

citizen of Kansas, I should have insisted on this policy, but I should certainly have desired a vote on the question of slavery as proposed by the late convention, disconnected from all other subjects, in preference to a vote on the constitution as a whole.

For its action the convention has been most roundly abused: and I do not intend to come to its defence, for many of the details of its proceedings I dissent. But it would not be candid to contend that there was nothing in the hearing of the enemies of the convention to impel it to fully exhaust, if not to abuse, the authority with which it had been clothed. The incessant menaces of the violent leaders of the republican party, who, in my judgment, never desired to have the controversy settled, was calculated to do this. The declaration that they would not judge of the merits of any form of government it might make, but would reject it, if possible, at the polls, for reasons mischievous and rebellious, was also calculated to produce such action. Nor is it candid to contend that this class of politicians in the Territory, and others out of it, when they dwell on the importance of submitting the constitution to the test of popular favor, had reference to disputes about railroads, banks, corporations, courts, legislative functions. The question—the all-absorbing and the only question—was, shall Kansas be a free or slave State? I believe Governor Walker went much further: and yet the very men who threatened to rebel on his hands at Topeka, and who put him through the shorter catechism of Kansas politics, never would have met him there, nor mentioned the name of constitution, had it not been for the question of slavery. They said "constitution," it is true, for the idea of a separate submission had not then been raised but even they had no other question on their minds than that of whether Kansas should be a free or a slave State. Throughout this broad land this has been treated as the question, and the only one.

That question the people of Kansas had an opportunity to settle in June last, by electing delegates to carry out their will. They are to have another to-day, by voting on so much of the constitution as relates to that subject. After all that has been said about fraud and trickery touching this issue, the great overshadowing fact cannot be denied, that the people of Kansas have had two opportunities to make her a free State. I am aware, sir, that the registry of voters at the election in June was very defective; but that was no reason why those who were registered should not vote. That complaint, however, cannot be made as to the vote on the slavery article, for no registry is required, and every white citizen above twenty-one years of age can vote. I regard the registry as very imperfect; but I cannot understand the picture presented by Governor Walker in a recent letter addressed to the President. He undertakes to show that less than one-half of the voters were registered when the delegates were elected, and yet the records show that over nine thousand names were registered in June, and that the whole vote for the congressional delegate in October last, after an exciting contest, and a large increase of population, was only a little over twelve thousand. How this mystery is to be solved I cannot tell, but the statements are singularly contradictory.

What my action may be on the question of admission, should the new constitution be presented, I cannot precisely foresee. The case is not yet fully developed. I am sure that what a day may bring forth in Kansas. Those who are to conduct the election upon the slavery article have been vested with large and dangerous powers, the use of which they may, if they choose, abuse to such an extent as to forbid the recognition of the result, whatever it may be. But if that election be fairly conducted, I shall feel required to vote for the admission of the State either with or without slavery. I should do this under the firm belief that it is the best mode possible of putting an end to the existing strife; for, after all, when we look at this question practically, it does not involve half so much as some would make us believe. When the State shall have been admitted, not only slavery, but all other institutions, will be subject to be changed and remodeled by the people. They can, if they please, do this within six months after Kansas becomes a State, and enjoy the same opportunity, whenever they desire it, forever thereafter. Why then contest the question as though the institutions under which the State may be admitted were to be, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unchangeable? I know it is alleged that the constitution cannot be changed prior to 1864; but that view cannot be maintained. Without discussing the terms of the schedule, which simply prescribes the mode in which the constitution shall be amended after 1864, the bill of rights is conclusive on this point. It declares that—

"All political power is inherent in the people, (of Kansas), and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit, and therefore they have at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to alter, reform, or abolish their form of government in such manner as they may think proper."

The mode of voting has also been a subject of criticism. The honorable senator maintains that the elector must give his sanction to all the other provisions of the constitution before he can enjoy the opportunity of voting for or against slavery. This is clearly a mistake. The ballot, "constitution with slavery," or "constitution without slavery," involves only the slavery clause. It is simply the question of whether Kansas shall be a free or a slave State, under the general form agreed upon by the constitution. That this was intended by the convention is made clear by its proceedings if they have been given to me accurately by a gentleman from Leocompton. His information is, that, before the adoption of the form of voting, the sense of the convention was taken on the proposition to submit the whole constitution to a vote of the people, which was decided in the negative, and never reconsidered. Subsequently, a motion to submit the slavery article was agreed to by a majority of two votes. This view is clearly sustained by the proclamation of the president of the convention, in which he says the vote shall be for or against the introduction of slavery into the State of Kansas.

The voting shall be by ballot, and those voting for Kansas as a slave State shall vote a ballot with the words "constitution with slavery," and those voting for Kansas to be a free State shall vote a ballot with the words "constitution with no slavery." It must be evident that if it had been intended to take the sanction of the elector on the whole constitution, the ballot would have been "for" the constitution. The honorable senator, and others who take this view, will be the first to deny, when the constitution is presented to Congress, that it has the sanction of the people.

But the honorable senator has labored to maintain his position by confounding the slavery

question with the ordinary institutions of a civilized community. Notice the extraordinary character of the following extract from his late speech:

"Sir, what would this boasted principle of popular sovereignty have been worth, if applied only to the negro, and did not extend to the white man? Do you think we could have aroused the sympathies and the patriotism of this broad republic, and have carried the presidential election last year in the face of a tremendous opposition, on the principle of extending the right of self-government to the negro, question, but denying it to all the relations affecting a white man?"

"Sir, I have spent too much strength and breath, and money, too, to establish this great principle in the popular heart, now to see it frittered away by bringing it down to an exception that applies to the negro, and does not extend to the benefit of the white man."

Now, Mr. President, can it be possible that the senator from Illinois expected to make the Senate and the country believe that the people of Kansas are indebted to the famous argument for their right to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property, and the ordinary institutions of a civilized community? He scouted the idea that the great principle of popular sovereignty should be frittered away by bringing it down to an exception that applies to the negro, and not to the white man? Whatever he may mean, his language is certainly calculated to make the impression that the Kansas-Nebraska bill settled some dispute about the ordinary institutions of government in the Territories. I cannot agree, sir, that that view is either candid or allowable. Who ever denied the right of the people to make their ordinary institutions? When was that a question which divided parties, or shook the Union to its foundation? The simple truth is, that the question of slavery, and that only, was involved and considered in passing the Kansas-Nebraska bill. It was to settle that dangerous sectional feud that the doctrine of non-intervention was adopted. The repeal of the Missouri line has in no way affected the right of the people to have all other domestic institutions either north or south of that line; and when the senator asks what the boasted principles of popular sovereignty would have been worth if applied only to the negro, and not to the white man, he utters a sentiment which is unworthy of the subject. What part are negroes to have in the government of Kansas, or who is proposing to restrict any of the rights of the white man, unless it be himself, when he denies them the right to make a government without the consent of Congress? I know how presumptuous it is in me to differ with that senator; but I cannot forbear to deny that the question of railroads, courts, banks, legislative functions, &c., were in any way involved in the repeal of the Missouri line, and the inauguration of the doctrine of non-intervention; and yet, sir, the senator has confounded the question of slavery, and that of the natural, inalienable, and undisputed rights of the people, in such a way as to make the impression, if possible, that all these had been granted, guaranteed, and protected by a new bill of rights, adopted in 1854, in the shape of the Kansas-Nebraska law.

Then, again, as the vote on the slavery clause, he says:

"Let me ask, sir, is the slavery clause fairly submitted, so that the people can vote for or against it? Suppose I were a citizen of Kansas, and should go up to the polls and say, 'I desire to make Kansas a slave State; here is my ballot.' They reply to me, 'Mr. Douglas, vote for the constitution first, if you please.' 'Oh, no, I cannot, conscientiously.' 'This, Mr. President, is hardly plausible. I have already shown the fallacy of the senator's assumption, that the elector is to be required to approve the constitution entire, before he can vote for or against slavery. I now propose to show that the senator's plan would be liable to nearly the same objections.'"

He insists that the constitution, as a whole, should be submitted. Now, suppose this had been done with the slavery article in it, and he had made his appearance at the polls as a pro-slavery man. Looking at the constitution, he finds that he cannot approve of the other provisions. He says, "I wish to vote for slavery, but it is not possible that I can swallow the bank and railroad scheme, and the plan for courts and corporations in this constitution. I cannot conscientiously do this; and I must be deprived of the right to establish slavery in the Territory." Then suppose he appeared again as a free State man; the constitution in the main is very acceptable to him, and he is exceedingly anxious to approve it, but it contains the provisions recognizing slavery, which he cannot approve; and again he is driven from the polls. It will be seen how easy it is to complain; but how will the senator guard against the repetition of similar hardships, under any law Congress may pass? Certainly, he will not propose to prescribe all the action of the people in convention. This has never been done and never can be done. The truth is, that the senator, in his ardent to maintain what he conceives to be a just position, has been driven into the use of abstract technicalities, and, in more instances than one in this discussion, has dwelt upon alleged wrongs in the proceedings of the Leocompton convention, against the repetition of which he can in no way protect the people.

In another part of his speech the honorable senator remarks:

"But I am beseeched to wait until I hear from the election on the 21st of December. I am told that perhaps that will put it all right, and will save the whole difficulty. How can it? Perhaps there may be a large vote. There may be a large vote returned." [Laughter.]

Here, again, it is difficult to determine what he means to allege. He says "there may be a large vote returned." His language would seem to imply an imputation upon somebody or power connected with the election. Upon whom is it to fall? Not upon his friend, John Calhoun, whom he has endorsed to one of the departments in this city as a worthy and competent man for surveyor-general. From whom, then, is the fraud to come? No department of the government here will have an opportunity to do this, and none would embrace it. Then, where is it to be practised? By those who conduct the election in the Territory? If they may act, I cannot say; but if there are no honest men in Kansas to hold the election, then the senator cannot have a fair election under his proposed remedy; unless, indeed, he has concluded that the republicans out there have more honesty than his own party friends. He will be slow to say, however, that men who have resisted the laws from the beginning, and so often incurred his just indignation for their folly, are more reliable than the democratic party. I can only say that, if he thinks this, he has changed his estimate of the character of both parties within a brief period. But, be this as it may, the senator has lamented an evil which he cannot remedy. Then, again, he says:

"I care not how the vote may stand. I take it, however, enough in the last three days to make it certain that it will be returned out, no matter how the vote may stand." [Laughter.]

Here is a second edition of anticipated fraud. I heard with pain and regret these words as

they fell from the senator's lips. How does he know that the slavery article will be returned out, no matter how the vote may stand? What had the senator seen within three days to force this conclusion upon his mind? If he has knowledge of a scheme of base fraud to cheat the people, or to impose on Congress, I know he is the man to develop it; and when so developed, no man will go further than myself to punish the offenders. If he cannot do this, then why would he become a slave State through their negligence to it at all? Why, in this unhappy case, if he at the same time held that the delinquent and offensive spirit, cast imputations upon those who have been, and are still, his friends? I can readily perceive—and it is that which now has the question of railroads, banks, which I most regret—how such a sentiment and clamor about real or imaginary wrongs when the result shall have been ascertained. It is virtually an invitation to malcontents to continue the strife.

The honorable senator, in his diligent efforts to render the doings of the Leocompton convention odious, has dwelt on that clause of the proposed constitution interdicting the migration of free negroes to Kansas. He was candid enough to admit that the constitution of his own State contained the same prohibition; and we all know that the Topeka party, by a popular vote, have instructed the legislature to pass a law to the same effect. But the senator should have done "the Leocompton concern," as he pleased to term it, the justice to say, that at this point, at least, it had conformed to the popular will; for both parties have spoken against the admission of free negroes. Nor has he yet told us that his native State, Vermont, practiced that great measure of wrong upon the people, if wrong it is, of asking admission for the State before the people had voted on the constitution; nor that his adopted State came into the Union without an enabling act half so good as the Kansas-Nebraska law; and that this same State, no longer since 1848, set the example for the late action of Kansas by submitting a part of the constitution to a vote of the people.

The senator will pardon me for looking a little further into his views. In an address delivered at Springfield on the 12th of June last, touching Kansas affairs, he says:

"Kansas is about to speak for herself through her delegates assembled in convention to form a State constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union." "The law under which the delegates are about to be elected is believed to be just and fair in all its objects and purposes." "There is every reason to believe the law will be fairly interpreted and impartially executed."

"The election law is acknowledged to be fair and just, and the rights of the voters are clearly defined, and the exercise of those rights will be efficiently and scrupulously protected."

Then, again, he says:

"The organic act secures to the people of Kansas the sole and exclusive right of forming and regulating their domestic institutions to suit themselves, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

He denounces all neglect of, or resistance to, the movement for a convention, and says, that if a portion of the people refuse to vote for delegates, and Kansas should become a slave State through their neglect, upon them should the responsibility fall. I should prefer to give the senator credit for his own words, than to read my remarks to so great a length. Now let us turn to what he said in the Senate the other day:

"If you apply these principles to the Kansas convention, you find that it had no power to do any act as a convention forming a government; you find that the act calling it was null and void from the beginning; you find that the legislature could confer no power whatever on the convention. That convention was simply an assemblage of peaceable citizens, under the Constitution of the United States, petitioning for the redress of grievances, and, thus assembled, had the right to put their petition in the form of a constitution if they chose; but still it was only a petition, having the force of a petition, which Congress could accept or reject, or dispose of as it saw proper. That is what I understand to be just the extent of the power and authority of this convention assembled at Leocompton."

How to reconcile these sentiments I cannot see. In the Springfield speech, he says, "Kansas is about to speak for herself through delegates assembled in convention to form a State constitution; and that the law under which her delegates were about to be elected is believed to be just and fair in all its objects and purposes. In the Senate, he says:

"You find that the act calling it [the convention] was null and void from the beginning; you find the legislature could confer no power whatever on the convention."

Then, again, at Springfield, he says:

"The organic act secures to the people of Kansas the sole and exclusive right of forming and regulating their domestic institutions to suit themselves, subject only to the Constitution of the U. States."

In the Senate, he says that the convention, which was, from its very nature, an assemblage of the people, through their representatives, "was simply an assemblage of peaceable citizens, under the Constitution of the U. States to petition for the redress of grievances;" which petition Congress could accept, or reject, or dispose of as it saw proper. Comment is scarcely necessary. If the right of the people in the matter of making a government for themselves be limited only by the constitution, as claimed by the senator in his Springfield speech, I should like to know where he finds the authority for congressional interference. Nor can I see how he could designate a law as just and fair in all its purposes, which he at the same time held to be "null and void from the beginning;" or what he could mean by saying that Kansas is about to speak for herself, holding at the same time that she cannot speak at all without the permission of Congress.

But this is not all, sir. I want to call attention to another view of this Springfield speech, which I have before me. The honorable senator has maintained in this body that the failure on the part of the convention to submit the constitution to the approval of the people, is a reason why the State should not be admitted; and yet, in this Springfield address, though made after the appearance of the inaugurations of Governor Walker and Secretary Stanton, no reference whatever is made to a vote on the constitution. He made special note of the election for delegates, but nowhere hinted that there was to be an election on the constitution after it was formed by that convention. If he knew the law calling the convention to be "null and void," and that the convention would not be vested with authority to make a constitution and State government, I can hardly see how he could fail to say so. I may be mistaken; but it seems to me that, as the statesman above all others who has had this subject in

charge, and the people of Kansas in keeping, know that the slavery article will be returned out, no matter how the vote may stand? What had the senator seen within three days to force this conclusion upon his mind? If he has knowledge of a scheme of base fraud to cheat the people, or to impose on Congress, I know he is the man to develop it; and when so developed, no man will go further than myself to punish the offenders. If he cannot do this, then why would he become a slave State through their negligence to it at all? Why, in this unhappy case, if he at the same time held that the delinquent and offensive spirit, cast imputations upon those who have been, and are still, his friends? I can readily perceive—and it is that which now has the question of railroads, banks, which I most regret—how such a sentiment and clamor about real or imaginary wrongs when the result shall have been ascertained. It is virtually an invitation to malcontents to continue the strife.

But where are our friends on the other side to be found on this new issue? They cannot object to the informalities and irregularities at Leocompton, for they have contended for nothing else at Topeka. They have urged the admission of Kansas as a State on the proceedings of a party convention, gotten up without the color of law, and in derogation of the authority of the territorial and United States government. Nor, indeed, can they complain that all the people have not had an opportunity to participate in the decision on the slavery question; for it was an article in their faith, declared in the Fremont convention, that not only a portion, but all the citizens, should be deprived of this right. They claimed the right for the people of the States, acting through Congress, which was virtually saying that those who did not go to Kansas should influence that decision, and that those who did go should have no representation on this subject.

Mr. President, I am nearly done with this subject. I have mainly followed the senator from Illinois. Without sitting down to systematize my views, I have pursued the several topics pretty much as he presented them. On some points I may have fallen into error; on others perhaps I may have manifested too much feeling; but I beg to say to the Senate, and especially to the senator from Illinois, that I have in this matter but performed what I conceive to be simply a right and a duty on my part as a senator.

Whilst having laid down those rules and principles which are the result of my humble judgment after all the reflection I could give the subject, I shall, about all things, be controlled by a desire to give peace to the country, and to silence forever a dangerous feud that at times menaces the stability of our great government. What I mean to say is, that if the exigency arises, there shall be on my part no want of concession or compromise that will secure the adjustment of this unhappy controversy; nor will the great question which is the leading idea in this discussion. No man shall say, because of the remarks I have made, that I am against giving the people the right to make their own laws, or that I would circumscribe the use of those great inalienable and fundamental rights which lie at the foundation of our republican system. I intend no such thing; but considering this question in all its bearings, I have been impressed with the belief that it was an exigency which should be disposed of at the first reasonable opportunity, by admitting Kansas as a State.

Sir, it is painful to reflect on the aspect of this question. I do not know what may be in progress in Kansas at this moment. If anything I have said on this occasion, has ministered to the agitation which exists there to-day, and which some fear may approximate to civil war, I pray forgiveness. I stand pledged to unite with the senator from Illinois in the patriotic sentiments which he uttered when he declared his desire to secure to the country peace on the slavery question. It has been magnified at every step; it has been aggravated every hour; and now, after a struggle of four years, the aspect is worse than ever. How are we to settle it? One party in Kansas is acting in a rebellious spirit, without authority of law; another has attempted to make a constitution by authority of law, and under the supervision of the federal government. We are to have, perhaps in a very few days, a contest between these positions. When that contest shall come, I know where the senator from Illinois will be. He will go with those who have acted according to law. I think I know him well enough to know that he estimates the recognition of resistance to law or rebellion as one of the most unhappy incidents that could be connected with legislation at Washington.

I have said all that I desire to say, except, simply, that whatever is to come out of this unhappy embroglio in future, I feel authorized to pledge myself first to the maintenance of justice and principle, and then to every reasonable concession to give peace to the country.

We are pleased to see that our young friend B. F. LEADER, Esq., has been appointed Assistant Post Master at this place. Frank is a good Democrat and a graduate of the *Gazette* office.

It was our good fortune to be invited to dinner at the "Bedford Hotel," on New Year's day. Col. Hafer sets a table that is hard to be beaten.

Two hundred revolvers have been sold in Lancaster since the Manheim tragedy.

The New-York papers say that there is more gold and silver in circulation in that city at the present time, than was ever before known.

It costs the New York Central Railroad Company one million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year for wood.

Lucy Stone refuses to pay taxes at Orange N. Y., on the old revolutionary principle of "no taxation without representation," and the collector is about to levy on her goods.

Gen. Packer will be inaugurated as Governor on Tuesday the 19th of January.

Col. Geary, one of the ex-Governors of Kansas, is in Washington, and, we see it stated, is decidedly favorable to the President's policy in relation to that Territory.

## JUDGE BLACK ON KANSAS.

Washington, Dec. 25, 1857.

Gentlemen—I am honored by your invitation to the meeting of Monday next. I cannot be there, but I believe your purpose to be just, and I trust I am not without a good reason for the faith that is within me. If the President has done his duty well, his fellow-citizens ought to express their approbation freely. That he has meant well for his country, will not be denied by any reasonable man who knows him. He has no object of earthly ambition, except to perform the functions of his good office, so that when he retires from it he may read his history in the eyes of a contented and prosperous nation. What has he done in this affair of Kansas that is worthy of death or bonds? Difficult, complicated, and entangled as that subject has always been, wherein has he failed to meet it like a patriotic statesman? Let his accusers stand forth and specify what act he has committed which should forfeit the confidence of the Democracy in the leader they love, and the chief they admire."

When his Administration began he found a portion of Kansas like Utah, in a state of organized and open rebellion against the laws. The most infamous crimes had been habitually committed. Murder, arson and robbery were common things. Some of the immigrants were bad men, and went there for base purposes. They would be led by nothing but the bayonet; and accordingly two thousand bayonets were sent there to keep them in order. But the very latest advice shown that even the presence of the army has not been sufficient to awe them into submission, or prevent them from committing the most atrocious outrages. The natural desire of the President's heart, and every honest heart in the country, was to put an end to the reign of terror, conflagration and blood as soon as possible, and to substitute in its place the supreme and peaceable rule of the law. The army might do for a while, but it was a disgrace to the American name that a military force was necessary to keep one portion of the people from cutting the throats of another.

It was plainly seen by every one who took the trouble to think about it, that no progress could be made in suppressing these disorders, while the cause and the excuse for them remained. So far as they were not prompted by the mere love of plunder and blood, they were the offsprings of one relentless feud, one fatal dispute, arising out of a single subject, and that subject was negro slavery. This split the people asunder, and made them hate each other with the deepest intensity of hatred. There was no other division among them. Every band of combatants was ranged under a pro-slavery or an anti-slavery banner. Every violent act of aggression or defence was by one of these parties against the other. When a life was lost the news of the victim's death was always accompanied by a statement of the side he had taken on the slavery issue. If a general riot took place the killed and wounded were enumerated according to their classification on this question. The abolitionists organized their party into the form of a State government, with all its machinery, civil and military, and ranging themselves under it they swore fierce defiance and deadly hostility to the regularly constituted authorities of the United States, simply because of their views on slavery. This was not all. The country was divided into two camps, the most bitter ends of the country. It became a great sectional controversy and everywhere the burden of all that was said and sung upon it was slavery. The Union itself was in danger; in great & imminent danger—no one dreamed of ascribing that danger to any cause except the unsettled condition of the slavery question in Kansas.

In these unhappy circumstances, the legal and satisfactory settlement of this exasperating dispute was a consummation most devoutly to be wished. To extirpate this root of bitterness was the first thing to be done towards pacification. But how was it to be effected? Our political opponents thought—and I suppose are still of the same opinion—that the people of the United States, through their representatives in Congress, might decide it without consulting Kansas, whose people, according to their theory, should be treated with utter contempt. But the Democratic party determined to leave it with those who alone were directly concerned in it. This latter doctrine was triumphantly sustained in Congress, at the polls and by the judiciary. After that the General Government could do no more than protect the people of Kansas doing the work assigned them. How they should do it, by what agents or organs, was not prescribed; they were to do it "in their own way"—by such representatives as they might see proper to choose.

But unfortunately the Abolition party had become so rancorous that the olive branch was offered them. They insulted and blasphemed the laws which left the matter to their own decision.—The regular authorities could do no more than give all a fair chance of voting. The Legislature first passed a law submitting the question of "Convention" or "no Convention" to a popular vote. The next Legislature afterwards in accordance with the known wishes of the people, and by virtue of their own rightful authority, enacted another law for the election of delegates to a Convention. The delegates were chosen at a fair and free election, after a full notice to all the voters. Whether the vote was large or small, it is not possible to deny the right of those who were chosen. To say that a portion of the electors by absenting themselves from the polls could invalidate an election otherwise legal & regular, is simply absurd.

The members of the Convention thus chosen met at Leocompton, and then was raised the new alarm that the delegates, or some of them, intended to make a slave Constitution in opposition to what they knew to be the will of the people. While the President saw that he had no right to interfere between the people of Kansas and their own representatives, and while he knew very well what was known to every other lawyer and statesman in the country, that it was for the Convention to shape the Constitution and to decide upon the form of its submission, he nevertheless expressed his opinion freely, that in the circumstances of the case, and with reference to that question of slavery, the Constitution ought to be submitted. It was submitted—so submitted that if there was a majority opposed to slavery, they had nothing in the world to do but go to the polls and say so.

But the moment the Abolitionists saw the whole disposition of the slavery subject placed in their own hands, they abandoned apparently all their hostility to it. They will not descend, not they, to vote on a question so trifling. The principle for which they were willing to drench the country in blood, has all at once become too insignificant to be worth a ballot. Something else in the organic law never thought of before, and not specified even now, has suddenly become so important in their eyes that

law, doth depose and say, that I was a victim to that worst of all, and that in its worst form. My life, and when, in order to save myself to swallow a leaden ball, I was reduced to a mere form. My life, and when, in order to save myself to swallow a leaden ball, I was reduced to a mere form. My life, and when, in order to save myself to swallow a leaden ball, I was reduced to a mere form.

If the Convention had with little confidence, make a Constitution what was its restoration, whole of it to a popular vote, I could eat and breathe as a man, and whoever denies the general power of a people to clothe their representatives with authority to make a Constitution binding on themselves and their constituents, knows not whereof he affirms. All reason as well as precedent is against him.

The power of the Leocompton Convention was certainly not restricted, except on the subject of slavery. But if its members abused their authority by fraudulently inserting any other provision which they knew to be wrong or believed to be disapproved by their constituents, and dishonestly refused to submit it, it should be regarded with the contempt due to a cheat. But where is the evidence of any such fraud? The Convention had no motive to commit it. They and their constituents did not differ on the necessity of having a Constitution, nor on any but one subject embraced within its provisions. On every other subject the unanimity of opinion was as perfect as it ever was in any of those States where a Constitution was not submitted at all. It is easy enough to accuse them, but a fair minded person will not accuse them without proof, nor suspect them in the absence of a motive. For myself, I think it was not unfair, certainly not fraudulent, for them to adjust all the undisputed points of their Government by the exercise of their delegated authority and to leave the subject on which there was division to a fair vote of the people.

The President seeing a Constitution about to be established for Kansas by legal authority, what could he do? He might regret some things that were done—he might disapprove of others—he might wish that it had been different in many respects; but still it was the lawful work of a lawful body. Could he set it aside? Could he order the election not to be held under it? Could he drive the people away from the polls? He had no more power to do any of these things than he had to veto an act of the Pennsylvania Legislature.

Since then there was to be an election on the direct question of slavery, and an opportunity given for a full show of hands, he expressed his wish fervently and freely that all the people, laying aside their animosities and prejudices, should come to the polls and there peacefully decide a question which, as long as it remained open, would produce nothing but excuses for crime and rebellion. He believed that a decision of the question by a clean majority of votes would give peace and order to Kansas, and with all his heart he wished her to enjoy those blessings, even though she should purchase them at the expense of postponing the adjustment of other points to a future and more propitious time. If these sentiments have caused the opposition to abuse him it cannot be helped; if they have afflicted the conscience of any honest man, I am sorry—if any intelligent Democrat misunderstands them, an appeal to his reason and judgment will soon set him right. Of one thing I am sure: that James Buchanan is the last public man in the country who need fear the place which will be assigned to him in the history of these proceedings; and this will be proved to the heart's content of all who live long enough to see the accounts made up.

I am, with great respect, yours, &c.,  
J. S. BLACK.

BENFORD & MEYERS,  
Attorneys at Law, Bedford, Pennsylvania.

Will promptly attend to all legal business entrusted to their care. [Jan. 8, 1858.]

LOOK HERE!

The subscribers will sell at private sale, their well known farm on which they at present reside, containing 250 1/2 acres of land, and having thereon erected a good dwelling-house plastered within and without, with a kitchen attached thereto, a double log barn and wagon shed with other sheds, good hog-house and also a good granary house. There is a never failing spring of good fresh water at the house also a fine orchard of bearing fruit trees, and young orchard bearing for two years past, about 1/2 of a mile from the dwelling. There is, likewise, another good dwelling house, one mile from the one just mentioned, which is at present occupied by a tenant, and has near it a good orchard of apples, plums and cherries, and a spring of good cold water that never fails, at the door. A stream of water flows through the whole farm, the distance of one mile, which is sufficient to drive a saw-mill six months in a year; a saw-mill site was leveled on it last spring. There is good timber on the place for sawing, that will last for thirty years to come. One hundred acres are cleared; forty acres are in meadow and a good quantity more can be made.—The farm lies 2 miles West of Schellsburg and 1/2 mile from the turnpike leading to Pittsburg, adjoining lands of John Bowser and Harry Egulph, in Napier Township, Bedford county, Pa.

JOHN R. MOWRY,  
ANDREW MOWRY.

Jan. 1, 1858.

NOTICE.

ALL persons are hereby notified not to meddle with the following described property which belongs to me, the subscriber, and which was left in my sole discretion, to the care of Samuel C. Longenecker, in Middle Woodberry Tp., viz: one bay mare, one black horse, one sorrel, two bays and one black colt, three cows (two red and one white spotted) one heifer, two yearling calves, (one white and one red), two red calves, twelve sheep, (7 ewes and 5 lambs from last spring) six fat hogs, four shoats, one carriage for double and single use, one two horse wagon, three sets of horse gears, one sett harness, one saddle and bridle, one windmill, two ploughs, one harrow, three show-ploughs, (two single and one double) one burr-plough, one cupboard, one cooking and one ten-plate stove, 115 bushels of corn in the ear, 150 bushels of wheat, 200 bushels of oats, 175 bushels of rye, 7 bushels of cloverseed, 6 tons of hay, also all the grain in the ground on the farm on which S. C. Longenecker resides, containing about 17 acres, and divided in three fields.

SIMON BEARD.

Woodberry, Jan. 1, 1858.