

Bedford Gazette.

Freedom of Thought and Opinion.

BEDFORD, PA., FRIDAY MORNING, MARCH 12, 1853.

WHOLE NUMBER 2787.

VOL. 1, NO. 32.

VOLUME 52.

NEW SERIES.

THE BEDFORD GAZETTE
IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING,
BY MEYERS & BENFORD,
At the following terms, to wit:
\$1.50 per annum, in advance.
\$2.00 " " if paid within the year.
\$2.50 " " if not paid within the year.
No subscription taken for less than six months.
No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publishers. It has been decided by the United States Courts, that the stopping of a newspaper without the payment of arrearages, is *prima facie* evidence of fraud and is a criminal offence.
The courts have decided that persons are accountable for the subscription price of newspapers, if they take them from the post office, whether they subscribe for them, or not.

DENTIST.
Will attend promptly and carefully to all operations in the branch of his profession. Teeth cleaned, gold and silver work, and all operations in the branch of his profession. Office on West Third Street, Bedford, Pa.

DR. F. C. BEAVER
RESPECTFULLY begs leave to tender his Professional Services to the Citizens of Bedford and vicinity.
Office in Julianna Street, at the Drug and Book Store. Feb. 17, 1854.

DR. B. F. HARRY
RESPECTFULLY tenders his professional services to the citizens of Bedford and vicinity.
Office and residence on Pitt-Street, in the building formerly occupied by Dr. John Hofius. June 24, 1853.

LAW PARTNERSHIP.
JOE MANN, G. H. SPANG.
The undersigned have associated themselves in the Practice of the Law, and will attend promptly to all business entrusted to their care in Bedford and adjoining counties.
Office on Julianna Street, three doors south of Mengel House, opposite the residence of Mrs. Tate. Feb. 12, 1854.

WM. P. SCHELL, ATTORNEY AT LAW.
WILL attend faithfully to all legal business entrusted to his care in the Counties of Bedford and Fulton.
Bedford, Nov. 1, 1847.

John P. Reed,
Attorney at Law, Bedford, Pennsylvania
Respectfully tenders his services to the Public.
Office second door North of the Mengel House.
Bedford, Feb. 20, 1852.

Cessna & Shannon,
HAVE formed a Partnership in the Practice of the Law. Office nearly opposite the Gazette Office, where one or the other may at all times be found.
Bedford, Oct. 26, 1849.

LAW NOTICE.
W. J. BAER, Attorney at Law:
WILL practice regularly in the Courts of Bedford County hereafter. He may, during Court Weeks, be consulted at his room at the Washington Hotel.
Nov. 23, 1853.

JOSEPH W. TATE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, AND REAL ESTATE BROKER.

BAER, BENFORD & MEYERS, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, BEDFORD, PENN'A.
WILL punctually attend to all business entrusted to their care. Office on Julianna Street, same as formerly occupied by Wm. M. Hall, Esq. Jan 28, 1853.

TO BUILDERS.
The subscriber is fully prepared to furnish any quantity or quality of Building Lumber and Plastering Laths. Orders directed to St. Clairsville, Bedford County, will be promptly attended to, by giving a reasonable notice.
F. D. BEEGLE.

NOTICE.
The partnership heretofore existing between James Buros and J. H. Tharp is this day dissolved by mutual consent. All money due the firm is payable to James Buros, and all debts owed or contracted by the firm, will be paid by James Buros.
JAMES BURS.
J. H. THARP.
Feb. 19, 1853.
JUST received at Shoemaker's Colonade Store, a large assortment of Boots, Shoes, Hats, &c. [Dec. 4, '57.]

TO BE HAD AT DR. HARRY'S.
Essence of Jamaica Ginger, which should have a place in every family, for sale at Dr. Harry's.

CORN.—One Thousand bushels for sale—also Family flour—Prime new Bacon also—by A. B. CRAMER & Co.
Feb. 19, 1853.

WAGONS.—Several new two horse wagons, work warranted, for sale on a liberal credit, or for country produce by A. B. CRAMER & Co.
Feb. 19, 1853.

LUMBER.—Twenty Thousand feet of Spruce & Pine Boards, also a large supply of Poplar Scantling—for sale by A. B. CRAMER & Co.
Feb. 19, 1853.

THE LECOMPTON QUESTION.

Our readers are aware that the Senate Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the Message of the President accompanying the copy of the Lecompton Constitution communicated by him to that body, presented on Thursday week, three reports in relation to the subject, representing as many different classes of views between which the Committee was divided. The report made by Senator Green, of Missouri, presents the views of the majority of the Committee, of the Administration, and of the Democratic party generally; that submitted by Senators Collamer and Wade reflects the sentiment of the Republicans; while a third prepared by Senator Douglas represents his own individuality, and the anomalous ground which the Senator occupies, as a Democrat of suspected orthodoxy, excommunicated by the leading organs of his party, yet stoutly affirming in the teeth of the President and the party, that his, not theirs, is the true democracy of the Kansas-Nebraska act and Cincinnati platform. We subjoin the more important portions of the majority report, which, after an extended historical review of the whole matter, commencing with the first acquisition of Kansas from France by the treaty of April 30th, 1803, and its subsequent erection into a Territory of the United States by act of Congress, May 30th, 1854, and closing with the adoption of the Lecompton Constitution on the 21st December, 1857, proceeds as follows:

Having thus given an historical account of the matter referred for their consideration, your committee will briefly review the whole subject, unembarrassed by details. They will look at the subject as it originated, as it has been for three years, and as it now is.

The population of our country four years ago, was principally confined by treaty and by law to the comparatively small region lying to the east of the river Mississippi. Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, and part of Louisiana were found on the western bank. Also, on the extreme southern bank, Texas; and Minnesota on the northern. California and the settlements of Oregon were upon the Pacific coast; in the centre, New Mexico and Utah. The immense country lying between our scanty settlements upon the Pacific and western boundaries of Iowa, Missouri and Arkansas, may be said, in general terms, and with the above exceptions, to have been unoccupied. Guarded by the Indian non-intercourse act and by Indian treaties, and without territorial organization, the country was rendered a vast wilderness, which might not legally disturb. Further extensions of settlement to the westward were thus arrested by law. The western border of these four States was the western border of the Sierra Nevada, and looked down upon the long and narrow settlement upon the shores of the Pacific. The border States had become dissatisfied, and clamored for western expansion over the beautiful and fertile wilderness which, though extending for a continuous distance of a thousand miles, approached within three hundred miles of the Mississippi, was abandoned by the government to the exclusive use of wild and uncivilized and vagrant Indian tribes. Unable longer to resist the demands of the West for the opening up to settlement of a country so contiguous, important and valuable, and which had been neglected so long as to become a just cause of reproach to the government, Congress, in 1854, took into its serious consideration the justice and policy of organizing it into Territories.

But two difficulties were in the way of an organization: one was the question of Indian occupancy—the other that of African slavery. The first was easily adjusted; the second was the subject of long, heated and angry discussion. More than one hundred speeches were delivered in Congress at that session upon the slavery question. At length the whole country lying west of Missouri, Iowa and Minnesota, east of Utah, Oregon and Washington Territories, and north of the 37th and south of the 49th parallels of latitude, was organized into two Territories, and named Kansas and Nebraska.

The law organizing these Territories settled the slavery controversy, by providing that the people of their own might form their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States; and to enable the people to do so without hindrance of any kind, there was inserted in the act a clause repealing all laws establishing, regulating or prohibiting slaveholding.

This settlement greatly pleased one party, and greatly displeased the other. The defeated anti-slavery party professed to believe that Congress had power and ought to exercise it, to exclude slave property from territory which had been acquired by the joint efforts and at the common expense of slaveholders and non-slaveholders.

The victorious democratic party believed that Congress had no such power under the Constitution, and that it would be inequitable to exercise it, if it had; and, also, that in this particular case, such an exercise of power would be a flagrant violation of the third article of the treaty with France, by which the country was acquired.

Immediately after the passage of the act, people living in Missouri, upon the borders of Kansas, being well acquainted with the country, poured into that territory in large numbers, and appropriated many of the most fertile, best watered and best timbered tracts. Many of these carried their slaves with them. On the other hand, prior to the final passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, but after its passage became evident, certain members of Congress formed a secret association, which ultimately became public, to incite and aid the emigration to Kansas of persons opposed to the existence of slavery, for the express purpose of so carrying out its provisions as to cause an exclusion of the slavery property of the Southern States from the Territory. This secret combination

of politicians to perpetrate sectional injustice was promptly followed by public ones; and monies were collected in numerous places for the express purpose of aiding an effort to exclude Southern property from Kansas. This sectional and fanatical purpose was, in practice, generally coupled with some one or more schemes of money making of a highly speculative character. This effort very naturally provoked counter efforts, and violent controversies between the assailants and the assailed followed.

The creators of strife, as often is the case, were worsted. Of the voters on that occasion this may be said: Many were bad men. The scene was, if possible, as disgraceful as those which have been such a scandalous reproach to the large cities of the Atlantic and Pacific States in violently contested elections.

Immediately after the very first election many of the voters belonging to each of the contending parties and among them the defeated candidate for delegate to Congress, left the Territory, never to return. Few of the emigrants from the various States other than those from the adjacent State of Missouri, who alone had easy and early facilities for making themselves comfortable, passed the first winter in Kansas, and many of the settlers in Kansas from Missouri passed the winter out of the Territory. But with the spring, emigrants and disturbances returned to Kansas. During the whole of the second year (1855) it is believed the majority of the actual settlers in Kansas were emigrants from the adjoining State. But as the mass of the emigrants sent out to Kansas under the inspiration of the abolitionists were poorly fitted for labor in unbroken fields, and had to draw largely upon the aid of absent and fanatical friends for support, and as both the supported and the supporters were accustomed to wrangling and dissipation, the Territory was quickly filled with strife. And as local contention and violence increased, so did the heat and the contributions of the remote supporters, until the turmoil in Kansas on one side matured into open defiance of all the laws of the Territory. The mere handful of emigrants were contemptuously furnished, even by religious men, amid prayers and hymns, with destructive weapons, and encouraged to set up an independent government. This was only not put into actual operation, probably, but for the firmness of the government officers, backed by the troops of the United States. For nearly three years these turbulent spirits, thus encouraged by the restless and fanatical emigrants, and their supporters, have uniformly disregarded the laws, so far as it has been possible for them to do so. When elections were held, instead of peacefully participating in them, they disturbed and annoyed the voters in every conceivable way, and ended in holding election upon days and in a manner unauthorized by law, and expressly to contravene the law.

When, at last, to end, if possible, these disorders and strife, the Legislature made provision for a vote of the people upon the question whether a State government should be formed by the making and adopting of a Constitution, these organized disturbers combined to prevent a full and fair vote. So, likewise, when the Convention had been ordered by a regular vote of the people to be called, these armed mischief makers threw every obstacle in the way of a full registration of the settlers, legally entitled to vote for members of the Convention; and when these violent, illegal and bloody efforts had been partially successful, they filled the country with their complaints that the registration, which they had resisted with arms, had not been full and fair; and as the registration was not full and complete, they wished the people of the United States to infer that the election of the members of the Convention was neither legal nor fair. The people having, by direct vote, ordered the calling of a convention to form a Constitution, the abolition agitators and disturbers refused to vote at the election of members of said Convention, and then after an obstinate refusal raised an outcry that the Convention was unjustly constituted, inasmuch as they were not represented therein. After the formation of a Constitution, they cried out against the Constitution, upon the ground that they had not been allowed to vote for its ratification, though they knew, before the election of the Convention, that the Convention had been clothed with full authority to make a Constitution; they well knew that the bill providing for the election of members of the Convention had been voted by the Governor upon the express ground that it enabled the Convention to make a Constitution, and that it had been made a law after a full consideration of such veto. They knew that the Governor and the officers of the Territory, in various ways, had made great exertions to induce them to go to the polls like honest law-abiding citizens, and vote for men who would respect their wishes, and that they had refused to heed these solicitations.

They also knew that the Convention had not only afforded an opportunity for the good citizens who had registered themselves as voters according to law, to decide whether slavery should or should not be established in Kansas as a legal institution, but had also allowed even those bad men who had disobeyed the laws, and who had combined to prevent a full registration, to vote with the registered voters upon this vital question, and they also knew that they refused to vote, even under such circumstances, upon this proposition.

The Convention was called by a direct vote of the people in direct pursuance of law; the people, in pursuance of law, subsequently elected a Convention to make a Constitution; and, in strict pursuance of all the forms observed by such Convention, that Convention, thus legally elected, did make a Constitution. That Constitution, thus legally created, is, if recognized by Congress, the supreme law of Kansas, and can only be changed by the people of Kansas, who through their legal representatives, have thus formally created it. No Legislature of

Kansas, after the people had, in pursuance of all the forms of law, called and elected a Constitutional Convention to make a Constitution, could legally interfere with it, either to increase or lessen its powers. The Convention, being the direct official representative of the sovereignty of the people, could no more be restricted in its legitimate action by a Legislature, than could the people themselves be restricted had they been assembled, in person, in one great mass meeting, to make a Constitution for their own government. Hence the work of that Convention was final and complete, and must so remain, in all its parts, until changed by the people that called and elected the Convention that made it. The vote on the single clause submitted on the 21st of December, 1857, was a final vote; the Convention itself, if re-assembled, could neither change the Constitution nor order a second vote. The power with which it was entrusted by the people is exhausted. Its members are now only private citizens, and like other private citizens, must obey each and every requirement of the Constitution which they severally helped to create. Far less can a thereto unauthorized Executive, Judiciary and Legislature, change, alter, modify or nullify the Constitution made by the people through their selected representatives—representatives elected by the people themselves, and clothed with special, direct and positive authority for that, and no other purpose.

Good citizens and representatives of good citizens, cannot consistently do any thing expressly to uphold violators of law and known disturbers of the public peace. It is alike impolitic and unjust to grant the turbulent demands of the disorderly, be they few or many; it is wrong to aid them to overturn a Constitution made by the law-abiding supporters of the government and laws of Kansas; the more especially when the habitual disturbers would not have any cause of complaint of any kind, as they themselves loudly assert, if they had listened to the earnest counsels of the President of their country, and the Governor of their Territory, and exercised their right and honestly performed their duty, by voting upon either of these occasions; 1, when the vote was taken upon calling a Convention; 2, when the Convention was elected; 3, when the question was submitted whether the slavery clause should or should not be retained in the Constitution. If the Abolitionists were in a majority, as they so loudly boast, and would not vote against the establishment of slavery in Kansas, they have no just cause of complaint. If they were in a minority, as there is reason to believe, they have no just cause of complaint, for the majority of the people voting, in accordance with the theories of all, ought to rule. Notwithstanding the noisy and incessant claims of the abolitionists to be considered a majority of the people of Kansas, the truth of these claims remains to be shown. Having been abundantly supplied with superior arms, such as Sharpe's rifles, Colt's revolvers and Bowie knives, and been trained for two or three years to their use, and to move in concert and in masses, the idle and the lawless men sent into Kansas by the fanaticism of New England have become dangerous and formidable. But their numbers have been, it is believed, greatly exaggerated; their power consists in their superior organization and arms, and in their being supported in idleness. When called upon to vote for or against the calling of a Convention to form a Constitution, these mercenaries of political priests did not venture to measure strength at the polls with the Democratic party of Kansas, but allowed the election to go by default.

So, again, when the members of the Convention were elected, the abolitionists shrunk from the contest. So, also, when the question came up whether there should or should not be a clause retained in the Constitution allowing slavery to be established in Kansas, they again shrunk from the contest, conscious of their weakness, or from sinister political design. It is possible there may be a majority of the citizens of Kansas from the non-slaveholding States, but all are not abolitionists or fanatics on the slavery question. Why this continued absence from the polls, if they had the real strength with which to the possession of the Legislature, and thus peacefully end all difficulties by having everything in their own way?

At the late election of State officers, they exerted their strength in union with certain favoring elements, and so close was the contest even when thus aided, that the result is as yet unknown.

The only election they ever carried was that which was held last fall, and their success is readily accounted for without resorting to the supposition that the Abolitionists compose a majority, or even a fourth, of the voters of Kansas.

As to their vote upon the Constitution, given upon the fourth of January last, two weeks after the day appointed by the only competent authority to appoint a day, little need be said, for it was utterly irregular, and was thrown upon a day other than the legal one, for the purpose of casting contempt upon the government. Votes cast without lawful authority upon a question decided, and with a purpose to unfavorably affect what is lawful, orderly and right, are entitled to no consideration at the hands of those who do not claim to favor lawlessness and anarchy.

That men who habitually set all law at defiance, and who consider all restraint upon their wishes tyranny, should report that they have cast ten thousand votes against a Constitution, when, upon the same day, and at the same places, they were able to rally in favor of their candidates for office not so many voters by three or four thousand, will surprise no one and influence no one. As good citizens, it was their duty to have voted on the lawful election day; as inebriated persons, they chose to vote two weeks after; hence, had they numbered millions, their numbers would not conceal or palliate, far less justify, their open disregard

and contempt of law.

Some consider the submission of a Constitution to a vote of the people for ratification as necessary to its validity. In this opinion the committee do not concur. The people may assemble, as in ancient days, in mass meeting, and make a Constitution, they may elect representatives to make one for them; or they may elect representatives to draft one to be submitted to them for approval or rejection. The last method is most approved of during the past few years, though formerly the second method was very generally resorted to.

The calling of the Constitutional Convention of Kansas is generally conceded to have been strictly legal. The election of its members is also admitted to have been legal. Is it not logical to infer that a Convention legally called, legally elected, and clothed with authority to make a Constitution, can no more be interfered with by Governor, Judge or Legislature, either to increase or diminish its power, or to alter, modify or nullify its acts, than the people could be interfered with had they assembled en masse instead of by representatives? The Legislature of a State may not alter or annul the Constitution thereof unless thereto especially authorized by the people.

No election of officers under a Constitution; no vote on the adoption of a Constitution, held on a day prior, or on a day subsequent, to the day fixed by the lawfully constituted authorities, is considered valid in any State, or in any Territory, or in any city, county, or town, in the United States no matter how few or how many persons may engage in the lawless proceeding. No man can be chosen President, or Governor, or Mayor, or Justice of the Peace, but on the day appointed by law, and except by lawless and shameless desperados in Kansas, no where in the United States has this doctrine been practically controverted. If the monstrous practice of the bold bad men of Kansas, now an exception, are to be erected into a rule, how long will it be ere some audacious sectional faction will find a pretence for holding a Presidential election on a day other than that appointed by law? And when elections are held without any law by factious, and on a day appointed by law, their candidates will always have most votes; the legal candidates will be and the irregular and illegal ones will be called the "majority candidates." Then will follow strife, bloodshed, and war. Rights, it must ever be borne in mind can be best and most effectually protected in the midst of civil commotion. There is no real and true safety to our liberties and institutions but in a strict adherence to the spirit and the letter of our Constitutions and laws; and there is no danger to our peace and our Union that we cannot easily escape if we will conscientiously adhere to them. Who ever heard of a Legislature other than that of Kansas which had the presumption to appoint a day, open the polls and request the people to vote for or against a Constitution which had been finally adopted by the people two weeks before, and which nobody could change but the people and they only by a formal action to that direct end? The action on the Constitution on the 21st December, 1857, was final action, and that instrument was on that day a completed one; it can be changed, as all State Constitutions can be; but, until formally and lawfully changed, it is valid; and its turbulent opponents will find that the validity of that fundamental law cannot be affected by a town meeting harangue, or by an irregular vote ordered by a rash body of beaten partisans.

Many generous persons who are quite indisposed to countenance the violence and contumacy of the abolitionists sent into Kansas for the purpose of excluding therefrom all property not pleasing to them and their abettors, urge that something might be done to lessen the hardships that will fall upon them in the event of the admission of Kansas into the Union with the Constitution made at Lecompton; that, although it is true that the abolitionists violently opposed registration, would not vote at elections, held sham elections on days subsequent to those appointed by law, and even refused to vote against the establishment of slavery at a time when they professed to believe their doing so would have excluded it, and thus have peacefully settled the question to their own satisfaction, yet they consider it would be too severe to compel such contumacious citizens even though it is their own fault, to live under a Constitution which, however grievous its provisions may prove to be, they cannot change, without resorting to revolution until the year 1864.

To such, without resorting to the ready answer that Congress has no power to modify or alter a State Constitution, and has expressly stipulated that the people of Kansas shall be permitted to form their own institutions, subject only to the Constitutions of the United States, two replies may be given. The first one is this:—The clause complained of in the Lecompton Constitution, in this connection, is in these words:—"The year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-four, whenever the Legislature shall think it necessary to amend, alter or change this Constitution, they shall recommend to the electors at the next general election, two-thirds of the members of each House concurring to vote for or against calling a Convention, and if it shall appear that a majority of all citizens of the State have voted for a Convention, to consist of as many members as there may be in the House of Representatives at the time, to be chosen in the same manner, at the same places, and by the same electors that choose the representatives; said delegates so elected shall meet within three months after said election, for the purpose of revising, amending, or changing the Constitution, but no alteration shall be made to effect the rights of property in the ownerships of slaves."

That this provision is not objectionable to the

abolitionists, in fact, and is now urged by them and their friends only for popular effect, is proved by the overwhelming fact that the abolitionists of Kansas inserted in their "Topeka Constitution" the following more objectionable provision:

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.—ARTICLE XIV.

Sec. 1. All propositions for amendments to the Constitution shall be made by the General Assembly.

Sec. 2. A concurrence of two-thirds of the members elected to each house shall be necessary, after which such proposed amendments shall be entered upon the journals with the yeas and nays; and the Secretary of State shall cause the same to be published in at least one newspaper in each county in the State where a newspaper is published, for at least six months preceding the next election for Senators and Representatives, when such proposed amendment shall be again referred to the Legislature elect, next succeeding said publication. If passed by the second Legislature by a majority of two-thirds of the members elected to each House, such amendment shall be re-published, as aforesaid, for at least six months prior to the next general election, at which election such proposed amendments shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection, and if the majority of the electors voting at such election shall adopt such amendments, the same shall become a part of the Constitution.

Sec. 3. When more than one amendment is submitted at the same time, they shall be so submitted as to enable the electors to vote upon each amendment separately.

Sec. 4. No convention for the formation of a new Constitution shall be called, and no amendment to the Constitution shall be, by the general assembly, made before the year 1865, nor more than once in five years thereafter.

The second reply is this:—Suppose the grievance real, and that it ought to be redressed, it is unnecessary for Congress to unlawfully interfere for that purpose, inasmuch as the Lecompton Convention has provided a full, lawful and perfect remedy for every conceivable grievance, and placed that remedy in the unrestricted hands of a majority of the people, by inserting in the Constitution of Kansas the following distinct and unequivocal recognition of power, viz:—

All political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit, and shall derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, in such manner as they think proper.

The abolitionists of Kansas have thus far sought power by methods unknown to the law and by violence, and not through the peaceful agency of the ballot-box. Claiming to have a majority of the voters of the Territory, and therefore able to elect Legislatures and Conventions, they ask Congress to wrongfully do for them what they may, at legal times and legal places, rightfully do for themselves: that is, change or abolish their Constitution. And in case Congress refuses to comply with their unconstitutional demands, they threaten to afflict the country with an attempt at bloodshed and revolution. Unless Congress will do for them what they assert they are numerous enough to do for themselves, but which they willfully refuse to do, they threaten to plunge the country into a civil war. This conduct is so exceedingly unreasonable as to force the conviction upon the mind that they are conscious of being in a hopeless minority, and only expect to compass their unworkable ends by extorting them from the general love of peace and quiet. If your committee are not greatly mistaken, these reckless men misjudge the American people, and will be required to seek peaceful methods for the redress of all these grievances, whether they be real or imaginary.

The committee do not approve the Ordinance accompanying the Constitution, and report against its allowance; but they do not regard it as any part of the Constitution, nor will its approval or disapproval by Congress affect the validity of that Constitution, if the State be admitted into the Union as recommended.

In conclusion, this committee is of opinion that when a Constitution of a newly formed State, erected out of our own territory, is presented to Congress for admission into the Union, it is no part of the duty or privilege of Congress either to approve or disapprove the Constitution itself and its various provisions, or any of them, but simply to see whether it be the legal Constitution of the new State, whether it be republican in form, whether the boundaries proposed be admissible, and whether the number of inhabitants be sufficient to justify independent State organization.

Believing that the paper presented is the legal Constitution of Kansas, that it is republican in its form, that the boundaries proposed by it are admissible, and conceding the sufficiency of the population, the committee recommend the admission of Kansas into the Union upon the Constitution presented, and report a bill accordingly.

"SAMUEL BEWARE OF THE VIDDERS."

The *Schenectady Reflector* is responsible for the following: "Quite a mistake lately occurred in a love affair at Duaneburg. A couple of young men agreed to elope together, and by some mistake in the preliminary arrangements, the gentleman put his ladder up to the window of the next to the one in which his sweetheart slept, and which proved to be that in which her anxious mamma, a handsome widow, reported. She jumped the mistake to her own advantage, got into his arms; returned his affectionate embraces; was borne by him to the carriage, and by preserving becoming silence until daylight, kept him blind of his error, and by the potent power of her blandishments, actually charmed him into matrimony with herself. We give these facts on the authority of a responsible correspondent."