

TERMS OF THE GLOBE.

Per annum in advance \$1 50
Six months 75
Three months 50
A failure to notify a discontinuance of the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

Four lines or less, 1 insertion, 3 do. \$ 25. 2 insertions, \$ 37.50. 3 do. \$ 50. One square, (12 lines), 1 do. 1 00. 2 do. 1 50. 3 do. 2 00. Two squares, 1 do. 2 00. 2 do. 3 00. 3 do. 4 00. Three squares, 1 do. 3 00. 2 do. 4 00. 3 do. 5 00. Half a column, 1 do. 10 00. 2 do. 15 00. 3 do. 20 00. One column, 1 do. 20 00. 2 do. 30 00. 3 do. 40 00. Professional and Business Cards not exceeding four lines, one year, \$3 00. Administrators' and Executors' Notices, \$1 75. Advertisements not marked with the number of insertions desired, will be continued till forbid and charged according to these terms.

Political.

Quite a Mistake.

A short time since the Huntington American published what purported to be a letter from "ROBERT RAY, Senr., blacksmith," defining his position on the Presidential question. In that letter Mr. Ray is made to say "that he has left the Democratic party after having given his support to it for over forty years." He has made up his mind, as a Union man, to go for FILLMORE—opposing FREMONT, because he "is no Statesman," because he "is a Union dissolver," and because he "likes mackerel on Friday."—This is all very fine for the Fillmoreites if it were true—no Democratic acquisition to their ranks would be something worth crowing over—but we have most excellent authority for saying that there is not a word of truth in the story.—Mr. RAY informed a friend of ours only a few days ago, that he never wrote such a letter or authorized its publication—that he has always, heretofore, belonged to the Whig party, and intends to cast his first Democratic vote this fall for BUCK and BRACK. Put that in your pipe, Sam, and smoke it.

A Negro Orator for Fremont!

A Black Republican meeting was held at Byberry, near Philadelphia, a few days ago, which was addressed by two white men, a subject of Queen Victoria, and a negro! The speakers all advocated a separation of the Northern and Southern States, and advanced doctrines of the most blasphemous and damning character. The Daily News gives the following as a part of the Negro's speech: "What are we doing? WE ARE A NATION OF ROBBERS, OF LIARS, OF HYPOCRITES; we are a nation of slaveholders. We batten and fatten and run riot in the bones and blood of our fellow-men."

I am, of course, as you know, politically disfranchised; but still in sentiment, in feeling, in conviction, I am a DISUNION-ABOLITIONIST, AND I REPUDIATE THE CONSTITUTION OF THIS COUNTRY. I think, stronger reasons than my friend here has given me, I wish JOHN CHARLES FREMONT elected. If I had no other reason, the simple fact that the South hates him would be a reason why I should suspect him to be an honest man. But it is not because the South hates him; it is because I believe he hates slavery. Where do I find him? There is a Spanish proverb which is pretty good test of character: "Tell me the company you keep and I will tell you what you are." He is found in close affinity with the true friends of freedom. I have been endorsed by such men as GERRIT SMITH, of world-wide philanthropy and benevolence.

I know that some of our friends—Republicans, they call themselves—exclaim, "Don't for the world, connect Fremont or our Club with this Abolition movement—you will hurt our cause." Hurt it how? Did truth ever hurt anybody? Don't you stand upon a rock? If John Charles Fremont can be elected upon principle without concealment and without compromise, HIS VICTORY IS OUR VICTORY. DEFEAT TO HIM WOULD BE DEFEAT TO US. I WANT NO DECEPTION. I HATE SLAVERY, AND WHILE I LIVE I WILL BE UNREQUITINGLY, UNFORGETFULLY, TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COUNTRY, HIS ELECTION WILL BE THE ENTERING WEDGE TO THAT SYSTEM WHICH WILL BRING DOWN ITS RUIN AND FALL BEFORE A GREAT WHILE."

"Some of my friends have intimated that when I have referred to the slave system, my expressions have been stronger than my calmer judgment would warrant. They are mistaken; my feelings on that subject are the result of deliberate conviction. I hold that until a right estimate is made of slaveholders and slaveholding, you need never attempt to bring this Union to a recognition of this class who are the victims of oppression. I hold that the slaveholder is a man stealer; I hold that he is a bloody minded man; I hold that he is a despot—A MONSTER, THE VILEST THAT LIVES UPON THE EARTH, AS I HOLD THE SYSTEM TO BE THE MOST MONSTROUS AND INFERNAL THAT EVER EXISTED IN THIS WORLD. I HOLD THAT THE SLAVEHOLDER HAS NO RIGHT TO LIVE A SINGLE MOMENT. I HOLD THAT GOD NEVER MADE HIM. HE WOULD DISGRACE HEAVEN AND THEY WOULD NOT ALLOW HIM A PLACE IN HELL; HE WOULD BE OBLIGED TO SWING SOMEWHERE—GOD KNOWS WHERE, HE IS UNFIT FOR EXISTENCE."

Citizens of Pennsylvania. Men who love the Union! Such is the language of a man who wants to see JOHN CHARLES FREMONT elected President of the United States! They are the sentiments of the whole abolition clan—the leading white niggers of the North. Will you lend your influence to aid these traitors in accomplishing their hellish work! Will you aid them in accomplishing that object which they claim will bring about the "ruin of our country?" Remember, the issue is BUCHANAN and the Union vs. FREMONT and Dissolution.

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE!—That a bill passed the Senate, in Washington, declaring void the obnoxious laws of the Kansas Legislature, and giving peace to that distracted Territory; and that the Black Republicans in the House refused to vote for it!

The Globe.

WILLIAM LEWIS,

PERSEVERE.

Editor and Proprietor.

VOL. XII.

HUNTINGDON, PA., OCTOBER 1, 1856.

NO. 15.

Fremont's Two Faces.

The distinguished mule candidate for the Presidency appears, from good testimony, to be very easy in his religious opinions, and not at all scrupulous about turning them to his political advantage. If he were not a candidate for the Presidency and a "fighting man," we should pronounce him a dishonest scoundrel better deserving of a good cowhiding than the Presidential office. But we will submit the matter to the judgment of his friends—that is, to that portion of them who are not entirely demoralized by grasshopper pie and Mariposa glitter.

Mr. B. F. Cook, a respectable and well known merchant of New York, called on FREMONT to ascertain from himself something reliable in regard to his religion. What took place between them Mr. Cook relates as follows: Some friends having desired to enlist the speaker (Mr. Cook) in the cause of so-called Republicanism, he expressed a desire to have all doubts removed on this mooted question; (Col. Fremont's alleged catholicism;) but said that nothing short of an assurance from Col. Fremont's own lips would satisfy him.—An interview was arranged for. The object of the visit being understood by the Colonel, he avowed himself ready to answer any questions proposed. Mr. Cook proposed the following, and received to each the answer annexed:—"Were you married by a Roman Catholic priest?"—"I was," the Colonel's lip quivering as he spoke. "Did you at the time believe in, or profess to believe in, the Roman Catholic religion?"—"I did not."

"Have you before or since, or at any time professed the Catholic religion?"—"I have not." Here Mr. Cook bowed, to signify that he had no more questions to ask. Col. Fremont then volunteered some remarks to the following effect:—that whilst in California he attended no church, and that he occupied his Sunday in reading and writing, and attending to such matters of business as he thought of importance. Mr. Fremont further said—"I am frequently interrogated by all parties on this subject. I presume the delegation now waiting for me up stairs wish to interrogate me on this point.—When they do I shall put the most favorable construction on the matter that I can. I wish to offend none, but to secure the votes of all. Why this very morning I have a letter from Maine, saying that unless I make a personal denial of Romanism, and that I am or have been a Roman Catholic, that State will be lost to the Republicans; and another letter from Indiana, telling me that if I will authorize my friends there to say I am a Roman Catholic, they can secure me a large German and Irish vote. I have to frame my replies so as to secure the votes of all. There is now a deputation waiting for me, whose errand I doubt not is the same. It is best to say as little about this matter as possible, and we must manage the thing as well as we can, so as to get the votes of both sides."—Here the interview terminated.

The Struggle between Truth and Falsehood.

The fundamental issue between democracy and republicanism is a contest between truth and falsehood. Republicanism was the offspring of a falsehood, and its whole power consists in the success with which in the vigor of its youth and early manhood it maintained the combat with truth. The final result of the conflict is as certain as that "truth is mighty and will prevail." It is a mere question of time when the victory will be consummated. As to the triumph, sooner or later, there can be no doubt. Republicanism owes its origin and its strength to the assumption that the repeal of the Missouri restriction by the passage of the Kansas bill was a measure for the extension of slavery. This assumption was false in its original inception, has been false every time it has been repeated, and is as false now as it ever was. When first announced, the falsehood found ready evener in the anti-slavery feelings and sentiments of northern men, and every possible device has since been resorted to by unscrupulous demagogues to keep up the delusion. During the last two years no republican speaker or journalist has discussed the Kansas bill without building his arguments upon the false assertion that it was a pro-slavery measure, and without drawing his conclusions from these false premises. Truth was crushed down in the first conflict with this falsehood, but it was not subdued, and never can be made to surrender. It renewed the contest upon the earliest opportunity, and has since constantly maintained itself in the field, gradually but surely growing in strength, until it brought its foe to the issue which is now pending, and which is to prove that "truth crushed to earth will rise again."

In the present great conflict between truth and falsehood, the success of the democracy, depends upon the establishment in the northern mind of a single proposition—and that is, that the friends of the Kansas bill did not pass it and do not advocate it as a measure for the extension of slavery, but as a measure to enable the people of Kansas to decide for themselves whether it should be free or slave territory. The moment this proposition is established, republicanism ceases to have vitality and the triumph of truth is complete. There are, comparatively, few at this day who dispute the abstract principle that the people of every political community ought to exercise the privilege of determining the character of their own local institutions.—The very fact that there are any who controvert this principle only proves that the progress of truth, although sure, is frequently slow in eradicating falsehood. Because the democracy were overwhelmed in 1854, upon the assumption that they were advocating the Kansas bill as a pro-slavery measure, it does not follow that that assumption was truthful. The time was when it was rank heresy to maintain that the people have any right to

govern themselves. The advocates of "the divine right of kings" resorted to every shift, whether by argument or force, to crush out the idea of popular self-government—just as the republicans are now laboring to defeat the application of the same idea in Kansas. Truth, however, was finally an overmatch for falsehood in the former struggle, as it certainly will be in the latter.

What we have said indicates distinctly the paramount duty of every democrat in the pending issue—that duty is to undeceive the northern mind in regard to the true character and object of the Kansas law. It is not true that the extension of slavery was the intent of the bill, but it is true that it was intended to promote the perfect equality of the States by securing to the citizens of each and all the rights of citizenry in the Territory, and, when thus settled, to determine for themselves whether slavery should or should not exist.—This is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as to the Kansas issue.—Whenever, or wherever, or by whomsoever, a different object is attributed to the bill, the truth of the case is violated. It is alike true that the measure was supported by men who desire to see slavery in Kansas, and by men who desire to see the Territory a free State; it is also alike true that some pro-slavery men expected the measure to be followed by the establishment of slavery, and that anti-slavery men expected it to be followed by the exclusion of slavery; but these conflicting divisions and expectations were compromised by agreeing that the natural law of peaceful and spontaneous immigration should decide between them, and that it should be either a free or a slave State, as this law should decide. The fact ought not to be forgotten, that whilst a majority of the supporters of the bill were pro-slavery men in Congress, many of them frankly and expressly declared that they supported it with the conviction that the natural law of emigration would make the Territory free. This conviction was based upon another fact, which shows that the compromise was not favorable to the wishes of the pro-slavery men—that fact is, that the anti-slavery portion of our population constitutes a large majority, and of consequence the natural law of immigration would give them a decided advantage in the decision of the character of the domestic institutions of Kansas. To secure a recognition of the perfect equality of the Southern States, and to remove an agitating subject out of Congress, the pro-slavery men were willing to concede to the anti-slavery the advantage which the natural law of immigration gave them, and to admit Kansas as a free or slave State, as this law should decide.

That the Kansas bill was a pro-slavery measure will be apparent upon a simple statement of the case. The Southern States, being the minority, claimed to be entitled, under the constitution, to equal privileges with the Northern States, the majority, in Kansas, which is common property. To settle the dispute, the minority proposed to the majority that the question should not be settled by Congress, but that the matter should be submitted to the inhabitants of their respective sections to go or not to go to Kansas, as they pleased, and that, when as many as choose to go should be settled there, a majority of them should decide either to recognize or to exclude slavery, as they might deem best. The question is, was this a pro-slavery proposition?—It was so far from it that it was a proposition of the minority to abide by a decision when the probable result would be that that decision would be on the side of the majority. There were far more anti-slavery men than pro-slavery men, and far more of the former than of the latter, likely, under the operation of the natural law of emigration, to settle in Kansas. It is absurd, therefore, to assume that the Kansas law, which does no more than carry out this proposition, was a pro-slavery measure.—Washington Union.

Practical Illustration of their Sentiments.

A few days since, at a political meeting in Brookville, Jefferson county, there was given a practical illustration of the prevailing sentiment of the "Remonters," which is bluntly stated in the words "Down with the foreigner, and up with the nigger." A German named Schmidt, a quiet, orderly citizen, in some remarks made in the crowd, gave offense to a big burly negro, who, urged on by his Fremont friends, fell upon the German and beat him terribly. The German's friends, being overpowered by the superior number of Abolitionists on hand, were unable to rescue him until he was much hurt, but remonstrated loudly against the commission of the act, and to his astonishment—against the will of the people—in territory now free; believe in the compact made in the formation of the General Government, and are disposed as honorable men to carry the same out in good faith, in a manner that shall be in accordance with the original contract, and in justice to both master and slave; unwilling to meddle with an institution in the hands of a Being "who is too wise to err, and too good to be kind," having full confidence in the number, energy and ability of the Northern citizens to make their way into the Territories of the West, and secure for themselves and their descendants homes upon free territory if they choose—believing that if left alone the institution of slavery will, in such time as God pleases, come to a peaceful end; that all the soil and climate unsuited to slave labor must naturally be free, and that if no measures had been taken by the North to force emigrants into Kansas, advances for the purpose of securing it for freedom, that Northern settlers would have gone into the Territory quietly, peaceably and unmolested, as in Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin and Iowa, and this day peace would have reigned, instead of war, bloodshed, and the fire of the incendiary. So it has been in Nebraska, so would it have been in Kansas.

The Rev. Mr. Nute of Lawrence, Kansas, says in a letter to the Springfield Republican, dated Aug. 22:—We are now having war in earnest—four fights within the last five days, in all of which the free state men were the assailants, and the victors.

Mark this admission—in all these fights, the free state men were the assailants, says this Rev. warhawk and abettor of treason and bloodshed.

From the N. Y. Daily News. Gen. Jackson and Col. Fremont.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-TWO AND EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN.

The great contest between the North and South, growing out of free trade on the one hand, and a protective tariff on the other, which threatened for a time the destruction of the Confederacy, is subject fresh in the minds of very many of our citizens, and reminds the wisdom and patriotism of the best men in the nation to preserve the Union unharmed. Such was the excitement in both sections that angry feelings took the place of calm reflection, and madness displayed itself in preparation for mortal combat. The rapid tread of the soldier warned the friends of liberty that an awful future awaited them; darkness covered the land, and the friends of self-government at home and abroad were sad.

Such was the position of America in the winter of 1832-3, when a Jackson with the sword in his right hand and the olive branch in his left, spoke in a voice of thunder to the troubled sea, and commanded it to be still.—"Come, let us reason together," was his language; "let no brother raise his arm in anger against his brother; let us be just and we shall be generous; let us meet together as friends and be brothers still. The sword of justice must continue uplifted, but the olive branch is presented for your acceptance." Henry Clay—a name dear to America—came forward with a sacrifice acceptable to all, and in a moment the winds of strife ceased to blow, and the troubled sea was at rest. Such was the dark cloud that hung over us in 1832, and it is well for us to review the past, for by it we gain instruction more valuable than fine gold. In this trying period Andrew Jackson occupied the Presidential chair—a man elected upon a platform covering the whole Union, having received a majority of the electoral votes in the States both North and South—representing within himself the interests of each portion of the Union, knowing no North, no South, no East, no West—being, in the language of the red man, the "great father" of us all.

How will it be with us in 1857, should we have a President sectional in his feelings, representing and pledged to carry out a principle against the expressed will of a large majority of the citizens of the United States, and in direct opposition to the unanimous wish of the other fifteen States? Having the votes which may elect the one with a moiety over one-third of the suffrages—under these circumstances, and not being a candidate South, it is possible we may have a President elected by not exceeding one-fourth of the votes cast for that high office in the United States, a contingency never contemplated by the framers of the Constitution.

What will our position should the great question which now agitates the country, over-riding all others, be brought before Chief Magistrate for action?—a nullification, for instance, presented itself before President Jackson in 1832? Whom can the nation look to, in that hour of trial, to quiet the raging tempest? Will it be the man elected by a section of the Union, pledged to carry out measures directly hostile to the opposition section, pressed on by an army of wild fanatics crying and hooting for the blood of their enemies, offering up prayers for more men and rifles? And what great principle is to be settled by the war now raging? Is slavery to be abolished? No, at all—none but the insane can be found to advance such a doctrine, being against reason and common sense. If to oppose the principle, that question already settled in the mind of every Northern man. What, then, is the true issue between a section North and the South? It may be answered simply—the people occupying the territories of the United States have the right of making their own laws, to decide by ballot for a State Government, with or without slavery, giving to the Territories of the United States the same rights now possessed by each sovereign State of the Union.

The great Democratic principle has always been to leave all power in the hands of the people in their sovereign capacity, not otherwise delegated to the General Government, and in this power is contained the right to enact laws not inconsistent with the laws of Congress. Democrats are in favor of Free Speech, a Free Press and a right to make their own laws; all opposed to slavery in principle, and to its extension—against the will of the people—in territory now free; believe in the compact made in the formation of the General Government, and are disposed as honorable men to carry the same out in good faith, in a manner that shall be in accordance with the original contract, and in justice to both master and slave; unwilling to meddle with an institution in the hands of a Being "who is too wise to err, and too good to be kind," having full confidence in the number, energy and ability of the Northern citizens to make their way into the Territories of the West, and secure for themselves and their descendants homes upon free territory if they choose—believing that if left alone the institution of slavery will, in such time as God pleases, come to a peaceful end; that all the soil and climate unsuited to slave labor must naturally be free, and that if no measures had been taken by the North to force emigrants into Kansas, advances for the purpose of securing it for freedom, that Northern settlers would have gone into the Territory quietly, peaceably and unmolested, as in Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin and Iowa, and this day peace would have reigned, instead of war, bloodshed, and the fire of the incendiary. So it has been in Nebraska, so would it have been in Kansas.

The notorious "Ned Buntline" has been making Fremont speeches at Williamsport and Jersey shore. All that class of desperate adventurers have left the sinking ship of Know Nothingism and taken to the trade in negro sentimentalism.

Kansas Affairs.

Inaugural Address

OF

JOHN W. GEARY,

Governor of Kansas Territory.

DELIVERED AT LEICOMPTON, SEPTEMBER 11, 1856.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—I appear among you a stranger to most of you, and for the first time have the honor to address you as Governor of the Territory of Kansas. The position was not sought by me; but was voluntarily tendered by the chief magistrate of the nation. As an American citizen, deeply conscious of the blessings which ever flow from our beloved Union, I did not consider myself at liberty to shrink from any duties, however delicate and onerous, required of me by my country. With a full knowledge of all the circumstances surrounding the executive office, I have deliberately accepted it, and as God may give me strength and ability, I will endeavor faithfully to discharge its varied requirements. When received my commission I was solemnly sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and to discharge my duties as Governor of Kansas with fidelity. By reference to the act for the organization of this Territory, passed by Congress on the 30th day of March, 1854, I find my duties more particularly defined. Among other things, I am "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

The Constitution of the United States and the Organic Law of this Territory will be the lights by which I will be guided in my executive career. A careful and dispassionate examination of our Organic Act will satisfy any reasonable person that its provisions are eminently just and beneficial. If this Act has been distorted to unworthy purposes, it is not the fault of its provisions. The great leading feature of that Act is the right therein conferred upon the actual and bona fide inhabitants of this Territory "in the exercise of self-government, to determine for themselves what shall be their own domestic institutions, subject, only to the Constitution and the laws duly enacted by Congress, under it." The people, accustomed to self-government in the States from whence they came, and having removed to this territory with the bona fide intention of making it their future residence, were supposed to be capable of creating their own municipal government, and to be the best judges of their own local necessities and institutions. This is what is termed "popular sovereignty." By this phrase we simply mean the right of the majority of the people qualified electors, to legislate, to make laws, and to make their own municipal laws. Thus understood, this doctrine underlies the whole system of republican government. It is the great right of self-government, for the establishment of which our ancestors, in the stormy days of the revolution, pledged "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor."

A doctrine so eminently just should receive the willing homage of every American citizen. When legitimately expressed, and duly associated, the will of the majority must be the imperative rule of civil action for every law-abiding citizen. This simple, just rule of action, has brought order out of chaos, and by a progress unparalleled in the history of the world, has made a few feeble infant colonies a giant confederated republic. No man, conversant with the state of affairs now in Kansas, can close his eyes to the fact that much civil disturbance has for a long time past existed in this territory. Various reasons have been assigned for this unfortunate condition of affairs, and numerous remedies have been proposed. The House of Representatives of the United States have ignored the claims of both gentlemen claiming the legal right to represent the people of this territory in that body. The Topeka Constitution, recognized by the House, has been repudiated by the Senate. Various measures, each in the opinion of its respective advocates, suggestive of peace to Kansas, have been formally proposed, and rejected. Men outside of the territory, in various sections of the Union, influenced by reasons best known by themselves, have endeavored to stir up internal strife, and to array brother against brother.

In this conflict of opinion, and for the promotion of the most unworthy purposes, Kansas is left to suffer, her people to mourn, and her prosperity is endangered. Is there no remedy for these evils? Cannot the wounds of Kansas be healed and peace be restored to all her borders? Men of the North—men of the South—of the East and of the West, in Kansas—you, and you alone, have the remedy in your own hands. Will you not suspend fratricidal strife? Will you not cease to regard each other as enemies, and look upon one another as the children of a common mother, and come and reason together? Let us banish all outside influences from our deliberations, and assemble around our council board with the Constitution of our country and the Organic Law of this Territory as our great charters for our guidance and direction. The bona fide inhabitants of this Territory alone are charged with the solemn duty of enacting her laws, upholding her government, maintaining peace, and laying the foundation for a future commonwealth.

On this point let there be a perfect unity of sentiment. It is the first great step towards the attainment of peace. It will inspire confidence amongst ourselves, and insure the respect of the whole country. Let us show ourselves worthy and capable of self-government. Do not the inhabitants of this territory better understand what domestic institutions are suited to their condition—what laws will be most conducive to their prosperity and happiness—than the citizens of distant, or even neighboring States? This great right of regulating our own affairs and attending to our own business, without any interference from others, has been guaranteed to us by the law which Congress has made for the organization of this territory. This right of self-gov-

ernment—this privilege guaranteed to us by the organic law of our territory, I will uphold with all my might, and with the entire power committed to me.

In relation to any changes of the laws of the territory which I may deem desirable, I have no occasion now to speak; but these are subjects to which I shall direct public attention at the proper time.

The territory of the United States is the common property of the several states, or of the people thereof. This being so, no obstacle should be interposed to the free settlement of this common property while in a territorial condition.

I cheerfully admit that the people of this territory, under the Organic Act, have the absolute right of making their municipal laws, and from citizens who deem themselves aggrieved by recent legislation, I would invoke the utmost forbearance, and point out to them a sure and peaceable remedy. You have the right to ask the next legislature to revise any act, laws, and in the meantime, as you value the peace of the territory and the maintenance of future laws, I would earnestly ask you to refrain from all violations of the present statutes.

I am sure that there is patriotism sufficient in the people of Kansas to lend a willing obedience to law. All the provisions of the Constitution of the United States must be sacredly observed—all the acts of Congress having reference to this territory, must be unhesitatingly obeyed, and the decisions of our courts respected. It will be my imperative duty to see that these suggestions are carried into effect. In my official action here, I will do justice at all hazards. Influenced by no other considerations than the welfare of the whole people of this territory, I desire to know no party, no section, no North, no South, no East, no West; nothing but Kansas and my country.

Fully conscious of my great responsibilities in the present condition of things in Kansas, I must invoke your aid, and solicit your generous forbearance. Your executive officer can do little without the aid of the people.—With a firm reliance upon Divine Providence to the best of my ability, I shall promote the interests of the citizens of the territory, not merely collectively, but individually; and I shall expect from them in return that cordial aid and support without which the government of no state or territory can be administered with beneficial effect.

Let us all begin anew. Let the past be buried in oblivion. Let all strife and bitterness cease. Let us all honestly devote ourselves to the true interests of Kansas—develop her rich agricultural and mineral resources—build up manufacturing enterprises—make public roads and highways—prepare amply for the education of our children—devote ourselves to all the arts of peace—and make our territory the sanctuary of those cherished principles which protect the inalienable rights of the individual, and elevate states in their sovereign capacities. Then shall peaceful industry soon be restored—population and wealth will flow upon us "as the dew on the rose"—and the state of Kansas will soon be admitted into the Union the peer and rival of her elder sisters. JOHN W. GEARY.

PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS: A large number of volunteer militia have been called into the service of the territory of Kansas, by authority of the late acting Governor, for the maintenance of order, many of whom have been taken from their occupations or business, and deprived of their ordinary means of support and of their domestic attachments, and have not authorized by any law of the United States, General Government, except upon requisition of the commander of the military department in which Kansas is embraced;

WHEREAS: An authorized regular force has been placed at my disposal sufficient to insure the execution of the laws that may be obstructed by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings; and

WHEREAS: I, JOHN W. GEARY, Governor of the Territory of Kansas, do issue this my proclamation, declaring that the services of such volunteer militia are no longer required; and hereby order that they be immediately discharged. The Secretary and the Adjutant General of the Territory will muster out of service each command at its place of rendezvous.

And I command all hodies of men, combined, armed and equipped with munitions of war, without authority, to disband, and instantly to disband or quit the Territory, as they will answer the contrary at their peril.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and affixed the seal of the Territory of Kansas. Done at Leicomspton, this eleventh day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six. JOHN W. GEARY, Governor of Kansas, DANIEL WOODSON, Secretary.

PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS: It is the true policy of every State or Territory, to be prepared for any emergency that may arise from internal dissension or foreign invasion;

Therefore, I, John W. Geary, Governor of the Territory of Kansas, do issue this my Proclamation, ordering all free male citizens, qualified to bear arms, between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years, to enroll themselves, in accordance with the act to organize the militia of the Territory, and they may be completely organized by companies, regiments, brigades or divisions, and hold themselves in readiness, to be mustered, by my order, into the service of the United States, upon requisition of the commander of the military department in which Kansas is embraced, for the suppression of all combinations to resist the laws, and for the maintenance of public order and civil government.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the Territory of Kansas. Done at Leicomspton, this eleventh day of September, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-six. JOHN W. GEARY, Governor, DANIEL WOODSON, Secretary.

In accordance with the foregoing Proclamation, the commanding officers will take notice, and in compliance therewith report their enrollments and organization to me at my office at Leicomspton, on or before the first day of October next.

By order of the Governor, H. J. STRICKLER, Adjutant General, Leicomspton, Sept. 11, 1856.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON.—This eminent statesman is reported to have uttered the following words, a short time previous to his death: "To break this Union would break my heart."

Let us pause and ponder upon these remarkable words, and determine that the Union shall be preserved until time shall be no more.