The Press.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1857.

ON THE FIRST PAGE—Editorial, Another European Monarchy; Letter from Sebastopol; Communications; The Tariff; The Crisis; Short Credits; Recent Decisions by the Secretary of the Treasury; Captain Van Vliet's Official Account of his Visit to Utah; Further Items of Foreign News; General News. ON THE FOURTH PAGE—Waifs from the West Branch Valley.

MR. SENATOR HUNTER AND GOVERNOR WALKER.

The Richmond *South*, a daily journal, of which Mr. ROBB A. PAYNE is the editor, does not relish our comments upon the views of Mr. Senator HUNTER on the Kansas complication. In *The South* of Wednesday last, the 4th inst., we find an article, which we print entire, trusting that a like courtesy will be accorded to us in the republication of our own comments upon that article:

FORNEY AGAINST HUNTER—A MISSTATEMENT CONTRADICTED.—The Philadelphia *Press*—Forney's paper—exhibits zeal without discretion in its apologies for Walker's usurpations in Kansas. For, not content with a worse than oriental idolatry of its hero, the *Press* endeavors to purchase his favor by an indiscriminate abuse of all its adversaries. Its ingenuity is hardly equal to the invention of an original expedient; so the old game is played over again with a servile imitation of precedent, even in the cast of characters.

Everybody remembers how, in 1850, the Southern and Northern opponents of the Compromise measures were confounded as equally obnoxious to public indignation. True, they occupied antagonistic grounds. True, Free-soilers opposed the Compromise because it fell short of their desperate ambition to annihilate slavery; while the patriots of the South resisted its passage for the reason that it involved fatal concessions against the rights and interests of their section. For all that, the followers of Foote and Forney were not a whit less charitable to Seward than to Hunter. In their perverse judgment it was the same thing to resist as to perpetrate a great iniquity. Taking the people to be no better than idiots, the organs of the Compromise thought to excite an equal measure of public resentment against the Abolition agitator and the conservative citizen of the South who fought against the aggression. Then, for the first time, was introduced the now so fashionable phrase of "ultraists" and "extremists." Then, for the first time, was it taught, by a certain school of politicians, that to resist a wrong was to incur some share of the responsibility, and that quiet submission to injustice was the only way of approving one's patriotism. In this day the expedient miscarried most miserably; but, nothing disheartened by failure, Foote and Forney are again clamoring against "extremists." This time it is to Walker's administration in Kansas that all Democrats are obliged to conform under pain of expulsion from the party and association with the Abolitionists. Because Senator Hunter and Colonel Davis cannot reconcile it with their judgment and their conscience to approve the most outrageous acts of Federal usurpation, the Philadelphia *Press* chooses to stigmatize them as schismatics and to confound them with free-soilers. In this instance the absurdity of the classification is all the more apparent from the fact that it is the apologists of Walker who are applauded by the Abolitionists, while we poor "fire-eaters" are exposed to the concerted attacks of the Black Republicans and the "National" organs. *The Press* will discover that the people are not to be deceived by the humbug now any more than they were imposed upon by it eight years ago.

The interminable article in *The Press* presents but one point worthy of consideration, and that we choose to notice because it affords us an opportunity to correct a misstatement of Senator Hunter's position.

The Press thinks to gain an unfair advantage of Senator Hunter, by representing him to oppose a submission of the Constitution of Kansas to the popular vote. But Mr. Hunter has never said any such thing. On the contrary, in his letter to Mr. Leake, he expressly reserves his opinion upon this point, for the reason that it is not for him, but for the Convention in Kansas, to determine the matter. Very likely he might favor such reference; but, on the other hand, in denying that the absence of the formality would justify Congress in refusing the Territory admission into the Union. If we understand his position, he is not averse to the ratification of the Constitution by popular vote. He only contends that the Convention, which represents the incipient sovereignty of Kansas, must settle the point exempt from Federal influence; and that if, the people of the Territory, speaking through the legitimate organism, should dispense with the reference, as the majority of the States have done, Congress would not be justified, for that reason only, in excluding it from the Confederacy. Is that repugnant to the theory of republicanism; or to the principles of the Democratic party? Is it not an inevitable deduction from the Kansas-Nebraska act? Every candid man will admit that it is nothing more nor less than the doctrine of non-intervention and popular sovereignty. Mr. Hunter adheres to the true and original interpretation of the Kansas-Nebraska act, while his adversaries would destroy its efficacy by a new and unwarrantable construction.

It is the misfortune of some of our southern cotemporaries that their discussions of principles are always made personal. To read their articles one would suppose that every pen was a pistol, inasmuch as nearly every sentence is an innuendo. To contradict one of them is almost cause of affront, and to write a reply or a criticism is often to provoke a challenge. With all these obstacles bristling before and around us, we ventured a few days ago to dissent, certainly in no exceptionable language, from some of the positions of Mr. Senator HUNTER on the Kansas question, as *contained in his letter of the 16th of October*, to Mr. LEAKE. We did this with no desire to participate in the dispute now progressing in Virginia, between the friends and foes of Mr. HUNTER, but simply by way of comment upon the opinions of a distinguished leader of public opinion in that State. Indeed, we are free to admit that the course pursued in order to compel Mr. HUNTER to speak on this subject was not seemed to us to be entirely chivalric or fair. But when he made his sentiments known, they became public property. As such we treated them. *The South* goes out of its way to construe our dissent from these sentiments in a personal manner. To this we have only to reply, that, first, our support of Governor WALKER is the result of nothing but a profound devotion to the great principle which he so boldly sustains; and, second, that while we were among the most steady advocates of the Compromise measures, eight years ago, we did not sympathize with General FOOTE in his wild war upon the State-Rights men, but we expressly concurred with these State-Rights men in many of their complaints, and never indulged in the application of this word "extremists" in speaking of them. This is a small matter; but as *The South* is raising an issue of veracity, we deem it right to revive the memory of our former friend in a matter of which he speaks so confidently.

And if, in 1857, the term "extremist" is applied to all the enemies of the principle that "the will of the majority of the people shall prevail" in Kansas, the *South* must find the cause of it in the fact that the bitter language of Northern Republicans in speaking of so gallant a defender of that principle as ROBERT J. WALKER, is, if possible, surpassed by many of the ablest papers and politicians in the slave States, in speaking of the same gentleman. The very number of *The South* from which we copy contains some strong proofs of this assertion. Have we not had Governor WALKER threatened, over and over again, by the organs of the extremists, with rejection by the Senate for his independence in Kansas? We scorn to attach any man's motives, especially any one whom we respect; and we are ready, therefore, to concede that *The South* is quite as honest in its opposition to Governor WALKER as we are in his support; but how long would that journal delay charging us with complicity with Free-Soilism, if Mr. SEWARD had co-operated as heartily with us as he certainly has co-operated with the Southern opponents of the Governor of Kansas?

THE PRESS, in its objections to Senator HUNTER's position on the submission of the Constitution of Kansas to the people of the country—to those, in a word, whom that instrument declares shall wield the sovereign power—takes no new ground. That he does not favor a vote upon that Constitution by the people of Kansas has been charged upon him by Southern papers of great and accepted influence in the Democratic party, and public Democratic meetings in his own State have demanded that this Constitution should be submitted to the people of Kansas, or returned to them by Congress. When a Senator bearing such a relation to the masses as Mr. HUNTER sustains to the Democrats of Virginia—to those Democrats who have borne him upon their broad shoulders into various high positions, now for nearly twenty years—is *silent* upon so great a principle as that which is involved in the contest in Kansas, he may well be put down as averse to it. And if in so regarding him, we are wrong, we shall be happy to hear it. But the Democrats of *Rockingham*, Va., demand that the Constitution of Kansas shall be submitted to the people after the Convention has agreed upon it. This they declare to be the true meaning of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. This is as we understand it here in Pennsylvania. It will not do to say that this Kansas question is to be settled by precedents, and that, because certain States and Territories have not submitted their Constitutions, new and reformed, to the ballot-box, *therefore* there is no necessity to submit this Kansas Constitution to the people of the Territory. But where certain Constitutions have, in a few case, not been subjected to the revision of the ballot-box, it was because there was little or no division among the voters. In the instances of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and other States, and in the bill passed by Congress providing for preliminary steps for admitting Minnesota into the Union as a State, (for which bill Senator HUNTER voted,) it was specially stipulated that the people should vote upon the Constitutions after they were framed, *and they did!* But in Kansas, there is a living and an irresistible reason for this popular judgment. If ever it was righteous in other cases, it is imperatively demanded in this. The whole spirit of the Kansas discussion by the Democracy, in Congress and in the country, looked to such a resort. There never was a more solemn pledge given. It was the people, and the people alone, that were to dispose of the question. The idea of *any Convention*, much less one like that now in session in Kansas, which was not chosen by the majority, refusing to commit its work *to the voters created by itself*, is a monstrous assumption, and we do not wonder that the gallant spirits of the South have recoiled from it with indignation. President BUCHANAN appreciated the importance of the ultimate judgment of the people upon the vote of their Convention, to the full extent of the principle, WHEN HE INSTRUCTED GOVERNOR WALKER TO SECURE THEM A FAIR VOTE UPON THEIR CONSTITUTION; and his example in the premises has been followed by every national man in the North, and by many thousands of our fellow-citizens in the South. The public man who *falters in this issue* seals his doom. The Northern Democrat who tries to make the Convention of Kansas superior to the people, and who advises that the Constitution shall not go to them for endorsement or rejection, finishes his career forever. We can conceive of a Southern citizen objecting to the rejection of the Oxford returns on a legal technicality; but we cannot hold an open opponent of the right and expediency of the people of Kansas to vote upon their own Constitution, even in the South, save as a foe to the most vital element of constitutional liberty—the principle that the majority should rule. The Northern man who acts upon the assumption that, after all the attempts to get a fair vote in Kansas at three elections, there should *not now be a submission of the Kansas Constitution to the people of Kansas*, will make himself an object of *contempt* to the South, and of laughter to the North.

And we shall be rejoiced if Mr. Senator HUNTER *will assist in letting* the Kansas Constitution go to the ballot-box. *The South* tells us that he has not decided against this remedy for all the disturbing events in Kansas, although his second letter—that to the Rockingham committee, and against the Rockingham resolutions—which we have just read, does not leave the same impression upon our mind. But it is not too late. He can do vast good with his great name in Kansas, if only he will follow out his natural instincts—his clear and candid character—and say, "LET THE VOTERS OF KANSAS SPEAK; I AM CONTENT." He did say, some two years ago, that Kansas could not be a slave State. The result has proved that he was a true prophet. Let him, then, not be afraid of the people of Kansas, and we will pledge ourselves for the people of Virginia, and for the people of Pennsylvania. High honors have been spoken of for ROBERT M. T. HUNTER. He is equal to them. But no man will ever attain the empyrean eminence of the Presidency who falters in regard to so irresistible a principle as "THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE SHALL RULE."

THE New Orleans *Delta* gives JACOB BARKER's opinion on the financial crisis as follows: "Mr. JACOB BARKER considers the present financial derangement as a perfect godsend to the banks, factors, and cotton-growers, but for which such facilities would have been wanted as would have induced an early shipment of the whole cotton crop. The present unequalled money pressure in all parts of Europe, independent of all influence from this side of the Atlantic, would have rendered sales out of the question, and it would have *been sacrificed at or below sixpence sterling* per pound, causing such an amount of exchange to be returned under protest as would have *ruined the banks, planters, and factors.* As it is, the cotton cannot go faster than required for consumption, which must proceed on a limited scale, or a revolution would be the immediate result. Hence, a shilling sterling per pound may not only be anticipated but obtained, if the planters will be true to themselves and to each other—a price which will reinstate the banks, and all others concerned, with a metallic currency, which the people of the United States are determined to maintain, be the consequences to the trading community what they may."

Another Plan.

A correspondent of the *Journal of Commerce* makes the following suggestions concerning a mode of supplying the leading defect of our banking system:

"Let Congress pass a law authorizing the Sub-Treasury, at its various offices to receive gold on deposit, and issue certificates therefor, of volumes over $20, and $100, payable to bearer, or order, as may be desired. This will furnish a currency at par from Maine to California, and serve to equalize exchanges also."

This strikes us as the most practical suggestion of the day. It would, without creating any of the dangers of a national bank, give us a truly national currency, representing simply so much gold and silver on deposit ready for redemption, and would furnish a medium of exchange superior to anything we now enjoy. It would, also, we feel assured, act as a check upon banking operations every where, and induce a state of soundness not attainable under present circumstances. The possession of the power on the part of the mercantile community in all the leading cities to convert their gold into this medium of exchange at par, would be in itself a wholesome restraint upon the banks, and lead them into an effort to make themselves equally as sound and accommodating as the Sub-Treasury *Pittsburgh Gazette.*

This project, we think, is not original with the correspondent of the *Journal of Commerce*, but with one of our most distinguished citizens.

☞ The course of the Pennsylvania railroad in passing its dividend is not only approved by the press of all parties in this State, but by many of the journals outside of our borders. They all look upon that great thoroughfare as one of the most substantial in the world, and as certain to pay handsomely to all who are interested in it. They regard the passing over of the semi-annual dividend as a sure evidence of an economical and careful administration of its affairs in time to come.

☞ WE direct attention to the call for a relief meeting in the Sixth ward this evening.

PUBLIC AMUSEMENTS.

Mr. Mathews continues at the Academy of Music during the present week. At his benefit on Friday evening, he was called on to address the audience, and made some remarks which so truly *and aptly explain the principle of his manner and* purpose of acting, that we shall give them here. He said:

Ladies and gentlemen: Allow me to thank you sincerely for the kind reception and encouragement I have met with in Philadelphia, at what may certainly be considered a most unpropitious moment. I have only paid you two visits in twenty years, and unfortunately, my arrival has each time brought a cris s with it. (Applause and laughter.) The present one is even worse than the last