

# The Bradford Reporter.

E. O. GOODRICH, Publisher.

REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER.

\$2 per Annum, in Advance

VOLUME XXVII.

TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., NOVEMBER 1, 1866.

NUMBER 23.

ing himself as so satisfied with the sweets of unsought power as to be indifferent to its honor. Ambition is not for him, for ambition aspires; and what object has he to aspire on elevating him from the pinnacle of greatness to another, until they have at last made him President of the United States. He might have been Dictator had he pleased; but what, to a man wearied with authority and dignity, would dictatorship be worth? If he is proud of anything it is of the tailor's bench, from which he started. He would have everybody understand that he is humble—thoroughly humble. Is this caricature? No; it is impossible to caricature Andrew Johnson when he mounts his high horse of humility and becomes a sort of cross between Uriah Heep and Josiah Boudinier, of Coketown. Indeed, it is only by quoting Dickens' description of the latter personage that we have anything which fairly matches the traits suggested by some statements in the President's speeches. "A big, fond man," says the humorist, "with a stare and a metallic laugh. A man made out of coarse material, which seemed to have been stretched to make so much of him. A man with a great puffed head and forehead, swelled veins in his temples, and such a strained skin to his face that it seemed to hold his eyes open and lift his eyebrows up. A man with a pervading appearance on him of being inflated like a balloon, and ready to start. A man who could never sufficiently want himself a self-made man. A man who was continually proclaiming, through that brass speaking-trumpet of a voice of his, his old ignorance and his old poverty. A man who was the bully of humility."

If we turn from the moral and personal to the mental characteristics of Mr. Johnson's speeches, we find that his brain is to be classed with notable cases of arrested development. He has strong forces in his nature, but in their outlet through his mind they are despatched into a confusing clatter of unrelated thoughts and inapplicable phrases. He seems to possess neither the power nor the perception of coherent thinking and logical arrangement. He does not appear to be aware that prepossessions are not proofs, that assertions are not arguments, that the proper method to answer an objection is not to repeat the proposition against which the objection was directed, that the proper method of unfolding a subject is not to make the successive statements a series of contradictions. Indeed, he seems to have a thoroughly animalized intellect, destitute of the notion of relations, with ideas which are but form of determinations, and which derive their force, not from reason, but from will. With an individuality thus strong even to fierceness, but which has not been developed in the mental region, and which the least gust of passion intellectually upsets, he is incapable of looking at anything out of relations to himself—of regarding it from that neutral ground which is the condition of intelligent discussion between opposing minds. In truth, he makes a virtue of being insensible to the evidence of facts and the deductions of reason, proclaiming to all the world that he has no position that he will never sever from it, and that all statements and arguments intended to shake his resolves are impertinences, indicating that their authors are Radicals and enemies of the country. He is never weary of vaunting his firmness, and firmness he doubtless has, the firmness of at least a score of mules; but events have shown that it is a different kind of firmness from that which keeps a statesman firm to his principles, a political leader to his pledges, a gentleman to his word. Amid all changes of opinion, he has been conscious of no change of will, and the intellectual element forms so small a portion of his being, that, when he challenged "the man, woman, or child to come forward" and convict him of inconsistency in his professions, he knew that, however it might be with the rest of mankind, he would himself be unconvinced by any evidence which the said man or woman, or child might adduce. Again, when he was asked by one of his audience why he did not hang Jeff Davis, he retorted by exclaiming: "Why don't you ask me why I have not hanged Thad. Stevens and Wendell Phillips? They are as much traitors as Davis." And we are almost charitable enough to suppose that he saw no difference between the moral or legal treason of the man who for four years had waged open war against the Government of the United States, and the man who for one year had sharply criticized the acts and utterances of Andrew Johnson. It is not to be expected that nice distinctions will be made by a magistrate who is in the habit of denying indisputable facts with the fury of a pugilist who has received a personal affront, and of announcing demonstrated fallacies with the imperious serenity of a philosopher proclaiming the fundamental laws of human belief. His brain is entirely ruled by his will, and the public man in the country is official head is only one whose opinion carries with it the least intellectual weight. It is to the credit of our institutions and our statement that the man least qualified by largeness of mind and moderation of temper to exercise uncontrolled power should be the man who aspired to usurp it. The constitutional instinct in the blood and the constitutional principle in the brain of our real statesmen preserve them from the folly and guilt of setting themselves up as initiators of Caesar and Napoleon the moment they are trusted with little delegated power.

Still we are told that, with all his defects, Andrew Johnson is to be honored and supported as a "conservative" President engaged in a contest with a "Radical" Congress! It happens, however, that the two persons who specially represent Congress in this struggle are Senators Trumbull and Fessenden. Senator Trumbull is the author of the two important measures which the President vetoed; Senator Fessenden is the chairman and organ of the Committee of Fifteen, which the President anathematized. Now we desire to do justice to the gravity of face which the partisans of Mr. Johnson reserve, and especially to do we commend their command of countenance while it is their privilege to contrast the wild notions and violent speech of such lawless Radicals as the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maine with the balanced judgment and moderate temper of such a pattern conservative as the Pres-

ident of the United States. The contrast prompts ideas so irresistibly ludicrous that to keep one's ribsibilities under austere control while instituting it argues a self-command almost miraculous. Andrew Johnson, however, such as he is in heart, intellect, will, and speech, is the recognized leader of his party, and demands that the great mass of his partisans shall serve him, not merely by prostration of body, but by prostration of mind. It is the hard duty of his more intimate associates to translate his broken utterance from *Andy Johnson* into constitutional phrase, to give these versions some show of logical arrangement, and to carry out, as best they may, their own objects, while professing boundless devotion to his. By a sophistical process of developing his rude notions, they often lead him to conclusions which he had not foreseen, but which they induce him to make his own, not by a fruitless effort to quicken his mind into following the steps of their reasoning, but by stimulating his passions to the point of adopting its orders. They thus become parasites in reality, that they may become powers, and their interests make them particularly ruthless in their dealings with their master's consistency. Their relation to him, if they would bluntly express it, might be indicated in this brief formula: "We will adore you in order that you may obey us."

The trouble with these politicians is, that they cannot tie the President's tongue as they tied the tongues of the eminent persons of the country to keep silent at their great convention at Philadelphia. That convention was a masterpiece of cunning political management; but its address and resolutions were hardly laid at Mr. Johnson's feet, when, in his exultation, he blurted out that unfortunate remark about "a body called, or which assumed to be, the Congress of the United States," which it appears, "we have seen hanging on the verge of the Government." Now all this was in the address of the convention, but it was not so brutally worded, nor so calculated to appeal those timid supporters of the Johnson party who stung, in their innocence, that the object of the Philadelphia meeting was to heal the wounds of civil war, and not to lay down a programme by which it might be reopened. Turning, then, from Mr. Johnson to the manifesto of his political supporters, let us see what additions it makes to political wisdom, and what guarantees it affords for future peace. We shall not discriminate between insurgent States and individual insurgents, because, when individual insurgents are so overwhelmingly strong that they carry their States with them, or when States are so overwhelmingly strong that they force individuals to be insurgents, it appears to be needless. The terms are often used interchangeably in the address, for the convention was so largely composed of individual insurgents that it was important to vary a little the charge that they usurped State powers with the qualification that they obeyed the powers they usurped. At the South, individual insurgents constitute the State when they determine to rebel, and an identical thing cannot be altered by giving it two names.

The principle which runs through the Philadelphia address is that insurgent States recover their former rights under the Constitution by the mere fact of submission. This is equivalent to saying that insurgent States incur no guilt in rebellion. But States cannot become insurgent unless the authorities of such States commit perjury and treason, and their people become rebels and public enemies. Perjury, treason, and rebellion are commonly held to be crimes; and who ever heard before that criminals were restored to all the rights of honest citizens by the mere fact of their arrest? The doctrine, moreover, is a worse heresy than that of secession; for secession implies that seceded States, being out of the Union, can plainly only be brought back by conquest, and on such terms as the victors may choose to impose. No candid Southern rebel, who believes that his State seceded and that he acted under competent authority when he took up arms against the United States, can have the effrontery to affirm that he had inherent rights of citizenship in the "foreign country" against which he plotted and fought for four years. The so-called "right" of secession was claimed by the South as a constitutional right to be peaceably exercised, but it passed into the broader and more generally intelligible "right" of revolution when it had to be sustained by war; and the condition of a defeated revolutionist is certainly not that of a qualified voter in the nation against which he revolted. But if insurgent States recover their former rights and privileges when they submit to superiors, there is no reason why armed rebellion should not be as common as local discontent. We have on this principle sacrificed thirty-five hundred millions of dollars and three hundred thousand lives, only to bring the insurgent States into the Union with the conditions he had himself exacted, the exaction of conditions was unconstitutional. To sustain this curious proposition he adduced no constitutional arguments, but he left various copies of the Constitution in each of the crowds he recently addressed, with the trust, we suppose, that somebody might be fortunate enough to find in that instrument the clause which supported his theory. Mr. Johnson, however, though the most consequential individuals, is the most inconsequential of reasoners; every proposition which is evident to himself he considers to fulfill the definition of a self-evident proposition; but his supporters at Philadelphia must have known that, in affirming that insurgent States recover their former rights by the fact of submission, they were arraigning the conduct of their leader, who had notoriously violated those "rights." They took up his work at a certain stage, and then, with that as a basis, they affirmed a general proposition about insurgent States which had been complied with by the President, would have left them no foundation at all; for the States about which they so glibly generalized would have had no history of organized governments. The premises of their argument were obtained by the violation of its conclusion; they inferred from what was the negation of their inference, and deduced from what was a death-blow to their deduction.

It is easy enough to understand why the Johnson convention asserted the equality of the Johnson reconstructions of States with the States now represented in Congress. The object was to give some appearance of legality to a contemplated act of arbitrary power, and the principle that insurgent States recover all their old rights by the fact of submission was invented in order to cover the case. Mr. Johnson now intends, by the admission of his partisans, to attempt a *coup d'état* on the assembling of the Fortieth Congress, in case seventy-one members of the House of Representatives, favorably to his policy, are chosen, in the elections of this autumn, from the twenty-six loyal States. These, with the fifty-four Southern delegates, would constitute a quorum of the house; and the remaining hundred and nineteen members are, in the President's favorite phrase, "to be kicked out" from that "verge" of the government on which they now are said to be "hanging." The question, therefore, whether Congress, as it is at present constituted, is a body constitutionally competent to legislate for the whole country, is the most important of all practical questions. Let us see how the case stands.

The Constitution, ratified by the people of all the States, establishes a government of sovereign powers supreme over the whole land, and the people of no State can rightly pass from under its authority except by the consent of the people of all the States, with whom it is bound by the most solemn and binding of contracts. The rebel States broke in *fact* the contract they could not break in *law*. Assembled in conventions of their people, they passed ordinances of secession, and their Senators and Representatives from Congress, and began the war by assailing a part of the United States. The secessionists had trusted to the silence of the Constitution in relation to the act they performed. A State in the American Union, as distinguished from a territory, is constitutionally a part of the Government to which it owes allegiance, and the seceded States had refused to be parts of the Government, and had forsaken their allegiance. By the Constitution, the United States, in cases of "domestic violence" in a State, is to interfere. "On application of the Legislature, or of the Executive when the Legislature cannot be convened." But in this case legislators, executives, conventions of the people, were all violators of the domestic peace, and of course made no application for interference. By the Constitution, Congress is empowered to suppress insurrections; but this might be supposed to mean insurrections like Shay's rebellion in Massachusetts, and the Whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania, and not to cover the action of States seceding from the Congress which is thus empowered. The seceders, therefore, felt somewhat as did the absconding James J. when he fled to the great seal in the Thames, and thought he had stopped the machinery of the English government.

Mr. Buchanan, then President of the United States, admitted at once that the secessionists had done their work in such a way that, though they had done wrong, the Government was powerless to compel them to do right. And here the matter should have rested, if the Government established by the Constitution was such a Government as Mr. Johnson's supporters now declare it to be. It is impotent to prescribe terms of peace in relation to insurrection, and is certainly impotent to make war on insurgent States. If insurgent States recover their former constitutional rights in laying down their arms, then there was no criminality in their taking them up; and if there was no criminality in their taking them up, then the United States was criminal in the way by which they were forced to lay them down. On this theory we have a government incompetent to legislate for insurgent States, because lacking their representatives, waging against them a cruel and unjust war. And this is the real theory of the defeated rebels and Copperheads who formed the great mass of the delegates to the Johnson convention. Should they get into power, they would feel themselves logically justified in annulling, not only all the acts of the "Rump Congress" since they submitted, but all the acts of the Rump Congress during the time they had a Confederate Congress of their own. They may deny that this is their intention; but what intention to forego the exercise of an assumed right, held by those who are out of power, can be supposed capable of limiting their action when they are in?

But if the United States is a government having legitimate rights of sovereignty conferred upon it by the people of all the States, and if, consequently, the attempted secession of the people of one or more States only makes them criminals, without impairing the sovereignty of the United States, then the Government, with all its powers, remains with the representatives of the loyal people. By the very nature of government as government, the rights and privileges guaranteed to citizens are guaranteed to loyal citizens; the rights and privileges guaranteed to States are guaranteed to loyal States; and loyal citizens and loyal States are not such as profess a willingness to be loyal after having been utterly worsted in an enterprise of gigantic disobedience. The organic unity and continuity of the Government would be broken by the return of disloyal citizens and rebel States without their going through the process of being restored by the action of the Government they had attempted to subvert; and the power to restore carries with it the power to decide on the terms of restoration. And when we speak of the Government we are not chiefly enough to mean by the expression simply its executive branch. The question of admitting an implicitly rebellious State, and of deciding whether or not States have a republican form of government, are matters left by the Constitution to the discretion of Congress. As to the rebel States now claiming representation, they have encumbered, thoroughly exhausted, in one of the costliest and bloodiest wars in the history of the world—a war which tasked the resources of the United States more than they would have been tasked with a war with all the great Powers of Europe combined—a war which, in 1862, had assumed such proportions that the Supreme Court decided that it gave the United States the same rights and privileges which the Government might exercise in the case of a national or foreign war. The inhabitants of the insurgent States being thus judicially declared public enemies as well as rebels, there would seem to be no doubt at all that the victo-

rious close of actual hostilities could not deprive the Government of the power of deciding on the terms of peace with public enemies. The Government of the United States found the insurgent States thoroughly revolutionized and disorganized, with no State governments which could be recognized without recognizing the validity of treason, and without the power or right to take even the initial steps for State reorganization. They were practically all out of the Union as States; their State governments had lapsed; their population was composed of rebels and public enemies, by the decision of the Supreme Court. Under such circumstances, how the former-in-Chief, under Congress, of the forces of the United States, could recreate these defunct States, and make it mandatory on Congress to receive their delegates, has always appeared to us one of those mysteries of unreason which require faculties either above or below humanity to accept. In addition to this fundamental objection, there are further ones which attack all of the delegates were rebels presidentially pardoned into "loyal men," were elected with the idea of forcing Congress to repeal the test-oath, and were incapacitated to be legislators even if they had been sent from loyal States. The few who were loyal men in the sense that they had not served the rebel government were still palpably elected by constituents who had; and the character of the constituency is as legitimate a subject of congressional inquiry as the character of the representative.

It is not being true, then, that the twenty-two dissenting loyal voters who placed Mr. Johnson in office, and whom he betrayed, have no means by their representatives in Congress to exert a controlling power in the reconstruction of the rebel communities, the question comes up as to the conditions which Congress has imposed. It always appeared to us that the true measure of conciliation, of security, of mercy, of justice, was one which would combine the principle of universal amnesty, or an amnesty nearly universal, with that of universal, or at least of impartial, suffrage. In regard to amnesty, the amendment to the Constitution which Congress has passed disqualifies no rebels from voting, and only disqualifies them from holding office when they have happened to add perjury to treason. In regard to suffrage, it makes it for the political interest of the South to be just to its colored citizens, by basing representation on voters, and not on population, and thus places the indulgence of class prejudices and hatreds under the penalty of a corresponding loss of a political power in the Electoral College and the national House of Representatives. If the rebel States should be restored without this amendment becoming a part of the Constitution, then the recent slave States will have thirty Presidential Electors and thirty members of the House of Representatives in virtue of a population they disfranchise, and the vote of a rebel white in South Carolina will carry with it more than double the power of a loyal white in Massachusetts or Ohio. The only ground on which this disparity can be defended is, that as "one Southerner is more than a match for two Yankees," he has an inherent, continuing, unconditional right to have this superiority recognized in the ballot-box. Indeed, the injustice of this is so monstrous that the Johnson orators find it more convenient to decry all conditions of representation than to meet the incontrovertible reasons for exacting the condition which bases representation on voters. Not to make it a part of the Constitution would be, in Mr. Shellabarger's vivid illustration, to allow "that Lee's vote should have double the elective power of Grant's; Seem's double that of Farragut's; Booth's—did he live—double that of Lincoln's, his victim!"

It is also to be considered that these thirty votes would in all future sessions of Congress decide the fate of the most important measures. In 1862 the Republicans, as Congress is now constituted, only had a majority of twenty votes. In alliance with the Northern Democratic party, the South, with these thirty votes, might repeal the civil rights bill, the principle of which is embodied in the proposed amendment. It might assume the rebel debt, which is repudiated in that amendment. It might even repudiate the Federal debt, which is affirmed in that amendment. We are so accustomed to look at the rebel debt as dead beyond the power of resurrection as to forget that it amounts, with the valuation of the emancipated slaves, to some four thousand millions of dollars. If the South and its Northern Democratic allies should come into power, there is a strong probability that a measure would be brought in to assume at least a portion of this debt—say two thousand millions. The Southern members would be nearly a unit for assumption, and the Northern Democratic members would certainly be exposed to the most frightful temptation that legislators ever had to resist. Suppose it were necessary to buy fifty members at a million of dollars a piece, that sum would only be two and a half per cent. of the whole. Suppose it were necessary to give them ten millions a piece, even that would only be a deduction of twenty-five per cent. from a claim worthless without their votes. The bribery might be conducted in such a way as to elude discovery, if not suspicion, and the measure would certainly be trumpeted all over the North as the grandest of all acts of statesmanlike "conciliation," binding the south to the Union in indissoluble bonds of interest.—The amendment renders the conversion of the rebel debt into the most enormous of all corruption funds an impossibility.

But the character and necessity of the amendment are too well understood to need explanation, enforcement or defence. If it or some more stringent one be not adopted, the loyal people will be tricked out of the fruits of the war they have waged at the expense of such unexampled sacrifices of treasure and blood. It never will be adopted unless it be practically made a condition of the restoration of the rebel States; and for the unconditional restoration of those States the President, through his most trusted supporters, has indicated his intention to venture a *coup d'état*. This threat has failed doubly of its purpose. The timid, whom it was expected to frighten, has simply scared into the reception of the idea that the only way to escape civil war is by the election of over a hundred and twenty Republican Representatives to the Fortieth Congress. The courageous, whom it was intended to defy, it has only exasperated

## FRUITS OF PUBLICATION.

The Reporter is published every Thursday Morning by E. O. Goodrich, at \$2 per annum, in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS exceeding fifteen lines are charged 25 cents per line for first insertion, and 15 cents per line for subsequent insertions. Notices inserted before Marriages and Deaths will be charged 50 cents per line for first insertion. All resolutions of Associations; communications of limited or individual interest; notices of Marriages and Deaths exceeding five lines are charged 25 cents per line.

1 Year, 6 mo. 3 mo.  
Per Column, \$40 \$20 \$10  
Single Copies, 5 2 1  
Advertisements, not exceeding 15 lines, \$1.50  
Notarials and Executor's Notices, .25  
Attorney's Notices, .25  
Business Cards, per Blank (per year), .50

Advertisements and others, advertising their business will be charged 50 cents. They will be entitled to a column exclusively to their business, with no other advertising in all cases exclusive of subscription to the paper.

PRINTING of every kind in Plain and Fancy, done with neatness and dispatch. Handbills, Cards, Pamphlets, &c., of every variety, printed at the shortest notice. The press has just been re-fitted with Power and every thing in the Printing line can be done in the most artistic manner and at the lowest rates. TERMS INVARIABLELY CASH.

## Selected Poetry.

### WHERE ARE THEY?

Where are they with whom I started,  
Travelling o'er life's joyful way?  
Years have vanished since we parted,  
I am here but where are they?  
O the blissful hours that I met us,  
O the friends that once earnestly us  
From friends that fondly press'd us,  
Where are they?

At the early crystal dawning,  
Reminds in a glorious day;  
So was life's exultant morning,  
Bright with Hope's delusive ray;  
Scenes of Heavenly brightness seeming—  
Scenes with fadeless lustre gleaming—  
Lit with smiles of Beauty beaming,  
Where are they?

As the stars in clustering bands,  
Sweetly smiling, softly roll;  
So with clasped hearts and hands,  
Full of bliss we sought the goal;  
Phosphenes' radiant sky was o'er us,  
Hope on gilded pinions bore us,  
Love in angel guise before us,  
Wood'd the soul.

As the streamlets dancing by,  
Joyful ever—  
As the rippling evening sky,  
As the gleam of fainter days;  
So the years in bright appearing—  
Dear playing—ever cheering,  
Wapt our souls in love endearing,  
Life this spring.

They have gone whose hearts were lightest;  
To whom I fondly cling;  
They whose bright hopes were brightest,  
Whose sweetest smiles and sung;  
Chicks whose in grace arrayed,  
Flaunts where Beauty blushing played,  
Eyes where Love his conquests made,  
Hearts among.

Way, ah! why, this mournful feeling,  
Why should tears embitter flow?  
Toss in silent swiftness gliding,  
Met where bowers of glory grow?  
There, I'll meet the buoyant hearted,  
Those with whom in life I started—  
Those with whom I weeping parted,  
Long ago!

## Political.

### President Johnson and his Accomplishes.

(From the Atlantic Monthly for November.)  
AMONG Johnson's has dealt the most of all blows to the respectability of a nation which rejoices in his name.—Early had the political Pecksniffs and harp-tongues contrived so to manage the mass-convention at Philadelphia that it should lose of the properties of intrigue and the qualities of dishonesty, and should be the commander-in-chief of the combination of carrying the country by assault. The objective point was the grave of Douglas, which became, by the time he arrived, a grave also of his own reputation and hopes of his partisans. His speeches the route were a volcanic outbreak of vanity, conceit, bombast, scurrility, ignorance, insolence, brutality, and baldness. Screams of laughter, cries of disgust, blushings of shame, were the various responses of the nation he disgraced to the harangues of this leader of American conservatism. Never before did the audience in the gift of the people appear as an object of human ambition and ambition. Andrew Johnson made it an eminence which to exhibit inability to behave and incapacity to reason. His low cunning aspired him throw off all the restraints of official decorum, in the expectation that he could find duplicates of himself in the words he addressed, and that mob diffused all hardly sympathize with mob imperator. Never was blistering demagogued by a distempered sense of self-importance into a more fatal error. Not only the great body of the people mortified and outraged, but even his "satraps and liegemen," even the shrewd politicians—products of an Accident and shadows of a god—who had labored so hard at Philadelphia to weave a cloak of plausibilities over his usurpations, shivered with apprehension or tingled with shame as they read the reports of their master's impolitic and ignominious abandonment of dignity and decency in his addresses to the people attempted alternately to bully and castrate. That a man thus self-exposed as unworthy of high trust should have had the duty to expect that intelligent constituents would send to Congress men pledged support his policy and his measures appeared for the time to be as pitiable a spectacle of human delusion as it was an exasperating example of human impudence.

Not the least extraordinary peculiarity of these addresses from the stump was the immense prostration they exhibited of the personal pronoun. In Mr. Johnson's speech, "I" resembles the geometer's description of infinity, having "its centre everywhere and its circumference nowhere."—Among the many kinds of egotism in which egotism is profuse, it may be difficult to find one of the most laughable; but it seems to us that when his arrogance apexes itself it is deserving, perhaps, of an in-degree of scorn or derision than when it rants in bravado. The most offensive part which he plays in public is that of the "humble individual," bragging of the weakness of his origin, hinting of the great things which could have lifted him to his present exalted station, and represent-

into more strenuous efforts against the insolent renegade who had the audacity to make it. Everywhere in the loyal States there is an uprising of the people only paralleled by the grand uprising of 1861. The President's plan of reconstruction having passed from a policy into a conspiracy, his chief supporters are now not so much his partisans as his accomplices; and against him and his accomplices the people will this autumn indignantly record the most overwhelming of verdicts.

## SELF-CONQUEST.

The wisest of men, King Solomon, says, "The beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water." In some countries where the shore is low, as in Holland, they raise immense mounds, or dykes of earth, to keep out the waves of ocean. If these should be the smallest breach in the dyke, the water begins to press from all parts towards the opening; and if not immediately stopped, the sea overcomes all resistance, and sweeps away the barriers, burying cities and villages beneath the flood, and spreading misery and ruin all around. "Therefore," speaks Solomon again, "leave off contention before it be meddled with,"—rather, before it be "mingled together"; that is, before your spirits be joined in conflict, before you deal out hard words against one another.

"Greater," says Solomon, "is he that ruleth his own spirit than he that taketh a city." Courage and skill only are needed in the one case; but what efforts, and above all, what strength from God, to accomplish the other! Such conquests, however, may and have been made, and that even by the young. As an illustration, let me mention how a little girl acted under circumstances of provocation, and the victory which she gained over herself.

Two little sisters—Frances about seven, and Augusta about five years old—were as happy as little girls could be, loving their parents and each other dearly. Sometimes however, as it happens with the best friends, little differences arose between them. On one of those occasions, Frances, perceiving how matters were tending, with a thoughtful, decision, and self-command surprising in so young a child, said, "I am getting angry; I had better go out of the room for a few minutes." She acted immediately upon her resolution, and left the room for a short time. When she returned the storm was hushed, and they went to their play as happy as ever.

This is no imaginary story, but a fact, and occurred just as it is related; and it teaches our young friends, nay, all of us, a most useful lesson.

Were all children to act like the little girl I have mentioned, how many sad scenes would be avoided, and what happiness would spring up in youthful hearts from self-conquest! There is this to encourage, that just as bad habits grow in strength the more they are yielded to, so each true temper is overcome will strength be gained for future conflict. Only remember, no effort of your own can accomplish it without the aid of God's Holy Spirit. The aid will be given if you earnestly and devoutly seek it. If parents, though sinful, know how to give good things unto their children, how much more shall your Father, which is in heaven, give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?

## DON'T LIKE MY BUSINESS.

There is no greater fallacy in the world than that entertained by many young men that some pursuit in life can be found which is suited to their tastes, whims, and fancies. This philosopher's stone can never be discovered, and every one who makes his life a search for it will be ruined. Much truth is contained in the Irishman's remark: "It is never easy to work hard." Let, therefore, the fact be always remembered by the young, that no life-work can be found entirely agreeable to a man. Success always lies at the top of a hill; if we would reach it, we can do so only by hard, persevering effort, while we rest with difficulties of every kind. Genius counts for nothing in the battle of life. Determined, obstinate perseverance in one single channel is everything. Hence, should any one of our young readers be debating in his mind a change of business, imagining he has a genius for some other, let him at once dismiss the thought, as he would a temptation to do evil. If you think you made a mistake in choosing the pursuit of profession you did, don't make another by leaving it. Spend all your energies in working for and clinging to it, as you would to the life-bark that sustained you in the midst of the ocean. If you leave it, it is almost certain that you will go down; but if you cling to it, informing yourself about it until you are its master, bending your every energy to the work, success is certain. Good, hard, honest effort, steadily persevered in, will make your love for your business or profession grow, since no one should expect to reach a period when he can feel that his life-work is just the one he could have done best, and like best. We are allowed to see and feel the roughness in our own pathway, but not in others; yet all have them.

PROFANITY.—Why will men take the name of God in vain? What possible advantage is to be gained by it? And yet they do it, and vulgar sin of profanity is evidently on the increase. Oaths fall upon the ears in the cars and at the corners of streets. The North American Review says well: "There are among us not a few who feel that a simple assertion or plain statement of obvious facts will pass for nothing, unless they swear to its truth by all the names of the Deity and bluster their lips with every variety of hot and sulphurous oaths. If we observe such persons very closely, we shall generally find that the fierceness of their profanity is an inverse ratio to the amount of their ideas." We venture to affirm that the profane men within the circle of your knowledge, are afflicted with a chronic weakness of the intellect. The utterance of an oath, though it may prevent a vacuum in sound—is no indication of sense. It requires no genius to swear. The reckless taking of sacred names in vain is as little characteristic of true independence of thought as it is of high moral culture. In this breathing and beautiful world, filled, as it were, with the presence of the Deity and fraught with its influence, it would be no security should we catch the spirit of reverent worshippers, and illustrate in ourselves the sentiment that the "Christian is the highest style of man."

GOOD ADVICE.—Some one says: "Girls, let us tell you a stubborn truth! No young man ever looks so well to a sensible young man, as when dressed in a plain, neat, modest attire without a single ornament about her person. She looks then as though she possessed worth in herself, and needed no artificial rigging to enhance her value. If a young woman would spend so much time in cultivating her mind, training her temper, and cherishing kindness, meekness, mercy, and other good qualities, as most of them do in external ornaments, to increase to her personal charms, she would, at a glance, be known among a thousand—her character would be read in her countenance."