AMERICAN VOLUNTEER.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING BY
John B. Bratton.

TERMS.

SUBSCRIPTION.—One Dollar and Fifty Cents, paid in advance; Two Dollars if paid within the year; and Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, if not paid within the year. These terms will be rigidly adhered to in every instance. No subscription discontinued until all arrearages are paid unless at the option of the Editor.

ADVERTISEMENTS—Accompanied by the CASH, and not exceeding one square, will be inserted three times for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each additional insertion. Those of a greater length in proportion.

JOB-PRINTING—Such as Hand-bills, Posting-bills, Pamphlets, Blanks, Labels, &c., &c., executed with accuracy and at the shortest notice.

American Volunteer.

BY JOHN B. BRATTON. "OUR COUNTRY—MAY IT ALWAYS BE RIGHT—BUT RIGHT OR WRONG, OUR COUNTRY." AT $2,00 PER ANNUM.

VOL. 44. CARLISLE, PA., THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1858. NO. 45.

The Montgomery Amendment.

DISCUSSION IN THE SENATE.

Friday, April 2d, 1858, on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill to admit Kansas into the Union.

Remarks of Hon. Wm. Bigler.

MR. BIGLER. Mr. President, I am not prepared to vote on this question without first submitting a few remarks explanatory of the views which I entertain. I do not intend to delay the Senate by an attempt at an argument, at length, against the House amendment; I shall be content to state, very briefly, some of the points which I think involve conclusive objections to the measure.

In the first place, the adoption of this amendment involves an utter and violent abandonment of the doctrine of non-intervention. It presents the broad question, whether a doctrine which the party to which I belong have cherished; a doctrine which is found in the organic law of Kansas, and which was enunciated in the democrat platform at Cincinnati, is to be abandoned, and we are to look for some other system of legislation with regard to the Territories.

I had hoped, sir, when the wise men of the country, with Clay, and Webster, and Cass in the lead, presented and adopted this new mode of settling the slavery question—the enlarged and liberal doctrine that when the people of the Territories were prepared for admission as States, they should come in with or without slavery, as the constitution presented by them might provide at the time—it would have proven a finality. In the liberal doctrines maintained by the democratic party, that the people of the several States may go into the Territories with whatsoever property they possess, including slaves, and when there, and when about to organize a government, preparatory to admission as a State, on terms of perfect equality with the other States, being left perfectly free not only as to the kind of government they will have, but as to the mode and manner of making it. I had hoped we were to find a simple and satisfactory solution of this unhappy difficulty which seems to arise on the application of each State for admission.

When this doctrine was proclaimed it was at variance with and superseded the former practice of the government: but it was one which commended itself to the judgment and patriotism of the people. It was a proposition to settle the controversy about slavery upon high principle—sacred principle; a principle that was co-extensive in its operation with the entire country, with all Territories we possessed then, or even can possess, and as imperishable as the government itself, equal to every emergency that may arise. An essential element in that doctrine is, that Congress shall not interfere with the domestic affairs of the Territories; that as to the mode and manner of making a government, the people of the Territories should be unrestrained; that Congress would decide only upon the question of admission under the obligations of the constitution, and that would be on the single point whether the government presented was republican in form, and not as to the mode of making the constitution—leaving that work with the people.

I had hoped that we were about to witness a beautiful illustration of the wisdom of this doctrine, by the admission of two States, the one slave and the other free, under this principle. Thus its beauties would be illustrated and illuminated; and I tell you, Mr. President, that in my humble judgment, no act of Congress will go further toward restoring those relations of fraternal feelings which in the younger and purer days of the republic existed between the people of its extremities, than the consummation of such a work. Nothing, in my humble judgment, would tend more to give peace to this great country: to promote its future progress and prosperity, to give prosperity and peace to the people of the various Territories.—Sir, that is the doctrine of the democratic party, held by them because it is consistent with the constitution—consistent with the true interests of this great country, and with the rights of all classes of the people, and all sections of the Union.

Now, sir, I regard the House proposition as direct and violent intervention, because it proposes to discard what the people have done and to institute a new mode of proceeding. It proposes to set aside what the people of Kansas have done in the way of changing their government from a territorial to a State form, and to prescribe to them how they shall proceed hereafter in making a government. I wish to mark the distinction between a case where the people of a Territory have not acted at all, and especially where a Territory may not, possess the usual population for a State where their powers have rested in obeyance, and where Congress volunteers to offer to those such an invitation to come into the Union. That we did in 1856 to the people of Kansas under the Toombs bill.—They could hardly presume, with the population which they then possessed, that they would be admitted as a State. Congress extended an invitation to them, they having taken no proper legal action on the subject. It is different now. They have acted; they have presented themselves with a republican form of government, which has come up to us through legal channels and regular steps. They have exercised the power which you gave them in the organic law, when you said their legislative power should extend over all the rightful subjects of legislation, and that the people should be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way.

But, Mr. President, if it were allowable on principle for Congress to remand to the people this government which they have sent here, and insist upon a revision of what they have done, I could not agree to the mode and manner prescribed in the House bill. The objections I make ought to be more specially unpleasant to those who have opposed the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution than to those who have favored it; and why so?—Because the people are required to vote under a form which deprives the free-State party of a fair opportunity to exercise their will. In the early part of this discussion, much was made out of the form of voting presented by the Lecompton Convention. It was said to be unfair. It was said that the elector, in order to vote for or against slavery, was bound to vote for or against the constitution; that those, therefore, who were not for that constitution, had no opportunity of voting on the slavery question.—I do not care now to inquire whether that view was correct and allowable or not; but I do say that the presentation of the question, as proposed in this amendment, would be liable to quite as conclusive objections as the mode of voting prescribed by the Lecompton convention.—What is the form? It reads thus:

"At the said election the vote shall be by ballot, and by endorsing on his ballot, as each voter may please, 'for the constitution,' or 'against the constitution.'"

That form you perceive, sir, would not present to the people of Kansas the great question at issue there, the question which has agitated the country from one extremity to the other, to wit: whether Kansas shall be a free or a slave State. Slavery is in the constitution as it stands, and the question thus presented would be, whether they would have a *Slave State* or *no State* at all. Those who desire it to be a free State would have no fair opportunity of carrying out their will. They are to be disfranchised on this vote. They can have no voice.—Now, sir, if this measure is to be adopted, the form of voting ought to be such as would give those people the opportunity of deciding, unembarrassed, the question of slavery which has harassed them, from the first hour of their organization. Look at the practical workings of the proposition. An elector presents himself at the polls who is in favor of slavery. He sees that his ballot must be for or against the constitution. He desires to vote for slavery, but he dislikes many features of the constitution; and he is driven from the polls. If a free-State man, on the other hand, makes his appearance, he encounters similar difficulties. He likes the constitution and all its features, except that of slavery. He desires to adopt the constitution, but he cannot do that without agreeing that Kansas shall be a slave State; and he is disfranchised. Now, sir, if this proposition is to prevail, why put it in this shape? Is it that there will be no alternative left to the free-State party but to vote the constitution down and to secure an endorsement of the opinions of those who have opposed the admission of the State? Is it to secure a rejection of the President's policy?—If I were for this measure, I should not agree to present it in this shape. I certainly could not, if I had stood so peculiarly and tenaciously up to the rights of the free-State party in Kansas.

The form should be "for the constitution without slavery," or "for the constitution with slavery," or "against the constitution." This would have given all parties a fair opportunity of carrying out their will.

But, sir, there are other features to which I wish to call attention. The first clause reads as follows:

"That the State of Kansas be, and is hereby, admitted in the Union on equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever; but inasmuch as it is greatly disputed whether the constitution framed at Lecompton on the 7th day of November last, and now pending before Congress, was fairly made," &c.

It is a question whether the constitution was *fairly made*. What is the deduction? It must be that in some way or other the obligation rests upon Congress to know that the constitution is *fairly made*; that fraud and violence shall not prevail. Now, sir, I do not care to raise or debate that question of fact at present. Whatever might have been held heretofore under the former policy of the government, I cannot see how those who subscribe to the doctrine that the people should be left perfectly free to form and regulate their institutions in their own way, can investigate this question of fairness and form. Is it maintained that we sanction the constitution by voting for the admission? That is not my understanding. The government which the people send here we must take or reject. I do not speak now of mere matters of form, but the vital features of the government. These we cannot touch. Is it otherwise held anywhere? I have not heard a senator allege that, by voting for the admission of Kansas, he necessarily sanctioned the constitution, or *vice versa*.

Now, sir, the point which I wish to make is this: if Congress has no right to touch the work of the people of Kansas—the government which they have sent here—what does it concern us that we inquire how that work was done? Here is a proposition simply to inquire how it was done; conceding that we have no power over the production itself. Not only that; but while this constitution is to be sent back on the assumption that it was not fairly made, what is proposed in addition? Why, sir, in case this constitution be voted down, the people of Kansas are authorized to elect delegates to constitute a new convention; they are to vote on that constitution, and then, if it be adopted, they become a State by the proclamation of the President.

Where is the guarantee that that new government will be made fairly? Where is the protection against fraud in that process? Who supervises that action? If it is the duty of Congress, in the case of the Lecompton Constitution, to see that it is fairly made, it is the duty of Congress in every other case. If it is the duty of Congress to inquire whether this constitution has been fairly made, it is an equal obligation not to give the opportunity of making any constitution unfairly. Here is a proposition to allow the people to make a government, put it in operation, and admit it into the Union, without its ever making its appearance before Congress at all. I do not understand how alleged frauds in this place can be claimed as reasons for returning this constitution, if we at the same time authorize the making of a State without any guarantee whatever as to how that power may be abused, without any protection against fraud, violence, and usurpation.

Then, sir, there is another point, and that is the extraordinary proposition which makes the President of the United States perform functions which the Constitution, in express words, vests in Congress. I do not speak now as to the government of Kansas that is before us; that we have seen; that constitution we have read; that Congress knows to be republican; that we may, on certain conditions, allow the President to announce admitted, and hold that the State is in the Union; but it is to the other alternative—the right to make a constitution and State government, and put it into the Union by a proclamation of the President, without ever having it before Congress at all—that I object. Who knows that it will be a republican government? Who can guarantee that it will be admissable in form? And if republican, may it not contain other features, making it entirely unacceptable? Sir, I have not that measure of confidence in the men who would be likely to get hold of this government in Kansas just now. Who is satisfied that Gen. Lane would exercise power with moderation? Who believes that if he controlled a convention, he would not indulge the excesses of his feelings of prejudice against the Southern States?

Sir, I should not be surprised if a constitution made in that way would emancipate the slaves that are in the Territory and confiscate the property value in them. I should not be surprised if a Constitution made in that way, without consulting Congress, should attempt to interdict or embarrass the execution of the fugitive slave law, or would set up other issues with the federal authority; and yet, whilst Congress might not seriously entertain the idea of admitting such a State, the President would be obliged to admit it by proclamation. For you will notice that it gives the President no discretion. The duty is imperative on him. When the facts are properly certified, he must announce that the State is in the Union, no matter how objectionable the Constitution may be. Here is State-making with a vengeance. Any measure of fraud may be practised; any extent of violence and usurpation in making the Constitution; and no matter how badly made, and yet the State must come in. The proposition is monstrous.

Now, sir, the subject matter of the bill is suggestive; it presents a wide field for discussion. I do not intend to pursue it this morning; but I could not pursuade myself to vote quietly on this question. I know that there are certain very insiduous features about this measure—features which can be used with great effect before the populace. It may be alleged that we have voted against a bill which was to give the people the right to vote on their constitution. That would be true, to some extent; but I answer that I hold a still more liberal doctrine towards the people of Kansas; I hold that they can make a Constitution in any way they please; making it according to law and in regular form. I would give to the people of Kansas that measure of right which those whom I represent here exercised; they made a constitution twice through their delegates; they have revised and amended that constitution through the agency of a popular ratification. It was competent for the people of Kansas to do the same thing; and if those in Kansas who claim to be adverse to this slavery article, who object most to this constitution, had exercised their high prerogative as freemen, probably we should have had no excitement on this occasion. But, sir, they did not perform the duty. In June, when they might have decided the question of slavery by electing delegates, they would not vote; the "bogus laws" were in their way. In October, when the question of slavery was not involved, but when officers were at stake, they did vote. In December following, when they had a direct vote on the question of making Kansas a free or a slave State, they could not vote—it would not do to recognize the "bogus laws" and the "bogus convention." But a few days afterwards, when it was a question of gaining the local offices, they rushed to the polls and elected the officers under what they have termed the "Lecompton swindle." There is the source of the trouble; and as the issue stands, the most that those on the other side can make out of it would be (taking their own ground) an issue between those who, through the forms of law, had abused to some extent, the right of suffrage, and those who had set themselves up against the use of that right; who had preferred other means; who had not exercised the high functions of freemen under our laws and policy of government. They avowed that determination, and they adhered to it. There may have been fraud, & there may have been usurpation to some extent, on the one hand. The best that can be said for the other was that it presented matured, persistent, and stupendous insubordination to the laws, if not rebellion to the government. Which of these alternatives shall we take? I shall not, for my part, cast a vote that will give success to those who have stood out persistently against the laws.

It may be said, and it is said, that this constitution is not agreeable to the majority of the people. Well, sir, I have searched in vain in the complicated history of legislation on this subject for the instance in which that question was distinctly raised and discussed! where it was claimed as a duty on the part of Congress to know that a majority of the people were for the form of government which they sent up to Congress. No such case could have arisen as to more than half the States heretofore admitted whose constitutions had not been submitted to popular vote. No such question could have arisen in the case of the State of my venerable friend from Kentucky, for that was declared in the Union a State before the form of government was made, not by the proclamation, I believe, but by act of Congress. That could not have been an ascertained fact in regard to Florida. No member of Congress, as I understand the history of that case, could have known whether the people preferred the constitution of Florida or not. Why not? I shall show. In 1838, the people of Florida held a convention, and made a constitution. They submitted it, it is true, to the ratification of the people, and, as I learn the history of it, a majority was only found by throwing out certain districts on the ground of informality. That constitution was sent up here. It was filed away in the archives of the Senate Legislative department. There it lay, cobwebbed and dusted over, for six long years. When it became necessary to bring in Iowa as a State, these musty papers were drawn from their solitude, and on them Florida was made a State. Who would say, that in the six years that intervened, there was not a large accession of population to the Territory of Florida? There could have been no satisfactory evidence that the people of Florida approved that constitution; no man could have known that it imbodied their will. I only present these historical facts for the purpose of showing that the doctrine that Congress must know that a constitution imbodies the will of a majority of the people before we have the right in propriety to admit the State, is a new doctrine.

But, Mr. President, I have spoken already much longer than I intended to do. I rose for the purpose of confining myself to a very few points. I trust we are near the close of this angry debate. For one, I am free to say to the Senate and to the country that I am tired of this topic of Kansas. I am tired of it in every sense. Especially am I weary of it, because I can see in it an element of growing mischief to this great, peaceful and happy country of ours. Why it is I know not; but it would seem to be a dispensation of Providence that we are to have a very plague among us in the shape of this slavery question, living and growing as the nation advances; spreading out yearly, overshadowing the whole country like some fatal upas, whose poisonous branches shade the very extremities and deal poison and death as the seasons roll by. I say, sir, that we are near the close of this debate, and with it I trust this feud will be put to rest forever—this strife which is so certainly and so constantly poisoning the very channels of intercourse between great divisions of this Union, severing the relations of the people who ought to be fraternal and affectionate, and abiding in a common faith. Sir, while I have my notions of this measure, I do not cherish them with the tenacity that some do. I desire, however, to make the admission of Kansas and Minnesota an exemplification of truthfulness, of the equity and wisdom of the democratic policy that Congress shall no longer deal with this vexed question; but that it shall be left to the people of the Territories to settle for themselves; and they shall quietly become States, with or without slavery, as their government may provide at the time of admission.

GOOD.

This reminds us of an old pulpit anecdote attributed to Rowland Hill. Two strangers passing the church in which he was preaching, entered, walked up the aisle, and finding no seat, stood for a while and listened to the sermon.—Presently they turned to walk out. Before they reached the door the preacher said, "But I will tell you a story."

This arrested the strangers, and they paused, turned again and listened.

"Once there was a man," said the speaker, "who said that if he had all the axes in the world, made into one great axe, and all the trees in the world made into one great tree, and he could wield the axe and cut down the tree, he would make it into one great whisp to thrash those ungodly men who turn their backs upon the gospel and stop to hear a story."

The strangers thought they had heard enough to satisfy their curiosity, and resumed their walk in the street.

Poetical.

THE HARP OF A THOUSAND STRINGS.

Come generous friends a little while,
And listen to my song,
And though my subject is very flat,
My story won't be long.
I'm going to sing about the times,
And several other things—
We'll sing the words and play the tune
On a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

Religion, Politics and Law,
Are raging under par,
As seen by microscopic aid,
In pulpit, forum, bar:
A focus brought on either one,
The same result still brings—
A human being playing away
On a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

The preachers don't as they used to do,
In the good old days gone by;
They used to preach of the souls of men,
'Till they made the women cry;
But they read their sermons now-a-days,
And the choir strikes up a 'sing,'
And the folks can't join when the tune is play'd
On a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

The members don't as they used to do—
Their zeal and love's grown cold;
They're thinking of the corn they've raised,
And how to get more gold.
And though the preacher reads quite well,
Their conscience never stings;
They'd rather steal the crown of gold,
And a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

The politician used to be
A man of some renown;
Now, half a dozen would-be-such
Are found in every town;
For when one finds he can make a speech,
Or soar on buzzard's wings,
He mounts a hobby and plays away
On a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

No matter how corrupt he is—
How off he turns his coat,
The nomination sets him right—
He gets the people's vote;
He eats his fill at the public crib,
He drinks at the public springs—
The charm succeeds—he plays so well
On a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

Then let us take a hasty view
Of Justice and the Bar;
Alas! how quickly we discern,
How altered all things are;
The sword and scales are little need,
The culprit seldom swings;
For gold will make the lawyers play
On a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

So turn your eyes to every part
Of Uncle Sam's machine,
You'll find a screw that's working loose—
Some place that needs a pin.
But I must end my story now,
Although my muse still brings
A verse or two for every chord
On a Harp of a Thousand Strings.

Miscellaneous.

THE LITTLE COURTESIES OF LIFE.

"A kindly word, a pleasant smile,
Are better far than gold."

A friend some time since, came to us and expressed great annoyance at what he regarded as an act of marked discourtesy on the part of a gifted and accomplished gentleman, to whom he had rendered a valuable service. He was quite excited at the time, not that he cared so much for the circumstance, but because it was calculated to dim the high picture which he had formed in his mind of the nature of the man. He had set him up as the model of a Christian gentleman, the very embodiment of a finished, polished, graceful and dignified character.—And yet, to his surprise, he found that he lacked one of the great essentials, namely, common courtesy, or ordinary politeness. In other words, he had either refused or declined to answer a note that had been sent to him on his own business, and this refusal was kept up for days, until it became necessary to refresh his memory and offer one or two sharp admonitary remarks. But this is no extraordinary case. It is but one of thousands. The little courtesies of daily life, the kindly and graceful amenities which are so admirably calculated to sweeten the relations between man and man, and to impart a genial spirit to our social every day intercourse, are too frequently neglected. We do not sufficiently appreciate our own self respect, or the feelings and good wishes of others. This is the more culpable, for courtesy and kindness are at the command of all classes—the poor as well as the rich, the humble as well as the elevated. There are some persons who never think it worth while to reply to a note or an invitation, unless some especial business matter be involved. There are others again, who never neglect such an act of courtesy and duty. In the first case, misunderstandings, irritations and unkindnesses will inevitably occur, and in the last these will be avoided. Some one has observed, truly and forcibly, that the little courtesies of life should be regarded as among the minor virtues, and their practice should be encouraged and cultivated from early youth.—What, indeed, could be more delightful than the interchange of civility, kindness and good will, on all proper occasions between friends and neighbors? What is so calculated to soften the rugged path of existence, and to give to the human heart agreeable feelings? Some time since a gentleman and lady were betrothed, and the proposed union was looked upon in the most approving manner by the parents of both parties.

It so happened that the former had occasion to visit Europe, and to remain abroad something like six months. He wrote home elaborately, or a few words by every packet; but during the whole of this period he received but three letters in reply, and of a character so brief, as to show that the fair correspondent took very little interest either in the subject or the object to whom the epistles were addressed. The effect was to annoy, irritate, create a coolness, and finally to break off the match. The truth is, no one likes to be treated either with indifference or contempt. A sense of self-pride revolts against such conduct. The courtesy we extend to others, we naturally and properly desire to see extended to ourselves in return. Reciprocity is the very soul of harmony, friendship and good feeling. A sensitive individual may be aggrieved and wounded, just as ready by indifference and neglect, as by an open and studied insult. By courtesy, we do not mean affectation, hollow pretence, shallow hypocrisy and artificial manners. On the contrary, these are all miserable counterfeits. But we refer to a genial, generous and kindly spirit, a sense of appreciation, a recognition of equality, a truthful air, and a frank and manly bearing. Not a day goes by, in which all these qualities cannot be exhibited more or less, especially in the sphere, and among the friends with whom we move and mingle. There is, on the other hand, nothing more unworthy, unmanly, pitiable and mean than a disposition to tyranize over and insult, not directly, perhaps, but indirectly, those who, in some sense may seem to be dependent upon us, or whom, in the exercise of a false pride, we may imagine we can outrage with impunity. The little courtesies of life never shine so sweetly or brightly, as when they are manifested by the rich towards the poor, or by the powerful towards the weak. They then become a grace and embellishment of the character, and while they adorn the one party with a moral lustre, they kindle in the hearts of the other feelings of kindness, affection and good will. But courtesy is never out of place. It is never thrown away. It always has its effect, and sometimes it tells far more efficiently than formal service, or even heavy obligations.—*Phila. Inq.*

PEN DROPS.

Man—A bubble on the ocean's rolling wave.

Life—A gleam of light extinguished by the grave.

Fame—A meteor dazzling with its distant glare.

Wealth—A source of trouble and consuming care.

Pleasure—A gleam of sunshine passing soon away.

Love—A morning dream whose memory gilds the day.

Faith—An anchor dropped beyond the vale of death.

Hope—A long star beaming o'er the barren heath.

Charity—A stream meandering from the fount of love.

Bible—A guide to realms of endless joy above.

Religion—A key which opens wide the gates of Heaven.

Death—A knife by which the ties of earth are riven.

Earth—A desert through which pilgrims wend their way.

Grave—A house of rest where ends life's weary day.

Resurrection—A sudden wakening from a quiet dream.

Heaven—A land of joy, of light and love supreme.

Marriage for Show.

To the question often asked of young men as to why they do not marry, we sometimes hear the reply, "I am not able to support a wife." In one case in three, perhaps, this may be so; but as a general thing, the true reply would be, "I am not able to support the style in which my wife ought to live." In this, again, we see a false view of marriage; a looking to an appearance in the world; instead of a union with a loving woman for her own sake. There are very few men, of industrious habits, who cannot maintain a wife, if they are willing to live economically; and without reference to the opinion of the world. The great evil is, they are not content to begin life humbly, to retire together into an obscure position; and together work their way into the world—he by industry in his calling, and she by dispensing with prudence the money that he earns. But they must stand out and attract the attention of others by fine houses and fine clothes.

The Maple Tree.

There is no shade tree so valuable as the maple, and no object more commendable than the encouragement of its growth, as proposed in this article:

"Plant them by the road side—plant them in the farm lanes—plant them by the side of rocks, stones, brooks, hill-sides, and in waste places, and in your farm yard and stable-yard; you can tap them above the reach of animals, and hang your buckets, and the flow will be just as great as though tapped down at the roots. No tree can be planted with more certainty of profit than the sugar maple. Its form and foliage are beautiful; its shade delightful; its sap delicious and healthful in all stages, from the water, to its honey-like syrup on the hot buckwheat cakes; and its sweet products will always be saleable and profitable. Maple syrup would outsell the very best 'golden syrup' at any time in the cities, if it was for sale; and maple sugar is sold, tons of it, every year in the confectioner's shops, and in the street, to be eaten like candy, at 30 to 50 cents a pound There will always be a market for any surplus that the country can produce, but that is not the grand object with us in urging its increase production. It is because it will greatly increase the happiness of the farmer's home. It is for that we ask—are you ready?"

☞ An interesting case came off last week, before the Recorder's Court in Kansas city.—One Dr. J. B. Chapman became enamored, last fall, with a beautiful and accomplished young lady by the name of Miss Little. Her charms were so prepossessing as to cause the Doctor to importune her greatly to join him in the holy bonds of wedlock. The Doctor being old—near sixty, and she young and beautiful, she required him to advance her a bonus on the promise of marriage. To this the Doctor readily consented, and made over to her, according to his account, about $9,000 worth of property. Since she came in possession of the property she declined marrying him and he brings his suit to recover the property, alleging that it was obtained through fraudulent pretences. She pleads that the Doctor is a married man, and therefore she would not marry him, and that she did not learn this until after the courtship. The suit went against the Doctor.

ABORIGINES AT THE CAPITOL.—Not the least interesting feature of life at the Capitol, at the present time, is the large number of Western Indians there, on business with the Government. As they mingle familiarly with Caucasian gallantry and beauty, on the fashionable promenades, their savage mien and barbarian costumes contrast strangely with the elegant carriage and artistic toilets of civilization and refinement.—The other day, a portion of the Sioux delegation, now there, desiring to see how "bad men" are treated by their white brethren, were conducted to the United States Penitentiary, and shown the prisoners at work. When told that the prisoners were kept within the walls for years hard at work without pay, and without the privilege of going out, or associating with their "squaws," they signified by a variety of guttural exclamations, their opinions of the severity of the punishment, and they were apparently impressed with horror on seeing an unruly convict confined in a dark, narrow cell. This seemed to them the most frightful punishment that could be inflicted; and such it would undoubtedly be to the wild and free red men of the forest.

GET A HOME.—Get a home, rich or poor, get a home, and learn to love that home, and make it happy to wife and children by your beaming presence; learn to love simple pleasures, flowers of God's own planting, and music of his own; the bird, wind and waterfall. So shall you help to stem the tide of desolation, poverty and despair, that comes upon so many through the scorn of little things. Oh, the charm of a little home: comforts dwell there that shun the gilded halls of society. Live humble in your little home, and look to God for a grander one.

☞ "Ah, Mr. Simpkins, we have not chairs enough for our company'" said a gay young wife to her frugal husband.

"Plenty of chairs, ducky, but too much company," replied Mr. Simpkins.

☞ "Ma, that nice young man, Mr. S., is very fond of kissing."

"Mind your seam, Julia, who told you such nonsense?"

"Ma, I had it from his own lips."

Spring Chickens.

Are always in active demand from May to September, in the vicinity of all our large cities, and larger towns. Of course they are profitable to the farmers, and small landholders and cottagers, who breed them. This is a good month to set the hens, and hatch them out. For this purpose, a warm hen-house, and coops in sunny places is required. Let the eggs be kept in a proper temperature, till the hen is ready to sit on them. Thirteen is a proper number for a clutch of chickens. When hatched, if milk curds can be had, this is their best food. If not, soaked bread for the first few days, and after that, Indian meal *well cooked*, like mush for your own table. Raw meal, wet up in the usual way, is harsh and scouring for their delicate stomachs. When a few weeks old, chopped cabbage, 'sives,' and other tender vegetables, are to be added, and sour milk is the very best drink they can have.

We would by all means, entrust the early chickens to *woman's* care. She seems to possess the necessary instincts—worth all the boys and men in the country. We have known a Scotch, Dutch, or Irish washerwoman's cottage, surrounded by a close wall, alive with early chickens, when the gentleman's and farmer's premises would scarce supply a fowl for the table before September.

Don't keep the 'big' breeds for spring chickens either. A close, compact, early matured fowl is the thing for this purpose. In most large towns a large fat chick, the size of a quail, will sell for as much in May or June, as a full grown one will in October; and if they only know you have them, the tavern-keepers and pedlars will be after them every day in the week. To the habit these latter people have of confining them in close filthy coops for days together, we enter our protest. It is cruel to the chickens. It poisons and defiles the taste of the flesh. It makes them poor. Exercise, good air, and plenty of good food they should have, till wanted for the table; and every one who keeps them on hand for immediate use, should be well provided with yards, and roosting accommodation. To make chickens edibly perfect, they should come upon the table plump, juicy, and full of their own natural gravy.—"Plump as a partridge," is the term which should always be truthfully applied to the early chicken; and if they be not so, half their excellence is lost, while, if in perfection of flesh, they are a positive luxury.

A Desperate Man Escaping From Justice.

After I had taken my seat one morning, at Paddington, in an empty railway carriage, I was joined, just as the train was moving on, by a strange looking young man, with remarkably long flowing hair. He was of course, a little hurried, but he seemed, besides, to be so disturbed and wild, that I was quite alarmed for fear of his not being right in his mind, nor did his subsequent conduct at all re-assure me. Our train was an express, and he enquired, at once, which was the first station whereat we were advertised to stop. I consulted my *Bradshaw*, and I furnised him with the required information. It was Reading. The young man looked at his watch. "Madam," said he, "I have half an hour between me and, it may be ruin. Excuse, therefore, my abruptness. You have, I perceive, a pair of scissors in your workbag. Oblige, if you please, by cutting off all my hair." "Sir," said I, "it is impossible." "Madam," and a look of severe determination crossed his features, "I am a desperate man. Beware how you refuse me what I ask. Cut my hair off—short, close to the roots—immediately; and here is a newspaper to hold the ambrosials curls." I thought he was mad, of course, and believing that it would be dangerous to thwart him, I cut off all his hair to the last lock. "Now, Madam," said he, unlocking a small portmanteau, "you will further oblige me by looking out of the window, as I am about to change my clothes." Of course I looked out of the window for a very considerable time, and when he observed, "Madam, I need no longer put you to any inconvenience," I did not not recognize the young man in the least. Instead of his former rather gay costume, he was attired in black, and wore a gray wig and silver spectacles; he looked like a respectable divine of the Church of England, of about 64 years of age; to complete that character, he held a volume of sermons in his hand, which—they appeared so to absorb him—might have been his own.

"I do not wish to threaten you, young lady," he resumed, "and I think, besides, that I can trust your kind face. Will you promise me not to reveal this metamorphosis until your journey's end?" "I will," said I, "most certainly." At Reading the guard and a person in plain clothes looked into our carriage. "You have the ticket, my love," said the young man, blandly, and looking at me as though he were my father. "Never mind, Sir; we don't want them," said the official, as he withdrew his companion. "I shall now leave you, Madam," observed my fellow traveler, as soon as the coast was clear; by your kind and courageous conduct you have saved my life, and perhaps even your own." In another minute he was gone and the train was in motion. Not till the next morning did I learn from *The Times* newspaper that the gentleman on whom I had operated as haircutter had committed a forgery to an enormous amount in London a few hours before I met him, and that he had been tracked into an express train from Paddington, but that—although the telegraph had been put in motion and described him acurately—at Reading, when the train was searched, he was nowhere to be found.

A DISCRIMINATING JUDGE.—The police court of the thriving town of B——, in Maine, which boasts a bay rivalling that of Naples, is presided over by one Judge W——, who is something of a wag as well as a lawyer. On one occasion, while enjoying a post-prandial "feast of reason and the flow of soul" with some of the jolly fellows of that region, the judge was summoned to the court-room, to try an Irishman arrested for drunkenness. Having heard the testimony, which clearly proved the crime, the judge asked the accused: "Have you any friends?" "No, your honor." Judge W——, "Have you any money?" "No, your honor." "Then, said Judge W——, "if you have no friends and no money, I must proceed to pronounce the sentence of the court, which is, that you be imprisoned for thirty days in the house of correction—and may God have mercy on your soul."

☞ The following is a specimen of sharp shooting between a coquette and her lover:

"You men are angels when you woo the maid,
But devils when the marriage vow is paid."

The lover not to be outdone, replied as follows:

"The change, dear girl, is easily forgiven,
We find we are in hell instead of heaven."

☞ When an English lady, at whose house Dr. Johnson was dancing one day, asked him if he did not think her pudding very good.

"Yes," growled the great moralist, "it is very good for hogs."

"Shall I help you to another plateful, then?" said the polite hostess.

From the Washington Union of the 10th.

The Fancy Ball in Washington.

The fancy ball given on Tuesday evening, at the residence of Senator Gwin, fully realized the highest expectations of those who participated in its novel pleasures, and was pronounced one of the most magnificent entertainments of the kind ever given in this country. The house is large, admirably adapted for a large gathering; nor had any pains or expense been spared in preparing and ornamenting the many spacious apartments thrown open. A fine band of music discoursed inspiring strains for the dancers, and there was a profusion of refreshments served up during the evening, with a sumptuous supper at midnight.

The guests were announced in their assumed characters by an usher, and were received by Mrs. Gwin, who was dressed as a *Marquise of the Court of Louis XIV*. For the benefit of our lady readers at a distance, we will state that this splendid costume was a skirt of white moire antique silk trimmed with deep flounces of rare lace, with a train of cherry-colored satin trimmed with a ruche of the same material. The boddice was trimmed with lace, and the coiffure was of that elaborately arranged and powdered fashion peculiar to the old French court. She was assisted by her eldest daughter, becomingly attired as a *Greek Girl*, and attended by a younger daughter, dressed as a *Court Page*.

The President of the United States, Secretaries Cobb and Thompson, and about twenty Senators, were privileged to appear in citizens' dress. All other guests were invited to appear in fancy costume, and the variety, brilliancy, and beauty of many of the dresses, made the scene novel and interesting.

Prominent among the ladies present were: Mrs. Senator *Clay* as Mrs. Partington, attended by the wilful *Ido*, Mrs. Senator Thompson as a Cantonniere, Mrs. Senator Davis as Madame De Stael, Mrs. Senator Hale as a Spanish Duenna, Mrs. Senator *Douglas* as Aurora, Lady Onseley as a French Marchioness, Lady Napier as a lady of the Olden Time, Madame de Stœkel as a Countess of Henry the Fourth's reign, Miss Cass as a Marquise of the same reign, Miss Winder as Folly, Miss Hale as Morning, Miss Martin as a Vivandiere, Miss Bradley as Night, Mrs. Pendleton as the Star Spangled Banner, Mrs. Belser as Hannah Prim, Mrs. Greenhow as a Housekeeper, Mrs. Hughes as Little Red Riding Hood, Miss Mechlin as a Spanish Peasant Girl, Mrs. Berg as an Indian Princess, Miss Parker as the Goddess of Liberty, Miss Semmes as Lady Charlotte Berkley, Miss Ray as a Flower Girl, Miss Porter as Madame Pompadour, Mrs. Evans as Isabella of Spain, Mrs. Clayton as a Lady of the Republican Court, Miss Beach as a Gipsey,—but we have not space to further prolong this bead-roll of beauty.

The costumes of the gentlemen were equally varied and elegant, as an enumeration of a few of them will show. Mr. Clingman appeared as a gentleman of the 20th century, Mr. Cochrane as a Matador, Mr. Keitt as Buckingham, Major Haveland as a Knight in veritable armor, Mayor Magruder as a Highland Chieftain, Capt. Nelson as Falstaff, Lieutenant Mowry as the Knight of Gwynne, Mr. Hughes as an Oxford Student, Mr. Kingman as a Diplomatist, wearing President Monroe's court dress, Mr. Trowbridge as a Ranchero, Col. Magruder as the King of Prussia, Mr. J. Buchanan Henry as Sir Roger de Coverly, Mr. Ledyard as an Egyptian Officer, Mr. Gillet as a Filibustero, Mr. Irving as a Quaker, and the Turkish officers were present in their full and richly embroidered uniforms.

The effect produced by so large an assemblage in these varied costumes, which were generally made of rich materials, and were ornamented with plumes, gold lace, and jewels, was picturesquely beautiful; and while some threaded the mazes of the dance, others engaged in humorous conversation, often identifying themselves with the characters which they assumed. The supper was served up in Gautier's best style, and it was daylight out of doors before the guests ceased dancing.

The Washington Hotel Mystery.

We conversed yesterday with a very intelligent gentleman of this city, one of the officers of the American Telegraph Company, who is among the sufferers by the mysterious disease which broke out in Washington City just prior to the last Presidential inauguration. From a condition of great bodily vigor and a comfortable degree of corpulency, he was gradually wasted until reduced to a feeble invalid. During the many weary days of confinement allotted him, he has watched the progress of the malady till the list of deceased victims has reached twenty-seven, including many eminent names; and he calculates that out of a total of three hundred sufferers, at least one half are in a state of decrepitude no better than his own. In spite of all the theories which have been advanced by medical men and sanitary committees, he adheres to the belief that the fatal epidemic, as it was called, was occasioned by nothing else than a malignant mineral poison; and the same opinion is held by other sufferers with whom he has conversed. Up to a recent period, he was treated by a physician of this neighborhood as for a malarious or atmospheric poison, with no perceptible benefit; but upon the physician and treatment being changed, substituting an antidote to arsenic, favorable symptoms became at once apparent, and he is now able to leave his apartment. The conclusions of the Washington examining committee, which attributed the disease to noxious effluvia, may have been influenced to some extent by the desire at that time existing to secure a large appropriation from the city government for an extensive system of sewerage, and which has since been obtained.

Whatever the origin of the disease, it is very difficult to satisfactorily account for all the phenomena attending it, especially the slow, deadly manner in which it preys upon the system, year after year, until the vital principle is destroyed, and the strong man prematurely cut off, unless the agency of a malignant mineral poison is admitted.

A GOOD WHITEWASH.—As this is the season of the year when people begin to clean up and make things look fresh for the approaching summer, the following recipes for the best and cheapest whitewashes, both for the outside and the inside of houses, from the *Scientific American*, will no doubt be received with pleasure, by all who study comfort and cleanliness.

Take half a bushel of fresh-burned white lime, and slack it either with hot or cold water in a tub or barrel. When thoroughly slacked, dissolve in the water required to thin the lime, two quarts of common salt, stir it thoroughly, add one quart of sweet milk, and it is ready for use to put on with a brush.

This wash is for the outside of buildings, fences, &c.,