

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

SUPREME JUDGE:

WILLIAM A. PORTER, PHILADELPHIA.

CANAL COMMISSIONER:

WESTLEY FROST, FAYETTE.

Special Notice.

All persons indebted to the late firm of McCollum & Gerritson for subscription to the Montrose Democrat are hereby forbidden settling with J. B. McCollum, or any person in whose hands he may place the accounts. Said accounts have not yet been assigned to him, in consequence of his having refused to render a value for them as agreed upon before the firm was dissolved; any collection which he may make will be fraudulent, and his receipts void, until further notice be given.

A. J. GERRITSON, Montrose, April 1st, 1858.

A Musical Convention will be held in Brooklyn, commencing on the 7th, to continue three days, and close with a concert. All lovers of music should be in attendance. For particulars see notice elsewhere.

Rev. J. B. King proposes to lecture on Friday of this week at 11 o'clock, A. M., also in the evening, at Academy Hall, "On the Origin, History, Traditions, Personal Appearance, Social, Civil, Religious and Military Habits and Amusements of the North American Indians." The lecture will be illustrated by a variety of maps, charts and colored lithograph portraits.

The following is one of the resolutions adopted by the California Legislature: Resolved, By the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, That our Senators be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to vote for the immediate admission of the Territory of Kansas into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever.

Other resolutions endorsed the Lecompton Constitution. We would suggest to our subscribers who may call upon us during our week hereafter to bring with them, if convenient, the receipts taken at this office during the last two or three years. Our reason for making this request is, that we find a considerable amount of money has been received at different periods which has been accepted for, but never credited upon the books. A reference to old receipts will save considerable trouble and perplexity in arranging accounts. We shall endeavor to guard against the embarrassment attending such a state of affairs in the future.

A caucus of the Democratic members of the House was held on the 27th and was fully attended by both Lecomptonites and anti-Lecomptonites.

A committee of twenty, composed of ten of each side, were ordered to be appointed, to report at an adjourned caucus, on Wednesday night, (last night), the best mode and manner of admitting Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton Constitution.

From all advices there is no doubt the bill will pass by a considerable majority. It is expected that the final vote will be taken to-day, we shall therefore be able to announce next week that Kansas has become a State of this Union, unless some unlooked-for treachery be developed.

In noticing the presentation of the petitions for certain changes in the school law in this county, last week, we stated that no further notice was likely to be taken of the matter, and that so far as we were informed no member took sufficient interest in the subject to present a bill for the change. Mr. Chase, on noticing this in our paper writes from Harrisburg, stating that we are not fully informed, refers us to a bill read in place by Mr. Stephens of Wayne county, and asks us to make the proper correction. Mr. Chase evidently misunderstood us. We had no reference to our educational system, or a general change of it, but to a special change for this county only, in reference to which we think our notice was correct.

Since the publication of our paper last week we have received a copy of the Daily Legislative Record which contains a bill supplementary to the act of 1854, of which we will give a brief synopsis; should it pass we will give it entire: Sec. 1. Provides that the sum of \$280,000 now appropriated to common schools shall be divided among the school districts in the State, in proportion to the number of children in each between 4 and 21 years of age.

Sec. 2. That no part of said funds shall be paid to State or County school officers, except 5 per cent. to pay a Normal school inspector.

Sec. 3. Abolishes the County Superintendent and substitutes the office of Normal school inspectors.

Sec. 4. Provides for one director for each school, and limits the tax to 10 mills on the dollar.

Sec. 5. The Inspector shall hold district institutes, train the teachers, give them certificates if qualified, receiving from each one dollar for the same.

Sec. 6. The directors shall meet in their respective districts on the first Monday of June '58, and each record in the Secretary's books his choice for inspector, the result to be sent to the prothonotary, who, in case of a tie, gives the casting vote; a plurality to elect—the election to be for three years.

Sec. 7. The teachers receive to be 2 1/2 days, the rest of the time to be devoted to visiting each others schools, &c.

Sec. 8. The expenses of printing notices, prothonotary's services, postage, &c., paid by the county.

Wilmot's Pledge—Its Violation.

As we have learned that Wilmot has recently denied giving a written pledge to the effect that if placed upon the bench of this district, he would refrain from mingling in political affairs, it may be well to refresh his memory, as well as that of others, with a brief reference to the circumstances connected with the transaction. It was written on the day of holding the Democratic nominating convention. Wilmot was here with his friends, to ask the convention to elect someone favorable to his nomination. It was found that a considerable majority of the delegates were opposed to him, many had positive instructions from their constituents to oppose him. Unless these objections could be overcome he could not be nominated, and of course, not elected. In vain his friends asked the delegates to yield. They had no confidence in the promises he and his friends freely made touching his conduct if placed on the bench. As a last resort he penned a note, addressed to F. B. Streeter, Esq. and others, and signed it, setting forth briefly, but positively that he could not so far forget the proprieties of the place he aspired to, as to ever think of interfering in politics, and if elevated to the bench he would in no way meddle in political affairs while occupying that position. Upon the strength of this solemn pledge some of the delegates finally yielded their opposition and permitted him to be nominated. This pledge was handed to Col. John Blanding by Mr. Streeter with a request that he take care of it. This Mr. Blanding declined doing, stating that he had so little confidence in the man that he regarded his written pledge as worthless. The fact of his giving this pledge is too well known to be denied with impunity, too many men of unquestionable character for veracity were acquainted with the circumstances, saw it, read it, and commented upon it. One gentleman who saw it, remarked to us recently that "a man who would deny so well remembered a transaction, was unfit to be trusted anywhere, either in public or private." Has this pledge been violated? This is the question which naturally presents itself. Here, it needs no answer, for its gross and unqualified violation has been witnessed by all. Out of court and in court from term to term, and from year to year has David Wilmot, contrary to his voluntary pledge, both verbal and written, and in defiance of public opinion,—may of justice itself—persisted in using the power and influence given to him by his judicial position to further the cause of anti-slavery fanaticism. Not content with spending his vacations, (and they comprise most of the year) in meddling in politics, he has spent a portion of the time allotted to holding court, to making speeches, which, for violent abuse of those differing with him are not equalled by any.

In June '54 he wrote a letter to a Hartford meeting in which he laid out the ground work of the plan he wished the anti-slavery men to follow. This letter was abusive and insulting in its style and language, denouncing Democrats as tools and puppets of the Slave Power, who had been bought and corrupted by patronage to betray the cause of freedom, and asserting that the Constitution was invaded, violated in fact, at its demand. This letter was published in August, at which time we see it mentioned in the county papers that Wilmot had been stamping the counties of Bradford, Tioga, Potter and Sullivan, also in Tioga county, N. Y., and meetings were given out for him in Rush and Dimock, and in Montrose during court week. We attended these meetings, and remember well the violent character of the speeches. This state of affairs has been continued almost without interruption, and from its further continuance our people have a right to be protected. In justice to Wilmot we ought to mention that at his last court held here he did not make a speech—perhaps for the reason that the power fellow had not recovered from the effects of the awful shock received on the second Tuesday of October last.

The Harrisburg Herald remarks that Wilmot "is making all sorts of promises in order to induce the Legislature to retain him in the position he has disgraced by his rash action. His last resort is to compel his friends to pour promises to do better into the ears of the Democratic members. Wherever he or any of his friends can grasp the button-hole of a Democratic Legislator, they drag him aside, and with tearful eyes admit, the delinquency of the past, with solemn pledges of different behavior in future. This is Wilmot's usual—every bit of it. Succumb to his desires, and in two minutes, if opportunity afforded, Wilmot would belie the severest asseveration just before uttered.

We caution the Democrats of the Legislature against permitting themselves to be seduced by Wilmot's flatteries, promise and hypocrisy. He is a most adroit trickster, and is working a desperate and treacherous trust without effect."

We notice that a studied plan is being pursued to elect to represent every Erie borough election, where the Democrats do not make and elect a strict party ticket, as an "anti-Lecompton" victory. We published an expose of the false statement in Forney's Press of the March Chuk equally false and we notice others equally false and slyly going the rounds of a certain class of papers. These reports are an "anti-Lecompton" victory in Reading, but the Know Nothing organ of that city, not being posted, exposes the falsehood, stating that the "Lecompton" and "anti-Lecompton" Democrats worked together harmoniously without reference to that question, and that it was an "American-Republican" triumph in the election of Mr. Keim, as Mayor. The Democrats however elected a majority of the Councilmen. So much for that "anti-Lecompton" falsehood. We also notice that a shout of triumph is raised over an "anti-Lecompton" victory in Tamaques. The vote of that place is put down at upwards of 900, yet on this occasion only 190 votes were polled—and further party tickets were not formed! If these are specimens of "anti-Lecompton" fruit, it will be a batch of "small potatoes" indeed.

A Blast from the Trumpet of Col. Forney Against the Free Soil Heresy, and Wilmot in Particular.

When Col. Forney was a member of the Democratic party, says the Pennsylvania, no man in its ranks was a greater stickler for adherence to its usages and observance to its behests when expressed through its accredited and responsible channels. A nomination once made, he was inexorable in the application of the pressing rule that every man in communion with the organization was bound to its support on pain of excommunication.

He was terrible in his repressive "bolters" from the ranks, and the "will of the majority" in his decisions, and for the same he is called the "law of the Masses and Persians." Wilmot incurred his supreme displeasure by setting up for himself, and breaking the traces of party discipline, no doubt with a design to work mischief to the party and its principles, and he denounced him with an unsparring hand. Forney was no doubt then right; but can he be right now, can he be honest, when following the same downward course that Wilmot did, and for the same purpose? Read his graphic portrait of that "bold, bad man," and see if you cannot find a parallel to the picture, in treachery and duplicity, in the writer himself!

THE LAST SPEECH OF WILMOT.

BY JOHN W. FORNEY.

The speech of the abolition representative from the Twelfth District, on Friday last, was prefaced with the cool declaration that as he desired to be absent for some weeks, he would not create confusion, and as he wanted to address the friends of the cause, he would do so in a separate session. This declaration is not of much account to his constituents, while to the country it has been a source of expense and disgrace for several years; but it is not often that a man can advertise his purpose of leaving his seat "for some weeks," just on the eve of important legislation, without being deservedly censured for indifference to his duties. But Wilmot is a sort of Congressional both, and never wakes up unless to create confusion. He is as the water at Washington, of his constituents, and the solid interests of the country at large are concerned, they have always received little or none of his attention. But we sat down to call attention to the following extract from his speech, as it appears in the Globe, not to cavil at his departure from his post, nor to proclaim his absence "for some weeks."

"I am the friend, and have ever been the constant supporter of party organization; but the organization I follow must be one based upon principle, and having for its object the attainment of legitimate ends. I will not organize to steal, to murder, nor to extend into territory now free, the institution of African slavery." "I shall support no organization, yielded by men who openly declare their purpose to extend slavery; and who profess to be the friends of the party, yet support no candidate unless he avows principles favorable to their policy."

This paragraph begins with a falsehood and ends with a falsehood. It is notoriously false that Wilmot has ever been "the consistent supporter of party organization." He opposed General Cass, after pledging himself solemnly, before a thousand witnesses, to support that candidate, and then he was rebuffed by the Democratic Baltimore Convention. So notorious was he to be understood as the advocate of regular nominations in March of 1848, that, in asking the Democratic State Convention, then assembled at Harrisburg, to accept George Sanderson, Esq., as the Delegate from his District to Baltimore, he said that every friend of the cause would carry out the will of the State and support Mr. Buchanan as the choice of the State; but he urged Mr. Sanderson as one who had no personal feelings on the subject, and, therefore, as a proper man to send. All this he urged, with a profusion of promises and pledges. Mr. Buchanan was not the nominee, and Mr. Cass was. Wilmot had no excuse, therefore, for breaking his pledge, under the circumstances, should have commended the respect of even those who condemned his judgment, and his conduct deserved a reward rather than disgrace. We are happy, however, to find enlightened presses of the North, of all parties, censuring this unwise act of political proscription."

WASHINGTON, March 29.—The Democratic Caucus Committee met this evening at the Capitol, all the members present, except Mr. Craig, of Missouri. There was a full and free comparison of views and interchange of opinion, all conducted in the utmost harmony. Several amendments to the Senate Kansas bill were suggested and explained, but the Lecomptonites thought that their substance was already embraced in the measure. One point discussed, was the power of the people in Kansas to amend their Constitution before 1860. On this there was a diversity of opinion, but there was a general agreement that it would be amended prior to that time, notwithstanding the words of the Constitution.

The Committee adjourned without taking any question on the propositions presented. It is contemplated that an effort will be made to morrow night, in caucus, to reconcile the conflicting views.

A caucus was also held to-night in one of the committee rooms of the Capitol. Its chief object was to ascertain, whether one of the Anti-Lecompton Democrats, who had just attended the conference of the committee of twenty, was present. It is believed that the caucus was composed of the Anti-Lecompton Democrats generally.

Consistent, Very. It is a common remark among the opposition, that Judge Douglas did wrong in abolishing the Missouri Compromise, while they at the same time are cheering him ever so loudly for opposing the Administration. Mr. Douglas contends he stands where he always stood, and if he was wrong in 1854, he is wrong now, according to his own statement. How is it, who is in the right? Will Greeley tell us whether or not the Capitol should be burned down now, since he has seen fit to lead the mover and measure whose passage called forth the vilest and most treacherous slander ever uttered by the Tribune. Where do you stand, MASS. GERRY!

A GERMAN DEFAULTER ARRESTED IN NEW YORK.—On Tuesday morning last, a German banker, named Ferdinand Arleider, was arrested, charged with being a defaulter to the amount of one million of dollars (\$1,000,000) from the city of Stuttgart, Wurttemberg, Germany, where he was one of the well-known firm of Arleider & Weiss, bankers. It seems that both members of this firm disappeared from Stuttgart on the 6th of January last, taking with them all the money entrusted to their care. They have both been traced to New York, and Arleider was arrested on a writ brought by the brother of one of the sufferers by the defalcation, and is now lodged in Eldridge street jail, to await the action of the United States authorities.

Our native forests furnish us with Nature's own remedy for all lung complaints. Dr. Watson in his Balsam, combines the essential qualities of the Cherry Bark with Tar Water. It has cured many cases of seated consumption. None genuine unless signed J. B. Tate.

Interesting from Kansas.

LAWRENCE, K. T. March 6, 1858. Quietness and order reigns throughout Kansas.

Like as it was in the French revolution, the baser men—the noisy extreme factions—have ruled in Kansas; the better class of citizens, though comprising a vast majority of the people of the Territory, have either remained inactive, or had to follow one or the other of the unscrupulous factions. The peaceable men have had no organization, no leader, no concentration or centralization of power, being composed entirely of farmers and mechanics. Lying politicians and partisan papers have deceived them, misled them, and chained them to certain policies. Daily I hear among such expressions as these: "O I am so sick of this gammon, this excitement and foolery of our political tricksters, who would all sell their souls for an office!" "We are tired to death of all talking and no action!" "We are disgusted with hearing about our great Kansas cause—our great battle, which has no end, no crisis, no nothing!" "We might have ended all the difficulties in one day, at one election; but no, the politicians here are linked with the Black Republicans East, and are determined to keep up our difficulties for their benefit."

Such is the language not only heard among the rank and file of the Free State party, but it is frequently in the mouths of the most respectable and worthy of their leaders. It must not be forgotten, however, that there is quite a large class of people here who are sincere fanatics, who are from principle and everything that is conservative; they, however, as intimated in a previous letter, will be come entirely unnecessary as a means of relieving Judge Loring of his Probate duties."

From the Providence Journal: "The removal of Judge Loring for an official act in which no corruption is alleged, and no impropriety is charged, is a very serious matter, and we think that the State of Massachusetts will have cause to regret it, in the long future, to see that it is not a precedent for the independence of the Judiciary as absolutely essential to the liberties of a Republic. If the doctrine of the Courts are to be overruled by the Legislature, or if the Judges are to be removed on pretext that would not subject them to impeachment, this independence is lost."

From the Boston Journal: "The Legislature did an unwise and arbitrary act in passing this address at the instance of a few misguided fanatics, supported by many men and boys who have been captivated into signing petitions for removal. It is not called for by public sentiment, and which will recoil upon its perpetrators. It is disingenuous, for no reasons are given in the address why Judge Loring should be removed, while those which were brought forward in the report of the Committee that reported the address have been pretty thoroughly refuted in the course of discussion."

The National Intelligencer has the following touching Gov. Banks' most intolerant act: "The Boston papers bring us intelligence of an act of political intolerance and injustice which has been committed on the elevated State of Massachusetts. It is the removal of an independent magistrate, Judge Loring, from his office by the Governor of the State of Massachusetts, in accordance of an address to that effect by a constitutional majority of the two Houses of the Legislature. His office was a firm and faithful performance of his duty as United States Commissioner in the prosecution of a fugitive slave some years ago at Boston—a case which caused much excitement at that time, and which our readers doubtless remember. This blow at the independence of the Judiciary, in cashiering a Judge for inflexibly following his conscience, even in the face of popular passions and intimidation, has been struck where we should least have looked for it. His moral courage and his honesty, under the circumstances, should have commended the respect of even those who condemned his judgment, and his conduct deserved a reward rather than disgrace. We are happy, however, to find enlightened presses of the North, of all parties, censuring this unwise act of political proscription."

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Interesting from Kansas.

LAWRENCE, K. T. March 6, 1858. Quietness and order reigns throughout Kansas.

Like as it was in the French revolution, the baser men—the noisy extreme factions—have ruled in Kansas; the better class of citizens, though comprising a vast majority of the people of the Territory, have either remained inactive, or had to follow one or the other of the unscrupulous factions. The peaceable men have had no organization, no leader, no concentration or centralization of power, being composed entirely of farmers and mechanics. Lying politicians and partisan papers have deceived them, misled them, and chained them to certain policies. Daily I hear among such expressions as these: "O I am so sick of this gammon, this excitement and foolery of our political tricksters, who would all sell their souls for an office!" "We are tired to death of all talking and no action!" "We are disgusted with hearing about our great Kansas cause—our great battle, which has no end, no crisis, no nothing!" "We might have ended all the difficulties in one day, at one election; but no, the politicians here are linked with the Black Republicans East, and are determined to keep up our difficulties for their benefit."

Such is the language not only heard among the rank and file of the Free State party, but it is frequently in the mouths of the most respectable and worthy of their leaders. It must not be forgotten, however, that there is quite a large class of people here who are sincere fanatics, who are from principle and everything that is conservative; they, however, as intimated in a previous letter, will be come entirely unnecessary as a means of relieving Judge Loring of his Probate duties."

From the Providence Journal: "The removal of Judge Loring for an official act in which no corruption is alleged, and no impropriety is charged, is a very serious matter, and we think that the State of Massachusetts will have cause to regret it, in the long future, to see that it is not a precedent for the independence of the Judiciary as absolutely essential to the liberties of a Republic. If the doctrine of the Courts are to be overruled by the Legislature, or if the Judges are to be removed on pretext that would not subject them to impeachment, this independence is lost."

From the Boston Journal: "The Legislature did an unwise and arbitrary act in passing this address at the instance of a few misguided fanatics, supported by many men and boys who have been captivated into signing petitions for removal. It is not called for by public sentiment, and which will recoil upon its perpetrators. It is disingenuous, for no reasons are given in the address why Judge Loring should be removed, while those which were brought forward in the report of the Committee that reported the address have been pretty thoroughly refuted in the course of discussion."

The National Intelligencer has the following touching Gov. Banks' most intolerant act: "The Boston papers bring us intelligence of an act of political intolerance and injustice which has been committed on the elevated State of Massachusetts. It is the removal of an independent magistrate, Judge Loring, from his office by the Governor of the State of Massachusetts, in accordance of an address to that effect by a constitutional majority of the two Houses of the Legislature. His office was a firm and faithful performance of his duty as United States Commissioner in the prosecution of a fugitive slave some years ago at Boston—a case which caused much excitement at that time, and which our readers doubtless remember. This blow at the independence of the Judiciary, in cashiering a Judge for inflexibly following his conscience, even in the face of popular passions and intimidation, has been struck where we should least have looked for it. His moral courage and his honesty, under the circumstances, should have commended the respect of even those who condemned his judgment, and his conduct deserved a reward rather than disgrace. We are happy, however, to find enlightened presses of the North, of all parties, censuring this unwise act of political proscription."

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.

Removal of Judge Loring. Several years ago Judge Loring of Massachusetts, in the capacity of United States Commissioner, remanded Anthony Burns, a runaway slave, to the custody of his master. There never was any question but that Burns was a slave, or that in surrendering him to his owner Judge Loring did anything more than fulfill a duty imposed upon him by the fugitive slave law. Yet for doing his duty, confessedly in accordance with law, Judge Loring was marked by the abolition power of Massachusetts. The Legislature addressed Gov. Gardner in favor of his removal from his office as a State Judge. Gov. Gardner refused to obey the command; but, notwithstanding, he did not pause at this slight check. They had determined to make Judge Loring a sacrifice, and were not to be thrown off the trail of their victim by the scruples entertained by Gov. Gardner against playing the part of executioner of a man who would have been false to his office and his oath had he not obeyed a State Judge.