus was so situated that he could get in either side—that is to say there were two fore sides to his bed, and no back side which Ned found very convenient.

One night Ned and Charley had been out and on returning, which they did near morning, they were considerably elevated. However, they walked up to their rooms with an air that seemed to say "not so very darned drunk after all," and sought long and patiently for a lamp. After knocking the pitcher on the washstand and smashing the looking glass they finally gave up the search and went to bed.

"Went to bed"—yes, that's the word, but owing to the darkness, and the confusion of their senses, they made a slight mistake. In short, Ned's bed had the honor of receiving the two companions rolling in on the other.

"I say, Ned," cried Charley touching somebody's calf; "there's a fellow in my bed!"

"Wonderful coincidence!" exclaimed Ned, "there's a strange fellow in the region of his hip, there's somebody in my bed too."

"Is there, though?" cried Charley, "let's look 'em over." "Agreed," said Ned.

And accordingly the two friends began to look. It lasted about a minute and a half, and Ned was sprawling on the floor; Charley was in possession of the bed. For a moment all was silent.

"I say, Ned," cried Charley.  
"What?" asked Ned sulkily.  
"I've kicked my fellow out!"

"You are a devilish sight luckier than I am, Ned," said Ned, "for mine has kicked me out."

Spirit of the Times.

DESPERATE BRAVERY.

Tr