

**LYNCHING INDIANS.**—We gave an account last week of an affray on the Sacramento between three white men and some Indians, resulting in the death of one of the former named McGowan. From the Shasta papers of Saturday, we learn that two of the Indians accused of being engaged in the affray, were hung by a mob. It seems that the Indian boy who shot McGowan had delivered himself up to the Sheriff, and is now in the Shasta jail; he says he shot McGowan to save his own life. The Republican gives the following account of the hangings:

The accused were Nep, who formerly lived with a citizen of our town, and his partially blind and decrepid old father. Of course the accusation was conviction, and they were sentenced to be hung to the first tree that could be reached. The tree was soon found and a table was placed under one of its limbs. On reaching the fatal spot, Nep addressed the Diggers who were present (about one hundred and fifty) and asked them if they intended to let the whites hang him and his father. They seconded the verdict of the whites. Nep then denounced them as cowards and stated that he had no wish to live longer. He then led his sisters to the table and bestowed them upon those of his tribe (his father was a chief and he was acting in his stead) who promised to protect them. At the same time he distributed all that he possessed among those who sympathised with him. Then mounting the table he called for water, which he presented to his father. The whites were then called, to whom he bid farewell.

Nep called for a handkerchief to bandage his eyes, and, when all was announced as ready, he jumped from the table. The rope was too long and his feet touched the ground. He immediately raised his feet. A draw was made upon the rope and the limb broke--the Indian falling to the ground half dead. He was again drawn up and strangled, and vengeance (or jealousy?) was satisfied.

# NEW AD A DEMOCRAT.

NEVADA, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 24, 1858. WHE

<p><b>How a Defaulting Cashier Carried on his Rascality for Four Years.</b></p>	<p>The Election News at Washington. The Washington States, a Democratic paper, referring to the late elections says:</p>	<p><b>ANGE, Nevada, Proprietor.</b></p> <p>RESPECTABLE, Nevada and the HOTEL ANGE, on Broad street high, and</p> <p><b>PROOF,</b></p> <p>been fitted up in</p> <p><b>are New,</b></p> <p>supplied with all</p> <p><b>BERS,</b></p> <p>accommodation</p> <p>from Nevada</p> <p>departure from</p> <p><b>HT, S-</b></p> <p>with the</p> <p>business I am con-</p> <p>at the best Ho-</p> <p>home for Trav-</p> <p>at the Times.</p> <p><b>ABLE,</b></p> <p>the North, and</p> <p>ing care of these,</p> <p>an at all times be</p>
<p>The Boston Atlas gives some interesting particulars of the way in which the defaulting cashier of the Brighton Bank managed his rascality: The reason for the recent resignation of Mr. Robert N. Woodworth, cashier of the Brighton Bank, has become apparent. He turns out to be a defaulter, having made way, as is alleged, with some \$40,000 belonging to the bank. An investigation is progressing by the directors. The bank is said to be secured against loss by the bondsmen of Mr. Woodworth and by his private property, which has been made over to the bank to protect it from loss. It is said he has been indulging in fancy stocks for some time, and which, as is usually the case, has brought him down. He is a leading Baptist in Brighton, and the revelations are heard with concern by the church. It was supposed at first that the roguesy was of recent occurrence, and this opinion was all the stronger from the fact that the cashier's books have balanced with the nicest exactness, and the examination of its affairs by the bank commissioners, in May last, revealed no suspicious circumstances. A few days since, the President of the bank, S. H. Bennett, received an inquiry from the President of Faneuil Hall Bank, whether he should furnish Mr. Woodworth with \$20,000 on New York, on account of the Bank of Brighton. He at once refused, saying if they did it was at their own risk. Mr. Bennett was then informed that they had already let him have the same amount. This led to an investigation, and to the confession of Mr. Woodworth that he had for four years been appropriating the funds of the bank to his own use, for speculation and other purposes. He had purchased a house in Brighton for \$15,000, which was furnished in palatial style, speculated at second hand, giv-</p>	<p>While the result is to be deeply deplored, there is no use attempting to smother the facts which produced it. These unfortunate causes will not be kept down. The proscription rests based upon the issue of Lecomptonism. Rise in judgment against the Administration; and when they take such shapes as Pennsylvania conjures them up in, they are desperately effective, and mark political epochs of momentous import.</p> <p>One of the most remarkable features of the effect produced in this city yesterday by the news, was that while the defeat of the Administration was the chief topic of conversation and comment on the street corners, and in the saloons and hotel lobbies, we did not hear one single voice raised in palliation of the causes, or in denunciation of the result. When we think that it is a democratic administration that suffers this defeat—a defeat not only springing from political routine, but extending to private and conscientious people, who cheered its advent—it is humiliating to contemplate. It is humiliating, however necessary the ordeal. It proves that, after an experiment of eighty-two years of the individual-sovereign system, the American Republic is satisfied with its own democracy, and utterly and manfully opposed to the introduction among us of those imperial and monarchical proscription tests and personal distinctions which, outside of our own country, send noble heads to the block, and noble hearts into penal servitude.</p> <p>Occasional, the Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Press, speaking of the Pennsylvania election says:</p> <p>The blow has come upon the officials here, like</p>	<p>The Amador, sent man-in that vicinity, scanty subsistence for and was so poor that search of better digs at an apparently hope a lead a few days ago to the pan. The big was severed since and from another obtained.</p> <p>Lucien Heermann, co-owner of the Nebraska Company is ready and freight with the n and 20th of each month until the Company's passengers will be to Mail Steamship Co.'s at Yontona.</p> <p>Among the passengers were Mr. Lewis Dal Eshier Baker, who was liant of the theatrical years since, and who amassed a handsome sum of a high order of received.</p> <p>At the sink of the i Nov. 10th, while a pa cards at Tyler &amp; Sumner Dixon, in which Ch pistol, causing death Subsequently, Chauri to Genoa.</p> <p>At an adjourned ca California District</p>
<p><b>Douglas' Freeport Speech.</b></p>	<p>When Douglas' Freeport speech reached California, the Lecompton press of the State, with one accord, and with much gusto, announced that the Illinois Senator "had forever separated himself from the Democratic party."—It making this announcement they but followed in the wake of the Washington Union, New York Herald, and other shining lights of Lecomptonism. The heretical portion of his speech, of course, was that relating to the "nigger question," and he merely reiterated what has long been an admitted fact by all the leading Democrats of the country. In order to show that the position of Judge Douglas is not novel, we give below the remarks attributed to him, together with extracts from the speeches of a number of other gentlemen, who hold to views precisely similar. The extracts we find in the Washington States. In the discussion at Freeport, August 27th, between the Illinois rivals, Douglas, in answer to a question propounded by Lincoln, said:</p> <p>"The next question Mr. Lincoln propounded to me is: 'Can the people of a Territory exclude slavery from their limits, by any fair means, before it comes into the Union as a State?' I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times, on every stump in Illinois, that, in my opinion, the people of a Territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery before it comes in as a State. Mr. Lincoln knew that I had given that answer over and over again. He heard me argue the Nebraska Bill on that principle all over the</p>	<p>When Douglas' Freeport speech reached California, the Lecompton press of the State, with one accord, and with much gusto, announced that the Illinois Senator "had forever separated himself from the Democratic party."—It making this announcement they but followed in the wake of the Washington Union, New York Herald, and other shining lights of Lecomptonism. The heretical portion of his speech, of course, was that relating to the "nigger question," and he merely reiterated what has long been an admitted fact by all the leading Democrats of the country. In order to show that the position of Judge Douglas is not novel, we give below the remarks attributed to him, together with extracts from the speeches of a number of other gentlemen, who hold to views precisely similar. The extracts we find in the Washington States. In the discussion at Freeport, August 27th, between the Illinois rivals, Douglas, in answer to a question propounded by Lincoln, said:</p> <p>"The next question Mr. Lincoln propounded to me is: 'Can the people of a Territory exclude slavery from their limits, by any fair means, before it comes into the Union as a State?' I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times, on every stump in Illinois, that, in my opinion, the people of a Territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery before it comes in as a State. Mr. Lincoln knew that I had given that answer over and over again. He heard me argue the Nebraska Bill on that principle all over the</p>