



A Weekly Paper, Devoted to Literature, Politics, the Arts, Sciences, Agriculture, &c. &c.—Terms: One Dollar and Fifty Cents in Advance.

BY DAVID OVER.

BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY, JANUARY 1, 1858.

VOL. 31, NO. 1.

Select Poetry.

THE PASS OF DEATH.

It was a narrow pass,
Watered with human tears,
For death had kept this outer gate
Almost six thousand years.
And the ceaseless tread of a world's feet
Was ever in my ears—
Thronging, jostling, hurrying by,
As if they were only born to die.

A stately king drew near,
This narrow pass to tread,
Around him hung a gorgeous robe,
And a crown was on his head;
But Death, with a look of withering scorn,
Arrested him and said,
"A humbler dress must the king draw near,
For the crown and the purple are useless here."

Next came a man of wealth,
And his eye was proud and bold,
And he bore in his hand a lengthy scroll,
Telling of puns untold;
But Death was ere he had time to rank,
Careless as he felt for gold—
"Here that scroll I cannot allow,
For the roll of the richest is powerless now."

Another followed fast,
And a book was in his hand,
Filled with the fables of burning thought
That are known in many a land;
But the roll of genius failed to hear
Death's pillus demand—
"How that book cannot enter with these,
For the bright light of genius is nothing to me."

Next came a maiden fair
With that eye so deep and bright,
That she within you strange sweet care,
Should you meet on summer night;
But Death, ere the good maid passed through
Snatched away its light—
"Beauty is power in the world," he saith,
"But what can it do in the Pass of Death."

A youth of sickly mien
Followed in a mournful mood,
Whose heart was filled with love to God
As the early morning dew;
Death felt he could not murther the heart
That lived for others good—
"I own," cried he, "the power of love,
I must let it pass to realms above!"

MISCHIEF MAKERS.

Oh! could there in the world be found
Some little spot of happy ground,
Where village pleasures might go round,
Without the village tiding.

How doubly blest that place would be,
Where all might dwell in liberty,
Free from the bitter isery
Of gossip's endless prattling.

If such a spot were really known,
Dame Peace might claim it as her own,
And in a she might let her throne,
For ever and for ever.

There, like a queen might reign and live,
While every one would soon forgive
The little slights they might receive
And be offended never.

'Tis mischief makers that remove,
Far from our hearts the warmth of love,
And leave us all to disapprove
Who gives another pleasure.

They seem to take on's part—but when
They're heard our ears, unkindly then
They soon retail their gains,
Mixed with their poisonous manna.

And then they've such a cunning way
Of telling their ill-meant tales, they say
"Don't mention what I say, I pray,
I would not tell another."

Sting to your neighbor's house they go
Narrating everything they know;
And treat the peace of high and low,
Wife, husband, friend and brother.

Oh! that the mischief making crew
Were all reduced to one or two,
And the world were painted red or blue,
That every one might know them!

Then would our villages forget
To rage and quarrel, fret and fret,
And fall to angry words and fret,
Withers so much of it.

For the degraded
To murther boys
And plagger boys
We do love
Then levers
In quiet
White ship
Joy space abound,
Feelers!

BORN TO... John Martin of London, is the possessor of a fine estate, which he has inherited from his father. The estate is valued at \$1,250,000, and he is now enjoying a comfortable life. He is a member of the London and Westminster Club, and is a great lover of the game of cricket. He is also a great collector of books, and has a fine library of over 10,000 volumes. He is a very generous man, and has given a large sum of money to the poor. He is a very popular man, and is loved by all who know him.

AGRICULTURAL.

SUGGESTIONS ABOUT STABLES.

In a previous article on the subject of the construction of stables we submitted a few suggestions to aid those who feel desirous of doing everything possible for the comfort of their horses, in the work of planning good stables about to build new ones, or to re-construct old ones.

As several suggestions, which were present to mind while writing our former article, were omitted on account of our limited space, we turn to the subject, and commence with remarks that provision should always be made, in some way or other, for a very free and sufficient ventilation in all stables.

There are a few stables where this matter is sufficiently attended to. There are but few stables where it does not emit a most offensive and disagreeable odor when the doors are first opened in the morning. A horse shut up in such an atmosphere for a considerable share of every twenty-four hours, can neither be as comfortable nor as healthy as he would be if provided with a secure a purer supply of air. The whole of the blood and humors of his system must be contaminated with the impurities of the atmosphere which he is obliged to breathe and imbibe through his lungs. This poisonous matter cannot be taken into the system for any great length of time without inducing some disease, or, at least, some degree of weakness and spirits, and a predisposition and readiness to be affected with actual disease. May not the dullness of eye, and want of sprightliness, which are sometimes observed in horses on first taking them out of the stable, be owing in a great measure to the impurities of the atmosphere which they have breathed during a long night, or a longer period of confinement in their stable? And may not the languor and listlessness, the want of strength and vigor, which are quite common with horses in the spring, be owing in a great measure to their being shut up in close, ill-ventilated and impure stables, during the winter months? However this may be, it is well established that inflammation and weakness of eyes, as well as coughs, colds, influenza and inflammations of the lungs, are often caused by confinement in the foul and unwholesome atmosphere of some much-neglected and ill-constructed stables. When horses, shut up in such an atmosphere during the winter, come to be exposed, as they naturally must be, to sudden changes of temperature in the spring, it need not be wondered that they should readily take cold and be seized with serious and even fatal inflammation of the lungs.

Notwithstanding the truth and obviousness of these and other considerations, horses are often shut up for whole days and nights in an atmosphere which many could not bear to breathe for one hour.

Two of the simplest contrivances which we have even seen, to remedy the closeness and impurity of stables, were adopted by one who became sensible of the injury and discomfort inflicted on his horses by the use of stables open to the objections. The first consisted in opening several windows in the walls of the stable, these being hung, could be opened and shut more or less according to the weather.

Another of these contrivances was the substitution of a door divided into an upper and lower half in the place of a whole undivided door. The door faced to the south, the upper half could be left open in all sorts of weather, save the most stormy and severely cold. By these means and the insertion of a sliding grate in the wall opposite, above the heads of the horses, a great improvement was effected in one stable, and by similar contrivances an improvement might be brought about in many cases.

In building new stables, however, provision should be made of a more scientific and efficient kind. The object may be accomplished in various ways, but one of the best is to admit fresh air by means of a sliding grate at the back of each stall, and to have a hopper in the ceiling with a trunk up to the roof, to allow the escape of heated and impure air.—Country Gentleman.

BREAKING STEERS.

Every careful observer must have noticed the difference in the speed of oxen. Some move at a snail's pace, while others walk almost as fast as horses. Now, I know a yoke that will plow a day and keep up with a span of good horses, and I contend that the difference is principally in the breaking. I was taught to work them I work, and play when I play, and it should be so with steers. If when you are training them, you keep them plodding about all day before they are used to work, it will make them slow, and no amount of whipping will slip them after years. But if you learn them to walk off at a good, lively gait, they will never forget it, and you will find it much pleasanter to work with oxen.

Steers should not be worked too much when young, as it retards their growth and otherwise injures them, but the sooner they are accustomed to fat work, the better. If allowed to run until they are three or four years old, they become wild and untractable, are always running away with the cart or sled, and never become so obedient and docile as those that are trained when younger. When they are a year old, the can be yoked and hitched to a small stick of timber or a sled, and be driven around for a few days, and they become docile and obedient. The second winter they should be yoked a few times. To little boys, if any in the family, and to it is excellent amusement for the young.

COOKING FOOD FOR STOCK.—Cooking food for farm stock is rapidly growing into favor. It is not altogether a new notion, either. But lately, grinding feed has been in vogue, until the toll taken by the miller has become so

large an item that our farmers are disposed to save both the grist and the toll by using different kinds of apparatus for cooking food.—We incline to the belief, from experience and from information derived personally from intelligent English agriculturists who have had experience in this manner of preparing food, that if an economical boiler can be procured—one that will economize fuel, using all the heat that is generated, thus saving a large per cent that is lost in the use of kettles—our farmers will not tax themselves with the labor and time of visiting the "gristmill." A correspondent says he feeds three fifths less grain to his hogs than when he fed raw grain, and thinks he saved the price of three steam boilers in three weeks.—Journal of Agriculture.

FARMERS TRY IT.—On examination of the Chinese sugar-cane, it will be found that at each joint there is a small shoot, covered up by the outside coating. It is by preserving the tops or stalks, and replanting the next season lengthwise of the rows, that the sugar crop in the South is produced from just such shoots.—We therefore suggest that some stalks be saved for experiment, and planted next year. If it succeeds the growth may be improved, and at least it will prevent the plant from running out or mixing with other species, as rumor says it is apt to do.

CURE FOR WARTS ON COWS.—Apply a few drops of nitric acid to the wart, two or three times. Use it carefully, and avoid putting it on the bag. I have always found it effectual. They are sometimes removed by tying a strong thread around them; but the acid is better.

KEEPING OLDER SWEET.—A pint of mustard seed, put in a barrel of cider, will preserve it sweet for several months. I have drank fall cider in the month of May, which was kept sweet by this means.

JUDGE DOUGLAS'S SPEECH.

We submit the concluding portion of Judge Douglas's speech of December 9, upon Kansas affairs, our space not permitting its publication entire:

Sir, I deny your right or mine to inquire of these people what their objections to that Constitution are. They have a right to judge for themselves whether they like or dislike it. It is no answer to tell me that the Constitution is a good one and unobjectionable. It is not satisfactory to me to have the President say in his message that that Constitution is an admirable one, like all the Constitutions of the new States that have been recently formed.—Whether good or bad, whether objectionable or not, is none of my business and none of yours. It is their business and not ours. I care not what they have in their Constitution, so that it suits them, and does not violate the Constitution of the United States and the fundamental principles of liberty upon which our institutions rest. I am not going to argue the question whether the banking system established in that Constitution is wise or unwise. It says there shall be no monopolies but there shall be one bank of discount in the State, with two branches. All I have to say on that point is, if they want a banking system, let them have it; if they do not want it, let them prohibit it. If they want a bank with two branches, be it so; if they want twenty, it is one of my business, and it matters not to whether one of them shall be on the north side and the other on the south side of the Kaw river, or where they shall be.

While I have no right to expect to be consulted on that point, I do hold that the people of Kansas have the right to be consulted and to decide it, and you have no lawful authority to deprive them of that privilege. It is no justification, in my mind, to say that the provisions for the eligibility for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant Governor require twenty years' citizenship in the United States. If men think that no person should vote or hold office until he has been here twenty years, they have a right to think so, and a majority of the people of Kansas think that a man of foreign birth should vote or hold office unless he has lived here twenty years, or their right to say so, and I have no right to interfere with them; it is their business, not mine; but if I lived there, I should not be willing to have that provision in the Constitution without being heard upon the subject, and allowed to record my protest against it.

I have nothing to say about the system of taxation, in which they have got back, and resorted to the old exploded system that we tried in Illinois, but abandoned because we did not like it. If they wish to try it, and get tired of it, and abandon it, be it so; but if I were a citizen of Kansas, I would not be the experience of Illinois on that subject, and defeat it if I could. Yet I have no objection to their having it if they want it; it is their business, not mine.

So it is in regard to the free negro. They provide that no free negro shall be permitted to live in Kansas. I suppose they are a right to say so if they choose; but if I lived there, I should want to vote on that question. We, in Illinois, provide that no more shall come there. We say to the other States, "Take care of your own free negroes, and we will take care of ours." But we do not say that negroes now there shall not be permitted to be in Illinois; and I think the people of Kansas ought to have the right to say whether they will allow them to live there; and, if they are not going to do so, how they are to dispose of them.

So you may go on with all the herent clauses of the Constitution. They make all right; they may be all wrong. That is a question on which my opinion is worth nothing.—The opinion of the wise and patriotic Chief Magistrate of the United States is no worth

anything as against that of the people of Kansas, for they have a right to judge for themselves; and neither Presidents, nor Senators, nor House of Representatives, nor any other power outside of Kansas, has a right to judge for them. Hence it is no justification, in my mind, for the violation of a great principle of self-government, to say that the Constitution you are forcing on them is not particularly objectionable, or is it excellent in its provisions.

Perhaps, sir, the same thing might be said of the celebrated Topeka Constitution. I do not recollect its peculiar provisions. I know one thing: We Democrats, we Nebraska men, would not even look into it, to see what its provisions were. Why? Because we said it was made by a political party, and not by the people; that it was made in defiance of the authority of Congress; that it was as pure as the Bible, as holy as the ten commandments, yet we would not touch it, until it was submitted to and ratified by the people of Kansas, in pursuance of the forms of law. Perhaps that Topeka Constitution, but for the mode of making it, would have been unobjectionable. I do not know; I do not care. You have no right to force an unobjectionable Constitution on a people! It does not mitigate the evil, it does not diminish the insult, it does not ameliorate the wrong, that you are forcing a good thing on them. I am not willing to be forced to do that which I would do if I were left free to judge and act for myself. Hence I assert that there is no justification to be made for this flagrant violation of popular rights in Kansas, on the plea, that the Constitution which they have made is not particularly objectionable.

But, sir, the President of the United States is really and sincerely of the opinion that the Slavery clause has been fairly and impartially submitted to the free acceptance or rejection of the people of Kansas; and that, inasmuch as that was the exciting and paramount question, if they get the right to vote as they please on that subject, they ought to be satisfied, and possibly it might be better if we would accept it, and put an end to the question.

Let me ask, sir, is the slavery clause fairly submitted, so that the people can vote for or against it? Suppose I were a citizen of Kansas, and should go up to the polls and say, "I desire to vote to make Kansas a slave State; here is my ballot." They reply to me, "Mr. Douglas, just vote for that Constitution first, if you please." "Oh, no," I answer, "I cannot vote for that Constitution conscientiously, I am opposed to the clause by which you locate certain railroads in such a way as to sacrifice my county and my part of the State. I am opposed to that banking system. I am opposed to this Know Nothing or American clause in the Constitution about the qualification for office. I cannot vote for it." They then answer, "You shall not vote on making it a slave State." I then say, "I want to make it a free State." They reply, "Vote for that Constitution first, and then you can vote to make it a free State; otherwise you cannot." Thus they disqualify every free State man who will not first vote for the Constitution. No matter whether or not the voters state that they cannot conscientiously vote for those provisions, they reply, "You cannot vote for or against slavery here. Take the Constitution as we have made it, take the elective franchise as we have established it, take the banking system as we have located it, take the railroad lines as we have located them, take the judiciary system as we have formed it, take it all as we have fixed it to suit ourselves, and ask no questions, but vote for it, or you shall not vote either for a slave or free State." In other words, the legal effect of the schedule is this: all those who are in favor of this Constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this Constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all.—That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the Constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. How many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the Constitution will be voted down instantly, by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving that minority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose.

Let me ask you if that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting that particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery, as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose on the slavery question, if you tell me I shall not vote on it until I vote for the Maine liquor law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question, if you tell me that I shall not vote either way until I vote for a bank? Is it freedom of election to make your right to vote upon one question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other question which has no connection with it. Is that freedom of election? Is that the great fundamental principle of self-government, for which we combined and struggled, in this body and throughout the country, to establish as the rule of action in all time to come?

The President of the United States has made some remarks in his message which I think would be very appropriate to read in this connection. He says:

"The friends and supporters of the Nebraska and Kansas act, when struggling on a recent occasion to sustain its wise provisions before the great tribunal of the American people, never differed about its true meaning, on this subject. Everywhere throughout the Union they publicly pledged their faith and honor that they would cheerfully submit the question of slavery to the decision of the bona fide people of Kansas, without any restriction or qualification whatever." All were cordially united upon the great doctrine of popular sovereignty, which is

the vital principle of our free institutions." Mark this:

"Had it then been insinuated, from any quarter, that it would have been a sufficient compliance with the requisitions of the organic law for the members of a Convention, thereafter to be elected, to withhold the question of slavery from the people, and to substitute their own will for that of a legally ascertained majority of their constituents, this would have been instantly rejected."

Yes, sir, and I will add, further, had it been then insinuated from any quarter, and believed by the American people, that it would have submitted the slavery clause in such a manner as to compel a man to vote that which his conscience did not approve, in order to vote on the slavery clause, not only would the idea have been rejected, but the Democratic candidate for the Presidency would have been rejected; and every man who backed him would have been rejected, too.

The President tells us in his message that the whole party pledged our faith, and our honor, that the slavery question should be submitted to the people, without any restriction or qualification whatever. Does this schedule submit it without qualification? It qualifies it by saying, "You may vote on slavery if you will vote for the Constitution; but you shall not do so without doing that." That is a very important qualification—a qualification that controls a man's vote and his action and his conscience, if he is an honest man—a qualification confessedly in violation of our platform. We are told by the President that our faith and our honor are pledged that the slavery clause should be submitted without qualification of any kind whatever; and now, am I to be called upon to forfeit my faith and my honor in order to enable a small minority of the people of Kansas to defraud the majority of that people out of their elective franchise? Sir, my honor is pledged; and before it shall be tarnished, I will take whatever consequences, personal to myself, may come; but never ask me to do an act which the President, in his message, has said is a forfeiture of faith—a violation of honor and that merely for the expediency of saving the party. I will go as far as any heart to save the party. I have as much heart in the great cause that binds us together as a party as any man living. I will sacrifice anything, short of principle and honor, for the peace of the party; but if the party will not stand by its principles, its faith, its pledges, I will stand there, and abide whatever consequences may result from the position.

Let me ask you, why force this Constitution down the throats of the people of Kansas, in opposition to their wishes, and in violation of our pledge. What great object is to be attained? *Cui bono?* What are you to gain by it? Will you sustain the party by violating its principles? Do you propose to keep the party united by forcing a division? Stand by the doctrine that leaves the people perfectly free to form and regulate their institutions for themselves in their own way, and your party will be united and irresistible in power. Abandon that great principle, and the party is not worth saving, and cannot be saved, after it shall be violated. I trust we are not to be rushed upon this question. Why shall it be done? Who is to be benefited? Is the South to be the gainer? Is the North to be the gainer? Neither the North nor the South has the right to gain a sectional advantage by trickery or fraud.

But I am beseeched to wait until I hear from the election on the 21st of December. I am told, that perhaps that will put it all right, and will save the whole difficulty. How can it?—Perhaps there may be a large vote. There may be a large vote returned. [Laughter.]—But I deny that it is possible to have a fair vote on the Slavery clause; and I say that it is not possible to have any vote on the Constitution. Why wait for the mockery of an election, when it is provided unalterably that the people cannot vote—when the majority are disfranchised?

But I am told on all sides, "Oh, just wait; the Pro-Slavery clause will be voted down."—That does not obviate any of my objections, it does not diminish any of them. You have no more right to force a free State Constitution on Kansas than a slave-State Constitution. If Kansas wants a slave-State Constitution, she has a right to it; if she wants a free-State Constitution, she has a right to it. It is none of my business which way the Slavery clause is decided. I care not whether it is voted down or voted up. Do you suppose, after the pledges of my honor that I would go for that principle, and leave the people to vote as they choose, that I would now degrade myself by voting one way if the Slavery clause be voted down, and another way if it be voted up? I care not how that vote may stand. I take it for granted that it will be voted out. I think I have seen enough in the last three days to make it certain that it will be returned out, no matter how the vote may stand. [Laughter.]

Sir, I am opposed to that concern, because it looks to me like a system of trickery and jugglery, to defeat the fair expression of the will of the people. There is no necessity for crowding this measure, so unfair, so unjust as it is in all its aspects, upon us. Why can we not now do what we proposed to do in the last Congress?—We then voted through the Senate an enabling act, called the Toombs bill, believed to be just and fair in all its provisions, pronounced to be almost perfect by the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. Hale] only he did not like the man, then President of the United States, who would have to make the appointments. Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a clause taken from the Minnesota act, which he thinks should be a general rule, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party. You all voted with me for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Topeka, treat both these party movements as irregular and void; pass a fair bill—the one

that we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit. Have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on their Constitution.

If the Toombs bill does not suit my friends, take the Minnesota bill of last session—the one so much commended by the President in his message as a model. Let us pass that as an enabling act, and allow the people of all parties to come together and have a fair vote, and I will go for it. Frame any other bill that secures a fair, honest vote, of men of all parties, and carries out the pledge that the people shall be left free to decide on their domestic institutions for themselves, and I will go with you with pleasure, and with all the energy I may possess.—But if this Constitution is to be forced down our throats, in violation of the fundamental principle of free government, under a mode of submission that is a mockery and insult, painful as it will be to me, I must break all associations or connections, rather than forfeit my principles.

I have no fear of any party associations being severed. I should regret to see social and political ties severed; but if it must be, I cannot act with you and preserve my faith and my honor, I will stand on the great principle of popular sovereignty, which declares the right of all people to be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. I will follow that principle wherever its legal and logical consequences may take me, and I will endeavor to defend it against assault from any and all quarters. No mortal man shall be responsible for my action but myself. By my action, I will compromise no man.

OLD SCENES REVISITED.

The progression of life is so simple, and in the greatest number of persons so quiet, that they are men only know, at length, that they are changing; but seldom perceive the process of changing. We knew that we are no longer boys, but cannot tell when we crossed the line. We are conscious that we have reached manhood and that youth has departed. But so gently did it go that we are as those who listen to a bird singing in a tree. After it has flown they listen still, and only know its flight because it is no longer singing.

But now and then we are turned back, and brought face to face with the past, in such a way that two lives gaze at each other, and we walk as if one identity had two expressions.

The recollections of the past beat upon the heart, and we stand in its door, as a parent to whom comes back the child not seen for scores of years, uncertain whether to doubt or to accept the familiar stranger. After long absence, let any one revisit the scenes of his childhood home, and see whether these things be not so. There will be a soft bewilderment, a sad joy of excitement, which perhaps, one may not be able to analyze, but which, in fact, the flowing together of the two great streams of life, the past and the present.

ARREST OF MURDERERS.

Two colored men have been arrested charged with the murder of Mrs. Garber and Elizabeth Ream, at Lancaster, an account of which we published last week.—They are residents of Lancaster, and have long been known as thieves—spending the greater portion of their time in the county prison.—When searched, upwards of \$90 in gold and silver was found upon their persons, which amount corresponds with that which Mr. Garber says was in the possession of his wife. There is no doubt that the object of the murderers was to get possession of the money said to be in the house. There was considerable blood upon their clothing. The evidence against them is of such a character as to leave no doubt of their guilt. The feeling against the murderers was so great, while they were undergoing examination, that fears were entertained that the excited crowd would inflict summary vengeance upon them. A few women, however, served to calm the excitement, and the officers were allowed to convey them to prison without hindrance.

GENTLE ROARING.

The Richmond South declines a controversy with Col. Forney, upon the following special ground:

"We have abundant opportunity for discussion with editors of respectable character. If we could not find a worthy champion, we should not accept one whose name is the synonym of personal dishonor."

We have an impression that this is the same Col. Forney who was chosen Clerk of the United States House of Representatives by the votes of the Virginia delegation. Is not this so? Col. Forney, like Judge Douglas, enjoyed a temporary period of respectability while cooperating with "Southern gentlemen." Like Judge Douglas, also he relapses into a condition of "impurity" and "personal dishonor" the moment he thwarts the purpose of these same interesting "gentlemen."—Washington Republic.

METHODISM.—The Methodist Church (North) has a membership, it appears from its minutes, just published, of \$20,219; being an increase of 20,192 over last year. Its travelling preachers number 5,134; its local preachers 7,169 its churches 8,335; and the value of its churches and parsonages is estimated at \$18,000,000.—Its contributions for missions, tracts, bibles, and Sunday-school publications reach \$311,315.—The Church South has a membership of 550,890.

An impertinent editor in Alabama wants to know when we "intend to pay the debt of nature?" We are inclined to think that when nature gets her dues from him it will be by an Execution.—Lou. Journal.