

TERMS OF THE GLOBE.

Per annum in advance.....\$1 50  
 For 3 months..... 75  
 For 6 months..... 1 00  
 For 9 months..... 1 25  
 For 12 months..... 1 50  
 A failure to notify a discontinuance at the expiration of the term subscribed for will be considered a new engagement.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

1 insertion..... 2 do. 3 do.  
 Four lines or less.....\$ 25.....\$ 37 1/2.....\$ 50  
 One square (12 lines)..... 50..... 75..... 1 00  
 Two squares..... 1 00..... 1 50..... 2 00  
 Three squares..... 1 50..... 2 25..... 3 00  
 Over three weeks and less than three months, 25 cents per square for each insertion.  
 3 months: 6 months: 12 months:  
 Six lines or less.....\$1 50.....\$3 00.....\$5 00  
 One square..... 3 00..... 5 00..... 7 00  
 Two squares..... 5 00..... 8 00..... 10 00  
 Three squares..... 7 00..... 10 00..... 15 00  
 Four squares..... 9 00..... 13 00..... 20 00  
 Half a column..... 12 00..... 16 00..... 24 00  
 One column..... 20 00..... 30 00..... 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.

SPEECH OF WM. A. STOKES, Esq.,  
 In the Democratic State Convention, at Harrisburg, March 5, 1858.

Mr. STOKES rose and spoke as follows: Mr. President: I have listened with great pleasure to the remarks that have been made by my friend from Schuylkill, [Mr. Hughes] but I confess that I regret the mistake which he made as to the resolutions which I modified so far as the language was concerned.— I refer to the resolutions which I had the honor to submit this morning. I thought I stated, at the time, so explicitly as to admit of no mistake, that supposing from the outrageous and tyrannical tone assumed yesterday by the majority of the Convention, that we had determined to meet their defiance in a tone equally defiant. But, finding that maintaining, as they do, the position upon which they stand, they have expressed themselves, nevertheless, in terms of proper mildness. I thought it fit and decent, in order, if possible, that we might come together to make these modifications—or, if this were impossible, that at least there might be some perfectly good feeling among us all—I thought it fit and proper that I should take my resolutions from the desk of the Secretary, and strike from them any expressions which, by possibility, could be construed into unnecessary harshness. And this, sir, shows the kindness which I intended to exercise. I know now that people must obtain a reward from their own consciences for doing kind acts—[laughter]—a reward which must always come from consciences that have exercised a spirit of charity and kindness, such as I have shown in this matter.— [Renewed laughter.] And wish that I am quite satisfied.

Now, sir, there is no use in attempting to conceal the fact that the position of the Democratic party, to-day, is a position of great difficulty and danger. And those who are in difficulty and danger can escape only by the exercise of prudence and wisdom. I suggest, therefore, to the majority of the Convention, that although they have unquestionably the power to do what they see fit, yet I see plainly they will place the party in such a position that they are bound to anticipate the most serious consequences. They may triumph temporarily over the feeble minority to which I belong, yet I submit they should consider well the rights of that minority. They should feel and know that upon a union of all the elements composing the great Democratic party of Pennsylvania depends the union of the Democratic party of the Confederacy, and upon the union of the latter depends the maintenance and perpetuation of the rights of man—a result which far outweighs any paltry considerations involved in any mere temporary triumph. The majority may for a time triumph by the brute force of numbers indiscriminately applied in this case, or directed by the passions or interests of those who vote. But the triumph will in the end be a barren one, and it may lead to most disastrous consequences, to results now the least anticipated. I warn them to beware. Let them pause ere it be too late to pause.

But let us look calmly to these matters.— Let us recollect that we are brethren; let us not forget that we shall have by-and-by to meet our common foe in arms. We should therefore do nothing, the tendency of which might be to impair the power of the Democratic party—its usefulness to the Constitution, and the Union, and to mankind.— Should hasty action or ill-advised counsels prevail, we might have to regret it most deeply. We might in the future be overwhelmed and disgraced, by consequences of such action, or the prevalence of such counsels. We are not to consider ourselves as enemies or antagonists, but as members of the same great Democratic family; as having differed in opinion upon one question only, and as still bound together by charity and kindness towards each other, and the desire for a common triumph over a common foe! A union thus based and cemented will crown our efforts with success and victory.

Mr. President, this is the first Convention in which I was ever a delegate, or which I ever saw; and, sir, I assure you it will be the last. [Much applause.] Long retired from politics, I was in Washington, on the night of the 3d of July, 1856, and attended the Senate of the United States on the occasion of the great debate of the session. The question involved in that debate was whether Congress had a right to make laws for the government of the people of the Territory of Kansas. In favor of that proposition were all the Black Republicans, and against it all the Democrats of the Senate. I come here now, sir, and find in favor of Congress having the power to make the laws for the government of the Territory all the opposition in the Convention. Sir, I find in the speech delivered from that chair (pointing to the president) the very position assumed by the Republicans in the Senate of the United States; that, sir, is the position you assumed in your inaugural address. [Laughter and great applause.]

Now, sir, I intend to answer you. I stoop not to a meaner foe! [Sensation and applause.] If I understand the position which is taken here—and I state it in this broad and general way, because we have no time for minute discussion—it is, sir, that Congress shall, by the irresponsible exercise of its power, for the sake of a mere temporary expediency, interfere with the rights of the people of Kansas. What, sir, is proposed to be done by the acceptance of this Lecompton Constitution by Congress? It is proposed to drag Kansas into the Union contrary to the will of a majority of her people, and to add to the act admitting her a condition precedent—a condition by which the honor and vitality of this Constitution is affected. The condition proposed, if inserted by Congress, according to the arguments of a portion of the Convention, becomes a portion of the instrument itself, having as much validity as any part thereof. Is not this Congressional legislation in regard to the rights of the people of the Territory?—

# The Globe.

WILLIAM LEWIS,

—PERSEVERE—

Editor and Proprietor.

VOL. XIII.

HUNTINGDON, PA., MARCH 24, 1858.

NO. 40.

Is it not a flagrant constitutional usurpation; intervention in its worst form?

Why, sir, the doctrine of the majority here to-day is the very doctrine advanced by Messrs. Seward and Hale, and all the other Republicans of the Senate of the United States, upon the memorable occasion I have referred to, and combated by Senators Mason, Douglas, and all the Democrats of that body.

[Here Mr. Hughes interrupted him, by asking if he meant to assert that the doctrines of Hale and Seward were those of the majority here to-day?]

Mr. Stokes, resuming. I mean to assert that the majority of the Senate at that time, and the majority of this body now have reversed positions upon this question.

Mr. Hughes. "Is not the gentleman mistaken?"

I may be mistaken in the application.— But I must confess that to my mind the idea that their positions are identical is inconceivable. It may not be an unenviable position for the majority here to occupy, but I cannot see how they can escape from it.

Sir, after going home, I considered the subject involved in that great discussion was a very serious matter; not because it involved any very considerable number of persons, but because it touches the great right of the people to make the laws under which they lived. Although long retired from politics, I did not rest; I felt myself impelled to take the stump and explain to my fellow citizens the nature of our Government, at the very bottom of which lies the great principle that "man is capable of self-government"—that he has a right to govern himself.

The assertion of this principle by the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, and its denial by the Republicans, constituted the basis upon which the campaign of 1856 was fought in this State. Upon that position we elected Mr. Buchanan; and upon it, sir, I stand this afternoon [Tremendous applause.] Talk about men! Why, James Buchanan was born but seventy years ago; and he may die to-morrow. Sir, in a few years every man in this room may be in his grave; but this principle, committed to our keeping, is to live or to die. As for me, sir, by no act of mine, either in 1856, when I assisted to elect James Buchanan, or by any act of mine in 1858, will I do anything to falsify my principles, or the consistency by which I have ever professed to be governed from that time to the present day. Sir, the gentlemen here opposed to us claim to be the particular friends of James Buchanan, but when I look around me, in this Convention, I find but two gentlemen who were his friends twenty years ago, besides myself. I supported him then with all the strength and power which nature had bestowed upon me. Who, Mr. President, are the real friends of Mr. Buchanan? Those who, like myself, twenty years ago, took an active part in the support of his claims? I see before me the gentleman from Venango, (Mr. Plumer,) who then with me, fought for the favorite son of Pennsylvania. He, with my friend from Somerset, (Mr. Hughes,) and myself, if any, may justly claim to be the particular friends of Mr. Buchanan. What is it Mr. Buchanan expects at the hands of those who have ever been his friends? Not a departure from what they conscientiously believe to be right and just, in order to sustain his course on any particular question; but frankness and candor. I hesitate not to say that he himself heartily despises the men who make false professions of their support to his Administration. Sir, in the reign of George III, when a party—or rather a faction—sprang up, having an existence only in deference to the will of the reigning monarch, the Whigs and Tories, the regularly organized parties of England, recognized them not as the embodiment of a political principle. They were known by the name of—"the King's friends." Thus they were called, they were the most wretched men that ever cringed and fawned at the footstool of power, to eat the crumbs that fell from their master's table. [Applause.] History has recorded the past; past ages inform the present; but no meaner or more despicable race have ever disgraced any age, if history or experience is to be trusted. And I know, sir, of no parallel more fitting or complete to the history and actions of the "King's friends" in the reign of George III, than that which is furnished by the conduct of those who style themselves the "peculiar friends of James Buchanan." [Im-mense applause.] If there is anything I despise more than all other things, it is this despicable man-worship. [Applause.] Sir, when you enunciated from that chair [pointing to it] the doctrine you did yesterday—when you gave us to understand contrary to the usage of presiding officers, who are supposed to be impartial as to the matters to be discussed—I say, when you gave us to understand that Congress, as a matter of expediency, might make laws to bind the Territories, did it not strike you that "all just powers derive their authority from the consent of the government; that when you declared that the actual will of the people of Kansas should be set aside, and disregarded upon a mere pettifogging technical, and petty nation of the preservation of a right, and that Congress shall have the power to impose laws upon Kansas, without the consent of its people, did it not occur to you, that in that very chair in which you are now sitting, John Hancock signed the Declaration of Independence, and declared to his competers the radical principle of the Revolution—that which gave birth to the Revolution—which enables us to assemble here to-day—"that all Government derive their just power from the consent of the governed;" that there can be no just Government except what is derived from the consent of the governed? [Great sensation and applause.]

Mr. President, let me draw your attention to this fact—and trust the inspiration of the last two days, derived from the occupation of the chair, may enable you to correct the error into which you temporarily and unguardedly fell. [A laugh.] But the true friends of James Buchanan are those who will tell him the truth. The position of the President renders it very hard and difficult

ever surrounded by parasites and flatterers, and its ear is slow in hearing the voice of the people. There are two classes who visit the President—those who desire favors and those who go merely to pay their respects to him. The first class go to him to lie, and the last class say nothing. They only are the true friends of James Buchanan who tell him the truth. And I tell you, sir, that if the Convention has magnanimity enough to elevate itself above the temporary position they hold, and speak as members of the Democratic party, and speak for the truth and the right, their voice would be heard at Washington, and listened to with the profoundest attention.

Mr. Stinson, of Lancaster, called the gentleman to order for reflections on the character of the body of which he was a member, as it was contrary to parliamentary usage.

Mr. Stokes resumed. Am I to suppose the Convention to be immaculate? [Applause.] The Convention, sir, may be immaculate, but I am certain the members are not. [Loud laughter.] I say, sir, if the members of the Convention could have elevated themselves beyond their temporary position, and have spoken plainly to Mr. Buchanan, their voices would have reached his ears in unmistakable tones, and my word for it, after ages would have assigned his name a much higher position upon their records, had he listened to the truth, than they will, should he deluded by this Convention telling him that it speaks the voice of Pennsylvania—continue on in the course of policy he seems now to have chosen. I believe that if the members of this convention would speak in the tones in which the people of Pennsylvania would have spoken, if assembled together, they would declare most emphatically that a continuous fraud has been practised upon the people of Kansas which had its consummation in this Lecompton Constitution. Sir, I despise chicanery and deceit, and would be the last man to impose upon James Buchanan in relation to Kansas, or any other question.

Mr. President, I have been at Washington twice. I had not yet, read myself out of the party, [laughter,] and when in that city I did not go near him, just because I did not choose to go near him, and thus add to the number of those who are ever annoying him. Now, sir, let us look at this matter in a quiet, calm and dispassionate manner, (and, gentlemen, you will, I trust, understand me to speak in the most perfect kindness, and with the utmost respect;) and permit me to say, with all respect to the gentleman from Lancaster, I said nothing of any human being at which he should take offence. Well, then, sir, what is the practical question before us?

Shall Kansas be admitted into the Union in accordance with the will of the majority of her people, or shall she be admitted contrary to their will? Shall the principles of the Kansas Nebraska act be sustained? Does any gentleman present pretend to say that the Lecompton Constitution embodies the expression of that will, or that it conforms to the declaration that "the people shall be left free to form their own institution in their own way?"

The thing is simply this: The Lecompton Constitution is presented to Congress for acceptance. It is supported by about 2,500 votes. On the other hand, more than 12,000 votes were given in January last, protesting against the admission of the Territory upon the basis of that Constitution. Now, the fact is, that the 2,500 persons of that Territory who say they wish to come into the Union, and the 12,000 who do not, all declare that the matter of settling their own institutions belongs to themselves. In this, they all most heartily concur. To seek, then, to thrust into that Constitution, by the action of Congress, a provision which would be nugatory from the beginning—and all the people of the Territory would so regard it—would be a flagrant example of Congressional intervention and usurpation. In the face of so plain an expression of the popular will, ought Congress to impose the provisions of that instrument upon the people of Kansas as their organic law? The whole thing should be left exclusively to the people, untrammelled in their action by fraud, force, or intervention.

Now, sir, this proposition contains in itself its own argument. It is a plain and simple matter leaving it in that way, for, after all, these should be so simplified as to be understood by all; and when you so elaborate and complicate them that they are not understood by the whole people, you are guilty of a fraud and wrong. Sir, if ever there were circumstances which will require the full exercise of the ingenuity and ability of my friend from Schuylkill, [Mr. Hughes,]—if ever there were considerations urging the strongest display of talent, to mystify and distract the popular mind upon a plain question, the fact of that exercise and display is fully shown in the various publications which have been made in defence of this Lecompton Constitution.

If they evoke a phantom in doing this which they cannot allay, I do not perceive either the justice or necessity of trying to drag the Democracy of Pennsylvania into its support.

More especially am I opposed to such an attempt because in asking us to do so, they ask us to violate and disregard the basis upon which we of Pennsylvania are in the habit of determining such questions. That basis is the will of the majority. If we, by our action here at home, determine every question in this plain way, why should we not recognize the fairness of the rule as applied to Kansas? It is an undeniable fact that five times as many refuse to be governed by the Lecompton Constitution as desire its adoption.

Is there greater validity in a Constitution which has not gone into operation than in one which has gone into operation? If the popular power is competent to declare, after a Constitution has been adopted and put into action, that it shall be abrogated and repealed, is not the same power fit to reject one framed but not adopted? Can it not say that it shall not be adopted? Is not that power which is sufficient to do a greater thing capable of doing a lesser? Now, sir, it appears to me clear that it is.

If, then, Kansas should, after its admission into the Union under a legitimate Constitution, think proper to alter that Constitution, the people have the power to do it; or, if they feel disposed to declare that they will not go for freedom there, they can do it. All regulations they can make in regard to the one thing they can make in relation to the other. Now, sir, if there is a power in the Legislature of Kansas to make a Constitution—to have one of their own creation—why, the right of rejection by a subsequent Territorial Legislature seems to be of equal validity.—They must fall or stand together.

There are provisions in the Constitution to which I beg to call the attention of the Convention. In the first place, sir, I do not see how we can very well adopt the Lecompton Constitution in the face of the Kansas-Nebraska act, because no man, according to it, would be eligible to be Governor, unless he had been a citizen of the State for twenty years. I object not to that; it is their right to make laws to suit themselves. But, sir, if we are going to adopt this Constitution, we had better say nothing to the Know-Nothings. [Laughter.] But the subject I was going to call your attention to (and I derive my authority from a very high source) is, that this Constitution was never adopted by the Convention. Sir, there is nothing, in the first place, in the proceedings of the Convention, or in the Constitution itself, whereby we are shown that the Constitution was ever adopted. In the second place, the people have never adopted it. The people, sir, were never allowed to vote on the adoption or rejection of the Constitution.

Again, Mr. President, let me call your attention to this clause. They were allowed to vote on the question of adopting a Constitution, with or without slavery. But its adoption or rejection, without that clause, is a question that the people never had presented to them. Here you have an instrument not adopted by the Convention that framed it—not adopted by the people for their Government. And this instrument, endorsed by neither, is to be made by the paramount power of Congress the law of the land for the people of that Territory for all time to come. Sir, it follows that, not having been adopted by the Convention—not having been adopted by the people, who never had the power of rejecting it, that if it is adopted, it will be by an act of Congress alone—an act directly interfering with the Kansas-Nebraska act, and against the rights of the people to self-government.

Now, Mr. President, I have just stated this proposition, not having time to elaborate it, and I call the attention of my professional brethren to the question. It does not allow of a denial. Sir, in their extreme anxiety to adopt the fraud, they have made their instrument invalid. But I object to this on another ground: the unquestionable Democratic ground; the ground that all Democrats acknowledge—the right of the people to pass upon all their domestic institutions, including slavery. So that they have the power to remove this in their own way, and not any law passed by Congress, or adopted by any other body, can prevent them. They can modify it according to their own judgment, in their own way, and at all times, provided the Lecompton fraud be not thrust down their own throats.

Now, Mr. President, the Lecompton Constitution denies this doctrine. It denies the right enjoyed by every State in the Union, because it puts the right of property in slaves before and higher than any constitutional sanction, and therefore her people are forbidden by the adoption of the Constitution to interfere with the rights of property in slaves.

Mr. Hughes, (interrupting.) I ask the question of the gentleman whether, under any constitutional form of Government in these United States, there is any right or power granted to take private property for public use?

Mr. Stokes. The gentleman is welcome to my answer. It is a distinction which has been drawn in every State in the Union where slavery has been abolished. Sir, there is a difference in the right of property in human beings; and in Pennsylvania that is the case, she having passed laws for gradual abolition of slavery; and so in every State where they have abolished slavery, except Massachusetts. Sir, I agree that the general proposition of the gentleman from Schuylkill (Mr. Hughes) is correct: but I deny its correctness as to a particular species of property. But, I say, it is a denial to Kansas of the right to do what we did, and what every free State of the Union has done—to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves.

Sir, I wish to call your attention to another point, and then I will pass as rapidly as I can. Now, my learned friend from Schuylkill has asked a question which is answered fully by the history of Pennsylvania, and of the Confederacy. There never has been an alteration of the Constitution in this State,

or any other of the Union—nor has any Territory been formed into a State and admitted into the Union without the consent fairly expressed of an overwhelmingly power majority of the inhabitants. The candor of my friend will admit that fact.

Mr. Hughes, (interrupting.) I would ask the gentleman if the amendments to the Constitution of Pennsylvania had not prevailed by less than one-third of her legal voters? Was not that such a majority of votes as is necessary by the political arrangements of this State to alter or amend its fundamental law?

Mr. Stokes replied. I would ask if the majority did not sustain them?

Mr. Hughes. A majority of the people of Kansas sanctioned the Lecompton Constitution just in the same way.

Mr. Stokes. Let me tell you that if the amendments to the Constitution last fall had been supported by 2,500 votes, and 12,000 votes had been cast against them, then the gentleman would have found a parallel case. I take issue with not only my learned friend from Schuylkill, for whom no man entertains a higher respect than I, but I take issue also with the law reported by the committee of thirteen, composed, I suppose, altogether of lawyers, but they have made an enormous legal blunder, I think. [Laughter.] Sir, I do not think, speaking as a lawyer, that the people of Kansas have the power—if the Lecompton Constitution be adopted by Congress, and it ever goes into effect—to alter any part of it until the year 1864. Why not, sir? Why, what is a Constitution? What force has it, unless it bind those whom it is intended to govern; unless its terms be complied with and obeyed?

I agree that there are cases, such as that of the Constitution of this State, in 1790, in which no specific mode for a change is pointed out in the instrument itself. In such cases, the Legislature of the State is the only body competent to take the initiatory steps to call a Convention to frame a Constitution. I admit such action is legal, and legal from the necessity of the case. But when there is a specific direction or limitation, you are bound by that. What is the use of making a plan, or Constitution, at all, if it does not bind?

After the highest power has passed upon a Constitution and adopted it in all its parts, can any but that sovereign power annul any provision it contains? Can even that power do it in any other way than that which it has voluntarily imposed upon itself? If it does, it resorts to revolution, and throws aside peaceful constitutional change. Mr. President, take the case of the constitutional amendments adopted in this State last fall. After two sessions of the Legislature have declared for a particular change, and it has been ratified by a majority vote, the Constitution is altered accordingly. But suppose it had not been so submitted, would not the people—would not you and I say that the Constitution had not been specifically followed? Would we not all agree in declaring that these amendments had no binding force because the specific mode pointed out in the Constitution for its own amendment had not been followed? So say I in regard to the Constitution of Kansas. There being a remedy, and the time fixed, and the specification made by the Constitution, they (the people of Kansas) are bound by these things, and there can be no change made until 1864.—Therefore, sir, I regard the proposed grant of authority for the alteration of the Constitution before the prescribed period as a snare and a delusion no palpable to deceive the most unwary. Those, therefore, who are ensnared by the delusion exhibited in the report of the committee of thirteen—and here is one of their mistakes I would not have made had I been on the committee, and which I have stated, not as a lawyer, but in the plainest possible manner—therefore, every man who hears me can understand it.

Again: all admit that the Lecompton Constitution should be changed. No one is so hardy as to risk his reputation in defence of the provisions it contains. If all, therefore, admit the allegation that it should be changed, such admission is proof positive that it ought to be changed. This very statement proves that it is not right, that its provisions are objectionable, and therefore that Congress ought not to force it upon Kansas. While your committee proposes a change, while they propose to insert a provision into the Constitution, giving the people the right to change the Constitution at pleasure, and not to wait until 1864—the Constitution itself, as it came from the hands of its makers, permits no such change. They, therefore, not only violate the true intent and meaning of the instrument, but they then advise you to accept of a Constitution containing provisions which are radically wrong. They advise you to do a wrong, and accept a bundle of wrongs, because the fraud may be cured and the wrongs righted, as they allege, in a short time. But, sir, how can you or your party go to the country upon such a record as that? Can you appeal successfully, as in past times, upon the purity and strength of Democratic principles? No, sir, the masses understand this question well. It has been thoroughly discussed, and they perceive at once the difference between the great principle which underlies this whole question, and the series of mere expediencies upon which the report of the committee is based.

Are we to steal our neighbor's horse, and after the wrong is accomplished endeavor to cure it? Had we better not steal the horse in the first place, so that no wrong will have been done which needs curing? This is precisely the condition of this question.—We had better commit no error in the first place, and then we shall have no need to rectify the injustice of the original act. Mr. President, I am heartily ashamed of myself. I have already occupied too much of your time. I must hasten on to a close. But there is a radical principle which overrides all questions of expediency. I think, sir, that principle is the right of the majority to rule, practically exhibited in popular governments, and I think the Democratic party is strong, and has achieved its past triumphs, not by studied expediency, but by principle; and I think the instant we abandon that glorious principle we are lost and

gone forever. Mr. President, I desire that, in coming as in past contests, we shall behold the success, the glorious triumph, of our flag; and therefore I am not to be controlled by your eloquence, much less seduced by it from the path which the clear convictions of duty and principle point out. [Applause.]

In regard to the first four propositions in the substitute for the report of the committee which I had the honor to submit, I would say they were taken from the works of Algernon Sydney; him whose head was cut off for advocating the principles of English liberty. And I am told that I am to have mine cut off. [Great laughter.]

Now, sir, we have changed the mode of doing these things. He was led to the scaffold in the light of day by the men of his time, they having the manliness to dispose of him in that way. But now, the descendants of those whose ancestors shed their blood for you and the freedom of our common country, are to have their heads cut off in a *meaneer* way. [Sensation and applause.] But, whatever may be the result, I am willing to live or die by that declaration of principles which our fathers proclaimed and endorsed as the great principles of liberty and justice—those principles whose fragrant incense are ever ascending to the throne of the Eternal Father. [Loud and enthusiastic applause.]

The Overland Route to California.

The disturbances in Utah have placed a serious obstacle in the way of the overland emigration to California, that has usually passed through the Salt Lake Valley. For the benefit and information of the public, we re-publish to-day in our columns an article from the Fort Smith (Ark.) Times, which gives some valuable information with regard to a direct and practicable route for the overland traveler. The statements made in the article copied below are vouched for in the Washington Union of March 4, by Hon. A. B. Greenwood, M. C. from Arkansas:

Nothing was known of the route from Albuquerque to San Francisco, on the 35th parallel, until 1853-4, when the intrepid traveler Aubrey found a road to Albuquerque, which he made from San Francisco to the latter place in about twenty-two days. His journal was published; and in 1854 he was killed in Santa Fe, in about half an hour after his arrival at that place. After his death no one attempted to find the route through until 1855, when Lieut. Whipple was sent out to survey a route for a railroad on the 35th parallel. His report was suppressed until a few months ago, and no one knew anything of the character of the country through which he passed, nor have his explorations been published so that the people of the United States could form an estimate of the country that he explored.

While things remained in this condition, the letter of Lieut. Beale, who had been sent out to explore and mark out the route on the 35th parallel, appeared in the newspapers, disclosing the fact that he had found a route and marked a wagon road from New Mexico to California. The country he describes as the most beautiful he ever beheld, and the road three hundred miles shorter from the western frontier than any other road across the continent. He says:

"You have thus, sir, in a few words, a short account of our journey on the road we were sent to explore. Of its advantages in detail I have not time in this letter to speak, except in general terms. I enumerate them. "It is the shortest from our western frontier by three hundred miles, being nearly directly west. It is the most level—our wagons only double-teaming once in the entire distance, and that at a short hill and over a surface heretofore unbroken by wheels or travel of any kind. It is well watered—our greatest distance without water at any time being twenty miles. It is well timbered, and in many places the growth is far beyond that of any part of the world I have ever seen. It is temperate in climate, passing for the most part over an elevated region. It is salubrious—not one of our party requiring the slightest medical attendance from the time of our leaving to our arrival. It is well grassed—my command never having made a bad grass camp during the entire distance, until near the Colorado. It crosses the Great Desert (which must be crossed by any road to California) as its narrowest point. It passes through a country abounding in game, and but little infested with Indians. On the entire road, until our arrival at the Mohave villages, we did not see in all over a dozen Indians, and those of a timid, inoffensive character. At the point of the crossing of the Colorado, grain, vegetables and breadstuffs may be obtained in any quantity from the Indians, who cultivate extensively, though rudely, the fertile bottom lands of the Colorado. It is possible alike in winter and summer.—These are the advantages which I claim for the road which we have discovered, marked and explored from New Mexico to this State.

"I mention one important fact, it leaves to the option of the emigrant the choice of entering California either at the city of Los Angeles, by the regularly traveled road in the most fertile part of the southern portion of the State, or turning off from that river, and by an easy road, frequently traveled, and coming into the head of the great Tulare valley, and by a good road through settlements all the way, extending to Stockton, Sacramento, and the more northern parts of the State.

"This road, being 300 miles the shortest, will undoubtedly be the road over which the overland mail will be carried. It must be so. The land, the grass, the wood and the water are all upon the 35th parallel, and the mail must go through this route. The population will soon follow, and what is now a wilderness will soon be 'bud and blossom as the rose.'"

THE TOOTHACHE.—"My dear friend," said H—, "I can cure your toothache in ten minutes."

"How? how?" I inquired. "Do it, in pity."

"Instantly," said he. "Have you any alum?"

"Yes."

"Bring it with some common salt."

"They were produced. My friend pulverized them, and mixed them in equal quantities, then wet a small piece of cotton, causing the mixed powder to adhere, and placed it in my hollow tooth."

"There," said he, "if that does not cure you I will forfeit my head. You may tell this to every one and publish it everywhere. The remedy is infallible."

It was as he predicted. On the introduction of the mixed alum and salt, I experienced a sensation of coldness which gradually subsided, and with it—the alum and salt—It cured the torment of the toothache.

Poetry should be an alterative, modern playwrights have converted it into a sedative, which they administer in such unreasonable quantities, that, like an overdose of opium, it makes one sick.