

Bedford Gazette.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

BEDFORD, PA. FRIDAY MORNING, SEPT. 1, 1854.

TERMS, \$2 PER YEAR.

VOL. XXIII, NO. 4.

BY GEO. W. BOWMAN.

NEW SERIES.

Select Poetry.



EVEN.

BY S. W. HAZELTINE.

O, I love to stray at even,
When the day has gone to sleep;
When upon the brow of heaven
Stars their nightly vigils keep
When the pale moon looks down calmly
O'er the meadow and the lea;
For the quiet, pleasant night-time
Hath a pleasing charm for me.

O, I love to stray at even,
In the dusky shades of night,
To think of the cherished blossoms
That have faded from my sight;
Of the ones who grew a weary
On the toilsome march of life,
And into the grave departed,
Where there comes no care or strife.

Then the breezes seem to whisper,
And the bright stars seem to say,
"Your departed friends are near you
All the night and all the day."
They are near you, though you see not
The bright gleaming of their eyes;
They are near to lead you upward
To a home in Paradise!

ADDRESS

OF THE
STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, No. 3.

To the People of Pennsylvania:

FELLOW-CITIZENS—The manner of organizing the territories of Nebraska and Kansas, you will agree with us, is not necessarily an issue in this contest—it is not a subject connected with the duties of a State Executive. It is scarcely possible that the election of a Governor, whoever may succeed, is to have any practical bearing upon the future policy of those territories—and surely no man will be so unreasonable as to hold the Governor of Pennsylvania accountable in an official sense for what Congress has already done on this subject. It is a subject with which that officer has had, and can have, officially, nothing whatever to do. As a member of the Democratic party it must be presumed that he takes an interest in public affairs, and has not been an inattentive observer that there has existed a diversity of opinion in relation to certain features of this measure.

Since the origin of our government, with occasional intervals, the question of slavery in some of its phases, has been a subject of violent and at times dangerous controversy in Congress; menacing the peace of the people and the existence of the national confederacy. Its adjustment within the territories has led to the most threatening struggles. These were invariably renewed by every new acquisition of territory. In 1820, the act of Congress fixing the Missouri line was adopted interdicting the extension of slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min. as a means of settling the controversy growing out of the acquisition of Louisiana from France in 1803.—In 1845 this line was extended over Texas, which had just been annexed to the United States and seemed to answer the purpose of an adjustment. In 1848, however, when it was proposed to extend this parallel of 36 deg. 30 min. from the Rio del Norte to the Pacific, it was defeated in the House of Representatives, after having passed the Senate, by a majority of ten votes. The agitation in the country soon became general, and by 1850 it had assumed an alarming aspect. The good and great men of all parties, forgetting former differences and constrained by a nobler spirit of patriotism, united in a common effort to allay the mighty surging of an excited public sentiment. Foremost in this great work was the eloquent and patriotic Clay, sustained by Cass, Webster, King and others. A series of acts were passed, familiarly known as the Compromise Measures, which were acceptable to the people and were ardently maintained.

One of these acts organized the territories of New Mexico and Utah, on the principle of non-intervention on the plan of allowing the people to decide for themselves whether they would have the institution of slavery or not. The whole country seemed satisfied with the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress, in the regulation of the domestic institutions of the territories, including that of slavery. Without stopping to inquire into the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on the subject or to what extent that power might be exercised, the people regarded it as wise and politic to remove this topic of angry and dangerous controversy out of Congress, and confide it to those who may occupy the territories. We may, however, remark that the question of authority in the passage of the Ordinance of 1787 under the old Confederation, is a very different one from the passage of the Missouri Compromise or any slavery restriction whatever, under our present Constitution. Under the Confederation the institution of slavery was not recognized—under the Constitution, it is, in three several particulars:

1st. In fixing the basis of representation and direct taxation.

2d. In tolerating the foreign slave trade until 1808.

3d. In providing for the rendition of fugitives from labor.

If it be clear that Congress is possessed of ample power to legislate on the subject (and this is denied by Gen. Cass and other eminent men of the country) it was proper to forego its exercise. The resort to this mode of adjustment in 1850, seemed most auspicious for the honor, the dignity and peace of the States—for the happiness and prosperity of the people, and above

all, for the stability of our National Union.

And is not this policy right and just in itself according to all our theories of government?—Indeed we should never allow ourselves to fear the consequences of trusting any question of politics or morals to the people, whether they be residents of a State or territory. This mode of adjustment rests on great principles, which in their application will be co-extensive with all the territory we now have or ever can have, and which are as enduring as the race of man. It is a principle in beautiful harmony with our republican institutions—the principle of self-government—the basis of our entire system. It was for this doctrine that our forefathers periled their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in the Declaration of Independence—that they struggled and bled, and left their bones to bleach on the battle fields of the Revolution. It was for this principle of self-government, that they invoked the interposition of heaven and accepted the proffered aid of the generous stranger. For seven long years did they labor to impress upon Lord North and George III, the virtue and power of this great fundamental truth in the science of government. The attempt of that monarch "to bind the Colonies in all things whatsoever," and to impose taxes without representation, gave this principle growth and vigor, and cost him arms and an empire. Since that day to the present time it has been gaining strength in all civilized countries. American experience has fully solved and settled the problem of man's ability for self-government. Where can be found the instance in which governmental affairs have been submitted to, or intrusted with the people, that the results have not been salutary? Who will then at this day doubt the fitness of the American people to dispose of any question of governmental policy found within the limits of the Constitution? Who will contend for the absurd idea, that a man loses his capacity for self-government by emigrating from a State to a territory? Who will say that a man residing in Massachusetts should, through his representatives in Congress, be permitted to adopt and regulate institutions of local government for his fellow man in Utah, New Mexico, Minnesota, Nebraska or Kansas? Will our Whig or Abolition friends agree that when they shall have emigrated to any of these territories, their Democratic fellow-citizens whom they leave behind, shall decide for them what kind of local institutions they shall have?—that their judgment and not that of the emigrants themselves shall control as to the institution of Slavery? Or who will contend that the people will be careless of their own true interests?—that their government will be feeble or injudicious? Whoever says these things doubts all the principles of our republican institutions, and disregards the lessons of experience and the teachings of the sages of the revolution.

We have already intimated, that we will not discuss the abstract and somewhat difficult questions of Congressional power, which have grown out of the slavery controversy in the Halls of the National Legislature. We care not to decide, whether many eminent men have differed, whether Congress has the power to establish or abolish the institution in the territories. Be that as it may, we assert that it was in 1850, as in 1854, to refer the whole question to the sovereign will of the people, to be settled through the action of the local governments, as all other questions of domestic policy are settled. The right of property, the relations between husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, are so confided, and we can conceive none more sacred and important in the social state; and we see of no good reason why the question of domestic slavery, the relation of master and servant, should alone be withheld from the action of the people.

It must not be forgotten, that we have not the creation of circumstances for ourselves, but that we must deal with existing facts. The same difficulty occurred in the early history of the country. We had the institution of slavery entailed upon us, and the only matter of enquiry has long been, how it was to be managed to the greatest advantage of both the white and black races. The latter number several millions, and we are forced to the dilemma of retaining a large portion of them in bondage, or make them our companions and equals, and permit them to share the honors of the State, and intermarry with our daughters and friends. In the forcible language of Mr. Jefferson, "we have the wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him nor safely let him go."

And yet much has been done in a legal and constitutional way for the amelioration of this unfortunate race of people. The men of the revolution had to deal with the institution of slavery as they found it, and they acted in the formation of the government. When these States were colonies of Great Britain every one was a slave-holding province. At the time the Constitution was framed, twelve out of the thirteen were slave-holding States. Six of the original thirteen have now become free, not by abolition agitation in Congress, but by the action of the people of the several States in their sovereign capacity at home.

This leaving the question to the people was first adopted by Congress in 1850, and was intended to be general in its application to all territories thereafter to be organized—that it was to be a finality as to the principle to be invoked, but not a finality as to its application—for that would imply that no more territories were to be organized. This position is sustained by the fact, that in forming the boundaries of Utah and New Mexico, no respect seems to have been paid to the act 1820, fixing what is termed the Missouri line, nor the act of 1845 extending that line to the Rio del Norte. The larger portion of territory included in the acts of organization was taken from the Mexican acquisition, but they include also a portion of the Texas territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. and a part of the Louisiana purchase, which was covered by that line. This territory was taken from under the act of 1820, interdicting sla-

very north of 36 deg. 30 min., and subjected to the action of the principles of the Compromise of 1850, that the territory thus embraced should be admitted into the Union as States with or without slavery as the people thereof might determine. These facts are claimed as a precedent for the act organizing Nebraska and Kansas. It is for these reasons, and in this sense also, claimed that the principles of non-intervention as adopted in 1850 should be regarded as a finality.

As Pennsylvanians we are not the advocates of the extension of slavery, and we deny that the principles of the Nebraska and Kansas bill produce that effect. It merely leaves it to the people to determine this question for themselves. But the soil, climate and productions of that region are not adapted to slave labor. It is our firm belief that slavery will not enter those territories. Those who are sensitive on this point should not close their eyes to the evidence that surrounds them. The indications are all opposed to its extension to that country. Such is the belief of the ablest men in the nation, those who advocated and voted for the Nebraska and Kansas bill, as well as those who voted against it.

Mr. Douglas said:
"I do not believe there is a man in Congress who thinks it would be permanently a slave-holding country; I have no idea that it could."

Mr. Badger said:
"I have no more idea of seeing a slave population in either of them (Nebraska or Kansas) than I have of seeing it in Massachusetts."

Mr. Edward Everett said:
"I am quite sure that everybody admits that this is not to be a slave-holding region."

Mr. Hunter said:
"Does any man believe that you will have a slave-holding State in Kansas or Nebraska? I confess that for a moment, I permitted such an illusion to rest upon my mind."

Mr. Bell said, that as respects the South, "it was a contest for a mere abstraction."

Mr. Benton said in his first speech against the bill:
"The question of slavery in these territories, if thrown open to territorial action, will be a question of numbers—a question of the majority for or against slavery; and what chance would the slave-holders have in such a contest? No chance at all. The slave emigrants will be out numbered and compelled to play at a most unequal game, not only in point of numbers, but also in point of States."

In his second speech, Mr. Benton again said:
"I believe in the futility of this bill—its absolute futility in the slaveholding States, and that not a single slave will ever be held in Kansas or Nebraska under it, even admitting it to be passed."

Gen. Houston said:
"There is no more probability of slavery being introduced into these territories than into Illinois."

Even Mr. Seward, who is astute on this subject, thus expressed himself:
"I feel quite sure that slavery at most can get nothing more than Kansas; while Nebraska the wilder region will escape, for the reason that its soil and climate are uncongenial with the staples of slave culture—rice, sugar, cotton and tobacco. Moreover, since the public attention has been so well and so effectually directed towards the subject, I cherish a hope that slavery will not be able to gain a foothold even in Kansas."

But to render assurance doubly sure, we have even a stronger opinion from Judge Pollock himself, the Whig candidate for Governor, who says in a letter dated June 19th, 1854: "Slavery can have no legal existence in those territories, either by act of Congress, or under the false pretence of popular sovereignty."

It may in fact be safely said that of all the acquisitions of territory from Mexico, there will not be a slave state added to the Union, and that the territory embraced in the Louisiana purchase not already admitted, will come in as free States.

It should also be borne in mind, that any territory that the United States may hereafter acquire must be south of 36d. 30m., and that this principle of popular sovereignty may drive the institution farther south than any positive act of Congress could do. Nor should it be forgotten that the interdiction of slavery north of 36d. 30m., is a virtual dedication of the territory south of that line for slave purposes. This has been the moral influence of such legislation, and it would no doubt continue to have that effect. It would in all probability have been a happy event for the country, had this doctrine of popular sovereignty in the territories been adopted in 1820. We should most likely have had a larger proportion of free States than we now have.

The Missouri line was never a favorite measure with the old Democratic statesmen. It suited a temporary purpose, and quieted agitation for a time, but it was manifestly wrong in principle, and legislation of a dangerous character, calculated to divide the country into geographical sections, and create dissensions and divisions among the States and the people.

Thomas Jefferson once said:
"This Missouri question, by a geographical line of division, is the most portentous one that I have ever contemplated."

In 1820 he wrote to John Holmes:
"A geographical line coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated."

James Madison said:
"I must own that I have always leaned to the belief that the restriction was not within the true scope of the Constitution."

James Monroe said:
"The proposed restriction as to the territories which are to be admitted into the Union, if not in direct violation of the Constitution, is repugnant to its principles."

We might swell the list of authorities on this same point, from eminent American statesmen,

living and dead.

It is difficult to force from the mind the belief that the whole subject of slavery in the territories is greatly magnified. The right of a sovereign State to control this subject is not disputed even by abolitionists. The right to establish or abolish the institution is admitted. The only effect that the legislation of Congress can possibly have, must be confined to the territorial probation of a State, during which time it can exercise but a limited influence upon the social or political affairs of the country. When once admitted into the Union with slavery, a State can abolish it—or admitted without it, she can establish it. Should the people north of 36d 30m in Nebraska become numerous enough to be admitted as a free State, they could afterwards establish the institution, even if the Missouri line or the act of 1820 had not been disturbed. Suppose, for example, that any of the States covered by the ordinance of 1787, were at this time to establish slavery, where would be the remedy? There would be none. If the people of a territory should desire to have the institution, but perceiving that Congress might object to their admission into the Union, they could forebear to establish it until after their admission, and then do as they might deem best. Hence the wisdom of allowing that power to control in the beginning, that will most certainly control in the end, or at a subsequent period.

It is not to be denied that there is a most violent and unwarrantable spirit evoked by this slavery conflict, that should be discontinued by the good men of all parties. It is one of the enigmas of human nature, that it can become so unreasonable in some of its manifestations. Our Anti-Nebraska friends should take care lest the mania of a wild and ungovernable fanaticism should possess them as it has already possessed many others. The inflammatory and treasonable proceedings of an abolition convention in the City of New York, not long since, calls for the earnest condemnation of every lover of our national Union.

Wendell Phillips said:
"The Union sentiment is the great vortex which swallow up the great minds, and they have power enough for the time being to influence the people. The only remedy for the slave is the destruction of the government. I challenge any man to tell me what the Union has done for us."

Wm. Lloyd Garrison proposed the following resolution:
"Resolved, That the one grand vital issue to be made with the slave power, is the dissolution of the existing American Union."

Henry C. Wright spoke to the resolution and said:
"I like that resolution very much. This country owes God, or if it believes in God, I do not. The Christian God is the most accused of demons. No man's right can be ascertained by reference to a Bible, a law, or a Constitution. I don't care that [snapping his fingers] for any such book or Constitution, when the question of liberty and slavery is to be considered. The only thing of importance is that the mass of the people venerate the Constitution. We should endeavor to do away with this. I thank God that I am a traitor to that Constitution. I thank God also that I am an infidel to the popular religion of this country and of all Christendom."

The Hon. Edmund Quincy said that: "The Constitution displayed the ingenuity of the very devil, and that the Union ought to be dissolved."

This warring the pendency of the Nebraska and Kansas bill before Congress. At the same time leading Abolition journals were loud in the denunciations of the bill itself, and treasonable in their opposition to the action of the government. Horace Greeley, through the New York Tribune, said in reference to the contemplated passage of the bill:

"Better that confusion should ensue—better that discord should reign in the National Councils—better that Congress should break up in wild disorder, nay, better that the capital itself should blaze the torch of the incendiary, or fall and burn all its inmates beneath its crumbling ruins, than that this perfidy and wrong be finally accomplished."

There were many reasonable exhibitions also, by the sane class of men, during the recent Anniversary of American Independence. At some places the bells were tolled, as if mourning for our great National calamity. At Farmington, Massachusetts, treasonable speeches were delivered, after which Garrison, above named, burned the Constitution of the United States and the Fugitive Slave Law, amid the applause of men of as little patriotism as Benedict Arnold or himself.

Sh are the incendiary and inflammatory sentiments with which despicable fanatics are endeavoring to indoctrinate the minds of the Northern people. Such sentiments are the fit precursors of the recent riots and murder in Boston, trampling the Constitution and Laws under the foot of violence.

Lus, therefore, fellow-citizens, discard the doctrines of the Abolitionists and anti-slavery agitators, and look upon the opinions which they have promulgated and are now promulgating, the false lights thrown out by the ancient federalists, during the Missouri controversy to mystify the people and regain lost power.

Whave great confidence in the doctrine of popular sovereignty, and in the justice and wisdom the people. They have saved the country many important crises in our affairs. It is the people that settled the government upon the republican platform after the Federalists 1798 were driven from power. It was the people who sustained Jackson against the maltoth bank. It was the mass of the people who have always upheld the country in time of war. It is to the people that we must look for protection against the miserable treason and detestable wiles of the enemies of the republic. The people of Pennsylvania will be true to

their constitutional obligations, and their triumph in 1851 and 1852, are evidences that they are not only willing to be so, but also that they have the power to be so. The day of wild fanaticism and stolid bigotry on the question of slavery, has passed by in this State, and the Democracy and her people generally have planted themselves upon the principles of the Compromise of 1850, and there they will continue to stand, whether victory or defeat awaits them. They are willing to see the citizens of the territories determine in their primary assemblies the question of domestic slavery for themselves, without the control or dictation of the Central Government, which may, by a usurpation of power, pretend to define the lines of freedom and slavery by degrees of latitude and longitude, or by geographical boundaries. The Democracy of Pennsylvania, guarding the destinies of the great central Commonwealth of this Union, will adhere faithfully to the principles of the Constitution, the sovereignty of the States and of the people, and the stability and repose of the nation. The people of Pennsylvania are unselfish and unambitious, but they are just—they are modest and unpretending, and slow at arriving at conclusions, but they are powerful for good. The people of Pennsylvania are patriotic by instinct, and will crush to atoms all the feeble barriers to a healthy flow of public sentiment. Pennsylvania has always been a patriotic, union-loving State. She has always stood by the flag of our common country. She is the Keystone of the Federal Arch, and standing midway between the North and South, she constitutes the great break-water, against which the waves of northern fanaticism and southern folly have long surged and will continue to surge in vain.

J. ELLIS BONHAM,
George C. Welker, Chairman.
Secretary.

Letter from Rev. John Chambers.

The following letter from Rev. JOHN CHAMBERS is characteristic of the man. He defends himself from the attacks of the opposition with a battle axe that hews its own path. We commend it to the many friends of the Rev. gentleman in this County.

From the Pennsylvaniaian.

LETTER OF THE REV. JOHN CHAMBERS.

Messrs. EDITORS.—During a recent visit to the Bedford Springs I was called upon by some of the most ardent friends of Temperance in the State, and invited to address the people of Bedford on the importance of inducing every friend of humanity to vote for a prohibitory liquor law at the ensuing election. I most cheerfully complied with the request of these gentlemen, and I had hoped that I had discharged the duty imposed upon me to the satisfaction of all.

My recollection is, that I urged upon the people present on that occasion the importance of the temperance reform generally, and exhorted to vote for a prohibitory law at the next election. I expressed the belief that the whole question was involved in the resolutions allowing the people to vote for and against a prohibitory law and that the real friends of temperance should direct their attention to that point and that only. I declared my belief that if the law was demanded in this way by the voice of the people it mattered but little who filled the office of Governor—the law would be sanctioned—that no man would set himself against the will of the people. I said then as I repeat now that I believe either of the distinguished gentlemen would carry out that will if put in a form consistent with the terms of the Constitution.

I did say that Governor Bigler was too good a Democrat to resist the will of the people, and that I had every confidence beside in his desire to do any reasonable and proper thing to arrest the vice of intemperance; that I knew from correspondence and personal intercourse with him, that he held the doctrine that the will of the people should be binding so far as related to the policy of the measure, but that he would not yield his right to judge of the constitutionality and justice of a law when it came before him—he would not so far forget the dignity of his station or the obligation of his oath. But Governor Bigler has written to me no letter inconsistent with his manly letter to the temperance Convention.

I felt more at liberty to say what I did of Governor Bigler, because I believe an attempt had been made to prostitute the sacred cause of temperance to mere partizan ends, and to turn its influence against his re-election. I did not hesitate, as I shall not, to rubuke this attempt, and I intend so to do whenever and wherever I meet it, and this is the true and real cause of the complaints which have been preferred against my Bedford address.

I also, at the same meeting in Bedford, referred to a secret sworn political organization, whose object, so far as is made known, is to disfranchise every adopted citizen of this glorious country, and that too, in the face of the guarantees of the Constitution of the United States, as well as of our own beloved Commonwealth, both of which recognize the adopted citizen on the same broad platform of civil and religious liberty, with the native born. Doubtless then "the head and front of my offending" in the eyes of some of the unknown and unknowing ones, is my strong and uncompromising opposition to Jesuitism whether Protestant or Papal, and with these men the same objection rests against Governor Bigler, because of his fixed determination not to violate the Constitution and laws of the land, by disfranchising adopted citizens either on account of their religion or the place of their birth.

There are in my own church, and in every other church in this "Land of the free and home of the brave," men of foreign birth, as pure patriots and as good men as ever breathed the air of freedom—men, who to the letter obey the Constitution and laws of the country of their adoption. Are these men to be stricken down

like felons, by the iron hand of a secret sworn band of petty despots? Every true hearted, Constitution and law-loving and law-abiding American Christian and patriot will answer no! But if the men who have emigrated from Scotland, England, Ireland, Wales, Germany, France and elsewhere, and made this the land of their adoption, citizens by choice and not by accident, and among whom are to be found our best citizens, are to be turned out of political society and treated like serfs, solely because they were born out of the United States, let those who are secretly sworn thus to treat them, follow the example of the Mayor of Philadelphia, and boldly avow their purpose, and not hide themselves or their actions from the light of day. It will be much more in accordance with the true American character.

So far as regards the bald and weak invention that I was stumping the State for Governor Bigler, and the vulgar and childish clamor for "that Letter," I can afford, so far as I am concerned myself, to treat them with merited contempt, and to let them pass me as the idle winds. I have a higher, holier, better object in view, the passage of a Prohibitory Law, and am therefore not alarmed by these Tempests of Penny Toots, neither will they prevent me from urging upon every friend of humanity in the State to vote for a Prohibitory Liquor Law without fail, and for Governor for whomsoever they please.

As regards my own vote, I will say that Governor Bigler, nor no other man shall have my vote for the office of Governor, unless he is willing to submit to the will of the people on this great and all-important question—nor will I vote for a member of either branch of the Legislature on any other ground. Nor will I ever vote for a member of any Jesuit Association, Protestant or Catholic, having good reason to believe him such. How could I vote for men who are sworn to disfranchise my father, my uncle, my brother, and some of the best neighbors and dearest friends that I have, and some of the very best men in my church? JOHN CHAMBERS.

Frightful Railroad Accident.

At half-past eight o'clock on Thursday morning, Mr. Vandusen's passenger train, which left Cincinnati at 6 A. M., met with a most serious accident when some three miles west of this place. The train was passing around a curve in an excavation, beyond which was a heavy embankment, and just as it got within view of the terminus of the excavation, a cow appeared on the track, and before the cars could be stopped she was under the wheels.—The most frightful result was the consequence. The engineer was so much alarmed that he was about jumping heedlessly into the trestle bridge, through which he would have inevitably fallen dead, had not the fireman, with great presence of mind, caught him and held him secure.—The locomotive jumped over the cow, at the same time breaking loose from the tender, and alighting square on the track, ran safely on.

The baggage car was thrown down an embankment of about forty feet, turning twice over before reaching level ground. In this car were some half a dozen persons, excepting two of whom, strange to relate, all escaped with but slight scratches. Two of them were seriously injured. Mr. Hartwell Locke, the express messenger, was, by several physicians, who soon arrived, pronounced in a dying condition, and such intelligence was borne throughout the country by the passengers who left on the train. He was insensible, and up to eight o'clock this morning has remained in that condition. His injuries are not flesh wounds nor broken bones, but what is worse, they are internal, and perhaps chiefly in his head. Mr. Kenan, the mail agent, was the other person who was badly hurt.

The newsboy, a lad of some fifteen years of age, was extricated from beneath the top of the baggage car, which had slid off, with scarcely a scratch upon him. The baggage master, Mr. Gardner, escaped with slight injuries to an ankle and a few cuts on his forehead, and George, the colored "train boy," came out yet better, for he complains of nothing but a little stiffness. That all who were in this car were not killed outright, is the greatest wonder of all who have seen the wreck, which is the most complete smash-up that ever occurred in this region of country.

The first passenger car was next to go off.—It pitched endwise down the hill, and was completely riddled by the trucks, which passed through the floor, tearing the seats loose, and throwing them, together with thirty or forty passengers, into one great heap.

Such a sight of bloody noses and limping people were perhaps never seen in one company before. One man had a shoulder joint displaced, another had a severe gash cut in his face; one had his finger smashed, another a foot scraped, but of the whole number, not one was seriously injured.—Cincinnati Times, Aug 19.

FATAL EFFECTS OF LIGHTNING.—A correspondent of the Detroit Free Press, writing from Pecosonica, Winnebago county, Ill., on the 14th ult., says:—I witnessed, yesterday, one of the most melancholy scenes I ever beheld. In the town of Lysander, one mile south of Pecosonica depot, there lay enshroued in five coffins a Mr. Merchant, two sons and two daughters, all of whom were struck with lightning during a thunder shower, about two o'clock, A. M.—leaving in the family only the wife and one son about eight years old; they both being much injured by the shock, the woman remaining mentally deranged, continually bemoaning the loss of her family. The circumstances of their deaths ought to be a caution to the public to manage differently from what they did. The night being very warm, they took off their beds and placed them on the floor in a cool room, where stood a stove, and the lightning, coming down the stove pipe, divided on the stove hearth, and struck the whole family of seven, of whom only two survived.