



CLEARFIELD, April 21, 1858.

Democratic State Ticket. JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT. WILLIAM A. PORTER. CANAL COMMISSIONER. WESLEY FROST. SENATOR BIGLER.

We publish this week the able speech of Senator BIGLER, delivered in the Senate of the United States on the 9th of March last, on the bill for the admission of Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton Constitution.

We would have preferred to give it to our readers at an earlier date, but we were compelled to postpone it until now. It is however, a document that will keep, and like good wine, it will improve with age.

It is entirely unnecessary for us to speak at length of its merits. It needs no praise beyond what will be accorded to it by every candid reader who will give it a careful perusal.

No better proof of the unanswerable character of its arguments in favor of the admission of Kansas, and the ability of our talented Senator could be given than the fact that no speech delivered in either House of Congress during the present stormy session, has called down from the enemies of the administration more violent personal abuse, more reckless and insane denunciation, or more base vituperation upon the head of its author, than this and one or two others delivered by Senator Bigler. The opposition generally, but more especially some of the leading anti-Lecompton Democratic organs, which are fast forfeiting all claim or title that they may have possessed heretofore to the name of Democrat, are particularly fierce in their abuse and vilification of our distinguished Senator.

The Philadelphia Press does not hesitate to place itself foremost in this category, and vent its impotent rage in language but one degree above the vilest billingsgate, because Mr. Bigler has not only dared to raise his voice in support of that administration which the Press is vainly endeavoring to overthrow; but in doing so he effectually vindicated the policy of Buchanan, that all the special pleading of that organ and its corrupt coadjutors must be futile and powerless against his reasoning.

A Grand Masquerade Ball, was set on foot a short time since in New York, by Mr. Ullman, a somewhat celebrated Theatrical or concert manager, to come off at the New York Academy of Music. Under the conviction of the immoral tendencies of such exhibitions, the city authorities have determined to prevent its taking place; and Mr. Welch, a police justice, has notified Mr. Ullman of this determination, in a pointed letter which concludes with the following sensible remarks, which, although they may have no practical applicability in rural districts far removed from Metropolitan influence and metropolitan customs, are important to all communities, as showing the true estimation in which such things are held by correct thinking people.

"Experience has proved that public masquerades in large cities are chiefly frequented by the vicious and depraved characters of both sexes, and it is for this reason that the citizens of New York, as liberal as they are in relation to all questions of public amusement, have acquiesced so readily in their suppression. The sight of a person's face, is to a certain extent, a guaranty of his conduct and a protection against his designs, and it is seriously felt that the present is not a time to lend disguises to the vicious, and to afford new facilities for the perpetration and escape of crime.

"With these views, I have felt it to be my duty as one of the magistrates of this city to notify you of the law and acquaint you with the moral sentiment of the community on the subject of public masquerades; and I desire to say, in conclusion, that I hold it to be of the utmost importance to the strengthening of the hands of the Magistracy of this city in the suppression of the low and dangerous assemblages which would be sure to grow out of the public toleration of the masquerade, that they be not revived and countenanced as so respectable a house as the Academy. You will find the 'Act for the prevention of Masquerades' in Davis' Laws of New York relative to the city, page 896."

CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS. Still seem to be pursuing the even tenor of their uneven ways. The Committee of Conference appointed by the two Houses to confer upon the measure for the admission of Kansas have made no progress in the object for which they were appointed, and there is very little hope that they will come to any agreement. The Senate are engaged in the discussion of the deficiency-appropriation bill, which was made the special order for Monday last. The Pacific Railroad bill has been laid over until next winter. The House is occupied with the consideration of bills on the private calendar.

A young man without money, among the ladies, is like the moon on a cloudy night, he can't shine.

OUR STATE LEGISLATURE. This body of law givers has at last succeeded in completing what has seemed to be the leading project of the session—the transferring of the balance of the State funds to the Sanitary & Erie Railroad Company. The bill providing for the transfer having passed the Senate with some trifling amendments upon the House bill, on Saturday, which amendments were immediately concurred in by the House, and the bill is now before the Governor.

We have not time to give an abstract of the bill at present, but will endeavor to give either the entire bill, or its main features in our next issue. The most important bill to the people, however, is one to regulate the sale of ardent spirits, which has also just passed both Houses, and been sent to the Governor for his examination.

This act changes in many respects the present mode of granting licenses, and makes other important alterations in the present law. We must, however, postpone giving the details until a future occasion. It may be as well to say that there is very little doubt that Gov. Packer will approve both acts.

No other business of importance has been transacted by our representatives since our last issue. The adjournment of the Legislature has been fixed for the 22d inst. (to-morrow.)

The River since last week has fallen, and the lumbering has ceased at this point. A considerable portion of our lumber has been enabled to reach Middletown and Marietta during the late freshet. The news from there are rather discouraging. Prices are very low and buyers exceedingly scarce. We can venture no predictions as to the prospect in the future. We think however that our lumbermen should not sell at the present prices, if they can avoid it. The gradual improvement that is taking place in the general business of the country, makes the chances rather in favor of higher prices.

A portable flouring mill is now on exhibition in Philadelphia, which is represented as a highly important invention, designed, if its practical operations come up to the standard fixed by its inventor, to in a great measure supersede the present massive structures filled with extensive and complex machinery now in general use in manufacturing the material for the "staff of life." It occupies but little space, can be placed in any moderate sized building, and requires but six-horse power to run it, which can be applied in almost any way; while its entire cost is only from five to seven hundred dollars. Mr. James M. Clark, of Philadelphia, is the owner and patentee.

The Mount Vernon House, at Lumber city, on the river, six miles above Curwensville, in this county, has just been opened by Mr. L. W. Ten Eyck, as will be seen by a reference to our advertising columns. Mr. Ten Eyck is not only an experienced landlord but also a gentlemanly fellow, who will omit no care and attention in the entertainment of his guests that will contribute to their comfort and enjoyment. Try him, and if you don't find him to be all we state and much more in the way of a good fellow, then we are mistaken.

The National Exchange Hotel, at Curwensville, has been taken this spring by that well known landlord, Mr. David Smith, who is now prepared to accommodate his old friends and the public generally in his usual clever and comfortable style, revised and improved. His card can be found in another column, but you needn't look at it; call and take a look at friend David himself, and try his good cheer.

We were favoured with a visit to our office this week, by Col. Wm. T. Alexander, the gentlemanly Editor of the Clarion Democrat, who is spending a few days in our town. The Col. looks remarkably hale and hearty; just as every democratic Editor ought to look.

It is said that the grass-hoppers threaten to be more numerous in Texas the coming summer than they were last. Millions already cover the prairies of that State the product of the eggs deposited last year. They have as yet confined themselves to the herbs on the prairies, without attacking the grass and grain crops.

A flood has prevailed on the Mississippi river for several days, and has done a vast amount of damage. A large crevasse has been broken through the levee or embankment opposite New Orleans, and all effort to close it up so far have proved ineffectual.

SANTA ANNA is said to be again on his way to Mexico for the doxenth time; in the hope it is presumed that in the present distracted state of the country he can once more obtain the government.

A Destructive FIRE occurred in Williamsport week before last at which about \$28,000 worth of property was destroyed.

AN EXCHANGE says that "Harrisburg Pa. has burst out into a building fever." We presume it is caused by a burning fever which lately visited that place.

THE FIRST BOUQUET of the season, as also the second and third have graced and perfumed the table of our sanctum sanctorum for several days. Those young Ladies who so kindly remembered us will please consider our beaver tipped in the most approved style.

Adjourned Orphans Court Sale. By virtue of an order of the Orphans Court, the real estate of the late John G. ...

NOTICE—The Store accounts of Leonard Gibbons & Co., and of Wm. B. Gibbons, late doing business at Hope Haven having been assigned to me for collection. All persons indebted to me are requested to immediately call on me and pay their accounts. J. B. McEXALLY, Clearfield, April 21, 1858.

M. T. VERNON HOUSE, Lumber city, Clearfield Co., Pa. The undersigned notices the public that he has opened at the above named house, and that he is well prepared to accommodate all who may favor him with a call. The house is three stories high, is commodious and well furnished, and no pains will be spared to render satisfaction to guests. His Bar is always supplied with choice liquors of all kinds. There is plenty of stabling connected with the house. He solicits a share of public patronage. April 21, 1858. L. W. TEN EYCK.

NATIONAL EXCHANGE HOTEL. The subscriber having taken the above well known stand, formerly kept by Wm. A. Mason, in Curwensville, Pa., is ready to accommodate all who may favor him with their patronage. His table will always be supplied with the best market affords, and his Bar with the choicest liquors. His stable will be under the care of attentive hostlers. DAVID SMITH, Curwensville, April 21, 1858.

LICENSE NOTICE.—The following persons have filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Court of Quarter Sessions of Clearfield county, their respective Petitions for License of MAY Session next, agreeably to act of Assembly of March 23, 1856, entitled "An Act to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors," &c. J. M. Bumgarther, Tavern, Beccaria tp. Peter Solt, Tavern, Bradford tp. Andrew Cross, Tavern, Boggs tp. John Beish, Tavern, Boggs tp. Adam Knurr, Tavern, Brandy tp. Isaac D. Henry, Tavern, Brandy tp. G. Goodlander, Tavern, Brandy tp. Dan. M. Weaver, Tavern, Clearfield tp. Geo. D. Jantch, Tavern, Clearfield tp. Wm. A. Mason, Tavern, Curwensville tp. David Smith, Tavern, do do. H. H. Post, Tavern, Decatur tp. Jacob Mack, Tavern, Morris tp. Thomas C. Davis, Tavern, Penn tp. L. W. Ten Eyck, Tavern, Penn tp.

LAWYERS OFFICE. Clearfield born, Wendell Adams, Clearfield born, April 21, 1858. GEO. WYLLIAMS, CLK.

TRIAL LIST FOR MAY TERM, 1858. D. Adams vs. Engle's adm'rs. McFarlan vs. Best. Rider and wife vs. Eliza Irwin. Hinds vs. Mason. Ritter vs. Huxtable & Bro. Draucker vs. Hartshorn. Wilson's Ex'rs vs. Melahoff & Mitchell. Callberry and wife vs. Powell, et al. Abless vs. Caldwell. Mitchell & Melahoff vs. Pennington. Frank vs. Bloom. Sabin vs. McGhee. Irvin's heirs vs. McCasters. Davis vs. McCracken, et al. McKee vs. Bloom. Best vs. McFarlan. Comford vs. Poutz. Jones et al. vs. Bartles, et al. Riddle vs. Swan. Askey vs. Stevenson. Drinkers vs. Locke. Kerlin vs. McGarvey. GEO. WALTERS, Pro'p. April 21, 1858.

COURT PROCLAMATION. WHEREAS, The Honorable JAMES BURN- SIDE, Esq., President Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of the twenty-fifth Judicial District, composed of the counties of Clearfield, Centre and Clinton, and the Honorable W. M. L. MOORE and BENJ. BOYSSAL, Associate Judges in Clearfield county, have issued their precept bearing date the twentieth day of Nov, last, to me directed, for the holding of a Court of Common Pleas, Orphans' Court, Court of Quarter Sessions, Court of Oyer and Terminer, and Court of General Jail Delivery, at the THIRD MONDAY of May, next, being the 17th day of the month.

Notice is, therefore, hereby given, To the Coroner, Justices of the Peace, and Constables, in and for the said county of Clearfield, to appear in their own proper persons, with their Rolls, Records, Inquisitions, Examinations, and other Remembrances, to do those things which to their offices, and in their behalf, pertain to be done, and Jurors and Witnesses are requested to be then and there attending, and not to depart without leave at their peril. GIVEN under my hand and Seal at Clearfield this 7th day of April, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-eight, and the eighty-first year of American Independence. JOSIAH R. LEED, Sheriff.

AUDITOR'S NOTICE. The undersigned an Auditor appointed by the Orphans' Court of Clearfield county at November Session, 1857, to audit the Administration account of Isaac Bloom, administrator of the estate John B. Bloom, dec'd, hereby gives notice that he will discharge the duties of his appointment on Thursday the 25th of March, 1858, at 2 o'clock, p. m. of said day, at the office of Larrimer & Test in the borough of Clearfield, when and where all persons interested may attend. J. H. LARRIMER, Auditor. Fe. 24, 1858.

N. B. All persons interested in the above audit, will take notice that it is continued until Thursday the 13th of May next at the same place and hour, by the auditor. J. H. LARRIMER. March 25th, 1858.

SHORT LIGHT ON A SHORT SUBJECT. FRANK SHORT announces to his friends that he has removed from his stock from the "Short Shoe Shop" on short notice, from his old stand, to the shop formerly occupied by Isaac Bloom, administrator of the estate John B. Bloom, dec'd, hereby gives notice that he will discharge the duties of his appointment on Thursday the 25th of March, 1858, at 2 o'clock, p. m. of said day, at the office of Larrimer & Test in the borough of Clearfield, when and where all persons interested may attend. J. H. LARRIMER, Auditor. Fe. 24, 1858.

But, Mr. President, I do not understand how honorable Senators on the other side can feel so free to interpose mere formal objections to the admission of Kansas as a State—how they can talk about informality, or irregularity, or usurpation of rights. They have claimed a right for Kansas on the Topeka Constitution—a movement commenced without the authority of any law, Territorial or Congressional, and in derogation of the authority of the United States. It was conceived in avowed rebellion; and presented in defiance of the Federal authority. Nor was it sustained by the popular will. It had its origin in a mass meeting of one political party, and had the sanction, its advocates say, of seven hundred voices—at the polls whilst its enemies say it did not receive exceeding seven hundred votes in all. In no particular, then, does it stand so well as the Lecompton movement, either as to regularity or authority. Nor will the historian be able to understand how a majority of five to one have been so constantly oppressed in that unhappy Territory—how one man has usurped the rights and powers of five or six or ten; as we are told,—"In one breath it is asserted that the free State party are as five to one, or ten to one; and in the next, that they have been hunted down, driven from their property, and deprived of their political rights." Some historians have a convenient mode of making out a proposition; but this is a little too sharp. I have noticed, in the discussion, that Governor Walker is given, by the Senators on the other side, as conclusive authority as to the nineteen disfranchised counties; as to the great strength of the free-State party; and the malpractices of the other party; but when he testified officially as to the rebellious movements and the mischievous designs of the Topekaites, his views are promptly discarded and denounced. This is not fair to him, or to the country. The Governor has made up an issue against this party, and it should be met and answered.

But, Mr. President, holding, as I do, that the application of the People of Kansas for admission as a State has been made in due form—that their appearance at the doors of Congress, with a Constitution and State Government is the legal and conclusive evidence of their application for admission, I conclude that an allowable opportunity is presented to admit them as a State; and it is to the alternatives thus presented that I wish to turn my thoughts for a few minutes.

Mr. Harlan—I rise to a question of order. It is very evident there is not a quorum of Senators present, and I object to any Senators proceeding with the discussion of questions involved in the bill before the senate.

Mr. Bigler—I shall be done in a few minutes. The Presiding Officer, (Mr. S. H. Hildell in the chair.) It is the impression of the chair that the Senator from Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. Bigler—I yielded the floor to the Senator to explain, not to make objections. I have the floor. I got unanimous consent and therefore I shall proceed.

Mr. Harlan—Of course, then, I shall have no further objection.

Mr. Bigler—I must be allowed to flatter myself with this interruption. I take it the Senator does not like my speech.

Mr. Harlan—Allow me to explain. I suppose that the remarks of the honorable Senator, judging from their applicability, would be better delivered to the Senate than to vacant seats.

Mr. Bigler—I have no idea that I can say anything that will influence the gentlemen of the Senate. They know as much about the subject as I do. Well, sir, I have held that the application is legal and proper, and that I may vote for the admission of Kansas as a State, if I deem it wise to do so. On the great question of admission or rejection, I have reflected long and seriously, and am a firm believer in the policy of admission. I think it best for Kansas, and for the whole family of States.—And I believe, in addition, sir, that so soon as the popular mind is turned from that war of crimination and recrimination—of alleged fraud and usurpation on the one hand, and persistent rebellion and violence on the other, to contemplate and count the consequences of admission against those of rejection, the measure will encounter much less opposition from the people. What great wrong can flow from admission? What interest or right of the people is to be damaged? Our ears are daily assailed with graphic descriptions of the great wrong of forcing a government upon the people of Kansas. Yet no one proposes to do this. We make no government for them. They make it for themselves. If they do not like it, after they get into the Union they can abolish it and adopt other forms. No power on the face of the earth, outside of the Territory, will dare to dispute their right to do this.—That there is nothing in the Constitution to interfere with this right for a single day, has been made so clear by the President, and by Senators, that I shall not discuss it again. It is a little singular, however, that this allegation of the want of power in the people, by virtue of their "inalienable and indefeasible right" to alter, amend or supersede their form of government at pleasure, should come from the advocates, par excellence, of popular sovereignty. Not only this particular, but as to the right of the people to make a State Constitution through the agency of delegates, have these expounders of popular sovereignty sought to impose serious restrictions upon the rights of the people. They would persuade the people that they are on the side of popular rights, whilst, in fact, their doctrines are the reverse.

But, sir, who can foretell the consequences of the rejection of the State?—How will the act be interpreted by the people of the South? Will they believe that it was the consequence of the informality or the want of popular sanction of the Constitution, or will they believe that it was the consequence of nominal slavery in the State, and that they are bound to treat it as a practical and positive evidence that no more slave States are to be admitted into the Union; that the faith of the compromises of 1850 is to be carried out? It does not become me to say what they should believe, or what they should do if they believe the worst. I should, for one, hope for the best, and struggle to the end to maintain those fraternal relations between the States under which we have so long grown and prospered as a nation. The State I represent will contend for the just rights

of all the States, North or South, who will stand by the Union with the Constitution, and resist the wars of sectionalism, even when they may. But, sir, it is no difficult task to discover that the people of Kansas would tend to the perpetuity and aggravation of the fruitless strife about slavery—this bitter feud, which is rapidly straining the feeling of one section of the country from the other, rapidly exhausting those sources of fraternal affection without which your Federal Union would be a rope of sand. I believe in the good feeling and affection among the people as the greatest agency in maintaining the family of States. That can only be done by dealing justly to all, especially toward the weak. The Constitution must be our bond and our guide.—Let the two States of Kansas and Minnesota come in, one slave and one free, as an exemplification of the compromises of 1850, and the beauties of the Democratic faith. This will be wiser, that the perpetuity of the war of crimination and recrimination, of assault on the one hand, and reprisal on the other. But if Kansas be rejected, what will be the truth of history on the subject? Will it be that the State was rejected because the mode of getting it up was not satisfactory, or because the Constitution recognized slavery? I am confident some Northern members of Congress are going against the admission of the State, who would not do so were the proceedings in Kansas satisfactory to them; but I am still more confident that the slavery article of the Constitution is a witness I could give no other testimony. There may be those who would differ with me in opinion; but, sir, it is too clear that whilst it is conceded on all hands that Kansas is to be a free State, the shadow of slavery that appears in the Constitution is the real cause of hostility to the admission on the Republican side.

Then, again, sir, what would follow in Kansas were she rejected on her present application? Let her be turned over to the tender mercies of General Lane and his followers, and what will they do? Who will guarantee that they will make a Constitution that could be accepted by Congress? What reason have we to believe that we should not have a repetition of the scenes of violence and excess that have so far marked the progress of that distracted people? Who believes that Lane and his party would exercise power with moderation? The conduct of the recent Republican Legislature is suggestive on this point. I should be disappointed—greatly disappointed, sir—if the rejection did not renew and heighten the strife and complications in the Territory. If the one party proceeded to make a State, the other would abstain from all agency in the work. Indeed, one party in the Territory are at this time engaged in electing delegates to another Convention, to make another Constitution. The other party refuse to participate, and allege that the election is being held without the authority of any law, the Governor has refused to sanction it; so we are to have a new complication. This new Convention will be violently anti-slavery; and I shall be amazed if they do not incorporate some extreme anti-slavery feature, having the defect to keep the State out of the Union. They may interrupt the execution of the fugitive-slave law, or confiscate the property in the slaves that are now in the Territory. It is evident that even the Senator from Wisconsin does not like the Constitution now before the Senate because it protects the property-value in the slaves now in the Territory. Is this to be the policy? Is this to be an issue? It is to be held that, under the doctrines of the compromises guaranteeing to the Territories admission with or without slavery, slave-owners are liable to lose the property-value in slaves whenever a decision is made against the institution. When the people of all the States go to the Territories, carrying with them their property, of whatever kind, in case the Territory should become a free State, are the owners of slaves to lose the property-value in such slaves? That has not been my understanding of the policy of the Government. The complications and new issues could scarcely fail to perpetuate this bitter controversy, which is so rapidly uprooting fraternity and confidence between the northern and southern States, and even poisoning the very channels of communication between the people of these several States.

On the other hand, as I have enquired, what evil consequences are to flow from the admission of the State? As was so forcibly remarked the other day by the Senator from Louisiana, (Mr. Benjamin,) what possible wrong do we inflict on the people of Kansas, by conferring upon them the rights and dignities of a sovereign State? We hear much about forcing a government upon Kansas; whilst the truth is, she has proposed to come in, and Congress is about to accept her proposition. That is all. It is said, the Constitution is not acceptable to the will of the majority. Well, sir, that is their business, not ours. If they do not like their fundamental law, they can change it. Some gentlemen talk about this Constitution as though it was to be, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. But so far from this, the question of slavery, like every other feature of the instrument, will be forever subject to the will of the majority. When this issue first came up in December last, it was a question between admission under the Lecompton Constitution on the one hand, and enabling act on the other. An enabling act—for what? Why, to enable the people to make a State government to suit themselves the answer is, why not do this under the auspices of a State Constitution? I said then, as I say now, the Constitution is the best enabling act that the wit of man can devise. It has all the good qualities of an enabling act, without its bad ones. It would determine, instead of extend the strife.

Then, again, as alleged, the popular will has been smothered by this Lecompton party, admission is the mode of complete vindication. It is under a State constitution that popular sovereignty is to have unrestrained sway. It is in this way that it rises to the complete majesty of its power. Those claiming and having that power can have no well founded objection to the remedy. Now, the power of the people of Kansas is not equal to the abolition of slavery. Slaves are now in that territory; slaves can go there and be held there; Congress cannot prevent it. The people, or the majority, cannot prevent it so long as they remain a Territory. But when clothed with the sovereignty of a State, they will become equal to the task. I am for admission. I am for giving the people that power. Senators on the other

side, whilst claiming a large majority for the free State party, object to an admission; object to giving the people the power; to immediately abolish slavery. They object and yet attempt to make the world believe that they are the peculiar friends of a free State. That is much after the plan that their friends in Kansas have used to abolish slavery. They would always vote when they could not vote against slavery. They would not vote for delegates, for their delegates might have rejected slavery. They would not go to the election on the 21st December, because they could have rejected slavery.

Now, a few words more as to the popular sovereignty. There are those who hold that because the constitution was not submitted to the popular vote as an entirety, the process of making it was in violation of popular sovereignty as recognized in the creed of the Democratic party. That is a fallacious view, unless our representative system be abolished and a common democracy be embraced as the system we prefer. Recognizing the representative system, it is perfectly competent for the people to delegate their sovereign power and authority to a convention to make and adopt a constitution and State government. My State did this; more than half the original States did it.

Mr. Fessenden—will the Senator give way to a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Bigler—Will the Senator permit me to utter a paragraph or two more?

Mr. Fessenden—I do not know that I shall want to adjourn then.

Mr. Bigler—That is another compliment.—The Senator does not like my speech.

Mr. Fessenden—Yes I do; I am enjoying it very much.

Mr. Bigler—It is near three and a half o'clock in the morning, and I have but a few words more.

The doctrine of non-intervention seems to have confused and confounded some people lately. They talk as though Congress has guaranteed that men should not cheat each other in Kansas; as though one political party should not take the advantage of the other; as though representatives should not deceive their constituents. This is more than was bargained for. Congress agreed that they would not interfere with the domestic affairs of the Territories, and that the States as such, should not interfere; but that was all. It never was pretended that the Federal Government could interfere between the people and their proper local representatives. Nor did Congress guarantee that those who do not vote should carry the election; nor yet that the majority should rule, if they did not do so through the agency of the law. It is the right of the law to rule, and the right of the majority to make the law; but the majority is as much bound by the law, whilst it is such, as is the minority.

I intend to vote for Kansas as a State; and in doing this I do not wish so much to signify my approval of the manner of getting up the State, and the circumstances surrounding the application, as I do to declare my conviction that admission, prompt admission, is the best and wisest of the alternatives that are before us.—There is much in the details of the proceedings in Kansas that is unpleasant and distasteful—partaking of evident abuse of the elective franchise on the one hand, and an attempt to supersede its lawful use by violence and faction on the other. Kansas should not be an example for future States; and I trust our country may never be required to witness such scenes again. But, sir, whatever may be the defects on the Lecompton side, on the other is matured, persistent, and avowed in subordination to the laws, if not rebellion to the Government. Between these I prefer the former side.

The addition of two members to the family of States should be cause of general joy, as an event bringing fraternal affection, energy, power, stability, progress and general prosperity to the family of States, and to our common country. That these blessings are to follow the admission of the two States now on the threshold of the Union, I hope and believe.

Now, sir, I have done for the present, and as it is after three o'clock, I think we should vote. [Laughter.] As I have said nothing for a long time, I may claim to close the debate.

REGISTER'S NOTICES.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that the following accounts have been examined and passed by me, and remain filed of record in the office for the inspection of heirs, legatees, creditors and all others in any way interested and will be presented to the next Orphans' Court of Clearfield county, to be held at the Court house in the borough of Clearfield, on Tuesday the 17th day of May next, for confirmation and allowance:

The account of John L. Cuttle, Adm'r. of the estate of J. Biddle Gordon, late of the borough of Clearfield, dec'd.

The final administration account of Jno. M'Goey and Mary M'Goey, adm'rs of Max. of the estate of Simon Lynch, late of Lawrence tp., dec'd.

Final administration account of Mary Fretwell, (formerly Mary Rose,) adm'x of Edward Rose, deceased.

The Administration account of Joseph Nicholson, Administrator of the estate of Samuel S. Nicholson, deceased.

The account of John W. Wright and Jesse Williams, Executors of the last will and testament of Jacob Leonard, late of Beccaria tp., dec'd.

The partial account of David Dressler and Elizabeth Dressler, Adm'rs of the estate of John Dressler, late of Union township, Clearfield county, dec'd.

The partial account of William Fullerton, surviving administrator of the estate of John Fullerton, deceased.

The partial account of James T. Leonard, one of the executors of the estate of William C. Welch, late of the borough of Clearfield, deceased.

The final administration account of Eli Fye, administrator of the estate of Samuel Fye, late of the township of Brady, in the county of Clearfield, deceased.

The final account of William Irvine, one of the administrators of the estate of Matthew Irvine, late of Burnside township, Clearfield county, deceased.

The final administration account of James T. Leonard, administrator of the estate of David Ogden, late of Lawrence township, Clearfield county, deceased.

The final administration account of James T. Leonard, administrator of the estate of Philip Fisher, late of Woodward township, Clearfield county, deceased.

The final administration account of James T. Leonard, administrator of the estate of Robert Leonard, late of Lawrence township, Clearfield county, deceased. [apr. 1858.] JAMES WRIGLEY, CLK.

BACON Flour—superfine and extra. Dried Peaches, &c. at KRATZER'S. April 1, 1857.