

The Little One.

There is a darkened chamber in the house. Over the windows of that room the thick curtains sweep downward heavily, and the sunshine and the daylight are excluded. Soft voices mingle in gentle cadences there, and softer of-fills across the covered floor. There are no loud tones, no harsh sound. A hush and a halo rest there, like the soft drooping of an angel's wing. Close pressed to a heart awakened to a new point of joy it never knew or dreamed of before, lies a little babe. Only the young mother feels the blessing and the responsibility of the precious boon; and in the slawdow room she lies and thinks of the little God-gift on her bosom; of the world unfriended, the path untrod, which lie before the portal of life it has just crossed. Tears of love and feeling rain down upon the little brow, as she thinks in what way is the world to try this pure young spirit, and whose hand will safest guide it over that untried way! The twilight comes, and the stars shine out, and a benediction and a prayer sway like heavenly pinions over the gently pillowed head of the new born; while through the house a new light shines, and manhood's brow grows brighter, and woman's eye grows softer, and under the roof-tree of home they rejoice with exceeding great joy, for a little one is there.

Spring has come, and the babe, a bright and pretty prattler now, is out among the flowers. The eye of affection watches him anxiously, for the lily disports possession with the rose on that fair cheek, and the blue eyes, soft as a dew-laden violet, is lifted often to the far-off skies, as if it knew its home was there. Slightly the little feet patter upon the stairs, sweetly the little voice sings through the house, and the mother's heart melts with tender delight in listening to it. Out on the turf the father lies down in the shade of the summer sunset, and like a child himself plays with his babe, and clasping his treasure to his manly breast, feels his eye grow moist with the dew of affection, and thankfulness to God for his glorious gift.

Again there is a darkened chamber in the house. The windows are more deeply shaded; the footfalls are soft; the voices are subdued and sad. The little one is ill. Quietly upon his little couch he lies and suffers. The sweet lips utter no moan; and the gentle features evince no pain; and it seems as though angels soothed him into silence. Again the twilight comes; again the stars shine out; but there is no joy now in the house, and the prayers of thanksgiving are turned to supplications for mercy, to pleading at the throne of grace to spare the loved one yet a little while.

Morning dawns, and there is a coffin in the house. A little narrow box, not two feet long! Robed in white, with flowers among his golden hair, and waxen hands folded over the heart that is still forever, lies the dead babe. How they tell of earthly love and the frailty of earthly things! How they tell of hollow human hopes and the mockery of mortal trust! In the very room where he was born, they close the coffin lid and yield him back, dust to dust, earth to earth, ashes to ashes.

Days and months roll away. Time, the consoler, has laid a healing hand upon the broken hearts of those who loved the child, and they have learned the great lesson the babe was sent to teach. The tendrils of the young vine, though fided, still retain their clinging hold upon their memory and their love; but out in the green graveyard stands a pure white monument, never forgotten, and never passed by without a tear, which points its pale finger to the blue skies, and whispers, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven."

All Cowards in the Dark.

An American medical gentleman, who some years since visited Paris under circumstances favorable to his admission to a circle of the survivors and supporters of "The Empire," tells a capital story, as he heard it related by the celebrated General Exelmans, one of Napoleon's "Paladins." It was at a dinner party, composed of some of the survivors of Waterloo, a few of their younger relatives, and the seion of an ex-king on a visit from his home in America, and to whom the gentleman owed his introduction to the circle we have mentioned. Some question arose about bravery, when the younger members of the company were electrified to hear the venerable and heroic Exelmans gravely and seriously declare: "Men are all cowards in the dark!"

The General smiled at their expression of dissent; remarked that it was "very like youth; and proceeded to relate the following anecdote, in support of his strange declaration:

There was a young hot-head in the Emperor's service, who, burning for action, and his duties for the time affording no opportunity, at last resolved to fight a duel accordingly, choosing to construe some remark or other of an older and superior officer into an insult, he challenged him. The old soldier, waiving all considerations of rank, agreed to meet the young man, but on the following unusual terms: The time should be night; the place a room; in opposite corners of which they were to stand. The seconds, having placed their men, were to withdraw outside of the door, taking the candle with

them. The word should be given from without, when he who had the first fire should discharge his weapon, and the seconds having the light should immediately rush in.

These strange conditions were accepted; the time arrived; and the seconds placed the parties as agreed upon, withdrawing immediately, and leaving their men in the dark.

The word was given; the fire was heard; the door was reopened; and there stood the elder of the two bolt upright in the corner, his adversary's ball having entered the wall so close to his head that his escape seemed little less than miraculous.

It was now the old soldier's turn to fire. They were again left in the dark; the word was again given from the outside; and, instantaneously with the discharge, the seconds rushed in to find the challenger prostrate upon the floor, not yet having recovered himself from his trick to avoid the ball, which, an examination, it was found must have killed him!

The young man was covered with confusion, and the seconds were overwhelming him with the expression of their scorn, while the veteran stopped them.

"Not so fast! not so fast! my young friends," said he, "you will live to grow wiser. Where do you suppose I was at the first fire? On my hands and knees in the corner! but I was up quicker than he. Ah! Messieurs, say what we will—hoast as we may—we are all cowards in the dark!"

It was afterward ascertained that the story was an actual fact, and that the elder of the parties was no other than the brave warrior Exelmans himself.

Youth and the World's Destiny.

The childhood of the world is to control the destiny of the world. The ten millions of the youth of the land are to decide its character, for weal or for woe, either upward or downward. Assuredly as the sun hastes in its strength to the zenith, so surely will the world's youth course up to power, speedily occupy the inheritance of the present generation, and impress upon America and the world their own individuality of honor or of shame. Who shall prevent this young man, of fervid intellect and untiring energy, from making his mark in his, and from standing, instead of before kings, a very king himself before the people? Who shall hinder this educated daughter, if trained to the life of ball-rooms and theatres, from showing the light of heaven from her own soul and the souls of her companions? If the tree lies as it falls, so ordinarily does life go on as it begins, influentially and irreversibly.

Now, a large proportion of these youth are educated youth. Their minds have been trained to knowledge, and disciplined by its acquisitions. There are the three or four millions of common school scholars throughout the land, the hundreds of thousands in academies and the tens of thousands in colleges. These are a strong host, fighting their way for the kingdom of this world. They leave more than ripples upon the surface of society; they are the mighty waves whose power gains victory in the mysteries of the deep and dashes up defiance upon the land.

It may be affirmed that it is characteristic of the age to respect the claims of youth, to honor it as a power among men, and to give it increasing importance in the affairs of the world. The recruiting officer has his standard of height and curls or rejects according to the degree of personal stature. Feet and inches go to make the soldier. But in our day, youth, influential by activity, becomes self-enrolled for positions of ascendancy. Youth is relatively more prominent than in the old times; and in the future it will be, perhaps, in this country, more so still. Under these circumstances of present and increasing influence in all the affairs of life, what momentous interests are wrapped up in the character of our young men and maidens, and especially of those whose education is qualifying them for the highest private and public stations! Pray, brethren, pray to God for his Spirit to rest upon them! They are to influence the destiny of the world.—Home and For.

Revol.

WHAT IS LINCOLN?—As a specimen of Lincoln's conservatism, we give below a comprehensive resolution adopted at the first republican State convention ever held in the State of Illinois. That body convened at Springfield on the 30th of October, 1854. It was called for the special purpose of organizing a new party and repudiating all former attachments. The committee on resolutions, appointed by the convention, was composed of Abraham Lincoln, J. Farnsworth, and Ichabod Gedding. The resolutions reported by the committee were unanimously adopted by the convention, and among them was the following:

Resolved, That the times imperatively demand the reorganization of parties, and repudiating all previous party attachments, names and professions, we unite ourselves together in defense of the liberty and Constitution of the country, and will hereafter co-operate as the republican party, pledged to the accomplishment of the following purposes: To bring the administration of government back to the control of first principles; to restore Nebraska and Kansas to the position of free Territories; that as the Constitution of the United States vests in the States, and not in Congress, the power to legislate for the extradition of fugitives from labor, to repeal and entirely abrogate the fugitive slave law; to restrict slavery to those States in which it exists; to prohibit the admission of any more slave States into the Union; to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; to exclude slavery from all the Territories over which the general government has exclusive jurisdiction; and to arrest the equipment of any more Territories under the position of slavery; therein forever shall have been prohibited.

From the Washington Constitution.

Squatter Sovereignty Not Democracy.

One is a system of constitutional government, and not of majorities merely. Rights are defined and secured, and not left to the caprice of arbitrary popular will. In this stands the bulwark of what we correctly denominate "self-government," each citizen being heard on the subject of rights and wrongs, in the Constitution itself, which is thus an expression of unanimous consent upon the fundamental principles of the civil organization of society; and if the boundaries thus defined be transgressed by legislative action, the courts will arrest the aberrations of the mere popular will. In the administration of the government, majorities rule, by agreement, as the organ of the whole body politic, according to a prescribed method, and within assigned limits, ascertained and determined in the organic instrument which defines rights and wrongs. Self-government, then, does not refer so much to the remedy as to the right. The right being secured, the remedy may be more or less defective without impairing the establishment of the former. It was not for remedies, but for right, that our ancestors fought.

Popular, or squatter sovereignty, as the term is used by Judge Douglas, substitutes for this legal authority an arbitrary and irresponsible will, and, as such, is despotism of the most unadorned type. Plausible in name, it is, in fact, every elementary principle of self-government, delivering the minority over, a helpless prey, to the power of the majority. It is wholly deceptive, and does not approach in the remotest degree to the standard of free principles adopted by the American people at the threshold of our national history. It is emphatically the opposite to self-government.

In a true popular government all must be heard, that all may become parties to the organization. This can only be effected by a constitution defining rights and securing remedies above the control of administrative bodies. If majorities may pronounce adversely to such rights, where will the minority find a voice? To vote or not to vote will be to them, equally valueless. Moreover, without the restraint of a constitutional instrument, the courts are estopped from interference. If the legislative will be the supreme law the judicial function can be only to administer it, according to the theory of the British judiciary, which is regarded by Blackstone as a mere representative of the executive branch, instituted for the purpose of administering the statutes enacted by the supreme legislative power. Thus, the fundamental idea of our American judiciary, as an independent co-ordinate department in the organization of the Government, would be destroyed by the theory we are opposing.

Hence, Judge Douglas's proposition to refer the question of a territorial statute is fallacious, except as the territorial legislature derives its authority through Congress as a constitutional government. If there is no constitutional standard by which to measure territorial legislation, what could a court do or say? Nothing whatever, as must be clear to every mind possessing the most superficial knowledge of law. Why, then, does he propose referring the question on a territorial act, independently of and separately from the validity such act must derive from Congress? One of two reasons only can be given: as I lately said, in reference to another and similar proposition of his, either he does not know what he says, or he says what he does not believe.

What, let me ask, is the standard by which an act of a territorial legislature is to be judged and determined? Is it the act of organization, or an original sovereignty in the people? If by the act of organization, then the supreme Court has adjudicated the present question in the Dred Scott case. If by the original sovereignty of the people, (this idea, introduced by Judge Douglas in order to escape the consequences of a gross and manifest error, requires apology,) then the decision of the court is a foregone conclusion—it is limited to a bare enunciation of the intention of the framers; authority—a view more servile than that of the English theory above noticed, inasmuch as the British judge is supposed to proclaim the will of an organ, and representative legislature, while the American court, under this supposition, would merely be the multiplicity of the majority of squatters for the time being, without reference to the terms of organization, because the force of the district would rest upon "original sovereignty." The court, of course, on such a hypothesis, could not do more than register the decree of the squatter sovereignty, as the Parliament of Paris, under the old regime, recorded the *les-lettres* of the King, pronounced, without appeal, in a "shot of justice." The presence that is used to justify superficial thinkers, as if the courts, after all, could declare against such inherent sovereignty and resist justification, is, on the supposition we are considering, not only absurd but impudent—a palpable self-contradiction.

Undoubtedly there resides in the people an original, inherent sovereignty, but it exists prior to organization—antecedent to expression. Before the natural law every man would be equal to every other man, before entering into any agreement or contract for the purpose of government. But as every individual, at his birth, finds himself already a member of civil society, in which rights are defined, and the means of remedy for their violation provided, it is not to such a supposed possible condition of individual humanity that practical political philosophy looks for the sources of law; and if it were, our argument would be no less conclusive. The Constitution is precisely the expression of that agreement upon the subject of right and wrong which adjusts domestic institutions, defines the limitations of individual independence, and ordains the method of legislating for social improvement. Each man's right and interest is in conflict with that of his fellow-citizen, except as the regulations of civil society—that is for us, the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State otherwise regulate, permit, and prohibit the exercise of natural freedom. The Kansas-Nebraska act (an act, be it remembered, of Congress) declares the special exemption of those Territories from future control in their internal policy by Congress, leaving them precisely free to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way—not absolutely, but subject only to the Constitution of the United States. This position illustrates the above argument, which seems not obvious to have been called in question, yet which has been systematically impugned by the whole Douglas faction.

The patriots of 1776 did not complain of the form of government, but of the manner of its administration; of a disregard of the rights of Englishmen; not, indeed, so clearly defined as those of an American citizen, for the very definition is an improvement due to our fathers in the formation of our system; but as they were deducible from the common law Magna Charta, &c. In violation of those *rights* the British Crown and Parliament—that is the imperial legislature—attempted to make the legislative will the criterion of rights, well as remedies, and for this purpose said that should they succeed "the sun of American liberty had set;" in resistance to this they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The same idea, accordingly, is now sought to be forced upon the States and people of this country, under the specious disguise of a regard for "popular sovereignty;" an idea, as we have shown, subversive of the foundations of self-government, whether philosophically or historically considered. W. C. P.

The Abolition Plot in Texas.

We extract the following from a letter to the Houston Telegraph, from Dallas, giving further particulars of the extensive Abolition plot discovered there a few days ago, some account of which we have already given:

The authorities, granaries, oats and grain of Mr. Crill Miller were destroyed a few days after the arrest of some white men, whose innocence, however, was proved beyond a doubt. Several negroes belonging to Mr. Miller were taken up and examined, and developments of the most startling character disclosed. A plot to destroy the country was revealed, and every circumstance, even to the minutiae, detailed. Nearly, or quite a hundred negroes have been arrested, and upon a close examination, separate and apart from each other, they deposed to the existence of a plot or conspiracy to impede the land by the destruction of the provisions, arms and ammunition, and then, when in a state of helplessness, a general revolt of the negroes was to begin on the first Monday in August, the day of election for State officers. This conspiracy is aided and abetted by Abolition emissaries from the North and by those in our midst.

The details of the plot and its modus operandi are these: Each county in Northern Texas has a supervisor in the person of a white man, whose name is not given; each county is laid off into districts under the sub-alias of this villain, who control the action of the negroes in the districts, by whom the firing was to be done. Many of our most prominent citizens were singled out for assassination whenever they made their escape from their hiding homes. Negroes never before suspected, are implicated, and the insurrectionary movement is wide-spread to an extent truly alarming. In some places the plan was conceived in every form shocking to the mind, and frightful in its results. Poisoning was to be added, the old females to be slaughtered along with the men, and the young and handsome women to be paraded out amongst these infamous scoundrels. They had even gone so far as to designate their choice, and certain ladies had already been selected as the victims of these misguided non-sens.

Fortunately, the country has been saved from the accomplishment of these horrors; but then, a fearful duty remains for us. The negroes have been incited to these infernal proceedings by Abolitionists, and the emissaries of certain preachers who were expelled from this country last year. Their agents have been busy amongst us, and many of them have been in our midst. Some of them have been identified, and have fled from the country; others still remain, to receive a fearful accountability from an outraged and infuriated people. Nearly a hundred negroes have testified that a large reinforcement of Abolitionists are expected on the 1st of August, and these to be aided by recruits from the Indians, while the rangers are several hundred miles to the north of us. It was desired to destroy Dallas, in order that the same and ammunition of the artillery company might share the same fate.

Our jail is filled with these villains, many of whom will be hung, and that very soon. A man was found lying at our neighboring city of Fort Worth, two days ago, believed to be one of these scoundrels who are engaged in this work. We learn that he had stolen away a number of rides, and the day after he was hung, a load of six shovels passed out to him, but were intercepted. He was betrayed by one of the gang, and hence his plans were thwarted. Many others will share his fate.

I have never witnessed such things. We are most profoundly excited. We are armed day and night, and know not when we shall be called upon to die.

The greatest news of the 24th facilities further particulars as follows:

We find in *All the Year Round* the following views in regard to ladies' dress, which we would recommend to the attention of our readers:

As you look from your windows in Paris, observe the first fifty women who pass; you have never depressed in the middle, a small quantity of dark hair, and a exactly complexion; but, then, what a color! Not only suitable for the season, but the age and complexion of the wearer. How neat the feet and hands! How well the clothes are put on, and more than all, how well they all conceal themselves!

Before English women can dress perfectly, they must have the taste of the French, especially in color. One reason why we see so little of it arranged in England, is that the different articles are purchased each for their own imagined virtues, and without any thought of what is to be worn with it. Women, while shopping, buy what pleases the eye on the counter, forgetting what they have got to wear. That part is pretty, but it will kill, by its color, one dress in the buyer's wardrobe, and be unprofitable for the others. To be magnificently dressed costs money; but to be dressed with taste, is not expensive. It requires good taste, knowledge and refinement. Never buy an article unless it is suitable to your age, habits, style, and to the rest of your wardrobe. Nothing is more vulgar than to wear costly dresses with a common looking, or cheap faces with expensive hair-dos.

What colors, we may be asked, go best together? Green with violet; cold with dark crimson or blue; pale blue with scarlet; pink with black or white; and gray with scarlet or pink. A cold color generally requires a warm tint to give life to it. Gray and pale blue, for instance, do not combine well, each being cold colors. White and black are safe wear, but the latter is not favorable to dark or pale complexions. Pink is, in some cases, the most becoming; not, however, if there is much color in the cheeks and lips, and if there is even a suggestion of red in the hair, or some complexion, which is the case with the majority of our present-day women. Ladies' very becoming, particularly, is a warm shade of blue, and green. But wherever the colors or ornaments of the entire dress, the details are all found in the harmonizing the human and dresses, the colors—the feet, all the trimmings, the dress. The ornaments in the head are to be made with the dress. It is almost with black hair, some of the most beautiful worn in the East, and the dress that are worn in the hair should harmonize the dress.

To be dressed to poor taste always been reproached, and the dress every man should wear, the more so in this country, where the dress should be simple and elegant. A New Orleans paper says there is in that city, a young man who has written a very good treatise on the subject of dress, and that he will be glad to send it to any gentleman who will send him a card.

From the *Anderson Gazette*. ANDERSON, S. C., July 29, 1850. GENTLEMEN: I have read and carefully considered your appeal to me to become a candidate for the Legislature in this District. The standard of moral support you gave me throughout my public career of sixteen years, rendered it painful to me to decline any position which you desire me to occupy, and yet permit considerations of the great weight to be disregarded, impel me to decline your call.

I am, like yourselves, deeply impressed with the critical aspect of our federal affairs, and believe we are drifting rapidly upon revolution. My hope, as you know, for years past for the preservation of the rights of the South in the Union, has been upon the Democratic party. So long as it was united, harmonious and triumphant, our rights and institutions were safe. That great party that has in times gone by, won so many brilliant victories over federalism, abolitionism and consolidation, and established so many sound and conservative principles, is now disunited, divided and broken up. Its disruption extinguishes my ardently cherished hope of preserving not only our rights, but the Union itself. It is idle to denounce or review the causes that led to its disruption. Let it suffice here for me to say, that in my opinion the session of the Southern delegates from the Charleston Convention was unwise and impolitic. It was manifest, there, to the most casual observer, that Judge Douglas, who was so justly obnoxious to the South, could not receive the nomination in a full convention, and it was equally certain that Mr. Breckinridge would have been the nominee, if the Southern delegates had not abandoned their posts. If Mr. Breckinridge had been the nominee at Charleston, his election would have been a certainty. It is now the nominee of only one wing of the party, the other wing having nominated Douglas—and whilst I shall give to Breckinridge and Lane, the nominees of the Baltimore Convention—gentlemen of tried patriotism and sound principles—a hearty and cordial support, I see no prospect of their election, either by the people or otherwise.

Lincoln and Hamlin, the Black Republican nominees, will be elected in November next, and the South must then decide the grave question whether they will submit to the domination of Black Republican rule—the fundamental principles of their organization being an open, unlegislated and declared war upon our social institutions. I believe that the honor and safety of the South, in that contingency, will require the prompt secession of the seceding States from the Union, and falling then to obtain from the free States additional and higher guarantees for the protection of our rights and property, that the seceding States should proceed to establish a new government. But whilst I think such would be the imperative duty of the South, I should emphatically reprobate and repudiate any scheme having for its object the separate secession of South Carolina. If Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi alone—giving us a portion of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, would unite with this State in a common secession upon the election of a Black Republican, I would give my assent to the policy.

I could indulge in no language of exultation or denunciation of our brethren of the South, who are impelled by a genuine patriotic duty to support Douglas and Johnson. I believe they are unifying the most efficient means of preserving the rights and interests of the South in sustaining these gentlemen; but I cannot to them a particular as catholic as I claim for myself, and I feel well assured that when the great sectional issue between the North and South is to be decided, no issue which words alone will not settle, that the South will have need for the services of all her sons, and that Breckinridge men and Douglas men will only combat each other in their gallant devotion to her honor and interests.

Thinking you, gentlemen, for your kind consideration, and reiterating my trust that I cannot respond affirmatively to your call, I subscribe myself most truly your friend and fellow-citizen. JAMES L. GERR. To JOHN MARSH, and others.

New Ladies' should Dress. We find in *All the Year Round* the following views in regard to ladies' dress, which we would recommend to the attention of our readers:

As you look from your windows in Paris, observe the first fifty women who pass; you have never depressed in the middle, a small quantity of dark hair, and a exactly complexion; but, then, what a color! Not only suitable for the season, but the age and complexion of the wearer. How neat the feet and hands! How well the clothes are put on, and more than all, how well they all conceal themselves!

Before English women can dress perfectly, they must have the taste of the French, especially in color. One reason why we see so little of it arranged in England, is that the different articles are purchased each for their own imagined virtues, and without any thought of what is to be worn with it. Women, while shopping, buy what pleases the eye on the counter, forgetting what they have got to wear. That part is pretty, but it will kill, by its color, one dress in the buyer's wardrobe, and be unprofitable for the others. To be magnificently dressed costs money; but to be dressed with taste, is not expensive. It requires good taste, knowledge and refinement. Never buy an article unless it is suitable to your age, habits, style, and to the rest of your wardrobe. Nothing is more vulgar than to wear costly dresses with a common looking, or cheap faces with expensive hair-dos.

What colors, we may be asked, go best together? Green with violet; cold with dark crimson or blue; pale blue with scarlet; pink with black or white; and gray with scarlet or pink. A cold color generally requires a warm tint to give life to it. Gray and pale blue, for instance, do not combine well, each being cold colors. White and black are safe wear, but the latter is not favorable to dark or pale complexions. Pink is, in some cases, the most becoming; not, however, if there is much color in the cheeks and lips, and if there is even a suggestion of red in the hair, or some complexion, which is the case with the majority of our present-day women. Ladies' very becoming, particularly, is a warm shade of blue, and green. But wherever the colors or ornaments of the entire dress, the details are all found in the harmonizing the human and dresses, the colors—the feet, all the trimmings, the dress. The ornaments in the head are to be made with the dress. It is almost with black hair, some of the most beautiful worn in the East, and the dress that are worn in the hair should harmonize the dress.

To be dressed to poor taste always been reproached, and the dress every man should wear, the more so in this country, where the dress should be simple and elegant. A New Orleans paper says there is in that city, a young man who has written a very good treatise on the subject of dress, and that he will be glad to send it to any gentleman who will send him a card.

TIME AND ETERNITY.

ANDERSON, S. C., July 29, 1850.

I came in the morning—it was Spring, And I smiled; I walked out at noon—it was Summer, And I was glad; I sat down at even—it was Autumn, And I was sad; I lay down at night—it was Winter, And I slept.

Half the ill-entured things that are said in society are spoken, not so much from a desire as from a desire to display the quickness of our perception, the smartness of our wit, and the sharpness of our observation. A young lady says the reason she carries a parasol, is that the sun is of the masculine gender and she can not withstand his ardent glances.

It is not high crimes, such as robbery and murder which destroy the peace of society but the village gossip, family jealousies, and pickings between neighbors, and meddling are the worms that eat into all social happiness.

The hardest grapple upon earth is that which obtains between pride and poverty, and the man who has become the dispirited province of these two belligerents is a stranger to repose and happiness.

Women have more power in their looks than men have in their laws, and more power in their tears than men have in their judgments.

They who have an honest and engaging look ought to suffer a double punishment if they belie it in their actions.

A polite gentleman of this city bears his own pardon every time he tumbles down, and thanks himself politely every time he gets up again.

The gentleman who stood upon ceremony has lost his footing, and now finds that he has slipped out of a very pleasant circle.

The pursuit in which we cannot ask God's protection must be criminal, the measure for which we dare not thank him cannot be innocent.

The rain which we shake from our feet may be met-enrolled into a millinery lead, and ultimately result in the form of silk stockings.

There is a lawyer so excessively honest that he puts all his lower parts out over night, so determined is he that everything shall have its due.

A countryman was dragging a calf by a rope in a cruel manner. An Irishman asked him if that was the way he treated his fellow creatures.

An exchange says, the best cure for palpitation of the heart is to get out of bed, and hugging the girls. If this is the only remedy that can be produced, we, for one, say let 'em palpitate.

A leading man with almost every politician is always to keep his countenance, and never to keep his word.

Mr. Willington, of the Charleston Courier is now supposed to be the oldest living editor in America. He commenced the Courier sixty years ago.

Prospectus of THE CHARLESTON MERCURY, A Political, Commercial and Literary Journal, PUBLISHED DAILY AND TRI-WEEKLY.

"THE MERCURY" represents the State rights resistance to the extension of the African race. It is published in the city of Charleston, S. C. It is published weekly, except on Sundays, and is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" gives full reports of Markets and Marine Intelligence of Charleston, the Commerce in the harbor, and the news of the world. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.

The "Mercury" is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance. It is published for the year at \$10.00 in advance.