

DEMOCRACY—What is it?

Or observations on Nominal and Real Democracy.

BY HORACE GREELEY.

Rhode Island, for five years preceding the last August Election, was known in the language of party as a Democratic State. Vermont, throughout the same period as well as for some years preceding, was stigmatized as a Federal State, in a sense which implies by Federalism something antagonistic to Democracy. And yet no greater contrast can be presented than exists between the government of these two States—both in a direction precisely opposite from that indicated by this classification. Vermont is to all intents and purposes a Democracy; the Democratic principle is the element not only of her Constitution, but of her whole being. She may be denied the name, but she cannot be divested of the substance until the blood of fifty thousand freemen shall redder her streams and their bodies shall cumber the sides of her yet unconquered and unconquerable mountains. Her form of Government is a pure Democracy, as far as human government has ever yet been; her manners and habits of society are Democratic; her provision for the Education of her youth (though she has no School Fund, and must provide wholly by direct taxation) is the best, we believe, that the Union affords. Her rule prescribing the Qualification of Voters is a correct index to her whole political system; any male citizen of the United States, twenty-one years of age, who has been a well behaved resident of the State for the year preceding the election, is entitled to exercise the Right of Suffrage. It would puzzle the most lynx-eyed defamer of the land of Warner and Ethan Allen to discover a stain of Aristocracy on her escutcheon.

Very different is the case with Rhode Island. The nucleus of her political system is not a constitution framed by the Representatives of her People, but a Charter granted by a British King, which she resolutely refuses to change or supersede. There is nothing reprehensible in this if the form of government imposed thereby were not at least half a century behind the age in which we live. But here lies the evil. It might be uncharitable to denounce the system of another State as short-sighted, narrow, and aristocratic; we will merely say that it is radically opposed to what we understand and esteem as True Democracy.

Woman is allowed to vote who does not own a freehold within the State worth at least \$134. No provision is made for the support of popular Education. The rest is left to the State. During the last few years, while what is in party parlance termed Democracy was largely in the ascendant, strenuous efforts have been made to form a popular and republican Constitution. It was all in vain, however. Not one-fifth of the voters could be induced to vote a Reform Ticket. A year ago, such a Ticket was formed, when there was no party contest to serve as a pretext for casting votes against it. The ticket received some five hundred votes, a State that can cast eight thousand.

Then, the hope of a reform seems to have yielded to despair. A revolution in the attitude of parties has taken place, however, and Rhode Island has in consequence readopted the Democratic Fold. But, we may presume, is a dispensation not at all very affecting, but that it may be viewed as a Christian fortitude. If she had been in any proper sense Democratic, she would have been the blinding nonsense of a party—her lapse would be lamentable and marvellous. But in her present position, as Democratic now as ever she was—that is, not at all. Her party attitude is one dictated by a sense of her own or the National interests. It has nothing to do with the fundamental principles of Government.

Another case: Massachusetts and Virginia have been regarded as the especial Representatives respectively of Federal and Democratic principles—the flag ships of the two systems. So far as regards the party names of the first thirty years' existence of the Federal Constitution, they undoubtedly were so. Times have changed since then, and States have changed with them; but the names apply to the time when they were at the head of the two great contending parties. That vitally important question of Democracy at the bottom of this difference is not only in the case of Massachusetts, but in the case of Virginia: Not only is the Democratic principle recognized and established—whether right or wrong, is in the case of Massachusetts, but free Democracy—free Democracy—land instead of sea—made the basis of the Right of Suffrage, and where this principle prevails, there are always more like it. At the same time, in Virginia, a man is allowed to vote who does not own a freehold; while he who does not own a freehold cannot vote at all. We speak of Democracy as she was during the thirty years' existence of the Federal Constitution, as she was regarded as the standard-bearer of Democracy. Her new Constitution, though the last named still exist—though the right of primogeniture, or unequal bequest of property and other advantages of the eldest son—a rule fatally inconsistent with Democracy—is, at least, as established by the Constitution of Virginia—the natural consequence of these regulations of fundamental law are plainly to be seen.

Whoever has mingled, however, in Virginia society will have been struck by its aristocratic temperament and

bearing. Ideas that he had thought banished from men's minds, or at least from this continent—ideas of birth, and blood, and family descent and dignity, which sound oddly to republican ears, but worse than oddly to republican lips, will have convinced him that if Virginia be the pattern of true Democracy, then it is high time we had new authorities for the meaning of language.

We will pursue the subject no farther. If we have suggested to any a clearer idea of what Democracy is and what it is not—of the essence as contra-distinguished from the uses which are made of the name—of the principle as often opposed to the unmeaning profession—we shall have accomplished our purpose. But we will hope, moreover, that we have added some to determine whether, in the bewildering whirl of party politics, they have rightly acquired or lost, as the case may be, the appellation of Democrats. Kind reader are you troubled with any doubts on this head? You may solve them by answering to yourself these simple questions. Are you willing that all men should enjoy the same measures of freedom as you desire yourself, and to conform to all the restrictions of natural liberty which you would impose upon others? Do you wish to see all who act as becomes good citizens entitled to equal rights under the laws and to an equal voice in choosing those who make the laws? Do you respect and show courtesy to your neighbors and to all men according to their worth rather than their wealth, and feel equal pleasure and pride in shaking the broad hand of your friend the blacksmith as the lily fingers of your friend the Congressman or Governor? If your true answer to these questions be Yes, it matters little to your Democracy whether Clay or Van Buren, Webster or Benton, be your favorite Statesman—whether Spieker or Treasury paper, Bank Notes or Shipplasters, have preference in your idea of a sound currency. Tried by an arbitrary standard, you may be orthodox or heretic in your notions of National politics—to-day in the majority, to-morrow against it. These are all matters of opinion or of circumstance, and what is really preferable to-day may be otherwise before the year closes. But with such principles you are to all intents and purposes a Democrat, and there is no need of sending to Washington or Albany for a diploma.

From the National Intelligencer.

THE LATE COMMODORE RODGERS.

The remains of this distinguished veteran officer of the Navy were not brought to this city for interment, as had been expected by his friends here, but were committed to the tomb in Christ Church burying-ground, Philadelphia.

Commodore John Rodgers entered the Navy as a lieutenant in the year 1798. He was 1st lieutenant of the Constellation in the action with the Insurgente which resulted in her capture. His zeal in performing his duty on the occasion, and complying strictly with the orders of his commander, (Commodore Truxton,) was, in Commodore Truxton's language, "not to be surpassed." After the action the command of the Insurgente was conferred upon him.

With Midshipman D. Porter (the present commodore) and 11 men, he took possession of the prize, and commenced removing her crew to the Constellation; but before this could be done, the ships were separated in a heavy gale of wind, and 173 prisoners were left on board to be guarded by Lieutenant Rodgers and his handful of men, whose situation was rendered peculiarly perilous by the circumstance of there being no handcuffs or shackles on board to secure the prisoners, who manifested a disposition to retake the prize. The energy of Lieut. Rodgers, assisted by the gallant Midshipman Porter, conducted the prize safely into St. Kitts.

Returning to the United States, Lieut. Rodgers was commissioned a Captain in the Navy, in consideration of his highly meritorious conduct and known qualifications. He was appointed to command the Sloop of War, Maryland, in which vessel he cruised in the West Indies for many months, rendering important services. In 1801, he sailed in the Maryland for France, with Mr. Dawson, sent as a diplomatic messenger to that Court.

In 1802, he was appointed to the command of the John Adams—attached to the Mediterranean squadron—destroyed the Meschouda of 22 guns, "the largest cruiser belonging to Tripoli," and performed other valuable services.

In 1804, he was appointed to the Frigate Congress, and proceeded to the Mediterranean as part of a squadron of vessels, under the command of Commodore Samuel Barron, sent thither against Tripoli.

From Comm. Barron's extreme ill health, he resigned the command of the squadron in May, 1805, to Comm. Rodgers, whose decisive conduct soon disposed the Bashaw of Tripoli to make peace with us, and in less than two months after the command devolved upon him, a treaty of peace was concluded with that Power, on terms dictated by him and Colonel Lear.

In 1812, the command of a squadron was given to him. He dashed into the European seas, made a number of captures, most of which he from necessity destroyed, returning triumphant after an absence of more than three months. At the time he sailed, a number of the enemy's vessels were on our coast, greatly exceeding the Commodore's squadron in force. These he successfully evaded, and by drawing them off in pursuit of him, enabled a great number of our merchant vessels, with valuable cargoes, to return in safety to our ports. One of the effects of this cruise was to save millions to our merchants and to our Government.

When the British army marched upon

Baltimore, Commodore Rodgers acted a distinguished part in the defence of that city. Many believe that Baltimore would have been surrendered but for the seasonable aid of the force under his command.

After the war, he was appointed Commissioner of the Navy, and presided over the Board for several years. He was mainly instrumental in making regulations which have conducted to the economy of the naval service. He was offered the appointment of Secretary of the Navy, but declined it. Having acted as President of the Board of Navy Commissioners about ten years ago, the President invited him to take the command of the Mediterranean squadron, mentioning considerations, inducing him to do so, highly honorable to the Commodore. He accepted, and his flag was hoisted on board the North Carolina ship of the line, of which D. T. Patterson, Esq. was appointed Captain. He cruised in the Mediterranean nearly three years. He had much intercourse with the commanders of other naval Powers, and was held by them in high estimation. The ship was particularly distinguished for her fine condition at all times and the high state of discipline maintained on board. The Commodore, his accomplished Captain, and this noble specimen of American naval architecture, were objects of universal admiration. Returning to the United States, he was again appointed President of the Board of Navy Commissioners, and continued to discharge with great fidelity and zeal the arduous duties of that station, till his constitution was literally worn out, and his mind exhausted, in the service. He then retired—made a trip to England in the hope of recovering his health, and was there received with those kind attentions which were gratefully remembered till his last moments.

Of his personal character, it may be added, that, though of quick temper, he was noble and generous in his disposition. He was a Patriot in reality. Though stern in his appearance, he was particularly distinguished for his humanity. The story of his noble and successful exertions to save two young ladies from the massacre at Cape Francois—his sublime efforts to rescue a poor old negro woman floating upon a cake of ice down the Susquehanna, which were also crowned with success, must be told as characteristic incidents of his life, when these brief outlines of his character shall be filled up by faithful history.

Shocking Increase of the Slave Trade.

Lord Brougham, in a recent speech in the British Parliament, which does him infinite credit, made some startling statements concerning the increase in this nefarious traffic. We quote some appalling facts on this head below, which ought to be known to the American people. His Lordship complained that the "clumsy and preposterous course which the civilized nations had adopted, positively aggravated the evil. The plan, as agreed upon by England and America, and the other parties to the arrangement, was to confine the right of capturing or searching vessels on the African coast to the United States and British cruisers; and in order to quicken the diligence of the commanders it was agreed that they should not only share in the proceeds of each vessel captured and condemned as a prize, but a certain sum of money per head, and therefore called head money, should be paid for each slave taken.

The effect of this mode of compensation proves to be that cruisers make no attempt to prevent slave vessels, known to be such, from taking in cargoes of slaves; but keep at a distance until they are fully loaded and put to sea, for the sake of the head-money.

The more slaves, of course the better for the captor. Some instances of the horrid consequences of this course were stated. The slaver, finding a cruiser after her, the captain proceeds to lighten his ship by throwing overboard the heaviest of the negroes. We quote some heart-stirring details—

Men, women, and children were thus thrown overboard without remorse and in numbers proportioned to the distance which the pursuing ship might be gaining on him. The slaves were thrown over with the fetters placed on them before they were brought on board—fetters which were considered necessary, first, for the protection of the crew against multitudes of the slaves, and also to prevent attempts at suicide, to which the slaves were ever ready to resort, if an opportunity presented itself on their voyage.

Another object of the fetters was, that when it became necessary to throw parties overboard to lighten the ship, they when cast in, fetters and all, would have the less chance of escape. To lessen that chance weights were sometimes added,—for the negro, with the Herculean strength which he generally possessed, and from that facility of swimming which gave him a sort of amphibious nature, could easily, if left to his own unfettered exertions, support himself in the waves until the pursuing schooner came, and if taken on board would prove a most important witness against those who had torn him from his native home; to prevent this the weights were added, which sunk him before aid could arrive; but that was not the only mode of lightening the vessel.

Sometimes three human beings were packed closely in a cask, which was thrown over with weights attached to it, and one slaver which was pursued had, before she was captured, thrown over 12 such casks, each enclosed packed with human beings. In another instance two slave ships which were chased had had upwards of 500 slaves on board, every one of whom met a watery grave. Let not their lordships imagine that this was a fancy sketch. It was unhappily, a detail of facts which he received from a gallant officer who was for some time a Commodore on the Western African station.

But he had not yet stated all. The sharks seemed to know this scene of bloodshed, and it was a fact stated to him on the same good authority, that they followed the slave ship from the coast, and the track of that ship could be traced across the Atlantic by the blood of her murdered victims hurled into the ocean to facilitate the escape of the vessel from its pursuers.

Of the increase and audacious boldness of this horrid trade, we have the following testimony—

He (Lord Brougham) knew that one time there were in one year, 1825, eighty-five slave ships fitted out at the Havana, of which seventy-five returned safe to the Havana. The number varied from 175 to 700, this average giving 28,000 imported into the Havana in the year 1826. After the dreadful treatment to which these slaves were subjected, and which he had detailed to their lordships, and the risk which they ran of being thrown overboard in chase, there were, horrible to relate, 500 in one vessel and 780 in another. He did not speak vaguely when he said that in one single month, the month of December, 1836, there arrived at Rio, in two vessels, called the Feliciade and the El Sincelo, two cargoes of slaves, the one 500, the other 780. In the year 1837, 4500 slaves were imported in the principal settlement of their friend and ally, the Emperor of Brazil. The greatest of all slave dealers were the Brazilians, the Spaniards, and the Portuguese; and this country, he might add France also, with the full knowledge of the fact, still continued quibbling with them about the construction of treaties, and endeavoring to obtain from those courts the right to search the ships, suffering all his time these dreadful enormities to be perpetrated, when they would not allow for one hour a common pirate to pollute the great highway of the seas, even though the flags of these nations protected him.

IF I COULD BUT ACQUIRE AN EDUCATION.

This is a remark almost as common amongst young men as another, "I wish I was rich;" and yet education is within the reach of every young man of ordinary capacity and determined industry. My worthy and eccentric friend, Grant Thorburn, justly remarks, that "the grand drawback to every kind of improvement, is the common and degrading idea, that certain things are beyond our reach, whereas everything is attainable by the employment of means, and nothing, not even the knowledge of a common laborer, without it." He says, also, "let no man think anything impossible for him. I speak from experience. I commenced a seed-store with fifteen dollars; finding it thrive, I resolved it should be the first, and now I think it is, for while in Britain last winter, I saw nothing equal to it; therefore, I again say, let no man think that any thing is impossible, for this is the bane of all improvement."

He also says that the motto of a Scotch gardener is "second to none." So let it be yours, my young friends; and rely upon it, a fixed purpose to be the first in your profession or calling, will certainly ensure to you, prosperity and competence.

Shall I tell you how to be first in your calling? Nothing can afford me more pleasure, and if one only in a thousand who read what I may write upon the subject, should thereby become a more intelligent and virtuous member of society, in consequence of reading this work, I shall be amply, richly paid for my labor; as it is, in my opinion, of more importance to society to make one man virtuous and intelligent, than to make ten men wealthy.

If you would be intelligent, and indebted only to yourself for it, you must be industrious; devote your leisure first to labor, and the proceeds of that to books, and not as I did, to fine clothes and to frolicking. When you have a book, divide your time—your leisure, I mean—between study and labor, that you may be able, when you have mastered and become familiar with the first, to obtain another. Adopt and pursue diligently this one simple rule, and you may rely safely upon it, to make you not only intelligent, but wealthy and virtuous. I never knew it to fail. [Jefter.]

Phylosophy in Madness.—This morning while waiting at the Post Office, our attention was attracted by a man in rather tattered attire, with a woman's cap and bonnet upon his head. His step was too firm and his eye too clear to admit the idea of intoxication. As he approached several gentlemen, he cracked a large wagon wheel which he held, and cut a few antics, exciting a laugh in the crowd. When he observed the effect of his conduct, he paused, threw back his bonnet, and displayed a head nearly bald and showing by the gray hairs upon his temples the frosts of about fifty winters. "Do not laugh, gentlemen," said the man, "every thing goes to the crack of a whip. The world would stand still without it. When I was a boy I was whipped to school; and when the lessons were whipped into me, many a scholar have I seen the whip make of a dull fellow. As I grew up, circumstances whipped me into employment and responsibilities. I was married, had children and means. But death and misfortune whipped all off, and now fate whips me alone round the world. 'Tis all to the crack of a whip. You are all scourged by the driver Time. He drives you at a gallop along the road of life, whether you will or not. You may whip the devil round the stump, but the devil will repay every lash ten fold. Here we go! All to the crack of a whip. Patience, patience! Better be whipped by poverty, disgrace, bereavement, age, by madness, in this world, than by the fiends of hell in the next. Here we go! All to the crack of a whip!" And suiting the action to the word, the crazy philosopher went on his way.—Cincinnati Express.

THE DEMOCRACY OF OFFICE-HOLDERS.

The ambitious and the sordid wish to distort Government from its legitimate ends to their factions and pecuniary purposes. They wish to convert it into a convenient and resistless engine to subserve their personal interests and purposes. They laugh at principle, and mock at patriotism. They believe in no possible Government but one of force and corruption. Restless at living under the name of a Republic, they would pervert it into a substantial resemblance of their favorite monarchical and aristocratical models. From these people, liberty is ever in danger; their actions and designs she must always watch with an unsleeping eye.—Globe Aug. 3d.

What more perfect picture of the "Democracy of office holders" is it possible to draw, than is contained in the above paragraph, quoted from the office-holders' great organ, the Globe?

The "ambitious and the sordid!" Of all the ambitious men in the world, where can one be found more desperately or more dangerously so than John C. Calhoun, who has just sold himself and his reputation for the bare shadow of a hope of power, and who from being lately the most bitter and inveterate enemy of the "office-holding democracy," has become their warmest friend and supporter? It must be confessed, however, that Calhoun is to a certain extent, consistent, in his very inconsistency. Having been the author and introducer of the "spoils" system, what wonder that now it is in danger, he becomes again its chief advocate and champion?

Of all the "sordid" men in the world, where can men be found more basely sordid, than Amos Kendall, who offered to sell himself to Mr. Clay for a salary of \$1,500 a year; than Governor Marcy, who makes the State pay for patching his small clothes; than Mr. Secretary Woodbury, who overcharges a congressional committee for attendance as a witness; than Mr. Secretary-Proctor, Attorney General Butler, who understands so well the art of drawing three rations at a time; than the all vigorous Globe itself, and the vast creeping and crawling swarm which covers the whole land like a cloud of locusts, ready to light upon and devour the smallest green thing that springs up in the shape of official patronage?

It was the "sordid" love of "the spoils," which formed the grand principle of union, upon which the "democracy of office-holders" came into power. It was a "sordid" longing after "plunder," that led first to the accumulation and to the seizure of the public treasure, from which act of violence and usurpation all our financial and currency troubles have originated. How truly then may the "office-holding democracy" be described as men "ambitious and sordid," who "wish to distort Government from its legitimate ends to their factions and pecuniary purposes!"

As we have said, one grand attempt of this sort, on the part of the "democracy of office-holders" was the destruction of the United States Bank, and the seizure and distribution of the public monies, as a part of the "spoils of victory," among the "democratic banks." But this attempt to convert the public treasure into a convenient and resistless engine to subserve their personal interests and purposes!

A very large proportion of the "office-holding democracy" during the late commercial convulsions became bankrupt,—principally by reason of the rash and foolish speculations carried on by means of the public monies, of which, through the pet deposit banks, they had obtained the temporary use. By reason of their bankruptcy they are no longer able to attain the situation of bank directors, and the SUB-TREASURY has been contrived, as an ingenious method of depositing in the hands of these bankrupt "office-holding democrats" the monies of the State, of which, if deposited in banks, they can no longer enjoy the use and control.—Such is the true history and real object of this same SUB-TREASURY SYSTEM. It is intended "as a convenient and resistless engine to subserve their personal interests and purposes."

"They laugh at principle and mock at patriotism." How true! Did not the present Vice President of the United States proclaim it as one of the great doctrines of the party, that though the administration to which they were opposed were "pure and virtuous as the angels of light," still it must and should be overthrown, in order to distribute the spoils among the victors? So much for their "principles," and as to their patriotism—have they not mocked" at the efforts of the virtuous and humane to preserve the honor of the country from the grievous stains brought upon it by the infamous Indian policy of the administration? In their conduct towards Mexico, have they not exposed the nation to charges of insolence, hypocrisy, and a design to plunder; while in their dealings with Great Britain have they not nearly sacrificed the colonial trade, and the north-eastern boundary, submitted to insults and aggressions on the frontier, and kissed the dust at the feet of that haughty nation?

"They believe in no possible government but one of force and corruption." Hence the instant proscription and expulsion from office of all those who decline to go every length in support of the administration. Hence the constant talk of Jackson, Van Buren, and the Globe, about the "bribery" of members of Congress and the all prevailing power of the banks. Hence

the notice of Amos Kendall to his fourteen thousand deputy post masters, that if they are "silent and inactive in the present crisis," they shall not be allowed "to sleep quietly on their pillows," hence, in fine, the whole theory and practice of the spoils system, which is compounded in about equal proportions of "force" and of "corruption."

"Restless at living under the name of a republic, they would pervert it into a substantial resemblance of their favorite monarchical and aristocratical models."

A very substantial resemblance, surely! According to the theory of the "office-holding democrats," the President is the "great representative of the people;" the majesty of the people is concentrated in him; the fact that the people have chosen him, is construed into a popular approval of all his opinions, acts and intentions. His authority is thus supreme and unquestionable. He "takes the responsibility." Such is the "monarchical model" of the "office-holding democrats." Their "aristocratical model" is like unto it. Amos Kendall held, in his famous mandamus case, that the supreme majesty set forth above, as appertaining to the President, descends by regular gradations through the whole hierarchy of office-holders, so that the meanest office-holder of them all, is elevated high above the heads of the people, out of the reach of the highest judicial tribunals, and responsible to nobody but the President, who appoints him.—Here is not only a substantial resemblance to a monarchy and aristocracy, but the very substance itself.

Let us close as we began, with the words of the Globe:—

"From these people LIBERTY is ever in danger;—their actions and designs she must always watch with an unsleeping eye." Undoubtedly of all the enemies which this country and its institutions has ever had, there are none, at once so powerful, hypocritical, cunning, desperate and dangerous as the "democracy of office-holders." May the genius of the republic protect us against their machinations; and may the votes of the people soon strip them of their ill-gotten and much abused power!

From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

POLICE OFFICE, Aug. 18.—Doing a Bit of the Dark Ages.—A family of rather respectable appearance, came to the Police Office on Saturday, and complained of being intolerably annoyed by another family who lodge in the same house with them. The complainants are Jews, who adhere most rigidly to the observances of their religion, and consequently consider the Hog an unclean animal, and hold pork in the utmost abhorrence. Their fellow lodgers, on the other hand, are a family of Germans, lately arrived in this country, and have come from a part of Germany, where, to the disgrace of Christianity and civilization, the Jews are still deprived of many of their rights, and are permitted by law or custom, to be insulted with impunity by their unchristian christian brethren. Some difficulty having occurred between the Jewish family and the Germans, the latter, forgetting that they were in a country where the law makes no distinction between creeds, but protects alike the followers of all or none, they thought they might avenge their quarrel by insulting the religious feelings of their fellow lodgers.

The Germans, therefore, procured a quantity of rancid pork with which they operated so as to torment the Jews in a most intolerable manner. The Jews occupied a room underneath that of the Germans, and if they happened to open the window, and sit or stand at it to breathe the fresh air, down came a piece of cord from the window over them, with a piece of pork dangling at the end of it, the insufferable odor of which obliged the Jews to shut down their window. If the Jews carried in a pail of water from the pump, they had scarcely laid it down when some of the Germans slipped a piece of pork into it, and the Jews had to throw out the water. If the Jews happened to leave their cooking utensils for a moment in the yard, the Germans threw pork into them, and deprived the Jews, of their dinner. In short, these Jews, although living in the 19th century, and in a free country, found themselves almost as much annoyed as their ancestors were hundreds of years ago, for their eating, drinking and even breathing the air of heaven, depended upon the caprice of their christian neighbors. And yet the annoyance was of such a nature that the criminal law could not well lay hold of it, until Saturday, when one of the Germans capped the climax of his barbarity by throwing a large piece of fat against the face of one of the Jewish ladies, lodged in the house. The whole family then came to the Police Office and stated their grievances, and Justice Hopson immediately issued a warrant for the ruffian who committed the assault. And we hope sincerely that he may be sent to Blackwell's Island for six months to teach him better manners.

The wrong way to stop a Paper. "Please stop my paper, and I will soon send the balance I owe you." This is altogether the wrong way to do business. If you wish your paper stopped, pay up what is due and it shall be stopped; but we detest the custom of saying, "please stop my paper, and I will soon send the balance I owe you." Soon! when? Ten years hence? If we may judge from experience, there is not more than one in ten of those who say "please stop my paper, and I will soon pay what I owe," who ever do pay. We have had so many of these promises totally neglected, that we are sick of them. We do not stop the paper when we have such an order, except at our own discretion. Pay up what is due, if you wish to have the paper stopped.—Trumpet.