The Press.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1857.

FORNEY'S CALIFORNIA PRESS

Will be Ready at the
OFFICE OF THE PRESS,
No. 417 CHESTNUT STREET,
At 1 o'clock To-Morrow, (Saturday.)
This paper is published expressly for
CALIFORNIA CIRCULATION,
And contains a complete summary of what has transpired in our City, State, and the Atlantic States, since the departure of the last steamer for California.
Price FIVE CENTS per copy, in strong wrappers, and stamped, ready for mailing.
All advertisements intended for the
STEAMER PRESS
Must be handed in before 10 o'clock on SATURDAY MORNING.

FIRST PAGE.—Lord BACON; FORREST and the Californians; Public Entertainments; Message of Gov. STANTON; Very Late and Interesting from Kansas; Ten Reasons why every Democrat should vote against the admission of Kansas unless the whole Constitution is submitted to the People; The President's Message; The Kansas Constitution; The Position of WALKER and DOUGLAS; The Utah Expedition; The Double Murder in Lancaster county; Havana Correspondence; U. S. Court; General News; The Courts.

☞ We make no apology for publishing a paper, this morning, so filled with the Kansas question. It is the exciting topic of the day, and therefore ought to be acceptable to all classes of readers.

GOVERNOR WALKER'S GREAT LETTER.

ROBERT J. WALKER wrote, probably, the most forcible letter in favor of JAMES BUCHANAN in 1856. Its style and its facts made a profound impression on the public mind. It was translated into German and French, and even into Spanish, Italian, and Welsh. He wrote then as if he felt that upon the issue depended the preservation of the Union. The principle which inspired his eloquence was the principle of popular sovereignty, which he regarded as the surest protection against a sectional or geographical party. This masterly letter was published in nearly every Democratic paper of the Union, and gave to Mr. WALKER a new hold upon the confidence and the affections of his countrymen.

To-day, however, we print another letter from ROBERT J. WALKER, being nothing more nor less than his letter of resignation as Governor of Kansas. At this hour of writing we have no time and no room to say more than that it is equal to his fame, and nobly consistent with his record as a statesman who always follows the right, no matter at what hazard to himself. No citizen can read what he has to say without feeling convinced that he is sincere and patriotic, and the array of facts and arguments which he presents will go far to establish, on enduring foundations, the injustice and oppression of the rule of the minority in Kansas. There is not a Democrat—not a Republican—not an American, who will not realize in this statesmanlike production the palpable outrages which the Lecompton Convention has sought to practice upon the people of Kansas.

The tone and temper of Governor WALKER's letter is not the least part of its merits. He addresses the President as a friend and a compatriot, and never for a moment fails in respect to the Chief Magistrate of the Republic.

We give the whole of Gov. WALKER's letter, by telegraph, corrected carefully by a copy received last night, by mail, from Governor W.

ACTING-GOVERNOR STANTON'S MESSAGE.

As a most appropriate companion of Governor WALKER's letter, we this morning print the message of Acting-Governor FREDERICK P. STANTON to the Legislature of Kansas. This calm, considerate, and conciliatory state paper will be perused with intense interest; and not the less so because it bears out all, and more than all, our apprehensions as to the rule-and-ruin policy of the minority in Kansas. Mr. STANTON is a native of the South, and has served with great distinction, and for many years, as a representative in Congress from Tennessee. He was one of the ablest defenders of President POLK's Administration, and while Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. WALKER were in his Cabinet, was their earnest and devoted champion. His clear and comprehensive message dissipates a thousand fallacies, and places the cause of the majority in Kansas on enduring foundations. HE IS THE LAST AND THE BEST WITNESS OF THE JUSTICE OF GOVERNOR WALKER'S POSITION.

OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS.

The President pointedly asserts that the whole Constitution of Kansas should have been submitted, by the Convention, to the people, because, as he well remarks, that is the only true principle. The bogus Convention of Kansas did not look at the principle; they doubted whether that would suit their policy, and hence they took the trick, thus violating the cardinal policy of the Democratic party. Their defenders here admit that our principles have been thus broken down, but they exclaim: What matters that? it will only be for a time; let the wrong be done, sanction it for a brief period, admit Kansas as a State, and then the people may at once do themselves the justice which it would not be politic for Congress now to do them. True, gentlemen, the error will be a brief one, and truth, though crushed to earth, will rise again; but it has not been thus that the Democracy of the North or South have hitherto been taught to act. They have inherited the spirit of their fathers, with whom, as Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia well said, (February 17, 1854,) in reply to the same Republican argument, "The question was not so much the amount of taxation; it was not the small duty on tea; that was far from being oppressive; but it was the *principle* on which it was placed; it was the principle asserted and maintained in the '*preamble*,' that our fathers resisted by arms. And Mr. WEBSTER well said, on some occasion, 'That the American Revolution was fought against a *preamble*.'" And Mr. STEPHENS then added: "It is, in vindication of that *new principle*, then established for the first time in the history of our Government, in the year 1850, the middle of the Nineteenth century, that we, the friends of the Nebraska bill, whether from the North or the South, now call upon this House and the country to carry out in good faith, and give effect to the spirit and intent of those important measures of territorial legislation." On February 18, 1854, Senator BRODHEAD said: "The question at present, (viz: the question involved in the Kansas-Nebraska bill,) is of no *practical* importance whatever. It is only important as establishing a permanent rule." It was for a principle, then, that the country was agitated by the Compromise measures of 1850; and it was to apply that principle, although then of no practical importance, that the Missouri Compromise was repealed and the Kansas-Nebraska bill was passed. But then, reply the friends of the bogus Convention, you, Messrs. WALKER and DOUGLAS, are agitators; you might let the little fraud, and wrong, and violation of principle pass for the present, it will afterwards be corrected by the people; why, then, do you agitate it now? That is exactly what the Republicans said to the Democracy in 1850 and 1854. They said the country was then quiet; truly the Missouri Compromise was a violation of an abstract principle, but it was so old, it was so venerable, that the wrong had become a compact, and sacred. What was our reply then? It was this, that the acts of 1850 established the *principle*; that the Missouri Compromise was in conflict with that principle, and that, old and sacred as it was, it should be repealed, and it was repealed, and that, too, by the Democracy of the North, *simply because it was not in accordance with a principle*; and when these same Republicans said: If, then, slavery can *not* be practically established in Kansas, why do the South require this compromise repealed? Because, answered the South, *it violates a principle*; and the Democracy of the North and South united and maintained that abstract principle. What, then, if agitation shall again follow our attempt to stand by the principles of our party? Let Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, answer such men. He said, (Feb. 17, 1854):

"It remains for me to say something about the great excitement which it is said this measure will produce. Well, sir, who raises any excitement now? Whence does the opposition come? What are the reasons for it? The North (now the Democracy) is to be excited, and about what?

"Why, because Congress by this bill recognises the territorial principle established in 1850. And what is the harm or mischief to be done? Why, nothing but extending to the freemen of Kansas and Nebraska that privilege which ought to be the birthright of every American citizen, to have a voice in forming the institutions and passing the laws under which he is to live. Who, then, is to be agitated by this outrage? Why, nobody but *those who deny to their fellow-citizens the capacity for self-government.*"

That was then the answer of a Southern Democrat to the objection of a Northern Republican. Certain Democrats are now so much afraid of our agitation for a principle, that they exclaim, Oh! you are distracting the party in the pursuit of a principle. Who are the men in our party whom it will distract? Why, our assertion of the same principle in 1850 and 1854 distracted a great many other Democrats—aye, some of them among the veterans of the party; but did this now-denounced Senator Douglas and the Young Guard faint or falter because of that?

Did we then fear to insist on the principle because it might agitate, and even distract the party? Far from it; and to the Democrats, who then feared to be just, Mr. W. H. WITTE well replied:

"Gentlemen assert that by the adoption of this measure you will divide and distract the Democratic party. I ask them to remember that the history of that party clearly attests that its purpose and function is one of trial and difficulty. It was cradled in storm and reared amid tribulation. It has ever been the advance-guard of all those great measures of progress that have made our country powerful and glorious. It was created for that purpose, and whenever danger has threatened, from traitors at home or foes abroad, it has always, in the hour of peril, been called upon to exercise its highest and holiest function. I care not if, to promote a great principle, it distract the party for a time. When its highest attribute shall have been exercised, and its highest mission performed, it will then, by the involuntary tribute of a free people, be knit together in bonds so strong and irresistible, that the forces of all the factions and isms, placing Abolitionism at the head, cannot break them. They must remember that the Democratic *party is not one of expediency*; and if it be now called upon, by the enactment of this bill, to make sacrifices at the present moment, in order that great good may flow from its *principle* in time to come, I repeat, *it is the solemn duty of every Democrat*, be he in or out of Congress, to make such sacrifice, with a patriotism and chivalry which becomes a true national man. I do not therefore fear the result. I am ready to go before the people and meet this question. It requires but little intelligence to comprehend a proposition so simple as the one embraced in this act. To the people I submit it, conscious that their instinctive perception of man's right to self-government will carry it safely through the storm of partisan agitation, and lead them to a just conclusion as to its merits."

To these sound views we then bore and we now bear assent, and we commend their application now to every Democrat, be he in or out of Congress.

But these friends of expediency further object, that even if the Democratic party do now carry out their principles and pledges, yet the Republicans will not be at peace, that they will again refuse to vote, and where then they ask is the security that their objections will cease? That also is a Republican argument, and was urged by them against the Democratic party. Mr. SUMNER urged it in 1854, and on February 23, 1854, Mr. TOOMBS, of Georgia, thus replied to it:

"Sir, there is another story of ancient history by which the gentleman might have profited. A minister once came to the Roman Senate to sue for peace. They asked him, 'what security do you offer us that if we grant you this peace it will last and be observed?' He replied, 'grant us a just peace, on fair terms, and it will be durable and permanent; but give us an unjust one, and it will not last long.'

"You should stand upon a broad, national *principle*—then you will have peace. The great pacification of 1850 adopted this basis, and if that be *carried out*, we shall have a permanent peace."

That was then Mr. TOOMBS's reply to the objection of the Republican, CHARLES SUMNER, and we adopt and re-assert it in answer to the expediency Democrats who now follow him, and who seek for peace through a temporary expediency, instead of basing it on an eternal principle.

But again, say those gentlemen, we have *now the power* to settle this question—not on principle, to be sure, but to *settle* it, whether on principle, or against principle. Perhaps you have the power, gentlemen, but to *that* Republican argument, let Mr. TOOMBS again reply, as he did in 1854: "The Senator from Massachusetts, not contented with perverting the history of his own country, misapplies even the ancient and familiar story of THEMISTOCLES and ARISTIDES.

"THEMISTOCLES wished to take an unjust advantage of the *enemies* of Athens, or those who were expected shortly to become so. *Forgetful of justice and right*, he desired the Athenians, under *prospect of advantage*, to destroy the fleets of their friends and allies.

"The scheme was referred by the Athenians to ARISTIDES. He said, 'True, you *can* do it; you have got the power; but, Athenians, it is *unjust*.'

"We, continued Mr. TOOMBS, appeal to the true and honest men of the North, as ARISTIDES did to the Athenians; gentlemen, you can do this, for you have the physical power, *but it is unjust*. We said that in 1850; and in spite of the Senator from Massachusetts, and all his coadjutors here, the free North, the honest North, took the same course which the honest Athenians did under the advice of ARISTIDES. They said: 'It is unjust, and we will not do it.'" Democrats of the North, these were the sentiments of an honest and high-minded Southron in 1854. You followed him then. You then scorned the petty by-ways of policy and a time-serving expediency, and walked in the broad highway of principle and justice. Will you not do so now? Will you not walk in the old ways, the tried ways, the ways in which you and your fathers have trod? Will you take the advice of the THEMISTOCLES in our party, who advise you to take an unjust advantage of the enemies of the Democratic party, and who, "forgetful of justice and right, desire you, under prospect of *advantage*, to destroy even your enemies?" "True, you can do it; you have got the power; but, Democrats, *it would be unjust*." In 1850, in 1854, the free North, the honest North, pursued the same course which the honest Athenians did under the advice of ARISTIDES—they said then, and in 1857 they will say again, "It is unjust, and we will not do it."

"HOUSEHOLD WORDS."

Many of our readers will thank us for informing them that the Christmas number of "Household Words," (most of which will be written by CHARLES DICKENS himself,) will contain "The Perils of Certain English Prisoners, and their Treasure in Women, Children, Silver, and Jewels." It will occupy thirty-six octavo pages, or the amount of a regular Number and a Half. Of course, Mr. T. B. PETERSON will reprint and republish it, the day after a copy reaches Philadelphia. He has a very *taking* way as regards DICKENS' works.

☞ The Pittsburgh *Daily Union* is making up a list of papers, with evident satisfaction, that have taken ground in favor of allowing Congress to compel the people of Kansas to accept the minority Lecompton Constitution. The *Union* omits itself in this list, which is wise, considering that it was one of the first to take ground against this minority Constitution.

☞ The announcement of a series of Lectures, on the Philosophy of the Bible, by Professor JACOBS, will attract general attention. It is an interesting subject, and will be ably treated.

THE SALE OF MR. ROBINSON'S PAINTINGS will be continued this morning. Some of the most valuable pictures will be included.

The sale of elegant books, suitable for Christmas presents, will be continued this evening, at the auction rooms. See Thomas & Sons' advertisement.

REAL ESTATE SALE.—James A. Freeman's sale on Wednesday evening next includes several properties by order of the Orphans' Court; also, a property in Coates street. All to be sold without reserve. See advertisement under auction head.

The Splendid new Marble Store, erected for Henry Korn, Esq., 28 North Third street, by Mr. Rubincam, the eminent builder, is so nearly ready for occupation, that we find it advertised in THE PRESS, of this day, to be rented. It has a frontage of thirty, a depth of one hundred and forty-seven, and a side extent of sixty-four feet, and is one of the most handsome and convenient stores in the city.

Fire.—The alarm of fire about five o'clock yesterday morning was caused by the partial burning of the lumber-yard of Mr. Nicholson, at Seventh street and Marriott's lane, which was set on fire, and damaged to the amount of about fifty dollars.

BY MIDNIGHT MAIL.

FROM WASHINGTON.

Governor Walker's Letter—Intelligence from Kansas—Treasury Notes, &c., &c., &c.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17, 1857.

In another column will be found the letter of resignation sent to Mr. Buchanan by Governor Walker. Regard for the harmony of the Democratic party at the same time that he stood firmly upon the ground of popular sovereignty, induced Governor Walker, after consultation with friends from every section, to pursue this course. The Administration had last night an extraordinary Cabinet council, to take into grave consideration the present aspect of Kansas affairs, and to determine upon some fair mode of adjustment. I am inclined to the belief, however, that they will reply to Governor Walker's letter, sustaining, with whatever of argument at their command the position which on this vexed question they are understood to assume.

Mr. Dexter has just arrived here from Kansas. This gentleman is known all through the Territory as an indomitable National Democrat. He reports that not only all the press of Kansas, even pro-slavery papers, excepting always the Lord President's pet organ, are in opposition to the Lecompton contrivance, and that ninety-nine-hundredths of the people are of the same way of thinking. National Democrats, he says, will be thunderstruck when they learn that the Administration, contrary to their expectations, favor what they determinedly set their face against. Col. Hazard, of Kickapoo, which gave 500 majority for the Democratic ticket, is with Gov. Walker, and opposed to the Lecompton Constitution. So are his constituents, with very rare exceptions.

A Democratic Senator in the State Legislature of Wisconsin, informs me that the Democratic members of the Senate, and of the House composing that body, have had an understanding for some time, that previous to the opening of their sessions they will meet in caucus, and pass resolutions of approbation of the course of Walker, Stanton, Douglas, and THE PRESS. I give you his words as he gave them to me. Furthermore, he states that there is *not a single dissentient*.

Hon. John Hickman, of the Chester district, was one of the first from Pennsylvania, in the last House of Representatives, to raise his voice in favor of the nomination and election of Mr. Buchanan. You know how he worked during the last campaign for the success of our cause. Now he prepares himself for continued advocacy of the great principle that the will of the majority, as fairly expressed, shall prevail, and will speak in the House on the first opportunity, in opposition to the Lecompton Constitution.

Mr. Hunter, from the Finance Committee of the Senate, reported a bill to-day, authorizing the issuance of treasury notes to make up the deficit in the revenues of the country for the ordinary expenditures of the Government. It is very lengthy, but in its main features is as I have heretofore *stated it*.

An old gentleman, who was sojourning in Europe, during the last Presidential campaign, for the benefit of his health, says that of all the documents which were sent to him favoring the object of his desire—the election of Mr. Buchanan—none were more grateful than the speeches of a young Philadelphia lawyer, named Dougherty.

The decease of the late Hon. J. G. Montgomery, from the Luzerne district, was announced this morning in the House by Hon. Paul Leidy, his successor. The remarks, both of Mr. Leidy and Colonel Florence, who seconded the resolutions, were appropriate, and touching in their expression of sorrow for their loss and the loss of their beloved State, *Pennsylvania*.

Acting Commissioner Mix has received a letter from Brigham Young, dated October 7, 1857. He writes:

"I improve the opportunity by first succeeding mail via Panama to inform you that I forwarded my report and accompanying papers for the quarter ending September, 1857, by the hands of the Hon. J. M. Bernhisel, our delegate to Congress, who accepted a very courteous invitation from Captain Van Vliet, U. S. A., to cross the plains with him *en route* to Washington, and notwithstanding the quarter was not quite ended, I deemed that course all the more proper from the fact that the mail to this Territory from Independence, Mo., had been stopped by the Post Office Department, and it was not known how soon the mail from California might, also, be stopped.

"I have also the honor to inform you that Dr. Garland Hurt, a United States Indian agent, in this superintendency, saw fit to leave the field of his official duty, on the 26th of September last, in company with some Indians, whom it is said he hired to escort him to the United States troops, and without having made any report to me of his wishes and designs, or of the disposition he had made of the affairs of his agency.

"Such an occasionless and unwise movement on his part, altogether needlessly exposing himself to sickness, hardship, and danger, I did all in my power, upon the earliest intimation of his plans, to prevent, as will be seen by a letter addressed to him, (a copy of which I enclose,) but which, unfortunately, did not reach his place of residence until a few hours after his departure.

"Trusting that my official course, as above indicated, will meet the cordial approval of your judgment, I have the honor to be, very respectfully,
BRIGHAM YOUNG,
"Gov. and *ex off.* Supt. Indian Affairs, U. T.
X. Y.

THE LATEST NEWS BY TELEGRAPH.

Non-Arrival of the Canada.

HALIFAX, Dec. 17—11 o'clock, P. M.—The steamship Canada has not yet been signalled below. The weather is calm, but slightly hazy.

FROM WASHINGTON.

The Pacific Railroad—Nominations Confirmed—The Resignation of Governor Walker.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The following named Senators compose the committee to whom was referred that part of the President's Message relative to the railroad to the Pacific: Messrs. Gwin of California, Douglas of Illinois, Bright of Indiana, Davis of Mississippi, Hunter of Virginia, Seward of New York, Bell of Tennessee, Foot of Vermont, and Iverson of Georgia.

In Executive Session to-day, the Senate confirmed M. B. Lamar of Texas, as Minister to Central America, and Austin R. Smith as Naval Agent in California.

The nomination of Judge Clifford to supply the vacancy on the Supreme Bench was warmly debated by the Senate, and then referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Governor Walker has printed his letter resigning the Governorship of Kansas, designing to supply the press with copies. Some of his friends confidently assert that the President will refuse to accept the resignation, so that by returning the letter to him, it will not appear on the public archives. It is also further said by his friends, that they anticipate the President will dismiss him.

U. S. Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The Supreme Court today was occupied with case No. 15, (before reported.) The argument for the plaintiff was continued, and the argument for the defendant was commenced.

Later from Kansas.

ST. LOUIS, Dec. 17.—The *Republican* has received Kansas dates to the 10th inst. The Legislature had done nothing toward carrying out the recommendations of acting Governor Stanton's message.

The election returns from Kickapoo have been declared fraudulent by the Committee of Investigation, and the Republican members admitted to their seats in the House.

John Calhoun, the President of the Constitutional Convention, had been nominated for Governor by the Democratic Convention, but he declined, and Frank Marshall was nominated instead. W. G. Matthews was nominated for Lieut. Governor.

Mr. Carr was nominated for Congress; District Attorney Weir was offered the nomination, but declined.

Gen. Denver, the newly appointed acting Governor, had not yet arrived in the Territory.

Nothing was yet known as to the character of the intelligence brought by the last messenger from Utah.

ST. LOUIS, Dec. 17.—The Kansas letters to the *Democrat* say that an attempt is being made along the border counties of Missouri to form companies of voters, to control the election to be held in the Territory on the 21st inst.

At a mass convention held at Lecompton on the 7th inst., resolutions were passed, endorsing the proceedings of the delegate convention, held at Lawrence on the 2d, and pledging themselves individually and collectively to oppose to the utmost the Constitution adopted at Lecompton, and to resist every attempt made to put into operation a State Government under the same.

The Death Warrant.

PITTSBURGH, Dec. 17.—The Governor has issued warrants for the execution of the McKeesport murderers, Henry Fife and Charlotte Jones, to take place on the 12th of February, 1858; also of Monroe Stewart (who, by the confession of Charlotte Jones, is exonerated from complicity in the murder) to take place a fortnight later.

On the Way to Washington.

BALTIMORE, Dec. 17.—Hon J. C. Breckinridge, Vice President of the United States; Senator Mallory of Florida, General Gonzales, and Dr. Smith, of New Orleans, came up to this city in the Norfolk boat. They are on their route to Washington.

Administration Meeting at New York—An Accident.

NEW YORK, Dec. 17.—An immense Democratic meeting congregated in the City Park this evening, to respond favorably to the views expressed in the message of Mr. Buchanan. Hon. Richard Schell presided. The speakers' platform broke down while Mr. Schell was speaking, and great excitement ensued among the crowd. Fortunately no person was injured. The meeting then proceeded to the vicinity of the City Hall, from the steps of which they are being addressed.

The Southern Banks.

AUGUSTA, Dec. 17.—The Legislature of South Carolina has refused to legalize the suspension of specie payments by the banks. The Georgia Legislature has done nothing yet.

The Governor of Florida has directed the tax collectors to receive the ordinary currency in payment of taxes due the State.

Rain commenced falling here last night, and there is every prospect of a deluge similar to that of last week.

Markets.

PITTSBURGH, Dec. 17.—Flour dull; no sales from first hands; prices is still unchanged; wheat dull; 80a90c for red and white; rye 55c; corn 40c; oats 30c. Nothing doing in provisions; whiskey, raw, 17c.

BALTIMORE, Dec. 17.—Flour is firm. Whiskey 21a22c. Exchange on New York 4½ per cent. premium.

CHARLESTON, December 17.—Sales of 400 bales of Cotton to-day, and for the week, 9,000 bales. The market closes with an advancing tendency; sales 10½ for middling. Gunny bags are selling at 11 cents for time.

Hon. Robert J. Walker's Resignation of the Governorship of Kansas.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—The following is the letter of Hon. Robert J. Walker, resigning the office of Governor of Kansas:

[CORRECTED FROM GOV. WALKER'S OWN COPY.]

WASHINGTON CITY, Dec. 15, 1857.

Hon. Lewis Cass, Secretary of State:

SIR: I resign the office of Governor of the Territory of Kansas. I have been most reluctantly forced to this conclusion, after anxious and careful consideration of my duty to the country, to the people of Kansas, to the President of the United States, and to myself. The grounds assumed by the President, in his late message to Congress, and in recent instructions, in connection with the events now transpiring here and in Kansas, admonish me, that as Governor of that Territory, it will no longer be in my power to promote the peace or promote the public welfare.

At the earnest solicitation of the President, after repeated refusals, the last being in writing, I finally accepted this office, upon his letter showing the danger and difficulties of the Kansas question, and the necessity of my undertaking the task of adjustment. Under these circumstances, notwithstanding the great sacrifices to me, personal, political, and pecuniary, I felt that I could no more refuse such a call from my country, through her Chief Magistrate, than a soldier in battle, who is ordered to command a forlorn hope. I accepted, however, on the express condition that I should advocate the submission of the Constitution to the vote of the people, for ratification or rejection. These views were clearly understood by the President and all his Cabinet. They were distinctly set forth in my letter of acceptance of this office, on the 26th of March last, and reiterated in my inaugural address on the 27th of May last, as follows: "Indeed, I cannot doubt that the Convention, after having framed a State Constitution, will submit it for ratification or rejection by a majority of the then actual bona fide resident settlers of Kansas. With these views well known to the President and Cabinet, and approved by them, I accepted the appointment of Governor of Kansas. My instructions from the President, through the Secretary of State, under date of the thirtieth of March last, sustain 'the regular Legislature of the Territory, in assembling a Convention to form a Constitution;' and they express the opinion of the President, that 'when such a Constitution shall be submitted to the people of the Territory, they must be protected in the exercise of their right of voting for or against that instrument; and the fair expression of the popular will must not be interrupted by fraud or violence.' I repeat, then, as my clear conviction, 'that unless the Convention submit the Constitution to the vote of all the actual resident settlers in Kansas, and the election be fairly and justly conducted, the Constitution will be, and ought to be, rejected by Congress.'" This inaugural most distinctly asserted that it was not the question of slavery merely, (which I believed to be of little practical importance then in its application to Kansas,) but the entire Constitution which should be submitted to the people for ratification or rejection. These were my words on that subject in my inaugural: "It is not merely, shall slavery exist in or disappear from Kansas, but shall the great principles of self-government and State sovereignty be maintained or subverted." In that inaugural I proceed further to say, that the people "may by a subsequent vote defeat the ratification of the Constitution." I designate this as a "great constitutional right," and add "that the Convention is the servant, and not the master, of the people."

In my official despatch to you of the second of June last, a copy of that inaugural address was transmitted to you for the further information of the President and his Cabinet. No exception was ever taken to any portion of that address. On the contrary, it is distinctly admitted by the President in his message, with commendable frankness, that my instructions in favor of the submission of the Constitution to the vote of the people were "general and unqualified." By that inaugural, and subsequent addresses, I was pledged to the people of Kansas to oppose, by all "lawful means," the adoption of any Constitution which was not fairly and fully submitted to their vote for ratification or rejection. These pledges I cannot recall or violate without personal dishonor, and the abandonment of fundamental principles, and therefore it is impossible for me to support what is called the Lecompton Constitution, because it is not submitted to the vote of the people for ratification or rejection.

I have ever uniformly maintained the principle that sovereignty is vested exclusively in the people of each State, and that it performs its first and highest function in forming a State Government and State Constitution. This highest act of sovereignty, in my judgment, can only be performed by the people themselves, and cannot be delegated to Conventions or other intermediate bodies. Indeed, the whole doctrine of the sovereignty of Conventions, as distinct from that of the people—of conventional or delegated sovereignty, as contradistinguished from State or popular sovereignty—has ever been discarded by me, and was never heard of, to my knowledge, during the great canvass of 1856. Indeed, this is the great principle of State rights and State sovereignty maintained in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798 and 1799, sustained by the people in the great political revolution of 1800, and embraced in that amendment to the Federal Constitution, adopted under the auspices of Mr. Jefferson, declaring that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The reservation to "the States" is as separate States, in exercising the powers granted by their State Constitutions; and the reservation to "the people" is to the people of the several States, *admitted or inchoate*, in exercising their sovereign right of framing or amending their State Constitution. This view was set forth in my printed address, delivered at Natchez, Mississippi, in January, 1833, against nullification; which speech received the complimentary sanction of the great and good Madison, the principal founder of our Constitution, as shown by a letter of Hon. Charles J. Ingersoll, of Philadelphia, as published in the *Globe*, at Washington, in 1836. What adds much to the force of this opinion is the statement then made by Mr. Madison that those were also the views of Mr. Jefferson. By this clause of the Federal Constitution, the *sovereignty of the "people" of each State* is clearly reserved, and especially their exclusive sovereign right to form, in all its entirety, their own State Constitution.

I shall not enter fully into the argument of this question at this period, but will merely state that *this is the position I have ever occupied*, and the reasons for entertaining this opinion are clearly and distinctly set forth in the printed pamphlet, published over my signature, on the 13th of June, 1856, and then extensively circulated, from which I quote as follows: "Under our confederate system, sovereignty is that highest political power which, at its pleasure, creates Governments and delegates authority to them. Sovereignty grants powers, but not sovereign powers; otherwise it might extinguish itself by making the creature of its will the equal or superior of its creator. Sovereignty makes Constitutions, and through them establishes Governments. It delegates certain powers to those Governments, distributing the exercise of the granted powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial departments. The Constitution is not sovereign, *because it is created by sovereignty*; and the Government is not sovereign for the same reason, much less any department of that Government. Having defined sovereignty, we must not confound the power with its source or exercise. That is, sovereignty is one thing; where it resides, or how *it is to be exercised*, is another. Under the system of European despotism, sovereignty was claimed to reside in Kings and Emperors, under the sacrilegious idea of the 'divine power of Kings;' and the blasphemous doctrine was, that Sovereigns, in legitimate succession—although stained with crimes and blackened with infamy—were clothed by Deity with absolute power to rule their subjects, who held nothing but privileges granted by the Crown. Such were the absurd and impious dogmas to which the people of Europe, with few exceptions, have been compelled to submit by the bayonet—sustained by the mere potent authority of ignorance and superstition. Under this theory, the people were mere ciphers, and crowned heads sub-deities—the sole representatives on earth of the governing power of the Almighty. Our doctrine is just the reverse, making the people the only source of sovereign power. But what people? With us 'sovereignty rests exclusively with the people of each State.' By the Revolution, each colony, acting for itself alone, separated from Great Britain, and sanctioned the Declaration of Independence. Each colony having thus become a State, and each adopting for itself its separate State Government, acted for itself alone under the old Continental Congress. Each State acted for itself alone in acceding to the Articles of Confederation in 1778, and each State acted for itself alone in framing and ratifying each for itself the Constitution of the United States. Sovereignty, then, with us, rests exclusively with the people of each State. The Constitution of the United States is not sovereign, for it was created by the States, each exercising for itself that highest political power called sovereignty. For the same reason the Government of the United States is not sovereign, nor does it exercise any sovereign powers. It exercises only 'delegated powers,' as declared by the Constitution, and those powers only which are granted by that instrument. Delegated powers are not sovereign powers, but are powers granted by sovereignty. Sovereignty being this highest political power, cannot be delegated. It is indivisible. It is a unit, incapable of partition. Hence the great error of supposing that sovereignty is divided between the States and the United States. The Constitution of the United States is the 'supreme law,' and obligatory as such. But a law is not sovereignty, but an act of sovereignty. All laws imply law-makers, and in this case those who framed and ratified this 'supreme law,' were those sovereignties called the States, each acting exclusively for itself, uncontrolled by any sister States, except by the moral force of its influence and example. The Government of the United States, possessing, as we have shown, no sovereignty, but only delegated powers, to them alone it must look for the exercise of all constitutional authority in Territories, as well as States; for there is not a single power granted by the Constitution to this Government, in a Territory, which is not granted in a State, except the power to admit new States into the Union, which, as shown by the Madison Papers, the framers of the Constitution, as first demonstrated in my first Texas letter, refused to limit to our then existing Territories.

"In the Territories then, as well as the States, Congress possesses no sovereignty and can exercise only the powers delegated by the Constitution, and all the powers not thus granted are dormant or reserved powers, belonging in common territory to all the States as co-equal, joint tenants there of that highest political power called sovereignty."

It will be seen that this doctrine that "sovereignty makes Constitutions," that "sovereignty rests exclusively with the people of each State," that "sovereignty cannot be delegated;" that "it is inalienable, indivisible," a "unit incapable of partition," are doctrines ever regarded by me as fundamental principles of public liberty, and of the Federal Constitution. It will be seen that those views, which I have ever entertained, were not framed to suit any emergency in Kansas, but were my life-long principles, and were published and promulgated by me in an elaborate argument over my own signature, twelve months before my departure to that Territory, and when I never thought of going to Kansas. These rights I have ever regarded as fully secured to the people of "all the Territories" in adopting their State Constitution by the Kansas and Nebraska bill. Such is the construction given to that act by Congress, in passing the Minnesota bill, so justly applauded by the President. Such is the construction of this Kansas act by its distinguished author, not only in his late most able argument, but in addresses made and published by him long antecedent to that date, showing that this sovereign power of the people in acting upon a State Constitution is not confined to the question of slavery, but includes all other subjects embraced in such an instrument. Indeed, I believe the Kansas and Nebraska bill would have violated the rights of sovereignty reserved to the people of each State by the Federal Constitution, if it had deprived them, or Congress should now deprive them, of the right of voting for or against their State Constitution.

The President, in his message, thinks that the rights secured by this bill to the people, in acting upon their State Constitution, are confined to the slavery question; but I think, as shown in my address, before quoted, that "sovereignty is the power that makes Constitutions and Governments," and that not only the slavery clause in a State Constitution, but all others, must be submitted.

The President thinks that sovereignty can be delegated, at least in part. I think sovereignty cannot be delegated at all. The President believes that sovereignty is divisible between conventions and the people, to be exercised by the former on all subjects but slavery, and by the latter only on that question. Whereas, I think that sovereignty is "inalienable," "indivisible," "a unit incapable of partition," and that it cannot be delegated in whole or in part. It will not be denied that sovereignty is the only power that can make a State Constitution, and that it rests exclusively with the people; and if it is inalienable, and cannot be delegated, as I have shown, then it can only be exercised by the people themselves. Under our Government, we know no sovereigns but the people. Conventions are composed of "delegates"—they are mere agents or trustees, exercising not a sovereign but a delegated power, and the people are the principals. The power delegated to such Conventions can properly only extend to the framing of the Constitution; but its ratification or rejection can only be performed by the power where sovereignty alone rests—namely, the people themselves. We must not confound sovereign with delegated powers. The provisional authority of a Convention to frame a Constitution and submit it to the people is a delegated power; but sovereignty alone, which rests exclusively with the people, can ratify and put in force that Constitution. And this is the true doctrine of popular sovereignty; and I know of no such thing, nor does the Federal Constitution recognise it, as delegated or conventional sovereignty.

The President, in a very lucid passage of his able message, gives unanswerable reasons why the people, and not Conventions, should decide the question of slavery in framing a State Constitution. He says, very truly, that from the necessary division of the inchoate State into districts a majority of the delegates may think one way and the people another; and that the delegates (as was the case in Kansas) may violate their pledges, or fail to execute the will of the people. And why does not this reasoning apply with equal force to all other great questions embodied in the State Constitution? and why should the question of slavery alone override and extinguish the doctrine of popular sovereignty and the right of self-government? Most fortunately, this is no sectional question, for it belongs alike to the States admitted, or inchoate, of the South as of the North. It is not a question of slavery, but of State rights and of State and popular sovereignty; and my objections to the Lecompton Constitution are equally strong, whether Kansas, under its provisions, should be made a free or a slave State. My objections are based upon a violation of the right of self-government, and of State and popular sovereignty, and in forcing any Constitution upon the people against their will, whether it recognised freedom or slavery. Indeed, the first question which the people ought to decide, in forming a Government for an inchoate State, is whether they will change or not from a Territorial to a State Government. Now, as no one, who with me denies Federal or Territorial sovereignty, will contend that a Territorial Legislature is sovereign, or represents sovereignty, or that such a Legislature, a mere creation of Congress, can transfer sovereignty, which it does not possess, to a Territorial Convention. This change from a Territorial to a State Government can only be made by the power that makes sovereignty rests—namely, the people. Yet a State Government is forced upon the people of Kansas by the Lecompton Constitution, whether they will or not, for they can only vote for the Constitution, and not against it. But besides the change from a Territorial to a State Government, which the people alone have the right to make in framing a State Constitution, there are many momentous questions included in that instrument. It involves all the powers of State Government. There is the bill of rights, the *Magna Charta* of the liberties of a free people, the legislative, executive and judicial functions, the taxing power, the elective franchise, the great question of education, the sacred relations of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, and all the rights affecting life, liberty, and property. There is also the question of State debts, of banks, and paper money, and whether they shall be permitted or prohibited. As all free government, as stated by Mr. Jefferson, in the Declaration of Independence, depends upon "the consent of the governed," how can it be known whether the people would assent to the Constitution unless it is submitted to their vote for ratification or rejection?

But if acquiescence can be presumed in any case, surely it cannot be in that of Kansas, where so many of the delegates violated their pledge to submit the Constitution itself to a vote of the people, where the delegates who signed the Constitution represented scarcely one-tenth the people, and where nearly one-half of the counties of the Territory were disfranchised, and (by no fault of theirs) did not, and could not, give a single vote at the election for delegates to the Convention.

I have heretofore discussed this subject mainly on the question that Conventions are not sovereign, and cannot rightfully make a State Constitution, without its submission to the vote of the people, for ratification or rejection. Yet, surely, even those who differ with me on this point must concede, especially under the Kansas-Nebraska bill, it is only such Conventions can be called sovereign as have been truly elected by the people, and represent their will. On reference, however, to my address of the 16th of September last, on the tax qualification, (a copy of which was immediately transmitted to you for the information of the President and Cabinet,) it is evident that the Lecompton Convention was not such a body. That Convention had vital, not technical defects, in the very substance of its organization under the territorial law, which could only be cured, in my judgment, as set forth in my inaugural and other addresses, by the submission of the Constitution, for ratification or rejection by the people.

On reference to the territorial law under which the Convention was assembled, thirty-four regularly organized counties were named as election districts for delegates to the Convention. In each and all of these counties it was required by law that a census should be taken and the voters registered; and when this was completed, that delegates to the Convention should be apportioned accordingly. In nineteen of these counties there was no census, and therefore there could be no such apportionment there of delegates, based upon such census. And in fifteen of these counties there was no registry of voters. These fifteen counties, including many of the oldest organized counties of the Territory, were entirely disfranchised, and did not give, and by no fault of their own, could not give, a solitary vote for delegates to the Convention.

This result was superinduced by the fact that the Territorial Legislature appointed all the sheriffs and Probate Judges in all these counties, to whom was assigned the duty, by law, of making this census and registry. These officers were political partisans, dissenting from the views and opinions of the people of these counties, as proved by the election of October last. These officers, for want of funds, as they allege, neglected or refused to take any census or make any registry in these counties, and therefore they were entirely disfranchised, and they did not give a single vote at the election for delegates to the Constitutional Convention. And here I wish to call attention to the distinction, which will appear in my inaugural address, to those counties where the voters were fairly registered and did not vote.

In such counties, where a full and free opportunity was given to register and vote, and they did not choose to exercise that privilege, the question is very different from those counties in which there was no census or registry, and no vote was given or could be given, however anxious the people might be to participate in the election. Nor could it [illegible] wherever they endeavored by a subsequent census or registry of their own to supply this defect occasioned by the previous neglect of the Territorial officers, the delegates thus chosen were rejected by the Convention. I repeat, that in nineteen counties out of thirty-four, there was no census. In fifteen counties out of thirty-four there was no registry, and not a solitary vote was given or could be given for delegates to the Convention in many of these counties. Surely, then, it cannot be said that such a Convention, chosen by scarcely more than one-tenth of the present voters of Kansas, represented the people of that Territory, and could rightfully impose a Constitution upon them without their consent. These nineteen counties, in which there was no census, constituted a majority of the counties of the Territory, and these fifteen counties, in which there was no registry, gave a much larger vote at the October election, even with the six-months' qualification, than the whole vote given to the delegates who signed the Lecompton Constitution on the 7th November last. If, then, sovereignty can be delegated, and Conventions, as such, are sovereign, which I deny, surely it must be only in such cases as when such Conventions are chosen by the people, which we have seen was not the case as regards the late Lecompton Convention. It was for this, among other reasons, that in my inaugural and other addresses I insisted that the Constitution should be submitted to the people by the Convention, as the only means of curing this vital defect in its organization. It was, therefore, among other reasons, when, as you know, the organization of the so-called Topeka State Government, and, as a consequence, an inevitable civil war and conflict with the troops must have ensued, these results were prevented by my assuring, not the Abolitionists, as has been erroneously stated—for my address was not to them, but the people of Kansas—that in my judgment the Constitution would be submitted fairly and freely for ratification or rejection by their vote, and that if this was not done, I would unite with them, (the people,) as I now do, in "lawful opposition" to such a procedure.

The power and responsibility being devolved exclusively upon me by the President of using the Federal army in Kansas to suppress insurrection, the alternative was distinctly presented to me by the questions propounded at Topeka, of arresting revolution by the slaughter of the people, or of preventing it, together with that civil war which must have extended throughout the Union, by the solemn assurance then given, that the right of the people to frame their own government, so far as my power extended, should be maintained. But for this assurance, it is a conceded fact, that the Topeka State Government then assembled in legislative session would have been put into immediate actual operation, and that a sanguinary collision with the Federal army and civil war must have ensued, extending, it is feared, throughout the Union.

Indeed, the whole idea of an inaugural address originated in the alarming intelligence which had reached Washington city of the perilous and incipient rebellion in Kansas. This insurrection was rendered still more formidable on my reaching the Territory by the near approach of the assembling of the revolutionary State Legislature, and the very numerous mass conventions by which it was sustained. In truth, I had to choose between arresting that insurrection, at whatever cost of American blood, by the Federal army, or to prevent the terrible catastrophe, as I did, by my pledges to the people of the exertion of all my power to obtain a fair election, and the submission of the Constitution to the vote of the people for ratification or rejection.

My inaugural and other addresses were, therefore, really in the nature of proclamations, (so often issued by Presidents and Governors,) with a view to prevent as they did in this case, civil war and insurrection.

Now, by my oath of office, I was sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, which I have shown, in my judgment, required the submission of the Constitution to the vote of the people. I was sworn also to "take care" that the Kansas and Nebraska bill "should be faithfully executed," which bill, in my judgment, as heretofore stated, required that the Constitution should be submitted to the vote of the people, and I was therefore only performing a solemn duty, when, as Governor of the Territory, to whose people my first obligations were due, I endeavored to secure to them these results. The idea entertained by some that I should see the Federal Constitution and the Kansas-Nebraska bill overthrown and disregarded, and that, playing the part of a mute in a pantomime of ruin, I should acquiesce by my silence in such a result, especially where such acquiescence involved, as an immediate consequence, a disastrous and sanguinary civil war, seems to me to be most preposterous. Not a drop of blood has been shed by the Federal troops in Kansas during my administration. But insurrection and civil war, extending, I fear, throughout the country, were alone prevented by the course pursued by me on those occasions, and the whole people, abandoning revolutionary violence, were induced by me to go, for the first time, into a general and peaceful election.

These important results constitute a sufficient consolation for all the unjust assaults made upon me on this subject. I do not understand that these assaults have ever received the slightest countenance from the President; on the contrary, his message clearly indicates an approval of my course up to the present most unfortunate difference about the so-called Lecompton Constitution. Inasmuch, however, as this difference is upon a vital question, involving practical results and new instructions, it is certainly much more respectful to the President on my part to resign the office of Governor, and give him an opportunity of filling it, as is his right under the Constitution, with one who concurs with him in his present opinions, rather than go to Kansas and force him to remove me by disobedience to his instructions. This latter course, in my judgment, would be incompatible with proper respect for the Chief Magistrate of the Union, inconsistent with the rules of moral rectitude or propriety, and could be adopted with no other view than to force the President to remove me from office. Such a course, it is alleged, would present me to the public as a political martyr in the defence of the great principle of self-government; but to go to Kansas with any such purpose, or with a certain knowledge that such a result must follow, would be alike unjust and improper. My only alternative, then, is that of a respectful resignation, in the hope that Kansas and our beloved country may be shielded from that civil war with which I fear both are threatened, by any attempt to force the so-called Lecompton Constitution upon the people of Kansas.

I state it as a fact, based on a long and intimate association with the people of Kansas, that an overwhelming majority of that people are opposed to that instrument, and my letters state that but one out of twenty of the press of Kansas sustains it. Some oppose it because so many counties were disfranchised and unrepresented in the Convention. Some, who are opposed to paper money, because it authorizes a bank of enormous capital for Kansas, nearly unlimited in its issues, and in the denomination of its notes, from one dollar up and down. Some because of what they consider a Know Nothing clause, by requiring that the Governor shall have been twenty years a citizen of the United States. Some because the elective franchise is not free, as they cannot vote against the Constitution, but only on the single issue, whether any more slaves may be imported, and then only upon that issue by voting for the Constitution to which they are opposed. They regard this as but a mockery of the elective franchise, and a perilous sporting with the sacred rights of the people. Some oppose because the Constitution distinctly recognises and adopts the Oxford fraud in apportioning legislative members for Johnson county, upon the fraudulent and fictitious *returns*, so falsely called, from that precinct, which recognition of that fraud in the Constitution is abhorrent to the moral sense of the people. Others oppose because, although in other cases the presidents of Conventions have been authorized to issue writs of election to the regular Territorial or State officers with usual judges, with the established precincts and adjudication of returns, in this case unprecedented and vice-regal powers are given to the president of the Convention to make the precincts, the judges, and to decide finally upon the returns. From the grant of these unusual and enormous powers, and from other reasons connected with the fraudulent returns of Oxford and McGhee, an overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas have no faith in the validity of these returns, and therefore will not vote. Indeed, disguise it as we may to ourselves, under the influence of the present excitement, the facts will demonstrate that any attempt by Congress to force this Constitution upon the people of Kansas will be an effort to substitute the will of a small minority for that of an overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas; that it will not settle the Kansas question or localize the issue; that it will I fear, be attended by civil war, extending, perhaps, throughout the Union; thus bringing this question back again upon Congress and before the *people in its most dangerous and alarming aspect.*

The President takes a different view of the subject in his message; and, from the events occurring in Kansas as well as here, it is evident that the question is passing from theories into practice, and that, as Governor of Kansas, I should be compelled to carry out new instructions, differing, on a vital question, from those received at the date of my appointment. Such instructions I could not execute, consistently with my views of the Federal Constitution, of the Kansas and Nebraska bill, or with my pledges to the people of Kansas. Under *these circumstances, no alternative is left me but to resign* the office of Governor of the Territory of Kansas.

No one can more deeply regret than myself this necessity; but it arises from no change of opinion on my part. On the contrary, I should most cheerfully have returned to Kansas to carry out my original instructions, and thus preserve the peace of the Territory, and finally settle the Kansas question by redeeming my pledges to the people. It is not my intention to *discuss, at this time, the peculiar circumstances* and unexpected events which have modified the opinions of the President upon a point so vital as the submission of the Constitution for ratification or rejection by the vote of the people, much less do I desire any controversy with the President on this subject, yet, however widely my views may differ from those *entertained by him on this question*—views which I have held all my life, and which, as involving fundamental principles of public liberty and of the Constitution, are unchangeable—yet, as regards all those great Democratic *measures which, I trust, will constitute the policy* of his Administration in other respects, it will give me pleasure, as a private citizen, to yield my cordial support.

I have said that the slavery question, as a practical issue, had disappeared from Kansas long before my arrival there, and the question of self-government had been substituted in its place. On some future occasion I shall *dissipate the delusion which has prevailed upon* this subject, and show, that after three years' experiment, when I arrived in Kansas there were less than three hundred slaves there, and the number constantly diminishing; that, as proved by the official records of Congress, published and authenticated by those distinguished Southern statesmen, John C Calhoun and Jefferson Davis, the winter climate, even of Eastern Kansas, is colder than that of New England and that the pro-slavery Territorial Convention of Kansas, consolidated with the pro-slavery Territorial Legislature, on the 4th of January, 1857, nearly five months before my arrival there, did distinctly abandon the slavery issue, because, as set forth by one of their number, "the pro-slavery party was in a small and admitted minority," "and the co-operation of the free-State Democrats was invited, as the only hope of success, not to make Kansas a slave State, which was conceded to be impossible, but to make it a conservative Democratic free State." Even as late as the 3d of July, 1857, when the Democratic Territorial Convention assembled at Lecompton, in consequence of the laws of climate and the well known will of the people, none contended that slavery could be established there. Nor was it until my Southern opponents interfered in the affairs of Kansas, and by denunciation, menace, and otherwise, aided at a critical period by several Federal office-holders of Kansas, including the surveyor-general, (the president of the Convention) with his immense patronage, embracing many hundred employees, intervened, and, as I believe, without the knowledge or approbation of the President of the United States, produced the extraordinary paper called the Lecompton Constitution. Yet *this act of intervention by Federal officers to defeat* the will of the people seems to be sustained by my opponents; whilst my intervention, as it is called, in obedience to my duty and oath of office to support the Federal Constitution, and to take care that our organic law should be fairly executed, by endeavoring to secure to the people of Kansas their rights under that act, is denounced and calumniated. It is still more extraordinary, that the hypothetical remarks made by me as regards climate in its connection with its influence upon the question of slavery in Kansas, after that issue had been abandoned there, which views were consolidating the union between conservative, free-State, and pro-slavery Democrats, so as to prevent the confiscation of the small number of slaves there held in Kansas, have been denounced by many distinguished Southern Senators, who, when the Kansas and Nebraska bill was pending in Congress, and when such remarks from them, if ever, might affect Southern emigration, were then loudest in proclaiming that, because of its climate, Kansas could never become a slave State. Indeed, it seems that all persons, in and out of Kansas, whether in public or private life, may publish what opinions they please in regard to these questions, except the Governor of that Territory, who has so little power and no patronage.

And now be pleased to express to the President my deep regret as regards our unfortunate difference of opinion in relation to the Lecompton Constitution, and to say to him, that as infallibility does not belong to man, however exalted in intellect, purity of intention, or position, yet if he has committed any errors in this respect, may they be overruled by a superintending Providence, for the perpetuation of our Union, and the advancement of the honor and interest of our beloved country.

In now dissolving my official connection with your department I beg leave to tender my thanks for your constant courtesy and kindness.

Most respectfully, your ob't serv't,
R. J. WALKER

THIRTY-FIFTH CONGRESS,

FIRST SESSION.

U. S. CAPITOL, WASHINGTON,
December 17, 1857.

SENATE

Mr GWIN, of California, presented a memorial signed by a large number of the citizens of California and New Mexico, praying for the establishment of the territorial Government of Arizona, and subsequently introduced a bill for that purpose. On his motion, a select committee of nine were ordered to consider so much of the President's message as refers to the Pacific Railroad and subsequently introduced a bill for its construction.

On motion of Mr SLIDELL, of Louisiana, a select *committee of five was appointed to examine into* the condition of the banking associations of the District of Columbia, and the authority by which such corporations assume to transact the business of banking. Also, what further legislation is necessary to regulate and control such banks.

On motion of Mr SEWARD (N. Y.), a resolution *was adopted calling upon the President for copies* of any correspondence which may have taken place between the Departments and the British and French residents on the subject of claims for alleged losses by the bombardment of Greytown.

On motion of Mr TRUMBULL (Illinois), the credentials of Messrs Bright and Fitch, of Indiana, together with the protest against their right to hold their seats, etc., were referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WILSON (Mass) gave notice of his intention to introduce a bill granting to the citizens of Washington and Georgetown, District of Columbia, a million acres of public lands for the support of their schools.

Mr. PUGH (Ohio) introduced a bill to improve *navigation at the falls of the Ohio river.*

Mr. CLAY (Ala.) introduced a bill to repeal all laws allowing fishing bounties.

Mr. HUNTER (Va), from the Committee on Finance, reported a bill providing for the issue of United States Treasury notes.

Mr. HUNTER asked its immediate consideration, *and caused to be read a communication from the* Secretary of the Treasury, in which it is stated that in the warehouse at New York there is merchandise to the amount of twenty-eight millions of dollars, on which the duties to be paid are estimated at more than six millions of dollars. There is now in the treasury, subject to draft, less than *six millions of dollars, and the excess of expenditures* is daily reducing this amount. Therefore, authority should forthwith be given to issue twenty millions of treasury notes.

Mr. HUNTER said this bill corresponded with that of 1817, with the exception that there was no provision for funding the debt, and the other difference is as to the mode of paying the interest.

The bill was read. It authorizes the President *to cause such sums to be issued as the exigencies of* the public service may require, but not to exceed at any time the amount of twenty millions of dollars, nor to be of a less denomination than fifty dollars; the notes to be paid and redeemed after the expiration of one year from the dates of such notes; from which dates, until they shall be respectively redeemed, they shall bear such rates of *interest as shall be expressed in said notes*, which rate of interest upon the first issue (which shall not exceed six million of dollars) shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approbation of the President, but in no case to exceed six per centum per annum. The residue shall be raised, the whole or part, after a public advertisement of not less than thirty days, as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct, by exchanging them at their par value for specie to bidders, who shall agree to make the exchange at the lowest rate of interest, not exceeding six per centum per annum: Provided, that after the maturity of the said notes interest thereon shall cease at the expiration of sixty days' notice of readiness to pay and redeem the same; which notice may at any time be given by the Secretary of the Treasury. Payment or redemption on such notes shall be made to the lawful holders thereof, respectively, upon their presentment at the Treasury, and shall include the *principal of each note, and the interest which* may be due thereon. The faith of the United States is to be solemnly pledged for the redemption of these notes. No notes shall be pledged, hypothecated, sold, or disposed of in any way, for any purpose whatever, either directly or indirectly, for any sum less than the amount of such notes, including the principal and interest. The notes shall be transferred by an assignment endorsed thereon by the persons, to whose order the same shall be made payable, accompanied by the delivery of a notice that they have been so assigned. The notes are to be received by the proper officers, in payment of all debts and taxes levied by the authority of the United States, and payment of public lands; and on every such payment credit shall be given to the amount of the principal and interest due on such notes, on the day when they shall have been received by such officers. Authority is given to purchase the said notes at the proper amount of the principal and interest at any time. The remainder of the bill relates to details, provides penalties for forgery, and appropriates $20,000 to carry it into effect.

Objection being made to the immediate consideration of the bill, Mr. HUNTER gave notice that he *would call it up to-morrow.*

Before proceeding to the election of printer, Mr. JOHNSON, of Arkansas, offered a proposition that the person elected should receive the contract on condition that Congress should have the right to repeal or modify all the existing laws relative to the public printing, and that no loss or damage to the person by reason of such modification or repeal shall be allowed as constituting any claim against Congress. The proposition was agreed to.

The balloting was then proceeded with. Mr Harris, of the *Union*, received 28 votes; George M Weston, 18; scattering, 3. Mr. Harris was declared elected.

Mr. DOUGLAS, before the result was announced, said that he had declined to vote for reasons satisfactory to himself.

Mr. FOOT introduced a bill granting a homestead of 160 acres to actual *settlers*.

Mr. WILSON presented the resolutions of the Legislature of Massachusetts, asking that the State be reimbursed for money advanced to the United *States during the war of 1812.*

After spending some time in executive session the Senate adjourned.

Note.—On account of the omission of a word in the telegraph copy, the position of Mr. Douglas *in his reply to Mr. Green, in the Senate on Wednesday*, is mis-stated. On one point Mr. D said—"*Firstly*—He did *not* regard it as a fatal objection that there was no enabling act in advance."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Leidy announced the death of John G Montgomery, member of Congress from the district of Pennsylvania, representing the counties of Luzerne, Montour, Wyoming, and Columbia.

Mr. Florence pronounced a eulogy on the character of the deceased.

The usual resolutions of respect were passed, when the House adjourned.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

PITTSBURGH, December 10, 1857.

Since the President has assumed a position, or at least shown a decided inclination, in favor of admitting Kansas with the Lecompton Constitution, it may be gratifying and encouraging to you to know that nine-tenths of the Democracy here *approve of the manly and dignified course* pursued by your journal. My individual sentiments are of little weight, but you have my cordial endorsement and earnest hope for the ultimate success of the great principle you advocate with so much zeal and ability.

But I write to assure you that the masses of our *stern and sturdy* Democrats are with you, in sympathy and feeling, in your gallant maintenance of one of the cardinal doctrines of our creed. Let this fact strengthen and sustain you. We are too firmly wedded to the doctrine of "*popular sovereignty*" to permit our affections to be alienated, simply because the Republicans are paying court to that dogma. It was our battle-cry in past campaigns, and it was an effective one; and surely we should not abandon or restrict it now, because it is likely to inure to the benefit of our opponents, by giving them an opportunity to vote down the Calhoun Constitution. If this new idea prevails, popular sovereignty will mean: "Let the majority rule" *if they agree with you*; if not, take away their right.

We do not anticipate any serious embarrassment to our party on account of this question; and we shall sincerely regret it should any be occasioned, for we have the most exalted admiration for Mr. Buchanan. At the same time, we feel that you are doing noble service in defence of a glorious principle, and it is but just to acknowledge our appreciation thereof.

ERIE COUNTY.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

WATERFORD, Pa., Dec 7, 1857.

Although a stranger to you, I take the liberty of addressing you out of the regular order of business, and of expressing my feelings of deep gratification at the stand you have taken in defence of what I deem true Democratic principles.

Notwithstanding whatever any hot-headed fanatics may say or do, the Democracy, as a great party, will sustain you in the position you have assumed against the principle of the Kansas Calhoun Convention, and in favor of the great principle "the will of the majority shall prevail."

I speak from personal knowledge when I say that the Democracy of this region highly approve of your course; and we have, too, the fullest confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of our Chief Executive, James Buchanan. We believe he will adopt the same policy, opposition journals and politicians to the contrary notwithstanding. We repose the utmost trust in his sagacity as a statesman, and his honesty as a man, and believe that, through his agency, all difficulties in Kansas will be speedily and amicably settled.

In conclusion, let me say—if I do not tire your patience before you get through with this letter—that *The Press* exerts an influence here that is surprising, considering the short time that it has been established. While Democrats look upon it as *the* paper of the age, the opposition accord you the meed of honesty in your belief, and the character of the true gentleman.

ERIE, Dec. 15, 1857.

Without any acquaintance, other than through the columns of your able and truly *Democratic* paper, THE PRESS, I have felt it a duty to extend to you my hearty congratulations upon your fearless, independent, and unanswerable defence of "popular sovereignty."

The men who occupy the front ranks in the present unexpected contest for the integrity of that corner-stone in the citadel of our liberties should be strengthened by the assurance that their labors are appreciated and applauded. Amongst those men yourself and Senator *Douglas must ever hold* a distinguished position.

Every Democrat who labored conscientiously during the last Presidential campaign in behalf of that first of principles in the history and institutions of our country, must tremble for the future of his party and country at the present insidious attack upon the most cherished article of a freeman's faith.

To sustain the proposed plan of submitting the Lecompton Constitution to the voters of Kansas would require of the Democratic party the most unequivocal desertion of its principles and pledges.

A party that would *seem*, even, to demand of its members unqualified stultification, must soon "go down" before the contempt and execrations of an intelligent and free people.

Our only safety as a nation and as a party, North and South, lies in the frank and fearless avowal and practice of what we know to be right.

The doctrine of expediency, in too many instances, is but the fellow of that other precept of error, that "*the end justifies the means*," under which any conceivable crime against God or man may be committed with impunity.

As a people, we can never be happy at home and respected abroad, if we wilfully swerve from those examples of wisdom and patriotism that fill to a glorious repletion the history of the past.

Expediency was a rare word, and a rarer "rule of action," with men whose "principles and hearts" resisted to the death the right to "take a penny," *because* it involved "the right to take a pound."

Having been honored by the Democracy of Erie county with a position as a standard-bearer at the State election of the fall of 1856, I feel some privilege in speaking what I know to be their almost unanimous sentiments.

FROM OLD MOTHER CUMBERLAND.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

CARLISLE, December, 15 1857.

The Democracy of old mother Cumberland are sure you are *right*, and say to you go ahead. We are almost a unit, for I have heard but one man in our county advocate the Calhoun swindle.

How any one pretending to be a Democrat and the friend of self-government can advocate this horrid outrage of forcing upon the freemen of Kansas a Constitution repudiated by the mass of her citizens, is a new phase of Democracy, which, to the old-fashioned Democrats of Cumberland, is an inexplicable mystery.

Why, in *Pennsylvania* we are so *firmly* wedded to this great principle, that we have recently amended our Constitution so as to prevent the Legislature from ever dividing a county without submitting it to a vote of the citizens, and our Legislature in 1857 passed an act preventing our courts from dividing townships until they ordered an election, and the majority had voted for such division. We protest against this new-light Democracy of forcing a Constitution upon freemen, contrary to their wishes, and against their solemn protest. This mode of submission is an improvement upon that adopted by the Emperor of France in submitting his election to the people. They might vote for or against him, but for no other. Under the Lecompton Constitution all must vote for the Constitution. No one is permitted to vote against it. It is all buzzard and no turkey. We consider the sanction of this attempted swindle by Congress contrary to the organic act, the Cincinnati platform, the President's Inaugural, his instructions to Governor Walker, and all Governor Walker's speeches and proclamations to the people of Kansas, under the instructions given him by the President. We concur with the President in expressing our deep regret that the Convention did not submit their work to a vote of their constituents, and cannot doubt that a Democratic Congress will vindicate the great Democratic principle of self-government, by rejecting the work of demagogues and aristocrats who hold the people to be too ignorant or too stupid to form their own Government.

[The writer of this masterly letter is "an old friend, a gentleman of high position, who has voted the Democratic ticket for thirty years, *and no other*."]

FROM LYCOMING COUNTY.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

WILLIAMSPORT, Dec. 16, 1857.

At the risk of being esteemed by you impertinent in addressing you, personally unknown as *you are, I feel as though I cannot* refrain from joining with hosts of Democrats throughout the country, in the expression of my regard for the bold stand you have taken in defence of the doctrine of "popular sovereignty."

As an humble member of the party who has contributed whatever of influence or talent I may possess for the establishment of this great principle against fearful odds, and having seen our efforts crowned with entire success in the elevation of Mr. Buchanan to the Presidential chair, I am not willing to see it frittered *away nor suspended, like a bye-law of a* debating club, whenever it may suit anybody's convenience.

Depend upon it, sir, the Democracy of Lycoming county are with you on this question to a man, and if need be, they will speak out at the proper time in a manner that will not be misunderstood.

I have yet to find a single man in our party, and I have conversed with scores of them, who dares express any opinion in opposition to the views of Judge Douglas. In common with the entire party here, I bid you God-speed in your noble mission.

Now, sir,

"This freedom in an unknown friend,
I pray excuse,"

And believe me your friend and well wisher,

FROM DELAWARE COUNTY.

[Correspondence of The Press.]

DELAWARE COUNTY, PA., Dec. 15, 1857.

SIR: I have the pleasure to inform you that, in this county, your course upon the Kansas issue is fully sustained. You occupy unquestionable Democratic ground, and advocate substantial Democratic doctrine; for what was sound doctrine last year should be good this. Vacillation impairs the usefulness of great principles. I know of no disposition to find fault with the President; but, beyond the peculiar notions of the South, this is a great nation, where it is understood public opinion should be all-powerful. If we yield principle for expediency a little, we will soon be called upon to yield more. The Democracy of the North has not interfered with the peculiar institutions of the South, nor is it disposed to do so; nor will it complain, if, upon a fair test, slavery be carried into Kansas. But let the question be fairly tried. Apart from the violence and cheat which have been so disgraceful to all in Kansas, let the people themselves be protected, and have a chance in deciding their own institutions.

The speech of Senator Douglas, powerful and convincing as it is, only speaks the sentiments of the masses, and they swallow all of it.

As for your own course, and that of THE PRESS, let the large circulation it has obtained in this county, which is daily increasing, speak.

BY THE PILOT LINE.

LETTER FROM NEW YORK.

[Correspondence of the Press.]

NEW YORK, Dec. 17, 1857—5.20 P. M.

There is a positive stagnation in the money market to-day—more than I have yet seen, and a complete absence of that class of borrowers who alone can make saleable paper. If they were to come out, they could get money on their own terms, and be thanked for taking it, but they "heed not the voice of the charmer," from a distrust, perhaps, in the wisdom of his seduction. In the meantime, the street is flooded with produce bills, but no one will touch them at any price, and thus shipping orders are almost reduced to nil.

It is thought that flour will touch $4, at which price it would seem profitable to export; but I very much doubt if even then the money will be forthcoming to buy the bills, even with a bill of lading attached. Here is our great hitch, and I do not see any prospect of immediate improvement. Every one is afraid, and every one is selfish, and every one is waiting to see some one else cross the bridge first, with a half resolution to follow *in case all should be right*. This apprehension arises partly from a fear of the banks here, and partly from from a fear of bad news from the other side. The absence of the expected news from Halifax adds to the hesitation and torpor, and except at the Stock Exchange, there is positively nothing doing. Foreign exchange is quite inactive; bills on London are nominally steady at former quotations; but only the signatures of one or two favorite houses are bought, remitters thinking it safer to send the specie.

Another attempt was made last evening to revive the Nicaragua Steamship Company, under the auspices of Col Stebbins. A report was read by Mr. J. L. White; and it is said that the new company will have their *steamers ready by the 20th of January.*

It is said that the country banks are not returning the certificates of currency as quickly as was anticipated. The amount now held here exceeds $4,000,000, of which the Bank of Commerce has $600,000, and the Shoe and Leather Bank, $1,300,000. It is said in the street that all the banks will soon declare dividends of greater or less extent. Some have done so already, as I have noted, and the others are to follow before New Years. This is satisfactory for the stockholders, but I cannot see what good it will do any one else. Suspension and insolvency often conduce to the fortunes of those who practice these expedients.

The clearing house settlement was: Clearings $13,231,727 11; balance $998,502 82. The sub-treasury received $32,238 57; paid $349,248 58, and has a balance of $4 091 306 71. The customs receipts were $32 000.

The Stock market was lively at a marked advance in prices. Bank shares were much in demand. The improvement was well sustained all day, and at the Second Board the market was firm, closing for Reading at 53⅞; Erie, 17⅞; New York Central, 77; Michigan Southern, 23, Chic and R. I., 76¾; Galena and Chicago, 73⅞, and Panama, 94. It is said that the Erie and Illinois Central new loans are progressing very favorably.

NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE—Dec 17.

SECOND BOARD

16000 Missouri 6s	79	20 Reading R	53
4000 Ind State 2½	55	10 do	53¼
1000 Brooklyn City 6s	91	200 do	53¾
8000 Ill Central Bd	87	50 Mi Southern R	22¾
5000 Mi Cen 8 p ct 1st		575 do	23
Mi Skg Fd Con Bs	83½	30 Mi S & N I Pref	34¾
40 National Bank	99¾	25 Panama R	94
160 Penna Coal Co	86½	275 Gal & Chi R	73¼
25 do	87	100 do	73
10 Del & Hd Cnl Co	103	50 do b10	73¼
100 Cumberl'd Coal	9½	350 Clev & Tol R b30	43½
50 Erie R R b30	17½	1000 do	43½
100 do	17⅝	250 Chi & R I R	77
100 do s30	17¼	46 do	76¾
10 do	17¼	100 LaCross & Mil b60	10¾
50 do s3	17⅜	30 do	10
200 Hudson River R	19½	200 N Y Central R	76¾
50 Harlem Railroad	7½	100 do b10	76¾
40 do	7⅞	100 do b60	77

THE MARKETS.

ASHES.—The market is very quiet; sales of Pots and Pearls at $6.

COFFEE.—After the auction sale yesterday, 2,000 bags Rio sold at the advance, and this morning some 750 bags have been taken at 9½ a10½c, fully sustaining the improvement of the sale by auction.

COTTON.—The market, *pending further foreign advices per Canada*, at Halifax, has been dull and nominally at our quotations. Yesterday the sales were 600 bales.

FLOUR, &c.—The demand for Western Canal flour is very moderate, and prices are 5c lower on common brands. *Early in the day sales were reported at a decline of 10c ℔ bbl, but at the close little, if any, could be had at our inside figures.* The arrivals are large, exceeding 35,000 bbls, which gives buyers the advantage. The inquiry is mainly for the home trade.

Sales of 7,000 bbls at $4 30a$4 45 for common to good state, $4 55a$4 70 for extra do.; $4 30a$4 50 for superfine Indiana and Michigan; $4 55a$5 50 for extra do.; $4 85a$5 45 for common to good extra Ohio; $5 45a$5 85 for good to choice do; $5 50a$7.25 for St. Louis brands, and $5 40a$7 60 for extra Genesee.

Canadian Flour is without important change, the demand is light. Sales 600 bbls at $4 30a$4 55 for superfine, and $4 75a$6 25 for extra brands.

Southern flour freely offered, and is dull and lower—the arrivals are liberal. Sales of 700 bbls at $5a$5.20 for mixed to good brands and $5.25a$6.85 for the better grades. Rye flour is lower, and is dull. Sales of 100 bbls at $3a$4 25. Corn meal is plenty at $3 25a$3 49 *for Jersey. Buckwheat flour steady at $2a$2 12½.*

GRAIN.—The demand for Wheat is limited, and the market is unchanged, the arrivals light; the demand is *mainly for milling*: sales of 4,000 bush at $1 20a$1 30 for Southern red; $1 25a$1 50 for white do; $1.40 for white Kentucky.

Rye is much lower and is plenty: sales of 1,000 bush at 70a72½c. Oats are plenty and lower; sales of State and Western at 41a45c. Barley is heavy at 70a80c. Barley Malt is lower; sales of 1,600 bush at 90c, cash.

Corn is without much change, the demand is quite light; sales of 12 000 bush at 56a66c for Southern and Jersey yellow, and 68a70c for Western mixed. Other kinds are nominal.

HIDES are quiet, the stock is much reduced by the recent activity and less plentiful arrivals, yet there is still a very large and burdensome supply on the market, which creates heaviness. The sales are not important this morning. The stock is 335 000.

LEATHER.—Hemlock continues in fair demand at 2c for prime Buenos Ayres middle and light weights. Oak is quiet, but firm.

MOLASSES.—More is doing; several hundred hhds have changed hands at 18a24c for Cuba, and 28c for Porto Rico—the sales are 850 hhds, two-thirds Cuba. New Orleans is not active at 34½c for prime.

PROVISIONS.—A heavy market for Pork. The arrivals are fair and the demand very light—sales of 127 bbls at $15 25a$15 85 for country and city Mess, and $13 50a$14 for do Prime.

Beef is heavy and is freely offered—sales of 140 bbls at $5 75a$9 75 for country Prime, $9a$10 for do Mess, $10a$12 75 for repacked Western Mess, and $13 75a$14 50 for extra do. *Prime Mess is quiet at $19a$24.*

Beef Hams are inactive at $14a$15 75. Bacon is in limited demand and is nominal at 8a9¾c. Cut Meats are steady—sales of small lots at 7a7¾c for Shoulders, and 9a9½c for Hams.

Lard is again lower and is plenty—sales of 3,000 bbls at 9a9¾c. Dressed Hogs are more plenty, and are lower and heavy—sales at 6a6½.

Butter is abundant and is heavy. Sales of State at 13a20 cents, and Ohio at 10a16 cents. Cheese is in limited request at 6a8 cents.

RICE is quiet but steady. We quote at $3a$3.75 ℔ 100 lbs.

TALLOW.—Holders are firm. Sales of 7000 lbs at 13 cents cash.

WHISKEY.—The demand is light, but holders are firm. Sales of 200 bbls. at 23 cents.

PHILADELPHIA MARKETS.

DECEMBER 17—Evening.—There is no change in the Breadstuffs market to-day, but holders generally are more anxious to realize, and the only sales of Flour that have been made public are 700 bbls Western extra at $5 25; 350 bbls good do at $5 50; 600 bbls Ohio extra family, on terms kept secret, and 200 bbls good superfine at $5, at which figures holders are anxious sellers. The local demand is also quite moderate at the above prices for common brands and extras, and $5 75a$6 75 per bbl *for extra family and fancy brands*, according to brand and quality. Corn meal is not very plenty, and Pennsylvania is held at $3 per bbl. In Rye flour, nothing doing, holders are asking $4 25, but there is little or no demand for the article. Wheats are more plenty to-day, and dull at 110a115c for red and 120a125c for white, the latter for prime lots, which is rather scarce. Corn is without demand, and holders are free sellers at 55a56c for good and prime dry Delaware, but there is very little taken at these rates; some damp lots have been sold at 51a53c afloat and 500 bushels old Pennsylvania at 68c in store. Oats are without change, and in fair request at 30c for prime Southern. Rye is unsettled, and the distillers are only offering 75c per bushel to-day. Nothing doing in Quercitron Bark. In Cotton nothing worthy of remark, and the market for best was very quiet. Groceries sell more freely. The only feature to-day was an auction sale of Rio Coffee, embracing 2,200 bags, at from 9½ to 11c per lb. 60 and 90 days, and 4 mos. Provisions are dull and unsettled; a small business doing. Seeds are unchanged, and Clover is selling as wanted at $5 25a$5 37½ per bushel. Whiskey is dull at 22½a23c for bbls. and 21a21½c for drudges.

[From the New York Express.]

BOLD ROBBERY OF A JEWELRY STORE—*Arrest of the Robbers and Recovery of most of the Stolen Property.*—A day or two since, Kate Connery, a woman 29 years of age, called at the jewelry store of Marquis Jacobs, No. 82 Oliver street under pretence of wishing to get a small job done, but being unable to agree on the price she left.

Early on Tuesday evening this woman again entered the store of Mr. Jacobs, followed immediately afterwards by two men, giving their names as John Stuart and Thomas Williams. The latter, without delay, seized from under the counter a box containing eight gold watches worth $360, eleven silver watches valued at $120, gold and silver chains, breast pins, ear and finger rings, &c., &c., worth in all $600 and upwards, with which he hastily left in company with his confederates.

Mrs. Sarah Jacobs, who was alone in the store at the time, gave the alarm and followed in pursuit of the fugitives till she lost sight of them. She then returned to the store, and, receiving information shortly afterwards that the woman Connery lived at 24 Oak street, communicated the fact to Officers Templeton and Jewett, of the 4th precinct, in order that they might make an effort to arrest her and her accomplices.

The officers went to Kate's house forthwith, but not finding her in, thoroughly searched the premises. Nothing was discovered, however, and the officers wisely concluded to lie in wait till she should arrive. They accordingly took a position in a retired spot, and after remaining some two hours, they saw Kate Connery approaching through the alley-way.

The officers jumped from their hiding places, and arresting the woman, searched her on the spot. Nothing was found on her, but while the search was going on, the prisoner, who had two of the stolen silver watches concealed under her dress, dropped them on the pavement, when they were secured by the officers. While the search was going on, Stuart and Williams, her accomplices in the robbery, came in through the alley-way, and were also arrested by Officers Templeton and Jewitt.

On searching the men, the officers found in their possession six gold and eight silver watches, gold chains, breastpins, keys, rings, &c., all of which *property* was identified by Mr. Jacobs as portions of that stolen from him by the prisoners, who were also positively identified by Mr. Jacobs as the persons who entered the store and ran off with the jewelry. The accused were taken before Justice Osborn at the Tombs, and fully committed to prison for trial, in default of $1,000 bail each.

Sailing of the favorite packet ship Philadelphia, Capt. Poole, for Liverpool.—The above named vessel left Almond-street wharf at one o'clock yesterday afternoon in tow of the steam-tug America. The following items comprise her cargo: 18,377 bushels wheat in bulk, 4,850 bushels wheat in bags, 5,448 bus corn, 4,143 barrels flour, 65 hhds bark, 10 tierces and 127 bags cloverseed, and 1 barrel mdze, and 30 passengers.