

eration should prompt a forbearance to exercise that right. If more were intended than meets the eye, more than to proclaim the theoretic right of discussion—if it were designed to announce the right of unremitted agitation, to continue the distractions of the country, and, finally, if possible to repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, patriotism and harmony must condemn the unwise course as fraught with the most mischievous and perilous consequences.

But we must make some allowance for human frailty and inordinate pride of opinion. Many persons at the North had avowed an invincible hostility to the fugitive law, and even declared their intention forcibly to obstruct its execution, and had appealed to a higher law, which, as they contended, was paramount to all human legislation. These untenable positions were wholly irreconcilable with patriotism, or even with the existence of regular government itself. Obeying the dictates, it is to be hoped, of wiser and purer, and more social counsels, the parties who, under the impulses of passion and fanaticism, had assumed, have now abandoned them, and acknowledged their unquestionable duty to submit to the law, until it is modified or repealed by competent authority. In descending from the high and perilous ground, which they could not safely occupy, to that of conceding the obligation of submission to the law, we discern, I hope, a just homage to the dictates of civilization, and to the duties of established government. If they have coupled with this proper concession the useless reservation of a right of discussion, and of insisting upon a repeal or the amendment of a law to which they had taken exception, may we not hope that their purpose was only to secure a decent retreat, with a secret and patriotic determination to forbear from disturbing that return to harmony and tranquility, so necessary to the safety and prosperity of the Union? Should it turn out otherwise—should the reckless spirit of agitation continue to disturb and distract our country—to array section against section, and to threaten the stability of the government—my confidence is unshaken in the great body of our Northern fellow-citizens, that they will, in due time, and in a right manner, apply an appropriate and effectual corrective.

In turning our attention to the South, and to the slaveholding states, we behold enough to encourage their friends of the Union, and but little to excite solicitude and alarm. In all those states, except three, there is an acquiescence in the terms of the compromise, and a firm attachment to the Union. In two of those three, (Georgia and Mississippi) we have much reason to hope, from their known patriotism and intelligence, that the same attachment exists on the part of large majorities of the people. At all events, those among them, of whose devotion and fidelity to the Union serious apprehensions were entertained, have been constrained, in deference to public opinion materially to change their principles, and to go to the polls upon a new issue. They have renounced and denounced the practical right of secession at present, and taken shelter under the convenient mask of the mere abstract right. Whether this shifting of position will satisfy the people of those two states, remains to be seen. They will doubtless seriously consider, that there is but a short step between the theoretic assertion, and practical exercise of that right; and in a contingency, neither remote nor improbable, if they affirm the right, they may be soon called upon to involve themselves in all the calamitous evils of a civil war.

South Carolina alone furnishes at present occasion for profound regret and serious apprehension; not so much for the security of the Union as for her own peace and prosperity. We are compelled, painfully and reluctantly, to yield to the force of concurring evidence, establishing that there exists in that State general dissatisfaction with, and a general desire to withdraw from, the Union; and that both parties—that which is for separate State action, and that which insist upon the necessity of the co-operation of other States—equally agree as to the expediency of secession, and differ only in the degree of rashness or prudence which characterizes them respectively.

Nullification and secession have sprung from the same metaphysical school: and the latter is the ally, if not the offspring of the former. They both agree that a single State is invested with power to nullify the laws of all the other States, passed by Congress; but nullification claims a right to accomplish that object, and to remain at the same time in the Union; whilst secession asserts a right to attain it, by withdrawing from the Union, and absolving the State from all obligation to the Constitution and laws of the United States. They both maintain that a resort to either process is peaceful and legitimate. Nullification derived an ambiguous but contested support from the memorable resolutions of the States of Virginia and Kentucky, and adopted in 1798-9; but these resolutions afford no color or countenance to the pretensions of secession.

The doctrine of secession assumes, that any one of the thirty-one States composing the Union, wherever or however situated, whether in the interior or on the frontier, has a right, upon its own separate will, and according to the dictates of its exclusive judgment, to withdraw from the Union whenever it pleases; and that this act of secession is peaceful, and not to be controverted or obstructed by the rest of the States, or the application of any force, within the limits of the seceding State to execute the laws of the United States, and that thereupon, the State and its citizens are absolved from all obligations and duties to the United States, and becomes a power independent and sovereign as any of the nations of the earth. The doctrine maintains that a right of secession may be

exercised whenever the State deems it has sufficient cause; at all times—in a state of profound peace and prosperity, or in the midst of a furious war; ranging in all our borders; and that, in the latter case, transforming itself into a distinct and independent nation, it may escape the calamities of war, make a separate treaty of peace with the common enemy, become neutral, or even ally with that enemy, and take up arms against the United States.

It asserts this right, although it may lead, in process of time, to the promiscuous dotting over, upon the surface of the territory of the United States, of petty independent nations, establishing for themselves any form of government, free or despotic, known to mankind, and interrupting the intercourse and violating or menacing the execution of the laws of the dismembered confederacy. It contends for this right, as well for Louisiana as for South Carolina, although the province of Louisiana cost us so much money, and was high involving us in a foreign war; for Texas, although it occasioned us a war with Mexico, the payment of ten millions of dollars to arrange its boundaries and to acquire it, many were willing to risk a war with England; and for distant California, although that was acquired by the double title of conquest and the payment of an ample pecuniary consideration.

If, indeed, the Union, under which we have so long and generally so happily lived, be thus fragile and liable to crumble in pieces we must cease to boast of the wisdom of our forefathers who framed it—tear from our hearts the sentiments of gratitude and veneration with which they had inspired us, and no longer expect an enlightened world to bestow the unbounded praise which it has hitherto lavished on them. A doctrine so extraordinary and indefensible, fraught with the destruction of the Union, and such other direful consequences, finds no encouragement or support in the constitution of the United States. It had none under the articles of confederation, which formed in terms a perpetual Union, however otherwise weak and inefficient the government was which they established. That inefficiency arose out of the fact, that it operated not on the people directly, but upon the States, which might, and often did, fail to comply with the requisitions made on them by Congress. To correct that defect, and to form a more perfect Union, the present constitution was adopted. It had been alleged that the union of the States, under the articles of confederation, was held together only by a rope of sand; but it was a rope of adamant, compared with the cord which now binds us, if the right of secession is sanctioned and sustained.

The Constitution of the United States established a Government, and like all Governments, it was to be perpetual, or to have unlimited duration. It was not restricted to the existing generation, but comprehended posterity. The preamble declares that "we, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." It makes provision expressly for the admission of new States into the Union; but, from the beginning to the end of it, not a clause is to be found which gives any authority or color to the right of secession of a State once admitted into the Union.

The partisans of this novel and strange doctrine attempt to support it on two grounds: First, they contend, that by an express amendment of the Constitution—as all powers not granted to the Government of the United States are reserved to the States or to the people—the power or right of secession is not granted, and that is therefore retained by the States and the people, and may be exercised at their pleasure.

This argument is refuted by either of two sufficient answers. The contested power cannot be retained, if its reservation is incompatible with the obligations of the constitutional compact. But the Constitution was intended to be perpetual, or, which is the same thing, to be of unlimited existence, subject only, from time to time, to such amendments as might be made, in the mode which it specifies. It created a more perfect Union, which was to secure the blessings of liberty to the generation which formed it, and to their posterity. The obligation which each State voluntarily assumed to the other States, by being admitted into the Union, was, that it would remain perpetually bound to the other States to preserve that Union for their own benefit, and to ensure to the benefit of posterity. To assert, in the face of that obligation, that a State may retire from the Union whenever it pleases, is to assert that a party, bound by a solemn compact to other parties, may cancel or violate the compact, whenever it thinks proper, without their consent. In order to secure respect and submission to the Union, the Constitution expressly provides "that this Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Thus each and every one of the States has agreed not only that its ordinary legislation, but that its Constitution, the higher law made by the people in convention, shall, in any cases of conflict, be subordinate to the paramount authority of the Constitution, laws made in pursuance thereof, and treaties of the United States. If, therefore, any State were—either in its Legislature, or in a convention of delegates of the people—to declare, by the most formal act, that it has seceded from the Union, such act would be nugatory and an absolute nullity, and the people of that State would remain bound by the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, as fully and perfectly as if the act had never been proclaimed.

But there is another view also conclusive against the pretension of secession, being a power reserved to the States under the amendment of the Constitution referred to. The reservation of a power implies its existence in the party reserving it prior to such reservation. But when a State existed in its independent, separate, and unassociated character, it would have no right of secession, there being no con-

federacy or other party from which to secede. Secession is incident to union or confederacy, without which it can have no existence, and, unless it is clearly provided for in the compact of Union out of which it springs, and still more, if it be utterly irreconcilable with that compact, it can have no constitutional or legitimate foundation.

It is contended, however, in the second place, that the right of secession appertains to the States, under and in virtue of their sovereignty. This argument scorns any reliance upon the reservation of powers in the Constitution, cuts loose from all the obligations in that instrument, defies the power and authority of the General Government, and finds a solution of the authority for secession in the sovereignty of the States. What that sovereignty is, it does not deign to define or explain, nor to show how one of its attributes is to disregard and violate grave compacts.

The sovereignty of the States, prior to the adoption of the present Constitution, was limited and qualified by the articles of confederation. They had agreed among themselves to create a perpetual Union. When, therefore, the thirteen original States passed from under those articles to the Constitution, they passed from a less to a more perfect Union, and agreed to further limitations upon their sovereignty.

Under the present Constitution, among the limitations and prohibitions upon the sovereignty of the States, it is expressly provided that "no State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation, grant letters of marque and reprisal, coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts;" and "no State shall without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will admit of no delay." It may be affirmed, with entire truth, that all the attributes of sovereignty which relate to peace and war, commerce, navigation, friendship, and intercourse with, and, in short, all that relate to foreign powers, and several of these attributes which relate to the internal administration of these States themselves, are voluntarily surrendered to the General Government, and cannot be exercised by the States. The performance of any of the forbidden acts would be null and void, no matter in what solemn and authentic form, nor by what State authority—the Legislature, a convention, or the people themselves of the State, in an aggregate mass—it might be performed. The Constitution of the United States would instantly intervene, vacate the act, and proclaim the overruling, supreme, and paramount authority of the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States.

It is clear, therefore, that no State can do anything repugnant to the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States. What it might do, if it were in possession of all its absolute sovereignty, and had never entered into this Union, is a different question. But if we suppose, contrary to the historical fact, that the States were absolutely sovereign when the existing Constitution was adopted, could they circumscribe and contract their attributes of sovereignty, by the stipulations and provisions contained in it? All history is full of examples of the total annihilation of sovereignty or nationality, oftener by the power of the sword and conquest, but some time by the voluntary act of one nation merging itself into another, of which we have a striking instance in the case of Texas in our own country. Assuming that the Constitution is a mere compact between independent nations or sovereign States, they are nevertheless bound by all the obligations which the compact creates. They are bound to abstain from all forbidden acts, and to submit to the supremacy of the Constitution and laws of the United States. But, it will be asked, have they not also the right to judge of the fidelity with which the common Government has adhered to the common compact? Yes, most certainly. They have that right, and so has every citizen of the United States, so has the General Government also. The alleged violation of the Constitution may be exposed and denounced by all the weapons of reason, of argument, and of ridicule—by remonstrance, protest, appeals to the judiciary and to the other States—by the press, public opinion, and all legitimate means of persuading or influencing it. If, after the employment of all or any of these peaceful methods, the Government of the United States, sustained by a constitutional majority of the nation, persist in retaining the obnoxious law, there is no alternative but obedience to the law on the part of the minority, or open, undisguised, manly, and forcible resistance to its execution.

The alleged right of secession is, I apprehend, sometimes confounded with a right of revolution. But its partisans mean a totally different thing. They contend that it is a peaceful, lawful, and, if not constitutional remedy, that it is not forbidden by the Constitution. They insist that it is a State right to be recognized and respected; and that, whenever exercised by a State, far from being censured or condemned, the State, if necessary, is entitled to the co-operation of other States. The prudent valor of these partisans, in imitation of the previous example of the friends of nullification, disclaim the purpose of using themselves, and protest against the application to them of any physical force.

The right of the revolution is that right which an unjustly oppressed people, threatened with or borne down by intolerable and insupportable tyranny and injustice, have of restoring to forcible resistance to prevent or redress the wrongs with which they are menaced, or under which they are suffering. It may aim simply at a removal of grievances, or it may seek totally to change the existing Government, or to establish within its limits a new Government. It is a right not confined by the boundaries of States, (although, being organized political bodies, they may be capable of giving greater effect to revolutionary efforts), but it belongs to oppressed man, whatever may be his condition. In all revolutions, however, there are two parties—those who revolt, and the Government which they forcibly resist.—There are generally two opposite opinions, also, entertained of the cause of resistance; that of those who rise in rebellion, believing themselves to be wronged, at that of the existing Government, which denies having inflicted any oppression or injustice. It is incumbent upon wise and considerate men, before they hastily engage in a revolution, deliberately to consider the motives and causes of revolt, and carefully to calculate the probable consequences of forcible resistance. If unsuccessful, they know they will be guilty of treason, and incur the penalty inflicted upon traitors.

I have thus, gentlemen, presented an imperfect sketch of some of the views which I have taken of the existing topics of the day. It would

admit of much enlargement and additional illustration, but I have already given to this paper an inordinate length. In contemplating that sketch, we behold much more to animate the hopes and to encourage the patriotism of the country, than to create regret and apprehension. After such a political storm as that which violently raged during the last Congress, it was not to be expected that the nation would instantly settle down in perfect quiet and repose. Considering the vast extent of our territory, our numerous population, the heated conflicts of passion, of opinion, of interests, and of sections, pervading the entire Union, we have great reason to be thankful to Providence for the degree of calmness, of tranquillity, and of satisfaction, which prevails. If there are local exceptions at the North and at the South, of rash and misguided men, who would madly resist the Constitution and laws of the U. States, let us not despair of their return, in seasonable time, to reason and to duty. But suppose we should be disappointed, and that the standard should be raised of open resistance to the Union, the Constitution, and the laws, what is to be done? There can be but one possible answer. The power, the authority, and dignity of the Government ought to be maintained, and resistance put down at every hazard. Government, in the fallen and depraved state of man, would lose all respect, and fall into disgrace and contempt, if it did not possess potentially, and would not in extreme cases practically exercise, the right of employing force.—The theory of the Constitution of the United States assumes the necessity of the existence and the application of force, both in our foreign and domestic relations. Congress is expressly authorized "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and "to provide for calling forth the militia, to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions." The duty of executing the laws and suppressing insurrections is without limitation or qualification; it is co-extensive with the jurisdiction of the U. States, and it comprehends every species of resistance to the execution of the laws, and every form of insurrection, no matter under what auspices or sanction it is made. Individuals, public meetings, States, may resolve, as often as their tastes or passions may prompt them to resolve, that they will forcibly oppose the execution of the laws, and secede from the Union. Whilst these resolutions remain on paper, they are harmless; but the moment a daring hand is raised to resist, by force, the execution of the laws, the duty of enforcing them arises; and if the conflict which may ensue should lead to civil war, the resisting party, having begun it, will be responsible for all its consequences.

Since the adoption of our present Constitution and the Union which created, by the blessing of Providence, we have advanced in population, power, wealth, internal improvement, and national greatness, with a degree of rapidity which, unparalleled in ancient or modern nations, has excited the astonishment and commanded the admiration of mankind. Our ample limits and extensive jurisdiction, more than tripled, have been made to embrace all the provinces of Louisiana, the two in Florida, Texas, and New Mexico; and passing the Rocky Mountains, have reached the Pacific Ocean, comprehending Oregon, and California, and Utah. Our population has risen from four to twenty-three millions; our revenue, without any onerous burden, has grown from less than three to fifty millions of dollars; our revolutionary debt is extinguished; our mercantile marine is not surpassed by that of the greatest maritime power, the abundant products of our agriculture satisfy all our wants, and contribute to the subsistence of other nations; our manufactures are rapidly tending to the supply of all we essentially need from them, and to afford a surplus for the prosecution of our extended foreign commerce; the surface of our land is striped over with railroads and turnpikes, and our sea-lakes and navigable waters resound with the roar of innumerable steam vessels.—Your own great city illustrates our greatness. After the commencement of the operation of this Constitution, in 1790, its population was 33,131. By the census of 1850 it was 515,384; and our other cities have increased in scarcely a less ratio. The problem of the capacity of representative government to maintain free and liberal institutions on an extensive territory, has been triumphantly solved by the intelligence of the people and the all powerful agency of steam and lightning.

Such are the gratifying results which have been obtained under the auspices of that Union which some rash men prompted by ambition, passion and phrenzy, would seek to dissolve and subvert! To revolt against such a Government, for anything which has passed, would be so atrocious, and characterized by such extreme folly and madness, that we may search in vain for an example of it in human annals. We can look for its prototype only (if I may be pardoned the allusion) to that diabolical revolt which recorded on the pages of Holy Writ, has been illustrated and commemorated by the sublime genius of the immortal Milton.

In conclusion, gentlemen, let us enjoy the proud consolation afforded by the conviction that a vast majority of the people of the United States, true to their forefathers, true to themselves, and true to posterity, are firmly and immovably attached to this Union; that they see in it a safe and sure, if not the sole guaranty of liberty, of internal peace, of prosperity, and of national happiness, progress, and greatness; that its dissolution would be followed by endless wars among ourselves, by the temptation or invitation to foreign powers to take part in them, and finally by foreign subjugation or the establishment of despotism; and that "united we stand—divided we fall."

I am, with the highest respect, your obedient servant,
H. CLAY.

EXECUTION OF A CHINESE MISSIONARY.

There is a thrilling interest in this announcement, and in the details given below. We regret that the place, and more of the circumstances of the murder are not given. The missionary was doubtless, a Romish Priest.—But that neither alters the case, nor lessens the reasons for a just abhorrence of the act. The fact is a mournful one, in any of its aspects, and elicit many a prayer for the spread of a purer religion in the so-called Celestial Empire.—We give the recital of this deed of darkness as we find it in an exchange paper:
Richmond Christian Advocate.

"On the 1st of May elephants and horses were prepared, and two regiments of Infantry were under arms, by order of the Grand Mandarin; from the preparations that it was an expedition against rebels which was fitting out or a descent was to be made on the retreat of some brigands. It was soon, however, understood that all these preparations had been or-

dered for the execution of Mr. Schoeffler. The mandarin fearing that the Christians would endeavor to rescue their missionary by force, wished to intimidate them by this display of troops. When his intentions were known, all the town showed the greatest affliction. The jailors, the prisoners, and all those who had any connection with the missionary expressed their sorrow and regret.

"The mandarin was apprehensive of a riot, and he took up his position on the ramparts, surrounded by his troops all ready for action. The cortege of the martyr was arranged in the following manner: Before him marched a soldier, carrying a board affixed to a pole, on which was written: 'Notwithstanding the severe prohibition against the religion of Jesus, a European priest named Augustin, has dared to come here clandestinely to preach and seduce the people. When arrested he confessed everything—his crime is evident. Let Augustin have his head cut off, and thrown into the river. Fourth year of Tu du; First of the Third Moon.' Eight soldiers, with drawn sabres, marched by the side of M. Schoeffler; one hundred men, armed with muskets or lances, formed the head of procession; two elephants formed the rear guard.

"On arriving at the place of execution, the martyr fell on his knees, kissed the crucifix three times, and at the request of the executioner he took off his coat, and turned down the collar of his shirt. The executioner having afterwards tied his hands behind back, the martyr said to him, 'Do your business as quick as possible.'

"'No, no,' replied the mandarin, who was informed of what M. Schoeffler had said. 'Follow the signal of the cymbal, and only strike at the third sound.' The signal was given.—The hand of the executioner trembled. He struck three blows of his sabre on the neck of his victim, and was at length obliged to cut the flesh with a knife, in order to detach the head from the body.

"The Christians obtained the body of M. Schoeffler but the head was thrown into the river, and had not afterwards been found.

A RUNAWAY SHOT.

A few nights ago a most desperate negro, known as Joe Miller, was shot by the patrol at the kitchen of Bette Irwin, Esq. The circumstances are as follows, as related to us by an eye witness. This negro had been terror for some time to the neighborhood near Mr. Irwin's, and numerous attempts, we believe, have been made to apprehend him, but all had failed. The Hopewell patrol getting a clew to his whereabouts resolved to take him if possible, and for that purpose agreed to meet at Mr. Irwin's. They were in ambush watching for him, and in approaching the kitchen he passed within a few feet of the patrol before he entered. As soon as he entered, the patrol, eleven in number, approached, opened the door, and four presented their pistols and ordered him to surrender. He hesitated a moment or two, and being aimed with a club and dirk, declared "he would either go out or die."—he then made a rush at the patrol, and in passing received several shot wounds, one proving fatal. He ran about a hundred yards after he was shot and fell dead.—*Char. Journal.*

A Jewish Divorce.—A Jewish divorce was granted in this city a few days ago. It is the first case that has occurred here during thirteen years. The applicant was the husband. The mode of untying the knot is simple. The aggrieved party lays the case before the chief Rabbi, who selects two other Rabbis, and the three hear the statement, call witnesses, and, if satisfied that there are grounds for a divorce, give to the suitor a writing of twelve lines—no more nor less—on parchment. This is signed by witnesses, who also see that this party deliver it to the party criminated. When this has been done the separation is complete, though the parties can be re-married if they wish; but if the wife, for instance, should marry another man, and he should die, the former husband cannot again marry her. The woman in this case is not a Jewess by birth or education. She was connected with no church. Shortly after her marriage she appealed most urgently to the Rabbis here to be admitted to the Jewish faith.—After considerable opposition her wish was granted. This is very rare, and only one other instance has occurred, so far as we can learn.—*Cleveland (Ohio) Plaindealer of October 6.*

THE FLYING CLOUD.—The clipper ship *Flying Cloud*, Capt. Creese, has made a most extraordinary passage to San Francisco—beating the celebrated run of the *Surprise* by seven days. The *Flying Cloud* left New York on the 2d of June, at 6 P. M., and arrived at San Francisco on the 20th of August, thus making the passage in the unprecedentedly short period of eighty-nine days!—the shortest, by seven days, ever before made by a sailing vessel.—She made Cape Horn in 50 days, and the line (Pacific side) in 71 days. Her run from Cape Horn to San Francisco was made in 39 days, miles—the greatest run ever made by a sea-going vessel—averaging 15½ miles per hour. While making this run, she was carrying top gallant sails, with the wind one point forward on the beam. She run in three days 992 miles! On one occasion, during a squall, 17 knots of line were found insufficient to measure her speed. Forty miles was her shortest run in 24 hours. When ten days out she sprung her mainmast head, rendering the most very tender the rest of the voyage. The *Flying Cloud* was built by Mr. Donald McKay, of East Boston, and owned by Messrs. Grinnell, Minturn & Co. of New York.—*N. Y. Courier & Enquirer.*

New Fashion.—The Paris correspondent of the Boston Atlas states that the fashionable dress-makers are attempting the revival of the hideous fashion of the empire—short waists, narrow petticoats, and long dresses; the coiffure to be a la grecque, and combs to be worn instead of diamonds. In a word, David's celebrated painting of the coronation of Napoleon is the plate from which we shall obtain all our winter fashions.—*Boston Transcript.*

This says the Providence Journal is worse than the Bloomer. It is to be hoped that the American women will manifest something of the "independence" of which they talk of in the Woman's Rights Convention, and repudiate the revival of this forgotten deformity.

A St. Louis paper tells us a story of a disconsolate widower, who, on seeing the remains of his late wife lowered into the grave, exclaimed, with tears in his eyes: "Well, I've lost cows, but I never had anything to cut me like this."

OPENING A MOUND.—The workmen of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad opened a mound on Saturday, the 15th, on the seventy feet in diameter and eleven feet high. Nearly on a level with the surrounding ground were found an altar of stone, extending north and south, and a slight declivity from the feet. This body was covered by a layer of a foot or more with ashes, in which was still manifest to the taste, as well as to the sight, the remains of human food. The body was remarkably preserved, and mostly preserved. Around this mound were twelve others, with their heads toward the west, and feet projecting. No human art were found except a polished stone twelve inches in length.—*Workingman.*

A Musical Prodigy.—Mr. J. H. Stanton, native of Rockingham, gave a Musical performance in our town last week. His performance most astonishing—with his ordinary voice produces the sweetest tone of music, and he is acquainted. Mr. S. desired Stanton again, when those who witnessed his astonishing performance were filled.—*Stanton Vin.*

LIFE INSURANCE.—An interesting trial is in preparation at Berlin, Pa. Teschek, a tailor, insured his brother, 10,000 thalers. The brother soon died, and was buried, and the insurance was given out a study hash, and at the trial produces the sweetest tone of music, and he is acquainted. Mr. S. desired Stanton again, when those who witnessed his astonishing performance were filled.—*Stanton Vin.*

Quarrel about a Silver Spade.—A quarrel about a silver spade, the result of turning the sod was performed by the test of Egin, and the instrument used by her was a silver spade, which Caporal, the manager, had made at his own expense. He claimed the right of presenting it to the Countess, but the Directors disputed his right, and followed words; Caporal refused to give up the spade; and the Directors revenged themselves by dismissing him from the management.—*Boston Journal.*

Java Coffee raised in Caswell.—We were shown, recently, a parcel of Java Coffee, fully matured, that grew in the midst of the shrubbery that decorates John T. Garland's yard, about a mile from this town. It looked as if it were the imported article. The shrub produced this coffee is but two years old, and bears prolifically. The tree sprouts a grain of coffee, which was placed in the North side of the house.—*Milton.*

There is a colored female giving lessons in the North. She is said to have a much power and sweetness. They call her "Black Swan!" Eliza Greenfield is the Savannah News says, a black swan green field! Won't she produce a song in a concert room, especially in summer?—*W. B.*

A sudden gust of wind took a parcel from the hand of its owner, and one had a chance to recollect what he would be etiquette to catch the parcel, a lady to whom he had never been introduced, a lively Emerald dropped bricks, caught the package amidst of its Elzler gyrations, and pressed it to the loser, and with a look which reminded us of poor Power's madam, said he, as he did so, "as strong as you are handsome, you have got away from you." "I shall thank you first, the service compliment!" asked the lady. "Troth, madam," said Pat, "agonying the place where once stood the foot of what was once a beaver," "that your beautiful eye thanked me!"

FOR THE GIRLS.—How many of themselves unhappy by marrying men who had nothing to recommend but riches. "Is he rich?" has been inquiry when a suitor had presented himself. Foolish girls!—Rather—be diligent? Is he industrious? Is he honest? Let these questions be answered the affirmative, and if he has not a shirt to his back, we will answer the course. Wealth may be lost, but the qualities of the heart will remain, sun-shine, to warm and to bless. Remember this.—*W. B.*

Cheap Boarding.—A thousand and more are told of the extreme cheapness in the "Far West," but as to the way the matter was explained by Dan McKeen. "You keep boarders here, madam, individual, addressing the landlady upon the door of which, he saw 'cheap' painted.

"We do," was the response.
"What do you charge a week?"
"For board without lodging, do you inquire the lady."
"Yes, madam."
"Three meals a day, sir!"
"Yes, madam."
"Fifty cents is our regular price."
"Well, rejoined the enquirer, "enough at all events; do you give the drier much of a variety?"
"Yes sir, something of a variety of dried apples for breakfast, warm water, and let 'em swell up for supper."

Marine Disaster.—The Schooner *Ellis*, from New York for Wilmington, was lately sunk at sea on the night of the 10th by coming in contact with the schooner *Brother Jonathan*. The schooner was cargo of dry goods, mostly, we believe, of Fayetteville, valued at \$20,000, mostly insured, of course. The vessel was of course totally lost; the crew, and passengers were saved, but on board the steamer. The vessel was in New York.—*Fly Observer.*