PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
SATURDAY MORNING,
BY
GRAHAM & JOHNSON.
J. A. JOHNSON, EDITOR.

TERMS.
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE, or TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS if not paid within *one month* of the time of subscribing, or the renewal of subscription. A failure to notify a discontinuance is considered as a new engagement.

THE EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE—"Literature well or ill conducted is the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown—RELIGION purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty—Morality refines the Manners—Agriculture makes us Rich, and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all."

VOL. XXXV. EASTON, MD., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1852. No. 37.

ADVERTISEMENTS
Not exceeding one square (14 lines) inserted THREE TIMES for ONE DOLLAR, and TWENTY FIVE CENTS for each subsequent insertion. Longer ones in proportion. A liberal deduction to yearly Advertisers. Advertisements not marked the number of insertions will be continued until forbid, and charged accordingly.

Merchants and others who advertise by the year, will in no case be allowed to insert any advertisement not connected with their regular business, without an additional charge.

All orders addressed to the publishers, post paid, will receive prompt attention.

THE LITERARY HUSBAND.

BY MRS. TAYLOR.

Wedded ere I reached the twenties,
To the one I loved the best,
Young, beloved, merry-hearted,
Who shall say I am not blest!

But that bliss may not be *perfect*,
Fate presents *one* cruel ban,
In the fact that my dear husband
Is a *literary* man!

You may see the poet-spirit
Shining in his careless dress,
Thrown unthinkingly about him,
With no thought of cleanliness.

By the state of wild disorder
Which his hair is always in—
By the soiled and dog-eared collar,
Curling 'neath his unshaved chin.

By the ink upon his fingers,
And the dark and dismal stains
Seen upon the table cover,
Spite of all my care and pains.

By the thousand like attractions
Which the *poet's gift* confers,
You may see that he is numbered
With the muse's worshippers.

I must speak in smothered whispers,
And on tiptoe move around,
Lest I scare his dainty fancies
By some rude and jarring sound.

And to draw his rapt attention
From his pen I vainly try,
And my kindly-worded question
Meets some foreign, strange reply.

Worse than this, and more perplexing—
Though he is the best of men—
He, of late, has really fancied
That *I*, too, might wield the pen:

That I, too, must spend long hours
Daily o'er a sheet of post,
Rubbing my bewildered forehead,
Courting fickle Fancie's host.

And if I attempt employment
While he pens romantic lore,
He abstracts my knitting-needles,
Rolls my spools upon the floor—

Till I, sitting down beside him,
Just to please the anxious man,
Weave long rhymes and rambling sketches,
Rather on the prosy plan—

Till my head is aching sadly,
And my fingers stained with ink—
And the editors and printers
Are quite puzzled what to think.

Ah, I *should* be really happy,
Did not fate present a ban,
In the fact that *my dear husband*
Is a literary man.

ANECDOTE OF THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUGH.

This nobleman was as much distinguished for his kindness of heart as for his riches, uniting real nobility of character to that of rank and station in the community. The following account is copied from the Glasgow magazine:—

Some time ago, the Duke of Buccleugh, in one of his walks, purchased a cow from a person in the neighborhood of Dalkeith, and left orders to send it to his place the following morning. According to agreement, the cow was sent and the Duke happening to be in dishabille, and walking in the avenue, spied a little fellow ineffectually attempting to drive the animal forward to its destination. The boy not knowing the Duke bawled out to him, "Ifeh, man, come here and gie's a han' wi' the beast."

The Duke saw the mistake and determined on having a joke with the little fellow. Pretending, therefore, not to understand him, the Duke walked on slowly, the boy still craving his assistance; at last he cries in a tone of apparent distress,—"Come here, man, and help us, and as sure's ony thing, I'll gi'e you the half o' what I get."

This last solicitation had the desired effect; the Duke went and lent a helping hand

"And now," said the Duke, as they trudged along "how much do you think you'll get for this job!"

"Oh, I dinna ken," said the boy, "but I'm sure o' something, for the folk up by at the house are guid to a' bodies."

As they approached the house, the Duke darted from the boy, and entered by another way. He called a servant, put a sovereign into his hand, saying—

"Give that to the boy that has brought the cow."

The Duke returned to the avenue, and was soon rejoined by the boy.

"Well, how much did you get?" said the Duke.

"A shilling," said the boy; "and there's the half o't i' ye."

"But surely you got more than a shilling?"—said the Duke.

"No," said the boy with the utmost earnestness: as sure's death that's a' I got; and d'ye no think it's plenty?"

"I do not," said the duke, there must be some mistake: and as I am acquainted with the Duke, if you'll return with me, I think I'll get you more."

The boy consented, back they went—the Duke rang the bell and ordered all the servants to be assembled. "Now," said the Duke to the boy, "point out the person that gave you the shilling."

"It was that chap there wi' the white apron," pointing to the butler.

The delinquent confessed, fell on his knees, and attempted an apology; but the Duke interrupting him, indignantly ordered him to give the boy the sovereign and quit his services instantly.

"You have lost," said the Duke, "your shilling, your situation, and your character, by your covetousness; learn, henceforth, that honesty is the best policy."

The boy by this time, recognised his assistant in the person of the Duke, and the Duke was so delighted with the sterling worth and honesty of the boy, that he ordered him to be sent to school, kept there and provided for, at his own expense.

THE LOBOS ISLANDS.

The National Intelligencer publishes the letter of Mr. Webster, dated the 21st., in reply to the Charge d'Affaris of Peru, respecting the sovereignty of the Lobos Islands and denying the claim set up by Peru. Mr. Webster denies any intention in his previous letter to facilitate the operations of speculators; he denies, also, that any action of our government with respect to these islands was predicated on the relative strength or weakness of the two countries; nor is any exclusive right to the Lobos Islands set up by the United States on account of Captain Morrell's supposed discovery of them.

It is asserted that no book generally known and circulated in this country mentioned the fact of the existence of guano on these islands until Captain Morrell's narrative was published, in 1832.

Mr. Webster then proceeds to discuss the general question of the right of Peru to the sovereignty over the Lobos Islands based on early discovery and possession for many years, which is fully and ably treated, and will undoubtedly settle the question of sovereignty. Mr. W. concludes as follows:

The Lobos, or Seal Islands, as their name imports, lie in the open Pacific ocean, the nearest of them 20 or 30 miles from the coast of Peru. They are, as Mr. Osma admits, more barren rocks in the sea, uninhabited and uninhabitable. Fisheries, and the pursuit of amphibious animals, especially the seal, have long been carried on around their shores, and even on those shores themselves, since it is well known that seals are usually taken and killed upon the land. In these pursuits, and in this use of the islands, citizens of the United States were engaged for a half century before any actual interruption took place by the Peruvian Government or any body else; their visits to them having commenced at least as early as 1793. All this is well known to the commercial world. Now, it is quite certain that, if Peru held and possessed full sovereignty over these islands, this fishing near the shore, and this pursuit and killing of amphibious animals upon the land, was as much an invasion of that sovereignty as in the taking of guano from them now.

As to the claim of Peru to those islands, founded on the law of proximity, the question will appear to be free of doubt. The well-settled rule of modern public law on this point is, that the right of jurisdiction of any nation whose territories may border on the sea, extends to the distance of a cannon shot or three marine miles from the shore, this being the supposed limit to which a defence of the coast from the land, itself, can be extended.

The whole discussion, therefore must turn upon this, viz: the Lobos Islands, lying in the open ocean, so far from any continental possessions of Peru as not to belong to that country by the law of proximity or adjacent position, has the government of that country exercised such unequivocal acts of absolute sovereignty and ownership over them as give to her a right to their exclusive possession, as against the United States and their citizens, by the law of indisputable possession? And the undersigned repeats that this is not a question between Peru and other governments, who may have more or less distinctly admitted her right, but it is a question between Peru and the United States, who have so long exercised that right and remonstrated against its interruption.

The Government of the United States, however, is prepared to give due consideration to all facts tending to show possession or occupancy of the Lobos Islands by Peru, and is inclined to stop or preclude discussion until the whole matter shall be thoroughly investigated. If there are any facts or arguments which have not been brought to its consideration, they shall receive the most respectful and friendly attention. If it shall turn out that, as has been intimated above, those islands are uninhabited and uninhabitable, and therefore incapable of being legally possessed or held by any one nation, they and their contents must be considered as the common property of all. Or if, unprotected by the presence of Peruvian authorities and without actual possession, their use has been by Peru abandoned or conceded, without limitation of time, to citizens of the United States for a long period, or yielded in consequence of the remonstrance of this Government or its agents, then no exclusive ownership can be pretended as against the United States at least

Under all the circumstances, the President thinks it most advisable that full instructions on this subject should be dispatched to the Charge d'Affairs of the United States at Lama, and that proper orders should be given to the naval forces of the United States in that quarter to prevent a collision until further examination of the case. No countenance will be given to the authors of such enterprises, claiming to be citizens of the United States, who may undertake to defend themselves or their vessels by force, in prosecution of any commercial enterprises to these islands. Such acts would be acts of private war, and their authors would thereby justly forfeit the protection of their own Government.

From the Washington Republic.

Gen'l. Pierce and Slavery—More Affidavits.

We consider the testimony already adduced, touching the character of General Pierce's speech at New Boston, perfectly conclusive. It *proves* that the General, among his friends and neighbors in New Hampshire, expresses statements that are well calculated to arrest the perfect gush of enthusiasm with which his nomination was hailed by Mr. Forsyth and Mr. Soule, and the Secessionists and Fire-eaters generally. We have nothing to say in regard to those sentiments, except that the New Hampshire Democracy have very solemnly affirmed on various occasions that they are such as the New Hampshire Democracy entertain. The *admitted* fact, which appears from the Life of Pierce published by the Democratic Central Committee, that General Pierce averred at Manchester on the 20th of November, 1850, that "the men who would dissolve the Union did NOT HATE OR DEPLORE slavery more than he did." This *admitted fact* renders the alleged New Boston speech a matter of less interest, except from the *denials* of General Pierce and his friends, which are calculated to convey a false impression of the facts in the case.—We have never entertained a doubt that the report of Mr. Foss of the General's remarks on slavery at New Boston was essentially and substantially correct.

The most sceptical can entertain no doubt of its accuracy as to the immediate points in controversy after reading the affidavits which follow:

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
MANCHESTER, Aug. 14, 1852.

Having been intimately acquainted with Rev. A. T. Foss, of this city, during the last seven years, I can most cheerfully state that he always has sustained an unblemished moral character, and is regarded in our community as a clergyman of ability, intelligence and piety.

FREDERICK SMYTH,
Mayor of Manchester, N. H.

GOFFSTOWN, N. H., Aug. 9, 1852.

This is to certify that Rev. Andrew T. Foss is a member of the Baptist church in Goffstown, N., in good and regular standing, and is a minister in regular standing in the Baptist denomination.

J. W. POLAND, Pastor.
JESSE T. PLUMER, Ch Cl'k.

We, Abraham Cochran, Solomon M. McCurdy, and James McCurdy, citizens of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say that we were at a political meeting in this town on the second day of January, 1852, at which General Pierce made a political speech; and we further say, that we saw a report of said speech immediately after in the Manchester Democrat, and we then thought the report a faithful statement of General Pierce's remarks on the slavery question; and our attention having been recently called to this subject, we say that, according to our best recollection, *the report on the part relating to slavery and the Fugitive Slave law is corret.*

ABRAHAM COCHRAN,
SOLOMON M. McCURDY,
JAMES McCURDY.

STATE OF N HAMPSHIRE. *Hillsboro' ss:*

On this 27th day of July, A. D., 1852 personally appeared the above named Abraham Cochran, Solomon M McCurdy, and James McCurdy, and made solemn oath that the foregoing affidavit by them subscribed is true. Before me.

JOSEPH COCHRAN, JR,
Justice of the Peace.

I, Daniel Andrews, of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I was present at a political meeting holden in this town on the second day of January, 1852, which was addressed by General Franklin Pierce; and I further say, that I saw the report of said speech made by A T. Foss, *and I then believed the report to be a true and correct report of said speech; and I never heard any person say that they doubted the correctness of the report until it became necessary to contradict it to save General Pierce's credit with his Southern friends.* DANIEL ANDREWS

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before
JOSEPH COCHRAN, JR,
Justice of the Peace.

I, Cyrus W. Campbell, of the town of Goffstown county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I was at a political meeting holden in New Boston, in said county of Hillsborough, in the State of New Hampshire, on the Second day of January, 1852, which meeting was addressed by General Franklin Pierce; and while I cannot recollect any precise words, I do recollect that he spoke of his dislike of the Fugitive Slave law; and I recollect that, after returning, *I said to a number of individuals, that he, General Pierce, was* AS GOOD AN ABOLITIONIST AS MYSELF, IF HE WOULD ONLY STICK. C. W. CAMPBELL.

Sworn, July 27, 1852, before
JOSEPH COCHRAN, JR.,
Justice of the Peace.

I, Rodney McCollom, of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I was present at a political meeting holden in this town on the second of January, 1852, which was addressed by General Franklin Pierce; and while I cannot now testify to the words used, I do recollect that he spoke so decidedly against slavery and the Fugitive Slave law, that I then thought, and made the remark to a number of persons, *that he, General Pierce, was as strong an anti slavery man as any we had about here.*

RODNEY McCOLLOM.

Sworn, July 27, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, Jr, Justice of the Peace.

I, E. W Griffin, of Pepperill, in the county of Middlesex, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certify and say, that I was at New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, on the second of January last, and that I heard the speeches of B. F. Ayer, Esq., and General Franklin Pierce, and that I heard A. T. Foss ask him several questions, and heard General Pierce's replies.

I distinctly recollect of hearing General Franklin Pierce say that he had the most revolting feeling at the giving up of a slave; that he loathed the Fugitive Slave law; and other expressions of similar import concerning slavery and the Fugitive Slave law. E. W. GRIFFIN.

Sworn, August 10, 1852, before
ROBERT MOORE, Justice of the Peace.

I, Nathan Hall, of New Boston, county of Hill-borough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I attended a political meeting holden in this town on the second day of January, 1852, at which meeting General Franklin Pierce made a political speech, and I distinctly recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as a moral wrong and revolting to his feelings. NATHAN HALL

We, Robert Warren and William P. Warren, of the township of Goffstown, county of Hillsborough, and State of N Hampshire, depose and say, that we were present at a political meeting holden in New Boston, in said county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, on the 2d day of January, 1852, which meeting was addressed by General Franklin Pierce, and we distinctly recollect that he said, in answer to the questions proposed to him, that the Fugitive Slave law was opposed to moral right and to humanity, and that his feelings revolted at the idea of giving up a fugitive slave.

ROBERT WARREN,
WM P. WARREN.

Sworn, July 27, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, Jr., Justice of the Peace.

I, Sandy Smith, of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, 1852, I attended a political meeting in this town, which was addressed by General Franklin Pierce, and I distinctly recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as morrally wrong, and odious to his feelings, but which he thought should be submitted to for the present to preserve our National Union.

I distinctly recollect that he said no man abhorred slavery more than he; that he never saw a human being in bondage without feeling his heart revolt at it.

SANDY SMITH.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, JR, Justice of the Peace.

I, David Kelso, of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, A. D. 1852, I attended a political meeting holden at said New Boston, at which General Franklin Pierce made a political speech, and I distinctly recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as a great moral wrong, and as repulsive to his feelings, and he used the expression, I never saw a human being in bondage without feeling my heart revolt at it; but he said we must submit to it as an evil for the sake of preserving the Union. DAVID KELSO

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, JR, Justice of the Peace.

I, Charles M. Fisher, of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, 1852, I was present at a political meeting holden at said New Boston, at which meeting General Franklin Pierce made a political speech and I distinctly recollect that he, General Pierce, spoke of slavery as morrally wrong, and as repulsive to his feelings. He said that he never saw a human being in slavery, but he felt his heart revolt at it. He further said that we ought to submit to the Compromise measures for the sake of quiet, and that our National Union might be preserved. CHARLES M. FISHER.

Sworn, July 29, 1852, before
GEORGE A. FRENCH,
Justice of the Peace.

I, George W. Clark, of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that on the second day of January, 1852, I attended a political meeting in this town, which was addressed by General Franklin Pierce, and I recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as a great moral wrong, and as odious to his feelings. He said that no man abhorred slavery more than himself, and that no man would do more than himself to abolish slavery if it could be done consistent with the Constitution; that he thought we ought to adhere to the Compromise for the sake of the National Union.

GEORGE W. CLARK.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, JR, Justice of the Peace.

I, Phinehas Dodge, in the town of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I attended a political meeting in this town, on the second day of January last, which was addressed by General Pierce and I distinctly recollect that Gen. Pierce spoke of Slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as a great moral wrong and revolting to his feeling, but to which we must submit for the sake of preserving the Union.

PHINEHAS DODGE.

Sworn, July 27, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, Jr., Justice of the Peace.

I, Jacob Baily, of the town of New Boston, county of Hillsboro' and State of N. Hampshire, depose and say, that I attended a political meeting in this town, on the second day of January, 1852, at which General Franklin Pierce made a political speech, and I distinctly recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as a moral wrong; and, according to the best of my recollection, he said that he loathed the Fugitive Slave law, but that we must submit to it for the sake of preserving the Union. JACOB BAILY.

Sworn, July 26, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, Jr., Justice of the Peace.

I, Samuel Done, of the town of New Boston, in the county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I attended a political meeting, holden in this town on the second day of January, 1852, which was addressed by General Franklin Pierce, and while I cannot remember the precise words which he used, I do recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as a moral wrong, and as repulsive to his feelings; but he thought we must submit to it for the present to preserve the National Union.

SAMUEL DONE.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, Jr., Justice of the Peace.

I, Stephen Whipple, of the town of New Boston, county of Hillsborough, and State of New Hampshire, depose and say, that I was at a political meeting holden in New Boston, on the second day of January, 1852, at which General Franklin Pierce made a political speech, and I distinctly recollect that he spoke of slavery and the Fugitive Slave law as a great moral wrong, and as repulsive to his feelings, but to which in the present circumstances, we must submit for the sake of preserving the Union. STEPHEN WHIPPLE.

Sworn, July 28, 1852, before
J. COCHRAN, Jr., Justice of the Peace.

Let us see if Mr. Norris and Mr. Hubbard will undertake to impeach the veracity of these witnesses. We take it for granted that the deponents entertain precisely the same feelings with regard to slavery that have been so repeatedly exhibited, in a marked public and official manner, by both Mr. Hibbard and Mr. Norris; but we do not think that on this account they are not to be believed upon oath. Of what value are *general* certificates, vague and sweeping disclaimers, against the positive and specific AVERMENTS ON OATH OF MEN OF UNIMPEACHED TRUTH?

General Pierce's own repudiation of Mr. Foss's report amounts to nothing. It is in General Pierce's power, if he can do so consistently with truth, to deny specifically the language on the slavery question attributed to him at New Boston, and to state as well as he can recollect, the precise words which he really employed on that occasion. He owed it to himself and his party—if he took *any* notice of the report—to disclaim it in such a manner that his disclaimer would "stick." He contents himself with saying that the "pretended report" is an "ENTIRE MISREPRESENTATION." Now we *know* from a dozen quarters, indeed, it is admitted, that a large part of the report is *not* a misrepresentation. *On some points all the witnesses on both sides agree.* But General Pierce says it is an "*entire* misrepresentation." This state of the case makes it necessary for General Pierce to write a letter in which he shall correct his testimony in such a manner that it shall not conflict with that of *all* the other witnesses.

General Pierce has undertaken to impeach the correctness of the report made at the time, and now sworn to, by a Baptist clergyman in good standing; and that report now confirmed by several other witnesses. Will the Union furnish us with one of the *several* letters which it has seen from General Pierce denying the "calumny" under his own signature? It may be more specific and distinct to the points in controversy.

We have seen it stated, (says the Boston *Atlas,*) that the Pierce Club at Concord, N Hampshire, the home of the General, have made John Van Buren, of New York, N. P. Banks, and Whiting Griswold, of this State, honorary members. Messrs. Banks and Griswold were members of the Massachusetts Legislature last year and this, and were among the most active of the Coalitionists to elect Mr. Sumner to the United States Senate. The junior editor of the *Post* voted for Hon. Henry Wilson, the President of the Pittsburg Free-soil Convention, for State Senator last fall, and the *Post* and both editors advocated his election.

This information we submit to the judgment of those Whigs who are unwilling to accept General Scott, on the Whig platform, because he is supported by Governor Seward.

HE NEVER KNEW IT.—In a recent speech the Hon. Thomas F. Marshall remarked; "They tell me that Mr. Pierce was a member of Congress when I was; it may be, but if he was I never knew it."—*Philadelphia News.*

ELOQUENCE OF THE FORUM AND OF THE FIELD.—The supporters of Gen. Pierce are not much disposed we believe, to place their candidate side by side with Gen. Scott in any form of comparison or contrast by which the respective merits of the two may be distinctly viewed. In the matter of military glory they may be excused for avoiding anything like a test of superiority. The issue there is too unequal.

With regard to civil qualifications there is an almost equal degree of diffidence on the part of Gen. Pierce's friends. They can point only to his votes against river and harbor improvements as illustrations of his statesmanship. His name is connected with no beneficent measures of public policy. He has never originated anything; the stamp of mediocrity has been upon him from the beginning, nor has he ever manifested any quality of intellect or energy that would indicate a capacity for greater things under more favorable circumstances. The State of New Hampshire has done all for him that could be asked by the favorite of the dominant party there; but the calibre of greatness, in the New Hampshire acceptation of the term, might be entirely filled without much enlargement of the standard of ordinary men.

But Gen. Pierce, we are told, did make a speech in Congress—and the occasion of his eloquence was the introduction of a resolution granting to the widow of the lately deceased President, Gen. Harrison, the first year's salary of his office. We do not know that any record of Gen. Pierce's speech in opposition to this resolution is preserved. But its character may be estimated by the nature of the sentiments indicated by his espousal of such an illiberal side.

Gen. Scott has never been a member of either House of Congress, and consequently it has not fallen in his way to make speeches or to cultivate the rhetorical art. In connection, however, with his vocation he has sometimes been called upon to speak, and we have a specimen of his eloquence at the battle of Queenstown Heights, when three hundred Americans were contending with thirteen hundred British and Indians and when complete and utter destruction seemed inevitable. If a man could speak at all under such circumstances he would be likely to speak in earnest—and so did Gen. Scott speak. He mounted a log and delivered to his troops the following oration:

"The enemy's balls begin to thin our ranks. His numbers are overwhelming.—In a moment the shock must come, and there is no retreat. We are in the beginning of a national war. Hull's surrender is to be redeemed. Let us, then, die arms in hand. Our country demands the sacrifice. The example will not be lost.—The blood of the slain will make heroes of the living. Those who follow will avenge our fall and their country's wrongs. Who dare stand?"

If the force of eloquence is to be appreciated by its effects we may infer that Scott's oratory on this occasion was most powerful and conclusive—for every man stood and fought like a hero. We should be glad to find, in the forensic annals of General Pierce's career, a piece of eloquence to be compared with this; it will not be discovered, we presume in his speech against the widow of General HARRISON.—*Balt. American.*

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—The *Union* is in ecstacies because there are *strong* indications, from the demonstrations of popular feeling in the State, that the Democrats will carry New Hampshire at the next election. Very like—very like. This will be a victory the parallel of which has never been heard since the last time the Dutch took Holland.

Col. Strother, of Virginia, who has been reported by the Democratic press as refusing to support Gen Scott, in a letter to the Warrentown, Va, Whig, says that he "approves without reservation all the principles and views of policy expressed in the resolutions of the Baltimore Whig Convention, and shall advocate and vote for the election of the candidates nominated by that Convention."

Private letters give a very bad account of the ravages of the cholera on the Illinois river. Where intermittent and bilious fevers prevail in summer, the cases are frequent and fatal, and the alluvial country, the bottom lands as they are called, are now in some cases deserted for the villages on the upland praries. At Peru and LaSalle, situated at the southern termination of the Illinois canal, the distemper prevails to a greater extent than ever before, and Princeton, and its vicinity, seated in a higher and more salubrious region, are crowded with fugitives. The greater number of the cases, it is said, end in death.

A NEW ENEMY TO THE POTATO.—A gentleman of Simsbury, Connecticut, writes to the Hartford Courant, that a new enemy to the potato has appeared in that section, in the shape of a black bug. It is in length from one-half to an inch, with a somewhat large body, but small slim head and neck. As seen on the vine, it appears to be striped; its body is ash color.

THE CUBAN INVASION.—The Nashville Gazette has received a letter from Franklin, Tenn., stating that recruits for another invasion have been raised in Hickman co. in that State.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm12401-0374.jpg