night, was heralded from this Capitol by the boom of cannon, since echoed upon the plains of Kansas in the sighs of its widows and orphans, and the wail of its martyrs to freedom. In order to drown these cries, and, if possible, to stifle the awakened sense of justice, and the excited sympathies of the human heart, we are called upon to perpetrate still another great outrage upon the rights of this people. There is no difficulty in giving peace to Kansas, and quieting the agitation of the country upon the exciting subject of slavery. When you will do justice to freemen, and allow them to make their own organic law, free from violence and fraud, that object will be accomplished.

There is in Kansas, to day, a state of things which has not existed there since its organization. At their first election, their government was seized upon by invaders, who held possession of it till the election in October last, when the people of Kansas, for the first time, elected their own officers.

Mr. Clemens. As the gentleman is the reputed leader——

Mr. Grow. I am the leader of nobody but myself.

Mr. Clemens. Well; I want to ask a question.

Mr. Grow. Very well.

Mr. Clemens. Do I understand the gentleman to maintain that the people of Kansas have not the right to amend their constitution until 1864?

Mr. Grow. I maintain that when you make a fundamental law for the people and put in it a provision prescribing the mode and manner in which it can be changed, it cannot be changed peaceably, except through those forms, as long as there is a party that adheres to the forms. If there is a party in Kansas who will attempt to change that constitution before 1864, except in the mode provided by it, in my opinion the Federal Administration, judging from its actions during the last four years, will send the Army of the United States to put down any such attempt.

Mr. Clemens. What becomes, then, of your doctrine of the sovereignty of the people?

Mr. Grow. The people place in their organic law the conditions upon which they will exert their sovereignty; and if it could be changed without any observance of forms, a constitution would be the same as a by-law of a corporation. By acquiescence of the people it could be changed at any time.—While I believe it to be the absolute right of a people to change their form of government at any time, I must act on such a question in view of the probable action of the President, who, if called upon, has to quell insurrection with the Army. In Rhode Island, the people had been protesting against their constitution for twenty years, and the people, by a clear majority, came together and framed a new constitution; but the Supreme Court of the United States said that they were rebels; and the President sent the Army of the United States to put them down.

More Annexation in Prospect.

After the passage or rejection of Lecompton, other agitations are in store for the country. The President will spring such issues upon the public as the purchase of Cuba, or its violent seizure upon the principles of the Ostend Manifesto, and the annexation of all Mexico, involving the payment of her foreign and domestic debt, amounting to $200,000,000. The annexation of Mexico to the United States, or its subjugation by means of a protectorate, will probably be favored by Great Britain and France. Subjects of those countries are proprietors of the foreign debt of Mexico, about $100,000,000, and naturally interested in pay represented by home creditors.

The principle of assuming the debts of governments which are absorbed is now fully established. Thirteen years ago we annexed Texas, with an express stipulation that the United States should incur no liability on account of her debt, and that she should keep her lands wherewith to pay them.—Notwithstanding this compact, the United States have paid nearly the entire public debt of Texas, and much more than would have been paid had that State remained an independent Republic. Nor can the principle be controverted. Foreign creditors of weak nations cannot be deprived of their remedies against them if they choose to merge their sovereignties with stronger powers, any more than an individual can repudiate his private liability for personal obligations, by forming a partnership with other men. We know, then, the exact pecuniary cost of annexing Mexico and Cuba. It is two hundred millions for each, four hundred millions for both. I do not say whether the bargain would be a good or a bad one, but of one thing there cannot be a reasonable doubt, which is, that it will, if consummated, lay the foundations of a national debt as enduring as the national existence. The bargain will carry another consequence—the assumption by the Federal government of the repudiated debts of the States. If this government can be made liable for the debts of Cuba and Mexico, by taking them into the Union, how much more firmly is she bound in honor to redeem the plighted faith of those States already in the Union? No man doubts that if the Federal government should withdraw the shield of its power from the defaulting States of Arkansas, Mississippi and Florida, that Great Britain would collect the amount of the bonds of which their subjects have been swindled by the governments of those States at the mouth of the cannon and the point of the bayonet. As then they are protected in their dishonor only by the *power* of this Government, it follows that sooner or later that protection must be withdrawn or the money must be paid. The first branch of the alternative is an impossibility; the Federal Treasury will make good the second.

These financial questions disposed of, the greatest political controversy that ever shook this Union will arise, if the attempt to annex Cuba and Mexico be persisted in as Democratic issues. That is whether these new acquisitions shall be admitted as States, or governed in perpetuity as provinces, without representation in the Senate and House.—*Washington Correspondence of the N. Y. Courier and Enquirer.*

In a Tight Spot.—The Washington correspondent of the *Journal of Commerce* writes as follows:

"The passage of such a bill—admitting Kansas and recognizing the Lecompton Constitution—will be a great triumph to the Administration. It will *not increase* their strength at the South, and may *decrease* their strength in the North; but a failure of the measure would prove *fatal* to them, and to the integrity and future success of the Democratic Party."

According to this view of the case the Administration is in a dilemma. The passage of the bill will not help them at the South and will hurt them at the North:—and its failure would be fatal. In any event, therefore, they are likely to be essentially damaged.—*N. Y. Times.*

☞ The Kansas question was made a *test* in several districts up the Lackawanna last election, and the Administration was beaten in some of its strongholds. This is cheering evidence that Luzerne will be right next fall. —*Wilkesbarre Record.*

The Independent Republican.

C. F. READ & H. H. FRAZIER, EDITORS.

F. E. LOOMIS, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

MONTROSE, PA.,

Thursday, April 8, 1858.

☞ Don't neglect to attend the Republican County Meeting advertised for next Monday evening.

☞ The various interruptions incident to "Court Week" have prevented us from devoting as much attention as usual to our editorial department. But as the interruptions referred to have been mostly by those who came to subscribe for the REPUBLICAN, or to pay the printer, we are not disposed to complain, and trust our readers will not.

☞ The lectures on the Indian Tribes of North America, delivered by Rev. J. B. KING, in Montrose, on Friday last, were exceedingly interesting and instructive. Having evidently devoted a good deal of time and research to the subject, Mr. King has provided himself with an abundance of facts not generally known; and, being possessed of a peculiar faculty for blending amusement with instruction, he cannot fail to be very successful as a lecturer. We believe that few indeed are so well acquainted with the habits and history of the aborigines of this country, that they may not acquire much curious and interesting information by attending Mr. King's lectures. We certainly did.

The following has been furnished to us for publication:

"On Friday, April 2nd, 1858, I enjoyed the privilege of listening to the lectures of the Rev. J. B. King, which were delivered in his peculiarly interesting style, on the origin, history, social, religious, and military habits of the North American Indians. These lectures contain much valuable information, not found in ordinary histories of the Indians, and will prove deeply interesting to all classes of society.

J. F. STODDARD."

☞ Connecticut held a State election last Monday. The returns received indicate a large gain and decided victory by the Republicans.

☞ The joy of the people of the Free States at the staggering blow struck at the pro-Slavery federal administration by the defeat of Lecompton in the House, has been exhibited in many places by public demonstrations. In New York City, one hundred and twenty cannon were fired, and the event was celebrated with processions and illuminations. A public demonstration was got up at Hartford, Ct., and another at Easton, Pa., in which Gov. Reeder participated.

Some of Mr. Buchanan's friends predicted that the defeat of this darling measure of the President, in the House, would prove the downfall of his administration. So be it.

☞ Senator Hammond, of South Carolina, who recently characterized all working people as "the mudsills of society," is himself the son of a butcher —the blood of a "mudsill" is in his veins. As Saxe says:

> "Depend upon it, my snobbish friend,
> Your family thread you can't ascend,
> Without good reason to apprehend
> You may find it waxed at the other end
> By some plebeian vocation."

☞ We publish this week the prospectus of the most valuable periodicals published in this country or any other.

☞ J. B. Lippincott & Co., publishers, Philadelphia, have sent us a copy of an English Grammar, by Rev. R. W. Bailey, A. M. We find it a concise, well digested system of Grammar, free from most of the erroneous doctrines that a love of innovation has incorporated into many modern Grammars. No doubt this science is susceptible of improvement, as well as any other; but "change is not always reform," and the author who revives and adopts a long-exploded error, or promulgates a new one, for the sake of appearing to be a discoverer, certainly deserves censure rather than praise. The author of this work appears to have contented himself with the endeavor to be useful rather than brilliant—to arrange, simplify, and illustrate his subject, rather than to excite wonder by the advocacy of startling paradoxes.

In addition to the usual definitions, principles, and rules, this book contains a collection of idioms, faulty or difficult constructions, &c., with the necessary explanations or corrections.

The same publishers also send us a Primary English Grammar by the same author, in which the subject is simplified to adapt it to young learners.

☞ We are indebted to Samuel C. Morton, Esq., President of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, for a copy of the Annual Report of the Directors of that Association. Among the subjects discussed by the Association during the past year, were the quarantine laws—interest and usury—insurance companies and their liabilities—the conformation of prices to our decimal currency—uniformity of weights and measures—uniform and cheap postage—reform in the currency and banking system of the State, &c.

☞ Judd's American *Agriculturist* is doubtless the best work of the kind now published in the country. It is of large size, and published monthly—each number containing about thirty pages of the most reliable information upon agriculture that can be found. We confidently recommend this work to every farmer and gardener who wishes to keep pace with the agricultural improvements of the day.

Price, one dollar a year for a single copy; six copies for five dollars. Address Orange Judd, No. 189 Water St., New York.

Problem.—Suppose a clock to have an hour, a minute, and a second hand, all turning on the same center. At 12 o'clock all the hands are together, and point at 12. How long will it respectively be before each hand will be at *equal distances* from the other two?

Will any of our readers send us a solution of the above?

Letter from Kansas

The following private letter from a citizen of Kansas, has been handed to us for publication:

Prairie City, K. T., Feb. 16, 1858.

Brother Miner:—I received your letter of January 15th, about a week ago. I should have answered it sooner, but the next morning after receiving it I was called away about fifty miles towards Missouri, to assist in making some arrests in regard to the election frauds. The Board of Commissioners appointed by the Legislature, chose Gen. Abbot Stewart and E. S. Willett who has been living with me for the last six months, to make arrests and serve subpoenas. The first two weeks they had no trouble, except in finding that a good many of the men they wanted, had left the Territory. But the next week, Willett took three men and went to Shawnee, in Johnson County, and found where there were seven in one house. Our boys went in, thinking the others would not suspect their business, but the ruffians were prepared for them, and in an instant sprang to one side of the room, in a line, with their guns cocked, and swore that forty men could not take them. Our boys backed down, and sent a dispatch to Prairie City for help. We started from Prairie City, about 2 o'clock, p. m., with twelve men, rode fifty miles that night, and took the Devils about 4 in the morning—got a little way out of town, and got lost, and were obliged to wait for daylight. We arrived at Lawrence Saturday afternoon. You said the *Montrose Democrat* denies these things. The *Montrose Democrat* is a liar. You wish me to write more fully about these things, but you don't think how much time it would take. It would take me six weeks to give all the particulars; but I will relieve your curiosity a little.

New Year's Day, just at dusk, I started with a company of fourteen mounted men, by order of Gen. Lane, for Oxford, to arrest the Judges of the October election—with the promise of being joined by Lane himself, with three other companies, to be there on the 4th of January and protect the polls.—We arrested the prisoners, but finding one thousand United States troops there to protect the polls, we left one James Walker to challenge votes, and went home. Well, Walker testifies under oath that on election day about two hundred of the Ruffians came there to vote, that he challenged their votes about an hour, with the promise of protection by the U. S. troops, but that finally one of the Judges came to the window and told the Ruffians to force their votes in, and then, having three revolvers pointed at his head at once, he was obliged to quit challenging, but staid till night. He says he saw one man vote fifteen times, without leaving the window. Now, I am well acquainted with Walker, and know this to be so.—And one of the Judges that we took this trip, swore that the day after election he went to Westport, and wrote names all day, to add to the election returns. These things would not be, if it was not for the United States troops, and we have about come to the conclusion that they must not meddle with our affairs much more.

J. Monroe Sturdevant.

For the Independent Republican.

Happiness of Slavery.

March 24, 1858.

Messrs Editors: Dear Sirs:—I find in a Northern paper a letter written by a young lady, now in Georgia, to a friend. She thinks those who are the loudest in denouncing Slavery, know the least about it; and says the negroes are so full of song and frolic that to her they appear really to be the happiest creatures in the world. I would answer that the imprisoned bird appears to be as frolicksome and full of song as the niggers who came under her observation; and it is natural to suppose that, as the song of the former is plaintive, consequent upon slavery, so often at least it might be with the latter. I would inform her, also, that I have known negroes to be full of songs for Jesus as a comforter when at the same time had they had full stomachs, and backs not running, putrid sores as inflicted thereon by a master or mistress, brother or sister in the same Church—the song would have been much less plaintive and devotional! But it matters not what may be the negro's condition or feelings—like the prisoned or freed bird, he will sing.

Our fair correspondent may have seen a few negroes that chanced to come under her observation who were well clothed; but I do assure her that during my stay in the South of nearly twenty-five years I never knew more than fifteen dollars' worth of clothing to be allowed a nigger for one year—rarely over ten dollars, including hats and shoes. I have hired them, many times, by the year, and my bond always called for ten dollars' worth of clothes; but I always thought it my interest to furnish them with twenty-five.

She spoke of the finely dressed wenches at church. She did not say whether or not said fine dresses were bought by the wages of prostitution! She says that the law provides that the niggers shall be well provided for, and well treated. I would add that the law of Mississippi provides that the master or overseer who inflicts more than thirty-nine lashes upon one of his negroes, shall be fined. Yet the niggers get from one hundred to one thousand blows with the cowhide, and handsome as ever. That is not all:—they continue to burn them to death with tar, as ever. And I never heard of a slaveholder being punished for mistreatment of his negroes, for murdering them downright—whipping them so they died from the effects of the same, (which I have witnessed) nor for burning them to death with tar, or at least so they died from the effects. Yes, in justice to the well treated, and alive one half of the niggers are mutilated in the South, by Southern people. She, our fair correspondent, talks that 'tis the interest of the slaveholder to treat his niggers well; very true; so 'tis the interest of every man to live a sober life, and treat his horse or ox well, provided he has one; yet we see one knowingly drink himself to death, and an other starve, whip, and drive to death his horse or ox, as the case may be.

Tennessee.

The Lecompton Bill Defeated.

The House of Representatives yesterday decided, by a majority of *eight*, that the Lecompton Constitution should be submitted to the vote of the people of Kansas,—and that the State should be admitted under it only in the event of its receiving their approval.—The manner in which this result was reached, and the vote upon it, will be found given in detail in our Congressional report. At one o'clock the Senate bill was taken up by general consent,—and the question was taken upon its simple rejection—without any attempt at amendment. This vote was lost, 95 to 137—the Republicans alone voting in its favor. Mr. Quitman then offered a substitute, which was the same as the Senate bill, except that it omitted the *quasi* recognition which that bill contains, of the right of the people of Kansas to change their Constitution at pleasure. This was lost by the decisive vote of 72 to 160. Then Mr. Montgomery offered the Crittenden amendment, which submits the Constitution to the popular vote; and this was adopted, Ayes, 120, Nays 112.

The bill thus amended now goes back to the Senate, where the amendment will probably be rejected, as it has already been once rejected, by a majority of that body. It will then go back to the House, where the question will be, *shall the House recede from its amendment?* We observe that hopes are expressed in some quarters that the House will recede, and pass the bill as the Senate insist on having it. We see no reason to believe that this will be done. The House of Representatives would scarcely under any circumstances yield its own deliberate judgment to so palpable an exercise of Senatorial dictation: and in this instance the members are too deeply committed upon the principle involved to permit them to recede without personal dishonor and political ruin.

We think it altogether probable that the House will adhere to the principle of *popular sovereignty*, which is so distinctly and unmistakably embodied in the Crittenden amendment which it has now adopted. The effect of this will be simply to reject the application for the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution,—just as Congress at the last session rejected her application for admission under the Topeka Constitution.—Kansas, therefore, remains a Territory, and the whole question is referred back to the Territorial Legislature. That body has already taken action upon it,—and ordered a Constitutional Convention, which has been elected and is now in session, engaged in framing a Constitution for submission to the popular vote. If Mr. Crittenden's amendment were adopted, this Convention would be set aside, and a new one elected; and it is barely possible that, in the last extremity and for the sake of securing another chance at the polls, the Senate may accept it:—but this is not probable. It is quite likely that another application for admission, with a new Constitution approved by the people, may be made before the adjournment of Congress. If so, it is not easy to see on what ground either the President or his friends in Congress could refuse it their support. If they are sincere in their desire to end this contest and put a stop to the Kansas agitation, they will avail themselves of such an opportunity, should it be offered. The present Convention was called by the regular Territorial Legislature, and is perfectly valid in all respects.—*N. Y. Times, April 2.*

Lecompton Defeated in the House.

On Thursday last, April 1st, Mr. Stephens of Georgia, called up the Senate Kansas bill. This bill, after reciting that "the people of the Territory of Kansas did, by a Convention of Delegates called and assembled at Lecompton, September 4th, 1857, form for themselves a Constitution and State Government," thereby assuming the legality and binding effect of the Lecompton Constitution,—provides that, "the State of Kansas shall be and is hereby declared to be one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

The bill was read once. Mr. Giddings objected to a second reading. The question then recurred, shall the bill be rejected?—Mr. Stephens demanded the yeas and nays. They were taken, and the bill was not rejected, yeas 97, nays 137. The bill was then read a second time.

Mr. Montgomery (Dem.) of Pa., offered a substitute, being the Crittenden amendment as amended by the anti-Lecompton Democratic Conference proposing to admit Kansas into the Union, to refer the Lecompton Constitution to a vote of the people, and in case they should reject it providing for the formation of a new Constitution by the people.

This amendment, called the Crittenden amendment, was *adopted*, yeas 120, nays 112. The bill was then passed as amended, by the same vote, namely:

Yeas—*To Amend:*

California—McKibbin—1.
Connecticut—*Clark*,—*Dean*,—2.
Illinois—*Elihu Washburne, Farnsworth, Lovejoy, Kellog*, Morris, Harris, Shaw, Robert Smith, Sam. S. Marshall—8.
Indiana—English, Foley, *Kilgore*, J. G. Davis, *Wilson, Colfax, Case, Petitt*—8.
Iowa—*Curtis, T. Davis*—2.
Kentucky—Underwood
Humphrey Marshall—2.
Maine—*Wood, Gilman, Abbott, Morse, I. Washburn, Foster*—6.
Maryland—Ricaud, J. M. Harris, H. Winter Davis—3.
Massachusetts—*Hall, Buffinton, Damrell, Comins, Burlingame, Davis, Gooch, Knapp, Thayer, Chaffee, Dawes*—11.
Michigan—*Howard, Waldron, Walbridge, Leach*—4.
Missouri—*Blair*—1.
New-Hampshire—*Pike, Tappan, Cragin*—3.
New-Jersey—*Clawson*,—

Nays.

Alabama—Stallworth, Shorter, Bodwell, Moore, Houston, Cobb, Curry—7.
Arkansas—Greenwood Warren—2.
California—Scott—1.
Connecticut—Arnold, Bishop—2.
Delaware—Whitely—1.
Florida—Hawkins—1.
Georgia—Seward, Crawford, Thippe, Gartrell, Wright, Jackson, Hill, Stephens—8.
Indiana—Niblack, Hughes Gregg—3.
Kentucky—Burnett, Peyton, Talbott, Jewett, Eliott, Clay, Mason, Stevenson—8.
Louisiana—Eustis, Taylor, Davidson, Sandidge—4.
Maine—Seward, Kunkel, Dean—3.
Missouri—Anderson, Clark, Craig, Woodson, Phelps—5.
Mississippi—Lamar, Davis, Barksdale, Singleton, Quitman—5.
New-Jersey—Huyler,
Absent—Caruthers, (Mo.)

Wortendrke—2.
North Carolina—Shaw Ruffin, Winslow, Branch, Scales, Craige, Clingman—7.
New York—Searing, Taylor, Sickles, Kelly, Maclay, John Cochrane, Ward Russell, Corning, Hatch—10.
Ohio—Miller, Burns—2.
Pennsylvania—Florence, Landy, Phillips, Glancy Jones, Leidy, Dimmick, White. Ahl, Gillis, Reilly, Dewart—11.
South Carolina—McQueen, Miles, Keitt, Bonham, Boyce—5.
Tennessee—Watkins, Maynard, S. A. Smith, Savage, Ready, Jones, Wright, Zollicoffer, Atkins, Avery—10.
Texas—Bryan, Reagan—2.
Virginia—Garnett, Millson, Caskie, Goode, Bocock, Powell, Smith, Faulkner, Letcher, Clemens, Jenkins, Edmundson, Hopkins—13.

Recapitulation.

Yeas.		Nays.	
Republicans	92	Democrats	104
Democrats	22	Americans	8
Americans	6		
Total	120	Total	112

The House then adjourned.

Mr. Crittenden's amendment as passed was materially improved and modified since it was first offered in the Senate. Instead of saying that the Constitution with which Kansas is now admitted shall be submitted to the popular vote, it refers to it merely as a Constitution framed at Lecompton. It prevents less than a majority of the Board of Commissioners from certifying the vote on the Constitution to the President, thus rendering Kickapoo frauds and the like fruitless. It rejects the land-grab ordinance, and punishes illegal voting or fraudulent returns with severe penalties. It declares that if Lecompton is rejected, and a new Constitution ratified by the people, Kansas shall be absolutely in the Union; thus preventing any factious resistance to her admission next winter, or any demands for compromises as conditions of admission.

The Americans of Washington are as rejoiced at the result as the Republicans and the Douglas Democrats in Congress. The Buchanan men mourn and threaten alternately. Old Buck is very gloomy and indignant. The whippers-in insist that the House must and will recede; but the anti-Lecomptonites are firm, and all say that the man who yields shall be branded by the whole phalanx as disgraced.

Mr. Harris of Illinois came in from his sick room, determined to vote, if it cost him his life, as it may. He, with Messrs. Hickman and Chapman of Pennsylvania, voted to reject the Senate bill absolutely.

A Stinging Rebuke.—Senator Clark, of New Hampshire, in the course of his speech, recently, in addressing himself to the remark of Mr. Hammond, of South Carolina, that Northern laborers are slaves, said:—

"With all due respect to the Senator, I say that they can not only get a dinner, but can give one to the Senator if he wants it. But I would advise the Senator not to talk of mud-sills there, otherwise five feet ten inches of ground—if that is the gentleman's height—might be his portion. In the Revolutionary war a blacksmith of New Hampshire gave his services to the State. His father said to him:—'The State is poor, don't ask for your money now.' And the sum due him stands on the record in the capital of New Hampshire, so many pounds, so many shillings—and his descendants are proud of that record of his patriotism. Little did the son of that man (Clark himself) think he would come into this Senate and hear the Senator from South Carolina call that father a slave!" (Applause.)

An old Citizen Gone.—Hon. Jonah Brewster, one of our oldest and most highly respected citizens, died at his residence, about a mile from this village, Sunday night. Mr. Brewster had lived nearly half a score beyond man's allotted time, and, we believe, enjoyed very good health up to a few weeks since, when he was prostrated by an attack of Rheumatism which resulted fatally.

Judge Brewster was several times a member of the Legislature of this State. He was likewise a State Senator from the Susquehanna district, and more recently, an Associate Judge of this county. The funeral takes place to day.—*Tioga Agitator, April 1.*

Sale of the State Canals.

The following is an abstract of the bill for the sale of the State Canals, to which we referred last week, as containing some very objectionable features:

The bill proposes and provides for the transfer by the Governor, of all the State canals to the Sunbury and Erie railrord company, and to no other company or persons.

By the first section, the Governor is required to sell the said Sunbury and Erie railroad company, within thirty days, if they agree to buy the public works of the Commonwealth, for the sum of three millions four hundred thousand dollars.

Second section provides for the issuing of seven millions of dollars of bonds, to be secured by a mortgage to trustees—three and a half millions of which bonds are to be received as payment in full for the canals by the State.

Third section provides for mortgages for two millions on the canals, and provides that these mortgages shall be exchanged by the State for others; and, annually, when certain specified stages of progress in the making of the railroad, are attained, shall be wholly cancelled.

Fourth section provides the time and manner of the transfer of the canals to the company by the Governor.

Fifth section provides for the company's enjoyment of the works, and that they may sell and lease them.

Sixth section provides for the delivery of the three and a half millions of bonds deposited by the company with the State, back to the company again.

Seventh section provides for the collecting of mortgages, if the interest is not paid on the bonds.

Eighth section provides that the proceeds of sale shall go into the sinking funds, and the

Ninth section provides for the keeping up of the canals.

It will be perceived, from the provisions of the bill, as proposed to the House by the majority of the committee, that the proposed sale, when divested of legal form and verbiage, is a simple transfer of all the State canals to the Sunbury and Erie railroad company, for three millions and a half of the five per cent. bonds of said company.

The following is a portion of the debate on this bill, in the House:

The question again recurring, will the House agree to the first section?

Mr. Chase moved to amend, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That it shall be the duty of the Governor, within twenty days after approving this act, to cause to be printed in one or more newspapers of extensive circulation, in the cities of Philadelphia, New York and the borough of Harrisburg, a notice, that all the canals of this Commonwealth will be exposed at public sale, at the Merchants' Exchange or some other place in the city of Philadelphia, on a day, and at an hour, to be selected by him; not more than ninety days after the passage of this act.

That at the time and place so selected, it shall be the duty of the Governor to have offered at public sale, to the highest and best bidder, all the canals owned by the Commonwealth; the same to be offered and sold in separate lines or divisions, as follows: The canal known as the Delaware division; the canal known as the Upper North Branch division, extending from Pittston northward to the New York State line; the canal known as the Lower Branch, West Branch and Susquehanna division, in one line; with all the property appertaining to each of said lines or divisions, or in any way connected therewith.

That it shall be lawful for any person or persons, or railroad, or canal company, now incorporated, or which may hereafter be incorporated, by and under the laws of this Commonwealth, to become purchasers of all or either of said lines or divisions of canals, at prices not less than the following, to wit: The Delaware division, for not less than $1,500,000; the Upper North Branch division, for not less than $1,000,000; and the Lower North Branch, West Branch and Susquehanna divisions for not less than $1,000,000.

On the question, will the House agree to the amendment?

Mr. Nill said—I am in favor of a sale of the State works for a reasonable sum well secured, and I do not object to the amount so much as to the kind of payments and the security proposed. Our State canals are about three hundred and forty-four miles in length. The Delaware division has always been deemed profitable. The North Branch canal has not yet been tested. The Susquehanna division has, it is believed, been productive. The West Branch is, it is conceded, worth but little; and I would be willing to make a present of it to the Sunbury and Erie road if they are satisfied with the gift. What is the Sunbury and Erie road? It begins at Sunbury, and is completed to Williamsport, a distance of forty-one miles. To make this has cost $2,000,000. From Williamsport to Farrandsville, a distance of thirty-three miles, parts are graded; and from Farrandsville, to the mouth of the Sinnemahoning, a distance of thirty-four miles, some grading, perhaps one-half, is completed; then from Sinnemahoning to Warren, one hundred and fifteen miles, not a rod of work is done. From Warren to Erie it is about one-half graded. This was done by issuing $500,000 worth of Erie city and Erie county bonds. If we are to judge of the cost of this railroad from what is already made, it will cost fifteen millions of dollars. Now what are the means of this railroad?—$2,250,000 Philadelphia city bonds were obtained under anything else than commendable circumstances. The Erie bonds of $500,000 are all the other means we heard of. The debt is $1,000,000, secured by mortgage. Whether it owes much to contractors or not I cannot tell. We have no information on the subject. If it takes $12,000,000 to complete the Sunbury and Erie railroad, or even $10,000,000, the incorporation is insolvent. Ought we to sell to an insolvent corporation? I think not. The amendment of the gentleman from Susquehanna, (Mr. Chase,) offers to sell to individuals or corporations that will buy at the same rate that it is proposed to sell the canals to the Sunbury and Erie railroad. Is this not fair? It is giving every one a chance to purchase. Is that not right? If we want to sell, should we not encourage competion among purchasers? This is the way we would act as individuals—we would hunt up solvent purchasers, and not do as we have been doing, selling to an insolvent corporation.

It is said that we ought to aid in developing the section of country along this road. It would be well to have it developed, but is it the duty of the State to do so? Is the State to give money for this purpose? This talk of developing this part of the State is not new. Some years ago we were asked to guarantee the interest on two hundred thousand dollars for the benefit of the Bald Eagle and Spring Creek navigation company. It was to throw business on our canals and on the Columbia railroad. It proved of no advantage, and now we are annually paying ten thousand dollars interest on this guarantee. Several appropriations were made to works on the West Branch. All our benevolence has heretofore proved unavailing.—We have derived no profit from the investment. Ought we, with this experience, to again give our money for such a purpose? Are the other portions of the Commonwealth to have their means so appropriated? He believed that sound policy demands that it should not be so.

Mr. M'Clure said—The amendment of the gentleman from Susquehanna strikes out the very vitals of the bill. It grapples it by the throat, and if the amendment prevails, the bill fails.

We propose by the bill to sell the public works, and at the same time to aid in the construction of the Sunbury and Erie railroad, without involving any loss whatever to the State. It is a grave question, therefore, whether the Sunbury and Erie railroad is responsible, or whether it is, as has been alleged, utterly insolvent. I speak advisedly, when I say that the condition of that company has been shamefully misrepresented in this debate. So far from the company being in a worse condition now than it was a year ago, as was alleged by the gentleman from Luzerne, (Mr. Jenkins,) it has five millions less of debt, has paid all its liabilities as they matured with promptness, and had over $180,000 of net profits on the last year's business. It has now but one million of debt—that is a mortgage upon the forty miles of the road now completed. Last year, when the gentleman from Luzerne (Mr. Jenkins) supported the proposition to give the same company $3,000,000 of a loan, it was nominally at least, if not actually, six millions in debt. Of the million mortgage now upon the road, one-half of the bonds issued upon it are still owned and held by the company. Its bonds have never sold below seventy-five dollars per cent., and could not now be brought under ninety dollars, if at that. The company is therefore solvent, and in my judgment, by this bill, we not only grant the oft repeated and long unheeded prayer of the people to separate the State from the public works, but at the same time develop a large portion of Pennsylvania, that never can, at least in our day, be developed in any other way.

In our own beautiful and wealthy Cumberland Valley, we have shared largely of the bounty of the State, and I would fear that the blush might be brought to my cheek were I to take the position assumed by my colleague (Mr. Nill). There is not a railroad, a turnpike road, that traverses my own section of Pennsylvania, that was not initiated and fostered by the Commonwealth. Appropriation after appropriation has been made to enrich our boasted Cumberland Valley—a portion of the State above all others able to defend itself. My colleague (Mr. Nill,) may stand in the centre of the beautiful town wherein he resides, and he cannot turn himself in any direction without witnessing the evidence of the fostering kindness of the Commonwealth; but when we propose to inaugurate an era of economy by disposing of the public works, and at the same time opening up the undeveloped portions of the State, he refuses even that little aid. This question is one that rises above the mere dollars and cents named in the bill. It will make a section of the State that can be reached in no other way, bloom and blossom as the rose, and enrich the Commonwealth tenfold.

Mr. Calhoun would show that the proposition of the gentleman from Susquehanna, was a loss to the State compared with the offer of the bill to sell to the Sunbury and Erie railroad company. He went into an analysis of the amendment, and then compared it with the original bill. The debts to contractors spoken of by the gentlemen from Chester, (Mr. Hodgson,) was a phantom, and had no foundation. He was authorized to say, there were no debts to contractors. He was in favor of selling to the Sunbury and Erie railroad company in preference to any other, because of the benefits that would accrue to the State from the development of her resources in completing the road.

Mr. Chase had always been averse to States managing public works—thought governments were never instituted for the purpose of becoming common carriers on canals and railroads. Entertaining these views he was in favor of the State's being divorced from all her public works. Last winter he advocated the sale of the main line, and he was now in favor of selling the remainder of our State works.

But while he was in favor of selling them, it should be done in a proper way. As representatives we are guardians of the property of the Commonwealth, and should sell these works as an executor or guardian would sell property of an estate to the highest and best bidder. This bill provides for selling them to the Sunbury and Erie railroad, which is said to be a bankrupt company, for a fixed price. Now we might not be able to realize any more were we to put them up at public sale, or to find any more solvent purchasers, but our constituents would be justifiable in presuming that we might, the same as parties interested in an estate might if an executor sold property at private sale.

He then alluded to the Sunbury and Erie railroad as one of the greatest enterprises of the age, and spoke at length of the advantages to be derived from its completion.

He would be glad to see it completed, and would vote to give the State works to them if they would satisfy him that this would complete it; but he could not well understand how they could complete a railroad that would cost over twenty millions of dollars, with canals that we are told are worthless. He disliked the section of this bill that makes the State a partner in the $7,000,000 bonds authorized to be issued by the company. He wanted no connection with any public work directly, or indirectly.

Mr. Chase's substitute provided for selling the works to anybody that would purchase them—to the highest and best bidder. The Sunbury and Erie would have the same chances to buy, and thus make what is to be made out of the works. This was the only fair way of disposing of them.

Mr. Chase proceeded further to give his reasons for his substitute.

Mr. Jenkins said the Junior member from Franklin, (Mr. M'Clure,) had pointed out how the Commonwealth had got into $40,000,000 of debt. Appropriations to turnpikes in Franklin county, and "tape-worm" railroad in Adams county had done it; and if the same course is pursued as he proposes in advocating this bill, it would be increased to $80,000,000. He did not blame the gentleman, through whose counties the road runs, for going in for the measure, if they thought it honest. But he wondered how many others could do so. He was here interrupted by

Mr. Wilcox, who said he did not like to interrupt the gentleman from Luzerne, (Mr. Jenkins,) was constrained to call the previous question, as too much time had already been wasted; the call was sustained.

On the question, shall the main question now be put? it was agreed to as follows:

Yeas.—Messrs. Abrams, Armstrong, Babcock, Benson, Bower, Brant, Bruce, Castner, Christy, Crawford, Dodds, Donnelly J. H., Donnelly J., Donovan, Dunlap, Evans, Garrett, Hamel, Hayes, Himrod, Houtz, Imbrie, Jackman, Kirkpatrick, Lloyd, M'Clain, M'Clure, M'Donald, Maugle, Miller, Owen, Pownall, Price, Ramsey, Rhodes, Roath, Roland, Rose, Scott, Shaw, Smith, (Cambria,) Struthers, Warner, Westbrook, Wilcox, Witmer, Yearsley and Longaker, *Speaker*—48.

Nays.—Messrs. Arthur, Askin, Bierer, Chase, Dohnert, Donehoo, Ent, Foster, George, Gilliland, Glatz, Goepp, Gritman, Hay, Hillegas, Hipple, Hodgson, Irwin, Jenkins, Kincaid, Lauman, Lovett, Negley, Nill, Nunemacher, Powell, Rupp, Sharp, Shields, Smith, (Berks,) Stephens, Stuart, Turner, Voegtly, Warden, Weaver, Weller, Wells, Wharton, Will, Williams, Wolf and Woodring—43.

The question being on the amendment offered by Mr. Chase, it was negatived by the following vote:

Yeas.—Messrs. Arthur, Askin, Bierer, Chase, Dohnert, Donehoo, Ent, Foster, George, Gilliland, Glatz, Goepp, Gritman, Hay, Hillegas, Hodgson, Irwin, Jenkins, Kincaid, Lauman, Lovell, Rupp, Sharp, Shields, Smith, (Berks,) Stephens, Stuart, Turner, Voegtly, Warden, Weaver, Weller, Wells, Wharton, Will, Williams, Wolf, Woodring and Longaker, *Speaker*—44.

Nays.—Messrs. Abrams, Armstrong, Babcock, Benson, Brandt, Bruce, Calhoun, Castner, Christy, Crawford, Dodds, Donnelly J. H., Donnelly James, Donovan, Dunlap, Evans, Garrett, Hamel, Hayes, Himrod, Hipple, Imbrie, Jackman, Kirkpatrick, Lawrence, Lloyd, M'Clain, M'Clure, Maugle, Melloy, Miller, Owen, Pownall, Price, Ramsey, Rhodes, Roath, Roland, Rose, Scott, Shaw, Smith, (Cambria,) Struthers, Warner, Westbrook, Wilcox, Williston, Witmer and Yearsley—49.

The question again recurring on the first section, it was determined in the affirmative, as follows:

Yeas.—Messrs. Abrams, Armstrong, Babcock, Benson, Bower, Brandt, Bruce, Calhoun, Castner, Christy, Crawford, Dodds, Donnelly J. H., Donnelly James, Donovan, Dunlap, Evans, Garrett, Gilliland, Hamel, Hays, Himrod, Hipple, Houtz, Imbrie, Jackman, Kirkpatrick, Lawrence, Lloyd, M'Clain, M'Clure, Maugle, Melloy, Miller, Owen, Pownall, Price, Ramsey, Rhodes, Roath, Roland, Rose, Scott, Shaw, Smith, (Cambria,) Struthers, Warner, Westbrook, Wilcox, Williston, Witmer and Yearsley—52.

Nays—Messrs. Arthur, Askin, Bierer, Chase, Dohnert, Donehoo, Ent, Foster, George, Glatz, Goepp, Gritman, Nay, Hillegas, Hodgson, Irwin, Jenkins, Kincaid, Lauman, Lovett, M'Donald, Negley, Nill, Nunemacher, Powell, Rupp, Sharp, Shields, Smith, (Berks,) Stephens, Stuart, Turner, Voegtly, Warden, Weaver, Weller, Wells, Wharton, Will Williams, Wolf, Woodring and Longaker. *Speaker*—43.

The hour of five having arrived, the Speaker adjourned the House until 7 o'clock this evening.

☞ The journals in the interest of Buchanan and Lecompton are exultingly proclaiming that the anti-Lecompton Members of Congress have conceded the main ground of dispute between them and their opponents in adopting the Crittenden-Montgomery substitute, and thereupon agreeing to the bill.—The *Herald* and its confederates ring the changes on this assertion from day to day.

Well, gentlemen, we call you to witness that the anti-Lecompton side of Congress has conceded all that can reasonably be required of them