THE PRESS,

PUBLISHED DAILY, (SUNDAYS EXCEPTED,)
BY JOHN W. FORNEY,
OFFICE, NO. 417 CHESTNUT STREET.

DAILY PRESS,
TWELVE CENTS PER WEEK, payable to the carriers.
Mailed to Subscribers out of the City at SIX DOLLARS PER ANNUM; FOUR DOLLARS FOR EIGHT MONTHS; THREE DOLLARS FOR SIX MONTHS; invariably in advance for the time ordered.

TRI-WEEKLY PRESS,
Mailed to Subscribers out of the City at THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, in advance.

WEEKLY PRESS.
THE WEEKLY PRESS, will be sent to Subscribers by mail, (per annum, in advance,) for $2 00
Three Copies, " " 5 00
Five Copies, " " 8 00
Ten Copies, " " 12 00
Twenty copies, " " (to one address) 20 00
Twenty Copies, or over, " " (to address of each subscriber), each 1 20
For a Club of Twenty-one or over, we will send an extra copy to the getter-up of the Club.
☞ Postmasters are requested to act as Agents for THE WEEKLY PRESS.

Hats.

WARBURTON'S INIMITABLE COVERINGS FOR THE HEAD
Embrace all the points necessary to
GENTEEL EFFECT,
and all the details and nice elegancies which impart
FINISH, COMFORT, AND DURABILITY.
Gentlemen are invited to call and examine.
de26-6m 430 CHESTNUT Street.

Holiday Gifts.

GREAT BARGAINS
FOR
CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR PRESENTS.
LADIES' WINTER CLOAKS.
FINAL REDUCTION
IN PRICES.
TO CLOSE THE SEASON.
J. W. PROCTOR & CO.,
Successors to Geo. Ralphs & Co.,
de22-tjs12 708 CHESTNUT Street.

Watches, Jewelry, &c.

BAILEY & CO., CHESTNUT STREET,
Manufacturers of
BRITISH STERLING SILVER WARE,
Under their inspection, on the premises exclusively. Citizens and Strangers are invited to visit our manufactory.
WATCHES.
Constantly on hand a splendid stock of Superior Watches, of all the celebrated makers.
DIAMONDS,
Necklaces, Bracelets, Brooches, Ear-Rings, Finger-Rings, and all other articles in the Diamond line.
Drawings of NEW DESIGNS will be made free of charge for those wishing work made to order.
RICH GOLD JEWELRY.
A beautiful assortment of all new styles of Fine Jewelry, set in Mosaic, Stone and Shell Cameo, Pearl, Coral, Carbuncle, Marquisite, Lava, &c., &c.
SHEFFIELD CASTORS, BASKETS, WAITERS, &c.
Also, Bronze and Marble CLOCKS, of newest styles, and of superior quality. aul-dtwkwly

J. E. CALDWELL & CO.
432 CHESTNUT Street,
Have received, per steamers, new styles
Jewelry, Chatelaine, Vest Chains,
Splendid Pins, Hair Pins,
Fruit Stands, Sugar Baskets,
Jet Goods and Flower Vases,
Coral, Lava and Mosaic Sets.
Sole Agents for Philadelphia for the sale of Charles Frodsham's LONDON TIME-KEEPERS. de10

SILVER WARE.—
WILLIAM WILSON & SON
MANUFACTURERS OF SILVER WARE,
(ESTABLISHED 1812,)
S. W. CORNER FIFTH AND CHERRY STREETS.
A large assortment of SILVER WARE, of every description, constantly on hand, or made to order to match any pattern desired.
Importers of Sheffield and Birmingham imported wares, and dealers in Jewelry. se30-dawly

J. S. JARDEN & BRO.
MANUFACTURERS AND IMPORTERS OF
SILVER-PLATED WARE,
No. 304 Chestnut Street, above Third, (up stairs,) Philadelphia.
Constantly on hand and for sale to the Trade,
TEA SETS, COMMUNION SERVICES, URNS, PITCHERS, GOBLETS, CUPS, WAITERS, BASKETS, CASTORS, KNIVES, SPOONS, FORKS, LADLES, &c., &c.
Gilding and plating on all kinds of metal. se2-ly

Money.

AMERICAN GOLD,
NEW YORK,
BALTIMORE, And BOSTON
EXCHANGES,
Bought and sold by
B. W. TINGLEY & CO.,
ja7-dtFeb2 37 South THIRD Street.

SCULL, CAMBLOS, CO.,
BANKERS,
No. 39 South Third Street.
The highest premium paid for
AMERICAN GOLD
AND
NEW YORK EXCHANGE.
Uncurrent Funds bought and sold.
Stocks bought and sold on commission only. no10-3m*

AMERICAN GOLD
AND
NEW YORK EXCHANGE
WANTED
AT HIGHEST CURRENT RATES,
BY
CRONISER & CO.
SPECIE BROKERS,
no24-4m* 140 SOUTH THIRD ST.

Express Companies.

WELLS, FARGO, & CO.,
NEW YORK AND CALIFORNIA EXPRESS CO.
and EXCHANGE DEALERS;
A JOINT STOCK COMPANY.
CAPITAL $600,000.
OFFICE, 400 CHESTNUT STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.
Express sent to CALIFORNIA, OREGON, and SANDWICH ISLANDS on the 5th and 20th, and to HAVANA on 7th, 12th, and 27th of each month, from NEW YORK.
EXCHANGE for sale in sums to suit, and COLLECTIONS MADE on California, Oregon, Sandwich Islands and Havana.
W. F. & Co. receive freight consigned to them at SAN FRANCISCO,
Per Clipper Ship, and collect invoices on delivery of the same.
NOTICE TO CALIFORNIA BONDHOLDERS
W. F. & Co are now prepared to receive the OLD BONDS of the State of CALIFORNIA, transport the same to Sacramento City, and procure new ones, in accordance with the act of 28th April, 1857, and return same to the city.
de23-1m D. N. BARNEY, Jr., Agent.

THE ADAMS EXPRESS CO., OFFICE, 320 CHESTNUT STREET, forwards PARCELS, PACKAGES, MERCHANDIZE, BANK NOTES and SPECIE either by its own LINES, or in connection with other EXPRESS COMPANIES, to all the principal TOWNS and CITIES of the United States.
E. S. SANFORD,
aul-tf General Superintendent.

Dissolutions & Copartnerships.

NOTICE.—The partnership heretofore existing between the subscribers, trading under the firm of BRIGGS & STEVENSON, is this day dissolved, by mutual consent. The business will be settled by HENRY STEVENSON, who alone is authorized to use the name of the firm in liquidation.
J. R. BRIGGS,
HENRY STEVENSON.
PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 1, 1858. ja4-m*

CARD.—The undersigned will continue the Tailoring business, as heretofore, at the old stand 107 North FOURTH Street, above Arch, where he hopes by strict attention to business to merit a continuance of the patronage so liberally extended to the late firm.
HENRY STEVENSON.
PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 1, 1858. ja4-tuwf3t*

DISSOLUTION.—The copartnership existing between THOMAS MADDOCK, Jr., and LEVERITT S. RAYMOND, under the firm of MADDOCK, RAYMOND, & CO., is this day dissolved by mutual consent. Either party is authorized to sign in liquidation. MADDOCK, RAYMOND, & CO.
Office Removed to 25 North SIXTH.
January 1, 1858. ja1-fmw3t

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the special partnership, between HENRY T. STANDBRIDGE and HENRY L. ELDER, is renewed, and continued for three years from January 1st, 1858.
HENRY T. STANDBRIDGE,
General Partner.
HENRY L. ELDER,
Special Partner.
PHILADELPHIA, January 1, 1858. ja1-tuw6w

NOTICE.—We have this day given J. FRANK BROWN an interest in our business.
GUILLOU, ANDERSON, & CO.,
PHILADELPHIA, January 1st, 1858. ja4-2w*

THE CO-PARTNERSHIP OF JAMES HARPER and EDWIN BENDER, under the firm of JAMES HARPER & CO., in the Lumber business, and as EDWIN BENDER, Carpenter and Builder, is this day dissolved by mutual consent.
JAMES HARPER,
EDWIN BENDER.
PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 1st, 1858. ja2-2w*

THE FIRM OF DILWORTH, BRANSON & CO., is this day dissolved by limitation. The business will be settled by either of the partners at the store, No. 211 Market street.
WILLIAM DILWORTH,
SAMUEL BRANSON,
HENRY D. LANDIS,
JAMES W. YANCE.
PHILADELPHIA, Dec 31, 1857. ja2-2w*

THE COPARTNERSHIP HERETOFORE existing under the firm of SIEGEL, LAIRD, & CO. is this day dissolved by the death of C. B. LAIRD.
The business of the late firm will be settled by the surviving partners, who have associated with them JOHN WIEST, W. D. SPONSLER, and D. B. ERVIN under the firm of SIEGEL, BAIRD, & CO., and will continue the Dry Goods jobbing and importing business as heretofore, at No. 47 North THIRD street.
PETER SIEGEL,
JACOB RIEGEL,
WM. S. BAIRD,
JOHN WIEST,
W. D. SPONSLER,
D. B. ERVIN.
December 31, 1857. ja1-1m*

I HAVE THIS DAY ASSOCIATED WITH me EDWARD BAINS, JOHN B. MELLON, and GEORGE O. EVANS as general partners, and will continue the importing of Hosiery and Small-wares under the style of THOMAS MELLON & CO., at No. 8 N. THIRD Street. THOS. MELLON.
PHILADELPHIA, January 1st, 1858. ja1-2w*

EDWARD H. LADD will have charge of his business in this city from this date, at No. 820 CHESTNUT Street. HUNT, WEBSTER, & CO.,
Manufacturers of Sewing Machines.
January 1, 1858. ja1-3m

CHARLES P. CALDWELL—Wholesale and Retail WHIP and CANE Manufacturer, No. 4 OUTER ARCADE. ap6

The Press.

VOL. I.—NO. 137. PHILADELPHIA, MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1858. TWO CENTS.

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1858.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

The great Virginian, who drew up that immortal document, our Declaration of Independence, was far too remarkable a man to be left without a good biographer. Hitherto, he has been, we will not say neglected, but inadequately done justice to. "Time at last sets all things even," says the poet, time has brought amends to him. On our table is the first volume (to be followed by two others next month) of "The Life of Thomas Jefferson," ably, impartially, and laboriously written by the Hon. HENRY S. RANDALL, LL. D. of New York State. When we use the word *laboriously* we do not mean *heavily*, for the book is extremely spirited, but to denote the immense pains which have been devoted to it.

Mr. RANDALL has been surrounded (we would say embarrassed, if he had not made such judicious use of them) by the abundance of materials. He has numerous living descendants, who have lively traditions, their parents' recollections of him. He left behind him a vast amount of memoranda and manuscripts. He also left his diary, kept with extraordinary minuteness for many years, with as much accuracy and care as a mercantile day-book. There also is an immense mass of JEFFERSON's family correspondence—not one of which letters has ever before been published. There are his daughter's Recollections of him, ably and impartially written. There are reminiscences of JEFFERSON by his many contemporaries and friends. There is the journal, kept by the physician who attended him, of his last illness and death. And, besides these original materials, wholly unused up to the time they accumulated in Mr. RANDALL's possession, there is a large and accessible quantity of public information, scattered through many memoirs and histories—for the life of JEFFERSON, as a public man, is written in the annals of that country which he helped to raise from the subject condition of a colonial possession to the Independence of a Nation.

In this biography, be it borne in mind, of a man who died at the age of eighty-three—tracing him from childhood to honorable old age—what a long and high career is to be recorded. Born in 1743, a true Virginian, JEFFERSON died in 1826—exactly half a century after the date of the Declaration of Independence. In 1769 he was elected a member of the Provincial Legislature of his own State. In 1775 he entered Congress, and drew up the famous Declaration. In 1779 he was chosen Governor of Virginia, succeeding PATRICK HENRY. In 1785, on the return of Dr. FRANKLIN, he was named his successor at Paris, from which he proceeded to London, as envoy, in 1786. He accepted the office of Secretary of State under WASHINGTON, in 1789—at this epoch Mr. RANDALL's first volume closes. He resigned in 1793; lived the next four years in retirement; was then elected Vice President; was called to the Presidential chair in 1801; finally quitted public life, after he had been President for two terms, and then finally retired in 1809, passing his closing seventeen years in honorable and happy retirement. This is a rapid sketch of his career. We may enlarge on it when Mr. RANDALL's work is completed.

There is an interesting and explicit account in this volume of Mr. JEFFERSON's drafting the Declaration. We are told:

> The committee to prepare a Declaration of Independence "unanimously pressed" Mr. Jefferson "to undertake the draft." It was done, but before submitting the paper to the full committee, communicated it separately to Dr. Franklin and Mr. Adams, requesting their corrections, "which were two or three only, and merely verbal." The report was then laid before the entire committee, which made no amendments; and on the 28th of June, 1776, it was presented in Congress by its author. "It was immediately read, and ordered to lie upon the table."

On July 2d, in Congress, the resolution to declare the Colonies independent was carried by the vote of nine Colonies. On the same day, the draft of the Declaration of Independence was taken from the table in Committee of the Whole:

> The question on its adoption was debated throughout that and the two succeeding days. Several amendments were carried in committee. Of the causes which led to the two most important ones, Mr. Jefferson gives the following account in his Memoir:
>
> "The pusillanimous idea that we had friends in England worth keeping terms with, still haunted the minds of many. For this reason those passages which conveyed censures on the people of England were struck out, lest they should give them offence. The clause, too, reprobating the enslaving the inhabitants of Africa was struck out in compliance to South Carolina and Georgia, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of slaves, and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it. Our Northern brethren also, I believe, felt a little tender under those censures; for though their people had very few slaves themselves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others."
>
> On the evening of the 4th of July, the Declaration, as amended in committee, was reported to the House and agreed to; and thus was consummated that legislation, which, sustained by subsequent years of struggle and suffering, of which history affords a few parallels, drew from the British realm a territory far exceeding its whole extent under its Plantagenets and Tudors—and to contain, even before the generation then living should pass entirely away, a population for outnumbering that which owned the sway of Henry or Elizabeth.
>
> How little various persons whose names are attached to the Declaration had to do with preparing it, or paving the way for it, at least in Congress, is a matter of notoriety and need not be here recorded. Several delegates arrived only in time to vote for it, and others were allowed to attach their names who were not present at that vote.
>
> Mr. RANDALL gives not only a printed copy of the original draft of this great document, with the parts which were stricken out enclosed in brackets and italics, and the amendments placed on the margin, but gives a lithographed fac-simile, occupying four pages foolscap, in JEFFERSON's own writing, with the erasures and interlineations. This document was written, all the world knows, in this good city of Philadelphia, but what follows may be new to many:
>
> In answer to inquiries from Dr. James Mease, Mr. JEFFERSON (September 25, 1825) tells *where* he wrote the Declaration of Independence. He says:
>
> "At the time of writing that instrument I lodged in the house of a Mr Graaf, a new brick house, three stories high, of which I rented the second floor, consisting of a parlor and bed-room, easily furnished. In that parlor I wrote habitually, and in it wrote this paper, particularly. So far I state from written proofs in my possession. The proprietor, Graaf, was a young man, son of a German, and then newly married. I think he was a bricklayer, and that his house was on the south side of Market street, probably between Seventh and Eighth streets, and if not the only house each of part of the street, I am sure there were few others near it. I have some idea that it was a corner house; but no other recollections throwing light on the question, or worth communication."
>
> The account book, before us, shows that on reaching Philadelphia, he remained eight days at his old lodgings, with "Ben. Randolph," and that on the 23d of May he "took lodging at Graaf's." Entries of the payment of the weekly rent of his rooms (thirty-five shillings sterling) continued throughout the session. He appears to have taken most of his meals at "Smith's—the keeper, we suppose, of the City Tavern.
>
> The little writing desk on which he wrote the Declaration of Independence is yet in existence. A grand daughter who, on her marriage, left Monticello for her future residence in Boston, intrusted most of her belongings to a packet sailing from Richmond, which was lost at sea. The most severely felt loss among her effects was a writing desk containing her grandfather's letters to her, and some other personal memorials of him. And there was another utterly bereaved party—John Hemmings, Mr. Jefferson's faithful old black, head carpenter, joiner, etc., of whom we shall see more as our narration progresses. John had fondly lavished all his skill on the lost treasure, for the favorite young "Missus." Innumerable were the different kinds of veneers on it, and curious and (John thought) *recherché* their arrangement. "He could not make another like it for Miss Ellen." "He had no more such choice sticks laid away." "Besides, he was getting old, and couldn't see well enough," etc., etc. In a word, he was inconsolable. Whether Mr. Jefferson had any eye on him in sending a substitute, which the faithful old fellow had learned to look upon with a sort of mystical veneration, we cannot say; but he probably thought that a little reading and writing desk in his possession—some fourteen inches long, by about ten in breadth and three in depth—would almost make good to the other parties the place of John's beautiful handiwork; and accordingly, he sent it (to divide the compliment) to his grand-daughter's husband, with the following inscription attached to the under side of the leaf which is turned down, in writing:
>
> "Thomas Jefferson gives this writing desk to Joseph Coolidge, Jr., as a memorial of affection. It was made from a drawing of his own, by Ben. Randolph, cabinet-maker at Philadelphia, with whom he first lodged on his arrival in that city, in May, 1776, and is the identical one on which he wrote the Declaration of Independence. Politics, as well as religion, has its superstitions. These gaining strength with time, may one day give imaginary value to this relic, for its associations with the birth of the Great Charter of our Independence.
>
> "*Monticello*, Nov. 18, 1825."

Numerous anecdotes and acute sketches of character add to the interest of this biography. Here is a pen-and-ink sketch of FRANKLIN, which conveys a very good notion of the man:

> "We have hitherto passed over one transcendant name, because, if Franklin was heard on the floor, as he doubtless was in his short pithy way, his influence on the decision of the pending questions was exerted principally in other quarters. That influence was truly great. If he lacked the eloquence and vehemence of John Adams, he greatly excelled him in other particulars. He was a more experienced, and undoubtedly a wiser man. He had a nice appreciation of the qualities of associates, and consummate tact in addressing himself to them. From the suavity of his temper and manners, from his respectful way of treating adversaries, from his entire want of that egotism which disgusts, and that dogmatism which offends all, and particularly equals in position—he was personally popular in and out of Congress. In the step which he, in his own quiet and peculiar manner, was urging onward, he was apparently incurring greater risks, and certainly making greater sacrifices, than a comparatively young man, who, as yet, had attained to nothing like his general position. Franklin's ability as a statesman had been tested and established, in the most difficult positions. He was better acquainted with Europe, and especially with England, than any of his colleagues. In science and philosophy, he enjoyed a reputation not before attained by any American. He possessed exquisite address as a writer. His "Poor Richard's Almanac" had made his shrewd sense familiar to every class of his countrymen. His style was adapted to all tastes and comprehension. The author admired his compact and nervous simplicity; the uneducated fancied the limpid diction was like that which they themselves employed in familiar intercourse. It united some of the characteristics of Bunyan and DeFoe, with some of those of Swift and Addison. There was an obvious common sense in its propositions; its illustrations were so inimitably apt and telling—its poignant but easily understood wit so surely exposed every weak point of an adversary, so surely carried the derisive laugh of the multitude along with it—that it may well be doubted whether a more effective popular writer, on a class of subjects (simple appeals to the understanding, in regard to the purely practical affairs of life), has written in the English tongue. If he lacked the deep earnestness and fiery enthusiasm of some naturalborn orators, his cool, calculating temperament disposed to surrender something than ask too much, and not a yielding than a stubborn part until deeply roused—if no one would suspect the cool, placid sage of loving danger for danger's sake—perhaps these negative qualities gave only his more weight to his opinions, when his reputation, his honors, and his life were staked on their accuracy. And all who knew that Franklin had cast off and severed every tie with an only and distinguished son, because he sided with the mother country, know how implacable were the resolves when his line of action was determined on."

The volume from which we quote is published by DERBY & JACKSON, of New York, in what is called library or octavo form. It is illustrated with the portrait of JEFFERSON by STUART, a view of Monticello, and fac-similes of a page of his pocket account book, a curious table of the vegetable market of Washington, during eight years, (also in JEFFERSON's writing,) the original draft of the Declaration, a page of the accounts kept while JEFFERSON's arm was broken, and a letter to his daughter PATSY, afterwards Mrs. RANDOLPH.

There can be only one opinion as to the ability, general impartiality and industry which Mr. RANDALL has brought into combination in the composition of this biography. He shows us JEFFERSON himself, and particularly fills up the blank, heretofore existing, as to JEFFERSON's character and course of life in Virginia, before he entered into the troubled ocean of national politics. We can well believe that Mr. RANDALL has spent five years in collecting, collating, and digesting his ample materials. He has worthily executed a much wanted book.

FROM HARRISBURG.

The forthcoming Report of the State Superintendent of Common Schools.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

HARRISBURG, Jan. 9, 1858.

The annual report of Hon. H. C. Hickock, State Superintendent of Common Schools, will be presented to the Legislature in about ten days. The statistics, I understand, present highly favorable and satisfactory results, and the general report will show the system to be in a healthful and prosperous condition. The framework of the system, after twenty-five years of patient labor and waiting, is now complete, and continued energy and prudence will doubtless enable it to realize the highest ultimate hopes of its friends. The county superintendency has been entirely successful in some counties, but not in others; the difference in the results being generally owing to the difference in the qualifications, fidelity, and prudence of the men elected to the office. No better legislation will be asked for except the usual school appropriation.

It appears there are upwards of thirteen thousand schools, and nearly six hundred thousand children in attendance in the Commonwealth, being an average of forty-eight to each school. The first year after the law creating county superintendencies had gone into operation, the volume composing the annual reports of the gentleman who had a superintending care over those who had in charge "the young ideas" of the Commonwealth was quite a "curiosity of literature" in the way of bad grammar, sentences like unto the Egyptian Labyrinth, and a total misconception of what should constitute the subject-matter of their reports. Mr. Hickock issued a circular of instructions to them, and we consequently find less of the didactic essay and of metaphysical discussion than characterized their initial efforts. There is, in fact, a marked improvement visible. As an evidence of the growing esteem in which county superintendents are held, it may be mentioned that there is an average increase of ten per cent. in their salaries—voted by the boards of directors in the several counties.

There is no subject connected with our public affairs in which we all ought to feel a livelier interest than this subject of popular education. The system has, until recently, been so imperfectly carried out, that expectation as to the result has, perhaps, been somewhat disappointed; but now, that it is fairly established and vigorously conducted, we may confidently predict that the next generation will be strongly marked with its salutary influence. Who, indeed, can look into one of our common schools without surprise and delight at the facilities enjoyed by the rising generation! The text-books in use, and the methods of instruction, are such as to make the present road to knowledge a royal road indeed, compared with the old crooked and thorny paths.

Some persons, I am aware, make this an objection. The road is made too smooth and easy, they tell us, for the development of the intellectual muscles; and that the old system, therefore, if it taught less rapidly, was more thorough and invigorating. In this view, so often taken, there is, I conceive, a single grain of truth with a bushel of error. To discipline the mind it is no doubt necessary to work it, and, with proper care, to work it to the full extent of its powers. But is it therefore necessary to work it in trimming away preliminary hedges which might be cleared at a bound? Are there not difficulties enough in science and literature to test the powers of the strongest mind—oven of a Locke or a Newton? Why, then, should a hard way of learning to read, or of learning the elements of grammar, arithmetic, or geography, be preferred, when there is an easier one? Let everything be learned in the easiest and shortest mode possible. The more that is thus learned the better, and the sooner will the student come to grapple with those real and higher difficulties which will be quite sufficient to call out and discipline the powers of men until they have attained the sum of human perfection. In short, the complaint against facilities for learning, because they make it too easy, is about as absurd as would be that against railroad cars as a means of transportation. The tonnage and the rate of speed of the old Conestoga wagon if applied to the railroad car would, no doubt, leave its powers in a great measure unexercised. But, in fact, we every day see the car loaded to its utmost capacity, and whirled at a rate forty times faster. Its powers are strained to the utmost, still, and its execution is a hundred fold greater.

Most of the Senators and Representatives are out of town on a visit to their constituency, until Monday, and those left behind appear to trend "a banquet hall deserted." The committees will be announced on Monday, when business will commence in earnest.

I was in error when I stated, in a former letter, that Mr. Welsh, the Speaker of the Senate, was the youngest member of that body. Mr. Welsh is the youngest Senator ever elected to the chair, but there are two or three members of the Senate who are younger than Mr. Welsh; but the juvenile honor belongs to Mr. Randall, of your city. *

Mr. John Buckley, of Bordentown, N. J., publishes in the *Register* a challenge to trot his horse, George M. Patchen, against any horse in the State for $5,000 aside. Here is a chance for speculation.

Jedediah Jack, Esq., an eminent lawyer, was shot dead on the 27th ult., at Metropolis, Ill., by a man named Stofer. Jack was from Pennsylvania.

LETTER FROM GOVERNOR HENRY A. WISE.

RICHMOND, Va., Dec. 30, 1857.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the invitation of the Society of Tammany to attend their celebration of the forty-third anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans, on the evening of the 8th day of January next. I regret that I cannot be with you in person, but I tender to you my warmest sympathy in the sentiments and objects of your celebration. I trust that your venerable order will always uphold the Federal Constitution, with which you proudly claim to be cotemporaneous; that you will strive to revive and perpetuate the spirit of the revolutionary fathers, who framed it; that you will strive to revive and perpetuate the spirit of the revolutionary fathers, who you boast were your founders; and that you will now, more than ever, cherish national as opposed to sectional feeling—a strict construction of the Constitution, as opposed to all compromises of its provisions—true Democracy in its republican form, as opposed to the licentiousness of mobs or mere majorities connoting their own "higher law"—and the liberties of the people against all power, delegated or undelegated, upon earth. To these ends you may well commemorate the victory of New Orleans. Its hero was "guided by law and bound by duty," when he took the responsibility to save a city then, and afterwards to save a country from a foe more formidable than foreign bayonets. He gave us the motto: "The Union must and shall be preserved;" and I hope that his great authority still remains potent to stamp it upon every heart, and upon every banner in the whole country. To preserve it we must steadily adhere to the Democratic faith and platform; we must stand by you in standing by James Buchanan as the people stood by Andrew Jackson. He had to contend with the money power, and subdued it by the Samson of Democracy. We now have to meet the black demon of the "higher law," and the same Samson survives in vigor to fight for the chosen people. God forbid that the Samson of Democracy shall at last be a Samson Agonistes, shorn and blinded, to grind in the prison house of his own people and every other party, except the American Democracy, have had their "bridges of asses;" but I do pray that we may not be such asses ourselves as to make a bridge of slavery, or of any other subject, for us to stall at in a career and progress of civilization. Any yet, gentlemen, there are a great many Kans-asses in our country, and they are not half as stubborn asses as the can't-asses. A driver can get along after a manner with an ass that can, but the ornery stubborn will not prevail with the asses that can't move, the stubbornness of all, and all are sure to stall just in his way and at the very place of most danger. They bray a political religion and religious politics. The best whip which ever touched these asses' ears only is the raw was James Buchanan's knowledge of the right upon the forty thousand political preachers "all in a row." As to your other motto, "Civil and religious liberty," ours was saved by the Virginia Democracy in 1855. We struck the dark lantern out of the hands of ineffable Sam, and have compelled him to hold the dark lantern for him. We, therefore, have some right to say to you on other topics that all common sense and justice require is that we let each other's property and peace and political privileges alone, and attend to the conservation of our own interests respectively. Union, then, is our watchword. When we happen to meet in the common Territories, to make new homes and neighborhoods there, all we have to do is to respect each other's equal rights. If we are Southern slaveholders, don't let our property be taken away from us by civil war. If you allow any power to prevent us from settling upon common lands, or don't drive us away from the settlements we have made upon a domain purchased or won by common treasure and united valor. On the other hand, if you prefer that slavery shall not be incorporated in the new body politic of which you are to become members, we promise you that it shall not be imposed upon you, with our consent, either by force or by fraud. We propose to go together to the polls as equals, justly respecting each other's rights to have and determine, by ballot, our own institutions. The ballot shall be the law of the case. If property be established in one form or another, it shall be respected; and, if forbidden in any other particular form, it shall not in that form exist in that community. Now, has this just, fair and equal course been pursued? Force and fraud both, on both sides, have been attempted, and have to a shameful extent prevailed. And it is the great vocation of Democracy to put down both fraud and force in this and in all other cases. How? The case divides itself into two aspects—the one *de jure* in the Territory as between the Convention and the people; and the other *de facto* in the country at large, as between Congress and the Territory. In the first, in Kansas there was an "enabling statute." If the Kansas-Nebraska act did not enable the people to hold a Convention, or to make laws for their own self-government, it had no virtue in it at all. The Kansas-Nebraska bill organized a Territory, and the people thereof were enabled thereby to govern themselves. By their own laws they organized a Convention to frame a Constitution of State government. That Convention was, therefore, *de jure*, legitimate. It formed a Constitution, and had a right to form it. That was its function, and there its power ended, except to submit it, as a proposed organic law, to the fair and free election of the sovereign people, to be adopted or to be rejected by them. They, in their organized capacity as legal voters, are alone sovereign. The entire Constitution ought to have been submitted to their voices at the polls. The power was not delegated to the Convention to proclaim and establish a State Constitution. It was to be proved by Congress, and much more still to be approved by the sovereign principals, the whole people, before it went into operation, acted. It was not a mere statute law, repealable at will by a Legislature at all yearly, and to be chosen by the precincts of annual elections. It was the great fundamental organic law, under which titles and tenures of franchises were to be held, and judges and legislators were to sit, and executive authority was to wield the arms of State, and offices were to be filled, and justice was to be administered, and law was to be enacted, and confederate station was to be assumed, and sovereignty itself was to be assumed—and it was to be irrepealable by legislation, and to be, in a word, the supreme law of a State, under which she was to be received into the most glorious Union of States which ever protected and fortified the liberties of mankind! What! Tell us that an instrument of this dignity, that republican government itself, was not to be submitted to the form and plan proposed, to the only lawful sovereigns—the organized people—not a mere mass of persons, but the *bona fide* inhabitants and legal voters of the State to be governed, for their election and their free vote, to reject if they pleased, or to have been so submitted. Pure and undefiled republicanism, conservative Democracy, required that it should be so submitted. There is no mobocracy in that idea. It is even just, steady, organized free republican action; the law of popular liberty exercised by ultimate right of the mass of election, and is the true example of essential sovereignty in the people. Instead of so submitting this proposed Constitution by the mere agent, the Convention, deferentially to the principles, the organic principles of the sovereign people, there was a—a withholding from them of a fair, free, full, and equal election to choose or not to choose their own Constitution of self-government. It was *ex parte*: it was all on one side; it was, in gambling phrase, the four aces and kings; it was "heads I win, tails you lose." The Constitution was obliged to be adopted, with the clause or without the clause; the vote was bound to be "for the Constitution;" it was all *pro* and no *con*; and we say that was no submission to an election at all. Election is choice of alternatives—to adopt or to reject; to have the right to adopt, to adopt as well as reject. There was no choice in this case, and no equality of votes in the case. Throw men vote to the polls: A said, "I vote for the Constitution with or without the clause; but B and C said, "We vote against it, with or without the clause." A's votes were counted, B's and C's were not to be counted, and thus one was made not only to offset two, but to be sole substitute in fact for three against the majority of two to one out of three. Now this was but the unveiled fraud and shameless fraud in so-called election. There was neither right nor justice in it. The Democracy of Virginia at least scorns a title of any sort founded on a fraud, occult or palpable, like this. We say that, as between the Convention of Lecompton and the people of Kansas, the question was *de jure*, and *de facto* the whole Constitution in all its parts ought to have been submitted to all the legal voters, *pro* and *con*, and the two voters ought to have been allowed their voices against it as well as the one voter his voice for it. And, so far as slavery is concerned, it made the case worse against that species of property, to submit the slavery clause alone to the election of the people. Why discriminate in respect to that "peculiar institution?" Is it because it was peculiar? If we contend for anything especially it is that our property shall not be distinguished or discriminated from other property in legislation. It stands on the same footing of right to protection and preservation which is claimed for any other description of thing owned or possessed by others as property. Why was this singled out for the chances of prohibition? Was it not enough that the Badger amendment of the Kansas-Nebraska bill had already enacted that all laws protecting and establishing it prior to 1819-'20 should be repealed? Why repeat a discrimination against slavery in this schedule of submission? This was ground enough to make pro-slavery partisans reject it. In fact, and of right, if the Constitution had not been submitted at all, in whole or in part, to the people, it would have been more impartial and more just to the slaveholder than it was submitted. If there be any mistaken and misguided and misguiding parties in the South who would be guilty of arraying against the equal rights of slave property the irresistible and indisputable rights of popular sovereignty, we would have our property from the guardianship of such folly, and rely as property and protection must always most safely rely, rather upon law and order and the rule of justice and fair dealing—to "ask nothing but what is right, and to submit to nothing which is wrong." On the ground of policy, then, as well as *de jure*, the whole Constitution ought to have been submitted to all the legal voters, without fear, favor, fraud, or force. So much for the case *de jure*. 3d. The Convention saw it to submit the Constitution to the one voter alone, and not to all three of the voters, and the Convention was legitimate. It was legitimate, *de facto*. Congress could not go behind the return; it cannot intervene, we are told, except to see that law has authorized the act, and that the form is republican. The law authorized the act, and we grant the form of the Constitution itself to be republican. We don't agree with Mr. Senator Douglas, that his own Kansas-Nebraska act was not an "enabling statute," and we don't agree, either, with the President, Mr. Buchanan, that slavery was the only "domestic institution" to be submitted, as such, to the people. The Kansas bill enabled the people to govern themselves; that was its very essence and its chief excellence, and every municipal institution of a State Government is a "domestic institution." The President is a bachelor, and he must, therefore, be excused for not comprehending a "domestic institution" as well as we who have houses full of children. He had better reasons for his recommendation than he assigned. He was bound to look to the fact that this was the work of a legitimate Convention, and that these were subjects for Kansas alone to judge of. But whether Kansas had been allowed to judge—whether her people had been allowed to choose, to elect, to adopt or reject the Constitution of government proposed for them—whether they had been allowed to govern themselves, was another fact which had not been looked to—*de facto*, whether the schedule was republican? *De facto*, whether there were not other domestic institutions besides slavery which ought to have been submitted to the sovereign legal voters? It is the very gladness and glory of our State Governments, when organized, that they guard and govern the hearthstones and homes of the people of the United States. The State governments are the municipalities of sovereignty which embrace especially the individual persons, the families, the households, the affairs and the homes of our people. It is that which makes State rights, State laws, State organization, State action, so precious, because so domestic, in our Confederacy. The Federal Government embraces rather national and foreign subjects of jurisdiction, and therefore, it ought to leave all domestic questions to the States and the people. What then? Why, then, if the schedule of submission was anti-republican, if it was partial, if it did not acknowledge and allow the sovereign right of the people to judge for themselves on the question of highest dignity, the organic law of their government, and discriminated unequally between the subjects of property, the Congress of the United States ought not to reject the legitimate and republican Constitution, but ought to adopt it, subject to a fair and legal vote of the people of Kansas, according to a law to be prescribed by their Territorial Legislature, and to admit the State under the Constitution whenever the Territory shall proclaim its approval and adoption by the people. If they adopt it, to admit her into the Union *ipso facto*; and if they reject it, to leave the people of Kansas in their own way to organize another Convention, and to submit another Constitution to Congress for approval. This would be a plain and easy solution, and would take all the asses over the "bridge of shrieks." And for any difference of opinion as to the mere mode of submitting or solving this question, I protest that no true, honest, earnest Democrat will become a bolter. I protest that no true Democrat will become a bolter. This question is not a party one, and all parties would have been satisfied. That the South at last could only obtain a mere empty and temporary triumph, the North, the Union, would be repeatable at will by a Legislature as at least yearly, and to be chosen by the precincts of annual elections. It was the great fundamental organic law, under which titles and tenures of franchises were to be held, and judges and legislators were to sit, and executive authority was to wield the arms of State, and offices were to be filled, and justice was to be administered, and law was to be enacted, and confederate station was to be assumed, and sovereignty itself was to be assumed—and it was to be irrepealable by legislation, and to be, in a word, the supreme law of a State, under which she was to be received into the most glorious Union of States which ever protected and fortified the liberties of mankind! What! Tell us that an instrument of this dignity, that republican government itself, was not to be submitted to the form and plan proposed, to the only lawful sovereigns—the organized people—not a mere mass of persons, but the *bona fide* inhabitants and legal voters of the State to be governed, for their election and their free vote, to reject if they pleased, or to have been so submitted. Pure and undefiled republicanism, conservative Democracy, required that it should be so submitted. There is no mobocracy in that idea. It is even just, steady, organized free republican action; the law of popular liberty exercised by ultimate right of the mass of election, and is the true example of essential sovereignty in the people. Instead of so submitting this proposed Constitution by the mere agent, the Convention, deferentially to the principles, the organic principles of the sovereign people, there was a—a withholding from them of a fair, free, full, and equal election to choose or not to choose their own Constitution of self-government. It was *ex parte*: it was all on one side; it was, in gambling phrase, the four aces and kings; it was "heads I win, tails you lose." The Constitution was obliged to be adopted, with the clause or without the clause; the vote was bound to be "for the Constitution;" it was all *pro* and no *con*; and we say that was no submission to an election at all. Election is choice of alternatives—to adopt or to reject; to have the right to adopt, to adopt as well as reject. There was no choice in this case, and no equality of votes in the case. Throw men vote to the polls: A said, "I vote for the Constitution with or without the clause; but B and C said, "We vote against it, with or without the clause." A's votes were counted, B's and C's were not to be counted, and thus one was made not only to offset two, but to be sole substitute in fact for three against the majority of two to one out of three. Now this was but the unveiled fraud and shameless fraud in so-called election. There was neither right nor justice in it. The Democracy of Virginia at least scorns a title of any