

AMERICAN TELEGRAPH

PUBLISHED EVERY AFTERNOON, (EXCEPT SUNDAY,) ON 7th st., opposite Odd-Fellows' Hall, BY CONNOLLY, WIMMER & MCGILL, At Ten Cents a Week, or TWO CENTS A SINGLE COPY.

To subscribers served by the carriers, the paper will be furnished regularly for ten cents per week, payable weekly. To mail subscribers, \$5 a year; \$3 for six months; \$1 for three months; 50 cents a month. No paper mailed unless paid for in advance, and discontinued when the term paid for expires.

CASH TERMS OF ADVERTISING. Half square, (9 lines or less) four insertions... \$1.00 1 square, (1 or 3 ins.) 1 do 2 months... 1.00 1 do 1 week... 1.75 1 do 3 months... 1.00 1 do 2 weeks... 2.75 1 do 6 months... 1.00 1 square, 1 month... 4.00 1 year... 30.00

ADVERTISERS will please endeavor to send in their favors before 11 o'clock, if possible.

THIRTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Term commences March 4, 1851, and terminates March 4, 1852.

The First Session opens on Monday, December 1, 1851.

SENATE.

The Senate consists of two Senators from each State. Since the admission of California, there are thirty-one States, represented by sixty-two Senators. The Senators who held over from the 4th of last March were forty-one, viz: eighteen Whigs and twenty-three Democrats.

Of the twenty-one new Senators, three are yet to be elected from the following States:

California—Legislature Democratic.

Connecticut—Legislature to be chosen in April, 1852.

Tennessee—Legislature Whig.

SENATORS HOLDING OVER AND ELECT.

Whigs in italics; Democrats in roman—those marked F. S. are Free-soilers; or Abolitionists; those elected as Union men; S. R., those elected as Southern or State Rights men.

Table listing Senators by State and Party, including names like Jeremiah Clemens, Wm. R. King, Wm. K. Sebastian, etc.

RECAPITULATION BY FIGURES.

Table showing counts for Whig, Dem., and Free-Soil parties across various states like Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, etc.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The House consists of two hundred and thirty-three members and four Territorial delegates. These delegates, however, have no vote. Annexed are the names of the MEMBERS ELECT.

Table listing House members by State and Territory, including names like John Bragg, Cyrus L. Dunham, Edward P. Marshall, etc.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN.

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER. Devoted to African Colonization and Civilization, to Literature and General Intelligence.

Washington, a weekly newspaper, bearing the above title, and dedicated to a sound morality in Politics, to the intelligence of the Union, to the cause of African Colonization and Civilization, and to all topics of a high and general interest to their country and mankind.

It will be printed with new type, on fine white paper, and, in mechanical execution, equal to the best newspapers in the country.

TERMS.—The Christian Statesman will be two dollars a year, payable in advance. Postmasters or others, who may be pleased to act as voluntary agents, will be responsible to those who may pay over to them subscriptions; and to the order of such agents, or to any other person named in the Christian Statesman, it will be supplied on the following terms:

Table of subscription rates: Single copy for one year \$2.00, Single copy for six months \$1.00, Three copies for one year \$5.00, etc.

CONSTITUTIONAL ROOMS, WASHINGTON, JUNE 11, 1851.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the American Colonization Society, held on the 10th instant, the Secretary laid before the Committee the Prospectus of a newspaper, to be called the 'Christian Statesman,' and to be devoted to sound morality in Politics, to the Union of the States, to the cause of African Colonization and Civilization, and to all topics of a high and general interest to their country.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEWS.

Among the late revolutions and counter-revolutions among the nations of Europe, which have followed each other in such quick succession, and of which 'the end is not yet,' the history of Great Britain has become invested with a degree of interest hitherto unknown.

These periodicals obtain a correct and connected account of the events of the day, and of the progress of the Old World, as they occur, and learn the various conclusions drawn from them by the leading spirits of the age.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, and BLACKWOOD'S QUARTERLY REVIEWS.

In these periodicals are contained the views, moderately but clearly and firmly expressed, of the three greatest parties in England—Tory, Whig, and Radical. 'Blackwood' and the 'London Quarterly' are the organs of the Whig and the 'Westminster Review' of the Radical.

The 'North British Review' owes its establishment to the late great ecclesiastical movement in Scotland, and is not ultra in its views on the rights of the different departments of human knowledge.

It is originally edited by Dr. Chalmers, and now, since his death, is conducted by his son-in-law, Dr. Hanna, associated with Sir David Brewster. Its literary character is of the very highest order.

The 'Westminster Review,' though reprinted under that title only, is published in England under the title of the Foreign Quarterly Review, and is the grand organ of the Union of the two worlds formerly published and reprinted under separate titles.

It has, therefore, the advantage, by this combination, of uniting in one work the best features of both, as heretofore published.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ASPECT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

With regard to the vote by States, which only occurs in case the Presidential election is referred to the House of Representatives, the following is the result thus far:

Table showing the distribution of Democratic and Whig States, including names of Senators and Representatives.

STIMSON & CO'S

New York, New Orleans, and Mobile Express, connecting with the swift and most responsible Expresses between the principal towns in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Lower Canada, New York State, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, District of Columbia, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, the Western States generally, the Mississippi and Alabama river towns, and the prominent places in Georgia and the Carolinas.

AMERICAN TELEGRAPH

(Communicated.) Licenses to Retail Ardent Spirits in

MESSES. EDITORS: Since my communication of Wednesday, which was hastily written, I have reflected more upon the opinion which I am informed, has been given by our city or Corporation Attorney to the Mayor, on the subject of licenses for taverns and liquor shops.

It is not denied that in law there is a clear distinction between a tavern and a liquor shop; but if the tavern shall sell or barter liquor, &c., in quantities less than a pint, it is impossible for me to see how it can escape from the plain and positive requirements of the late law, as it expressly repeals all other laws authorizing license for that traffic, and it is the only existing law under which it can be carried on.

What is a tavern? Mr. Webster, in his Dictionary, says it is a 'house licensed to sell liquors in small quantities, to be drunk on the spot.' In some of the United States, tavern is synonymous with inn, or hotel, and denotes a house for the entertainment of travelers, as well as for the sale of liquors.

Tomlin, in his Law Dictionary, calls a tavern an inn, and says that 'inns were instituted for lodging and relief for travelers; and at common law, any man might erect and keep an inn or alehouse to receive travelers, but now they are to be licensed. Every inn is not an alehouse, nor every alehouse an inn; but if an inn uses common selling of ale, it is then also an alehouse; and if an alehouse lodges and entertains travelers, it is also an inn.'

These definitions show plainly what a tavern, inn, or liquor shop is. They are in accordance with the common understanding, and cannot be mistaken. I have not access to our Corporation laws, but take it for granted they are of the same import.

There is then in law and in common sense a clear distinction between a tavern and an alehouse or grog-shop—though there is little difficulty in the one running into and merging itself in the other. So long as the tavern, in the sense above given, is confined and restricted to its legitimate business of entertaining travelers—feeding and lodging sojourners, boarders, &c.—they are useful establishments and an advantage to the community in which they are located.

I make no war against such establishments; on the contrary, they are meritorious, and deserve to be cherished and protected by law as well as public opinion; and that whether they be kept in a marble palace, with its splendid saloons and marble rooms, or the more humble and unpretending brick, frame, or even log-building, with its three or four rooms and beds—all are equally convenient if not necessary to the wants of the people, and are alike entitled to protection and respect.

Now, for such establishments as these, I have no doubt our Corporation laws provide; and the Mayor is right in giving them licenses, under the forms and regulations of the old laws on that subject. But if these taverns degenerate into the ale-house or grog-shop, by embarking in the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, then the new law comes into play, and no matter what name you give them, they must be licensed under the forms and in the mode prescribed by it, for it is the only law in force which authorizes the traffic.

It is doubtless true that a license for a tavern, under the old law, carried with it, by authority of that law, the right to retail liquors in quantities less than a pint. What I maintain is, that that old law was not like the laws of the Medes and Persians—fixed, unchangeable, and irrevocable—but an ordinary law, subject to be altered, amended, or repealed by the authority which enacted it, in the usual and ordinary mode in which other laws are amended or repealed—that is, by passing a law directly referring to it and repealing or modifying it; or by passing an independent law on the subject, with different and inconsistent provisions, which, under all the rules of construction and interpretation, must supersede and take the place of the old law.

The general rule is, 'that a subsequent statute, comprehending and confined to the same subject-matter, and containing provisions clearly and necessarily repugnant to those of a prior statute, operates as a repeal of such prior statute by implication, though the latest statute contain no repealing clause.' (See Dwarrior on Statutes.)

Now, if the holder of a tavern license seeks to escape the provisions of the late law by insisting that it does not refer in terms to the act under which his license was granted, but was designed and intended to amend another and an entirely different law, still he is met by the stubborn fact that the new law contains provisions utterly repugnant to the law under which his license was granted, and must therefore supersede it. It contains the last will of our lawmakers in relation to the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, and it cannot be dodged or evaded.

I maintain, then, that this faculty of selling liquors in quantities less than a pint is not a fixed, unchangeable fact, but may be given or taken away at the will and pleasure of the Councils; and that the Councils, by the passage of the late law, have changed the system, and provided, in terms, plain to be evaded or misunderstood, that no establishment—call it what name you please—hotel, tavern, inn, ordinary, ale-house, confectionery, or porter cellar, possessing the faculty to sell or barter spirituous or malt liquors, wine, cordials, or acids—can be licensed by the Mayor of Washington without a strict compliance with the forms, terms, and conditions of said law. Here I plant myself, and at that point I appeal to the deliberate and enlightened judgment and action of the citizens of Washington. I insist that the housekeepers of the city have rights as well as the tavern-keepers, and that the Mayor of the city is as much bound to guard

AMERICAN TELEGRAPH

(Communicated.) Licenses to Retail Ardent Spirits in

MESSES. EDITORS: Since my communication of Wednesday, which was hastily written, I have reflected more upon the opinion which I am informed, has been given by our city or Corporation Attorney to the Mayor, on the subject of licenses for taverns and liquor shops.

It is not denied that in law there is a clear distinction between a tavern and a liquor shop; but if the tavern shall sell or barter liquor, &c., in quantities less than a pint, it is impossible for me to see how it can escape from the plain and positive requirements of the late law, as it expressly repeals all other laws authorizing license for that traffic, and it is the only existing law under which it can be carried on.

What is a tavern? Mr. Webster, in his Dictionary, says it is a 'house licensed to sell liquors in small quantities, to be drunk on the spot.' In some of the United States, tavern is synonymous with inn, or hotel, and denotes a house for the entertainment of travelers, as well as for the sale of liquors.

Tomlin, in his Law Dictionary, calls a tavern an inn, and says that 'inns were instituted for lodging and relief for travelers; and at common law, any man might erect and keep an inn or alehouse to receive travelers, but now they are to be licensed. Every inn is not an alehouse, nor every alehouse an inn; but if an inn uses common selling of ale, it is then also an alehouse; and if an alehouse lodges and entertains travelers, it is also an inn.'

These definitions show plainly what a tavern, inn, or liquor shop is. They are in accordance with the common understanding, and cannot be mistaken. I have not access to our Corporation laws, but take it for granted they are of the same import.

There is then in law and in common sense a clear distinction between a tavern and an alehouse or grog-shop—though there is little difficulty in the one running into and merging itself in the other. So long as the tavern, in the sense above given, is confined and restricted to its legitimate business of entertaining travelers—feeding and lodging sojourners, boarders, &c.—they are useful establishments and an advantage to the community in which they are located.

I make no war against such establishments; on the contrary, they are meritorious, and deserve to be cherished and protected by law as well as public opinion; and that whether they be kept in a marble palace, with its splendid saloons and marble rooms, or the more humble and unpretending brick, frame, or even log-building, with its three or four rooms and beds—all are equally convenient if not necessary to the wants of the people, and are alike entitled to protection and respect.

Now, for such establishments as these, I have no doubt our Corporation laws provide; and the Mayor is right in giving them licenses, under the forms and regulations of the old laws on that subject. But if these taverns degenerate into the ale-house or grog-shop, by embarking in the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, then the new law comes into play, and no matter what name you give them, they must be licensed under the forms and in the mode prescribed by it, for it is the only law in force which authorizes the traffic.

It is doubtless true that a license for a tavern, under the old law, carried with it, by authority of that law, the right to retail liquors in quantities less than a pint. What I maintain is, that that old law was not like the laws of the Medes and Persians—fixed, unchangeable, and irrevocable—but an ordinary law, subject to be altered, amended, or repealed by the authority which enacted it, in the usual and ordinary mode in which other laws are amended or repealed—that is, by passing a law directly referring to it and repealing or modifying it; or by passing an independent law on the subject, with different and inconsistent provisions, which, under all the rules of construction and interpretation, must supersede and take the place of the old law.

The general rule is, 'that a subsequent statute, comprehending and confined to the same subject-matter, and containing provisions clearly and necessarily repugnant to those of a prior statute, operates as a repeal of such prior statute by implication, though the latest statute contain no repealing clause.' (See Dwarrior on Statutes.)

Now, if the holder of a tavern license seeks to escape the provisions of the late law by insisting that it does not refer in terms to the act under which his license was granted, but was designed and intended to amend another and an entirely different law, still he is met by the stubborn fact that the new law contains provisions utterly repugnant to the law under which his license was granted, and must therefore supersede it. It contains the last will of our lawmakers in relation to the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, and it cannot be dodged or evaded.

I maintain, then, that this faculty of selling liquors in quantities less than a pint is not a fixed, unchangeable fact, but may be given or taken away at the will and pleasure of the Councils; and that the Councils, by the passage of the late law, have changed the system, and provided, in terms, plain to be evaded or misunderstood, that no establishment—call it what name you please—hotel, tavern, inn, ordinary, ale-house, confectionery, or porter cellar, possessing the faculty to sell or barter spirituous or malt liquors, wine, cordials, or acids—can be licensed by the Mayor of Washington without a strict compliance with the forms, terms, and conditions of said law. Here I plant myself, and at that point I appeal to the deliberate and enlightened judgment and action of the citizens of Washington. I insist that the housekeepers of the city have rights as well as the tavern-keepers, and that the Mayor of the city is as much bound to guard

AMERICAN TELEGRAPH

(Communicated.) Licenses to Retail Ardent Spirits in

MESSES. EDITORS: Since my communication of Wednesday, which was hastily written, I have reflected more upon the opinion which I am informed, has been given by our city or Corporation Attorney to the Mayor, on the subject of licenses for taverns and liquor shops.

It is not denied that in law there is a clear distinction between a tavern and a liquor shop; but if the tavern shall sell or barter liquor, &c., in quantities less than a pint, it is impossible for me to see how it can escape from the plain and positive requirements of the late law, as it expressly repeals all other laws authorizing license for that traffic, and it is the only existing law under which it can be carried on.

What is a tavern? Mr. Webster, in his Dictionary, says it is a 'house licensed to sell liquors in small quantities, to be drunk on the spot.' In some of the United States, tavern is synonymous with inn, or hotel, and denotes a house for the entertainment of travelers, as well as for the sale of liquors.

Tomlin, in his Law Dictionary, calls a tavern an inn, and says that 'inns were instituted for lodging and relief for travelers; and at common law, any man might erect and keep an inn or alehouse to receive travelers, but now they are to be licensed. Every inn is not an alehouse, nor every alehouse an inn; but if an inn uses common selling of ale, it is then also an alehouse; and if an alehouse lodges and entertains travelers, it is also an inn.'

These definitions show plainly what a tavern, inn, or liquor shop is. They are in accordance with the common understanding, and cannot be mistaken. I have not access to our Corporation laws, but take it for granted they are of the same import.

There is then in law and in common sense a clear distinction between a tavern and an alehouse or grog-shop—though there is little difficulty in the one running into and merging itself in the other. So long as the tavern, in the sense above given, is confined and restricted to its legitimate business of entertaining travelers—feeding and lodging sojourners, boarders, &c.—they are useful establishments and an advantage to the community in which they are located.

I make no war against such establishments; on the contrary, they are meritorious, and deserve to be cherished and protected by law as well as public opinion; and that whether they be kept in a marble palace, with its splendid saloons and marble rooms, or the more humble and unpretending brick, frame, or even log-building, with its three or four rooms and beds—all are equally convenient if not necessary to the wants of the people, and are alike entitled to protection and respect.

Now, for such establishments as these, I have no doubt our Corporation laws provide; and the Mayor is right in giving them licenses, under the forms and regulations of the old laws on that subject. But if these taverns degenerate into the ale-house or grog-shop, by embarking in the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, then the new law comes into play, and no matter what name you give them, they must be licensed under the forms and in the mode prescribed by it, for it is the only law in force which authorizes the traffic.

It is doubtless true that a license for a tavern, under the old law, carried with it, by authority of that law, the right to retail liquors in quantities less than a pint. What I maintain is, that that old law was not like the laws of the Medes and Persians—fixed, unchangeable, and irrevocable—but an ordinary law, subject to be altered, amended, or repealed by the authority which enacted it, in the usual and ordinary mode in which other laws are amended or repealed—that is, by passing a law directly referring to it and repealing or modifying it; or by passing an independent law on the subject, with different and inconsistent provisions, which, under all the rules of construction and interpretation, must supersede and take the place of the old law.

The general rule is, 'that a subsequent statute, comprehending and confined to the same subject-matter, and containing provisions clearly and necessarily repugnant to those of a prior statute, operates as a repeal of such prior statute by implication, though the latest statute contain no repealing clause.' (See Dwarrior on Statutes.)

Now, if the holder of a tavern license seeks to escape the provisions of the late law by insisting that it does not refer in terms to the act under which his license was granted, but was designed and intended to amend another and an entirely different law, still he is met by the stubborn fact that the new law contains provisions utterly repugnant to the law under which his license was granted, and must therefore supersede it. It contains the last will of our lawmakers in relation to the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, and it cannot be dodged or evaded.

I maintain, then, that this faculty of selling liquors in quantities less than a pint is not a fixed, unchangeable fact, but may be given or taken away at the will and pleasure of the Councils; and that the Councils, by the passage of the late law, have changed the system, and provided, in terms, plain to be evaded or misunderstood, that no establishment—call it what name you please—hotel, tavern, inn, ordinary, ale-house, confectionery, or porter cellar, possessing the faculty to sell or barter spirituous or malt liquors, wine, cordials, or acids—can be licensed by the Mayor of Washington without a strict compliance with the forms, terms, and conditions of said law. Here I plant myself, and at that point I appeal to the deliberate and enlightened judgment and action of the citizens of Washington. I insist that the housekeepers of the city have rights as well as the tavern-keepers, and that the Mayor of the city is as much bound to guard

AMERICAN TELEGRAPH

(Communicated.) Licenses to Retail Ardent Spirits in

MESSES. EDITORS: Since my communication of Wednesday, which was hastily written, I have reflected more upon the opinion which I am informed, has been given by our city or Corporation Attorney to the Mayor, on the subject of licenses for taverns and liquor shops.

It is not denied that in law there is a clear distinction between a tavern and a liquor shop; but if the tavern shall sell or barter liquor, &c., in quantities less than a pint, it is impossible for me to see how it can escape from the plain and positive requirements of the late law, as it expressly repeals all other laws authorizing license for that traffic, and it is the only existing law under which it can be carried on.

What is a tavern? Mr. Webster, in his Dictionary, says it is a 'house licensed to sell liquors in small quantities, to be drunk on the spot.' In some of the United States, tavern is synonymous with inn, or hotel, and denotes a house for the entertainment of travelers, as well as for the sale of liquors.

Tomlin, in his Law Dictionary, calls a tavern an inn, and says that 'inns were instituted for lodging and relief for travelers; and at common law, any man might erect and keep an inn or alehouse to receive travelers, but now they are to be licensed. Every inn is not an alehouse, nor every alehouse an inn; but if an inn uses common selling of ale, it is then also an alehouse; and if an alehouse lodges and entertains travelers, it is also an inn.'

These definitions show plainly what a tavern, inn, or liquor shop is. They are in accordance with the common understanding, and cannot be mistaken. I have not access to our Corporation laws, but take it for granted they are of the same import.

There is then in law and in common sense a clear distinction between a tavern and an alehouse or grog-shop—though there is little difficulty in the one running into and merging itself in the other. So long as the tavern, in the sense above given, is confined and restricted to its legitimate business of entertaining travelers—feeding and lodging sojourners, boarders, &c.—they are useful establishments and an advantage to the community in which they are located.

I make no war against such establishments; on the contrary, they are meritorious, and deserve to be cherished and protected by law as well as public opinion; and that whether they be kept in a marble palace, with its splendid saloons and marble rooms, or the more humble and unpretending brick, frame, or even log-building, with its three or four rooms and beds—all are equally convenient if not necessary to the wants of the people, and are alike entitled to protection and respect.

Now, for such establishments as these, I have no doubt our Corporation laws provide; and the Mayor is right in giving them licenses, under the forms and regulations of the old laws on that subject. But if these taverns degenerate into the ale-house or grog-shop, by embarking in the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, then the new law comes into play, and no matter what name you give them, they must be licensed under the forms and in the mode prescribed by it, for it is the only law in force which authorizes the traffic.

It is doubtless true that a license for a tavern, under the old law, carried with it, by authority of that law, the right to retail liquors in quantities less than a pint. What I maintain is, that that old law was not like the laws of the Medes and Persians—fixed, unchangeable, and irrevocable—but an ordinary law, subject to be altered, amended, or repealed by the authority which enacted it, in the usual and ordinary mode in which other laws are amended or repealed—that is, by passing a law directly referring to it and repealing or modifying it; or by passing an independent law on the subject, with different and inconsistent provisions, which, under all the rules of construction and interpretation, must supersede and take the place of the old law.

The general rule is, 'that a subsequent statute, comprehending and confined to the same subject-matter, and containing provisions clearly and necessarily repugnant to those of a prior statute, operates as a repeal of such prior statute by implication, though the latest statute contain no repealing clause.' (See Dwarrior on Statutes.)

Now, if the holder of a tavern license seeks to escape the provisions of the late law by insisting that it does not refer in terms to the act under which his license was granted, but was designed and intended to amend another and an entirely different law, still he is met by the stubborn fact that the new law contains provisions utterly repugnant to the law under which his license was granted, and must therefore supersede it. It contains the last will of our lawmakers in relation to the sale of liquors in quantities less than a pint, and it cannot be dodged or evaded.

I maintain, then, that this faculty of selling liquors in quantities less than a pint is not a fixed, unchangeable fact, but may be given or taken away at the will and pleasure of the Councils; and that the Councils, by the passage of the late law, have changed the system, and provided, in terms, plain to be evaded or misunderstood, that no establishment—call it what name you please—hotel, tavern, inn, ordinary, ale-house, confectionery, or porter cellar, possessing the faculty to sell or barter spirituous or malt liquors, wine, cordials, or acids—can be licensed by the Mayor of Washington without a strict compliance with the forms, terms, and conditions of said law. Here I plant myself, and at that point I appeal to the deliberate and enlightened judgment and action of the citizens of Washington. I insist that the housekeepers of the city have rights as well as the tavern-keepers, and that the Mayor of the city is as much bound to guard

one else to ride in it this winter, and that you'll be very sorry when the ride is over, too!" "Oh, but I shan't bet," said Dick, "for I don't wish to win anything from you, and, besides, it is against all honesty to bet on a certainty."

"But will you give me your grey coat that I begged you so much for last summer, if I turn out a true prophetess?" said Lucy. "Certainly, with pleasure—coat, saddle, bridle, and whip—you will deserve them all. And, moreover, I will esteem you the most wonderful reader of futurity ever known."

CHAPTER II. The Thornton District, as it was called, was very small, and contained but one or two wealthy families. The "school money" was so trifling that it was scarce sufficient to initiate the rising generation into the mysteries of reading, writing, and ciphering. In order to make the most of it, the custom prevailed from time immemorial of giving the board. Great account was made among these rural people of boarding the school ma'am. Preparations were commenced several days before the arrival of the important person, and carried on with the most untiring zeal—whilst every child looked forward to the time as a jubilee equal to Thanksgiving and Independence day.

A week or so after the occurrences related in the foregoing chapter, an uncommon bustle commenced in the squire's house. Lucy had been awakened from her dreams long before the first streak of daylight appeared in the east, and told "to make haste, for they had everything to do that day to get ready for the school ma'am." Mrs. Thornton could be seen hurrying to and fro, enveloped in an enormous check apron; sounds of beating, stirring, and rolling proceeded from the pantry. Old Joe Simons, the man of all work, was dismissed from his wood-chopping, and sent to help the "women folks" the whole day. The havoc carried on in the store-room was frightful. Flour, sugar, butter, eggs, etc., disappeared with fearful rapidity, but assumed, however, a more tempting shape under the skillful management of Mrs. Thornton. Old Joe carried on a merciless slaughter among the poultry. Deafening cries resounded from the precincts of the barn, as some promising captives were marched off to adorn the triumphal approach of this rapacious teacher, or when the bloodthirsty Joe again appeared with clubs, to prosecute yet further his ravages among their flying ranks. One would never have guessed that such preparations were intended for the entertainment of a single individual: had a marching regiment designed to partake of the worthy farmer's hospitality, very little more could have been necessary for their sustenance. The closet-shelves actually groaned beneath the weight of the provisions. There were rows of apple and pumpkin pies, cup cake, gingerbread, cookies, doughnuts, custards, and puddings, besides the indispensable brown bread and beans, and the carcasses of Joe's poor victims suspended around the walls.

Lucy had special charge of the cleaning department. Every room was carefully swept and dusted, but her chief energies were exerted in arranging the "spare bed-room" for its expected occupant. The curtains and table-cover were of spotless white. The bed, decked tastefully in a quilt of her own piecing, loomed half way up to the ceiling in the profusion of feathers. The andirons were rubbed and polished, with the wood and kindlings placed on them ready to light a fire at a moment's warning. Lucy cast a satisfied glance around the room after the pleasant task was finished, gave a last rub to the looking-glass, dusted for the third time the old-fashioned mantel-piece, and pronounced every thing in order.

(To be continued.)

THE LONDON TIMES AND KOSUTH.—The London correspondent of the Boston Post explains the Times' hostility to Kosuth as follows: "It may be asked, en passant, why the great 'Thunderer'—the 'first paper in the world,' the Times—a paper that professes to 'go with the times,' should go so bitterly, violently and falsely against the great Hungarian hero. That paper is generally on the side of tyranny and absolutism. That is not all in this case. Austrian funds are constantly sinking; and as the cause of Kosuth comes up that of Austria goes down. The house of Rothschilds—half Austrian in stocks, funds and persons—has a branch here in London, as well as that in Austria, has a great stake in Austrian bonds; and that, with the great moneyed interests here, including no doubt that of Baring & Brothers, have swung out at least ten thousand pounds to that paper to write Kosuth down! Yes, AUSTRIAN GOLD has attempted to crush where Austrian bayonets could not. They have reckoned without their host. That spirit which prompted a band of draymen to pull the beard of a Haynau, will not permit the champion of Hungarian freedom to get foot on English soil without at least showing a sympathy with a people who struggle, however vainly, for their liberties. Rothschilds, the Times & Co., have kicked against a wall—against a wall of human hearts, and the rebound will injure the utterers, but not those whom they attempt to destroy.

Jenny Lind will be in New York during the week, but out of delicacy to Miss Hayes, she will not give any concerts there at present. She will proceed to Boston, and sing there, and perhaps in other cities of New England, and returning in December, will give some concerts in New York. This delicate course on the part of Miss Lind to a sister songstress shows that there is a good feeling between these vocalists.

WINDFALL FOR A HATTER.—Mr. James Miller, who has worked as a journeyman hatter for the last ten years, in Cincinnati, a few days ago received notice from Washington city that the sum of \$63,000 was awaiting his orders at the capital—he being heir to an old Mexican indemnity claim to that amount, which has recently been allowed by the Commissioners. The good news was entirely unexpected by him.

A convention of counties and corporations favorable to the extension of the Alexandria and Manassas Gap railroad from Strasburg, in Shenandoah county, Virginia, to intersect the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, at Paddytown, in Hampshire county, Virginia, will be held at Romney, on Tuesday, the 25th instant. A number of counties and corporations interested have already made provisions to send proper delegations to this convention.

A SENSIBLE PAPER.—The Richmond Why says it will publish original poetry on the same terms as advertisements. Massachusetts House of Representatives—172 Whigs, 155 Coalitionists—thus far.