

Raftsmen's Journal.



S. B. ROW, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

CLEARFIELD, PA., MARCH 26, 1856.

Memorial of the Philadelphia Convention.

FOR PRESIDENT,
MILLARD FILLMORE.
VICE PRESIDENT,
ANDREW JACKSON DONNELSON.

"FREEDOM OF SPEECH."

In an article under this caption, "our neighbor" of the *Republican* makes use of the following language:

"The great achievement of those 'primitive days' was the guarantee of 'freedom of speech' to every citizen. We would maintain that guarantee inviolate. Can our neighbor say as much? Would not he and his party deny to the naturalized citizen, and to the citizen of a certain religious belief, the right to hold office?"

—It is a singular way, of a verity, that our down-street "neighbor" has of "maintaining inviolate" the guarantee of freedom of speech, when in the very next paragraph to the one in which he asks the above questions, he would not have ministers speaking "after the impious manner of the three thousand New England clergymen in their remonstrance against the passage of the Kansas Nebraska bill!" Is that "maintaining that guarantee" inviolate? If it is, we acknowledge our inability to discern in what way.

Americanism has been so much discussed within the two last years, that it was thought no misapprehension of the principles upon which it is based, could exist. But, it seems, there still are some, who, whether willfully or not, will not say, have difficulty in arriving at a correct understanding of the same. The evil which would result from an exercise of foreign influence in our governmental affairs, attracted the attention of the statesmen of our country long ago, and induced them to utter their condemnation of it. Washington himself set the example in this respect. The evil tendencies of foreign influences caused the great apostle of modern Democracy, General Jackson, to declare that "we must become more Americanized." "Pennsylvania's favorite son," James Buchanan, was in the earlier days of his career, impressed with the same idea, and, contending, in a speech delivered at Lancaster on the 4th July, 1815, which we find in an exchange, that

"We ought to use every honest exertion to turn out of power those weak and wicked men who have abandoned the political path marked out for this country by Washington, and whose wild and visionary theories have been at length tested by experience and found wanting. Above all, we ought to drive from our shores foreign influence, and cherish exclusively American feeling. Foreign influence has been in every age the curse of Republics." Already our infant Republic has felt the withering influence. Already has she involved us in a war, which had nearly cost us our existence. Let us then learn wisdom from experience, and forever banish this fiend from our society."

There is what James Buchanan, the choice of the Democracy of this State for President, said relative to foreign influence. At the time it was spoken, it was regarded as being orthodox. Why is it not now? Why is it that at the present time, when our elections are being controlled by foreign votes, the principle is regarded as erroneous by the Democracy? Is it not for the self-evident reason, that their political success in a great measure depends upon securing the foreign vote? That is the correct solution of the problem. It was truly said that "men change, principles never!"

In the few lines quoted at the beginning of this article, the question is asked whether the American party would not "deny to the naturalized citizen, and to the citizen of a certain religious belief," which means a Roman Catholic, "the right to hold office." What "right" has any foreign Catholic to hold our offices? Where did he acquire it? And by what authority was he invested with it? Does a blind obedience to a foreign spiritual head, confer it upon him? Does his adherence to the peculiar dogmas, superstitions and prejudices of the Church of Rome, or even an abandoning of his adherence to a temporal prince of Europe or any other section of the world, bestow upon him such a "right"? Has he any right at all to hold office? Certain privileges are granted upon certain conditions; but to talk of the right of a foreigner to hold office, is an absurdity. The constitution forbids a "naturalized citizen" from holding the office of President of the United States, and, we believe, the same rule applies to the office of Vice President. Now dreadfully proscriptive the Constitution and the American party are! The Catholics, so far as their religious privileges are concerned are not persecuted in the United States, nor does the American party wish to persecute them. They have their priests and churches, and are allowed the full enjoyment of these. With their religion, no party wishes to interfere. Politically they are distrusted, and for this they have themselves to blame. Their subservience to a foreign, priesthood and foreign spiritual head, superinduced this distrust. To a free use of the ballot-box, after a compliance with the requirements of the constitution and laws, no one presumed to object; but when they were found, as a church, in obedience to the instructions of their priests, who are bound, by solemn oath, to obey the Pope of Rome, who is, and has always been opposed to liberal institutions and a free use of the Bi-

ble by the people at large, taking a united stand for one of the great political parties of this country, and thus controlling our elections, a spirit of jealousy was engendered that can never be subdued. It is in their character as a politico-ecclesiastical body that they are opposed. Had they contented themselves with the privileges extended to other citizens, and employed no suspicious and insidious means for gaining an ascendancy, they would have met no opposition from any party.

Thus it will be seen, that it is not the religion of Catholics that Americans contend against. They war with Rome; for, as a contemporary remarks: "Rome is the enemy of America, and America is the enemy of Rome." We war against the imposition by Rome of a Priesthood upon us, alien to civil Laws, our Customs, our Schools, and ever seeking indirectly or directly, the subversion of them all. We war against a hierarchy, Roman-made, that robs its own people of their own property, to concentrate it all (in church form) upon itself, utterly selfish in Church. We war against a hierarchy that rushes into our elections, and turns huge masses of votes in solid bodies into our American ballot-boxes to create American demagogues to obey its will. Rome has been, and is attempting, through her powerful hierarchy, to rule the civil power of the United States. For this purpose she exports here and imposes upon us, the Irish hierarchy, as the most subservient tool of its power. For this purpose, this Irish Roman hierarchy turn all the Irish Catholic masses one way, into one ballot, the better thus to overawe and to control American demagogues and politicians. For this purpose, we have "Church Property Bills" to concentrate on the one man power of Rome, the now immense Roman Catholic estates of this country. For this purpose our School System has been attacked, and a portion of our School money demanded from us at the ballot-box and in the State Legislatures. It is upon such Roman Catholicism that Americans war.

—To us it seems strange that the Democratic presses, which so much "honor the minister of the gospel" for manfully expressing his sentiments, should direct their denunciations against Protestant clergymen for so doing, but never say a word when a Roman Catholic bishop or priest does the same thing! Who ever heard of a Democratic newspaper say aught against a Catholic church dignitary for expressing his opinions, either in the pulpit, or thro' the medium of the press, on matters pertaining to the political condition of our country? It would almost seem as if they were the special guardians of the "mother church." If they are, we congratulate them upon the happy circumstance. For our part, however, we do not envy them their occupation, but shall consider it our duty, so long as the head of that church endeavors to exert an influence in the affairs of our government, to hold it up in its true colors, by exposing its insidious policy and anti-republican tendencies, which, if carried into effect, would prove subversive of our institutions and destructive to our liberties.

THE "ALGERINE LAW."—We are indebted to the attentive and energetic Senator from this district, Henry Southey, Esq., for a copy of the Bill repealing the supplement to the act of May 8, 1812, known here as the "Algerine Law," which he read in place on the 13th inst. In order that Mr. Southey may be enabled to work effectively in this matter, petitions asking for the passage of the repealing act should be immediately forwarded, well signed, from the various townships of this county which are most directly interested in it. The repeal of the supplement is of high importance to the lumbermen of the Susquehanna, and it is to be hoped that they will make the necessary exertions to secure it. A little activity is all that is required. Petitions have already been forwarded from our borough, and other steps have also been taken here.—But Clearfield borough can't do all—the rest of the county must lend their assistance.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ELECTION.—The result of the recent election in New Hampshire shows that the Pierce Democracy have been sadly routed. The opposition have carried both branches of the Legislature. No choice for Governor having been made by the people, that duty devolves upon the Legislature, and as the anti-administration party has a decided majority, their candidate will be elected. This is a serious loss to the Pierce party, which made every exertion to carry the State, knowing that if they lost New Hampshire their case was desperate. Several prominent speakers were sent there, and money was used in liberal profusion, to secure a victory. But it was all useless—they are signally defeated.

The Trenton State Gazette publishes an appeal signed by all the members of the New Jersey Legislature opposed to the present National Administration, calling upon all the voters of the State of similar inclination to assemble in their respective wards and townships and elect delegates to a State Convention to be held in Trenton on Wednesday, the 4th of June, whereat a candidate shall be nominated for the office of Governor, to be supported at the ensuing election.

SENATORS FROM KANSAS.—The St. Louis Democrat has a letter from Topeka, dated the 8th inst., stating that the Free State Legislature of Kansas has in joint convention elected Hon. A. H. Reeder and Hon. James H. Lane United States Senators. Mr. Reeder was elected on the first, and Mr. Lane on the second ballot. Each received 28 votes out of 56 members present.

THE FRUIT CROP OF NEW JERSEY.—The Newark Daily Advertiser states that the prospects, in New Jersey, of a large yield of fruit, were never better than at the present time. The buds are generally uninjured, and the lingering cold weather will prevent them swelling until the season is too far advanced to have them suffer from high winds or frosts.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM REV. J. CHAMBERS.

PHILADELPHIA, March 15th, 1856.

Richardson L. Wright, Esq., Speaker of the House of Representatives—My Dear Sir: Your letter addressed to me through the columns of the *Pennsylvanian* of to-day, received my respectful consideration, as I trust this will secure yours. First, as to the caustic biting part of it. "Time serving politician"—"billingsgate notoriety"—"moral desperado"—"unchristianable ravings"—statements which have no foundation in truth," &c. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you can afford to employ such epithets, I can afford to have them heaped upon me. I do not disturb my equanimity or ruffle my temper in the slightest degree. It is always unfortunate for a man to fly into a passion, but it is peculiarly so when he is writing for the eye of the public and the scrutiny of intelligent men. Any body can call hard names. Our women in the fish market can beat you all hollow in multiplying opprobrious epithets, so that no honor or capital can be gained on that score. You will Mr. Speaker, please bear this in mind when you write your next letter for the public papers. Keep your temper at any cost. Don't be so anxious to call hard names that you lose your self-control. Secondly, let us look at one or two more important matters. You say, "I was constrained by a sense of duty, as a consistent friend of Temperance, to advocate such measures as I thought best calculated to remedy existing evils," &c. "Consistent friends of Temperance!" Let us see. You and your Democratic colleagues, pending the election last October, proclaimed yourselves the "consistent friends of Temperance." If the dear people would only elect you, you would give them a better law than the act to "restrain the sale of intoxicating liquors." And what did you do? A bill was introduced to repeal, unconditionally, the act of last year. Messrs. Morris and Dock objected to that, and insisted that a bill should be introduced to take the place of that act before it was repealed." And what did you and your Democratic colleagues do? Voted for the unconditional repeal of the act of last year, opening the flood-gates of intemperance and ruin upon the community. Your names stand upon the record, and you cannot gainsay it. Every one of you deserved, at the time, the indignant rebuke of an injured and insulted constituency.

But thanks to N. B. Browne and a majority of the Senate, the flagrant wrongs of the House were checked. A stringent license bill was introduced and passed that body. When it was sent to the House for concurrence, what did you then do? You advocated those amendments which would have destroyed the vitality and the beneficial effects of Mr. Browne's bill, and would have made it a weak, inefficient, wishy washy thing, almost worthless as to all practical purposes. This you did as a "consistent friend of Temperance!" Do you not think the Liquor League would give a heap of money to have just such "friends of Temperance" sent every year to the Legislature?

It will not do, Mr. Speaker, to throw dust and try to hoodwink the people in this way. I say it openly and publicly, that you and your Democratic brethren from Philadelphia have misrepresented the people, and abused the confidence reposed in you. You are good representatives of the Liquor League, and I commend you all to their special regard. They ought to take good care of you for you have been faithful to their interests. Do you say this is a hard allegation? Look at your recorded votes, and judge. It is no use to be sneeringly about this matter. It is true, and every body knows it, that every Democratic member from this city in the House and the Senate, (excepting N. B. Browne, Esq., noble specimen of humanity,) have bowed down and worshipped at the shrine of the Liquor League.

I want the people distinctly to understand that you left the Speaker's chair and earnestly advocated the granting of licenses to our restaurants and eating houses, to sell ardent spirits. You and your Democratic colleagues from this city voted for this measure, while you and they know full well that in these places, in consequence of the maddening effects of rum, a vast amount of disorder, wrangling, riot and fighting, is constantly occurring. You and they know equally well, that a vast majority of the people of Philadelphia are most decidedly opposed to granting licenses to these places to sell alcoholic drinks. Why did you do it? To gratify the Liquor League and the rummies? That was the reason, and you cannot deny it. Let the Liquor League take care of you and your Democratic brethren, for it is quite certain you have forfeited the respect and confidence of sober, virtuous, intelligent, temperate citizens. After all this you speak of yourself in your letter as a "consistent friend of Temperance!" Fudge, Mr. Speaker, all fudge. We are not to be fooled in this way.

JOHN CHAMBERS.

DEATH OF DR. BOND.—The venerable and talented Dr. T. E. Bond, editor in chief of the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, the leading paper of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and a local preacher of that denomination, died at his residence in New York city, on Saturday last. Dr. Bond was a native of Hartford county, Maryland; he was a successful practitioner of medicine in Baltimore city for many years, and as a clergyman, was eminent for his piety, self-sacrificing devotion and learning. Beloved and lamented by all who knew him, personally and by report, he has passed to his final account at the advanced age of 76 years.

CAVING IN.—The Pittsburgh Union learns by passengers that on Thursday night last a portion of the earth, in that part of the big tunnel which yet remains unfinished, fell in, and for a couple of hours obstructed the passage of the train. The rubbish was removed as speedily as a large force of hands, who were promptly set to work, could do it.

On Monday, Flour was selling in Philadelphia at from \$7 to \$8.50; wheat \$1.65a\$1.75; rye is dull at \$1; corn 58a59c; cloverseed \$8.87a\$9.50; timothy \$9.50; flax \$1.90a\$2.

THE KANSAS QUESTION.

In Senate, March 12, Mr. COLLAMER, from the Minority of the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the President's Message on Affairs in Kansas, made a report, from which we extract the following paragraphs:

"A succinct statement of the course and progress of the material events in Kansas is this: After the passage of this law, establishing the Territory of Kansas, a large body of settlers rapidly entered into said Territory with the view of permanent habitation therein. Most of these were from the Free States of the West and North, who probably intended by their votes and influence to establish there a Free State, agreeably to the law which invited them. Some part of these, from the Missouri Emigrant Aid Society, formed in Massachusetts, which put forth some exertion in this laudable object by open and public measures, in providing facilities for transportation to all peaceable citizens who desired to become permanent settlers in said Territory, and providing there-in hotels, mills, and so forth for the public accommodation of the new comers."

The Governor of Kansas, having, in pursuance of law, divided the Territory into districts and procured a census thereof, issued his proclamation for the election of a Legislative Assembly there, to take place on the 30th day of March, 1855, and directed how the same should be conducted and the returns made to him, agreeably to the law establishing said Territory. On the day of election, large bodies of armed men from the State of Missouri appeared at the polls in most of the districts and by most violent and tumultuous carriage and demeanor, overawed the defenseless inhabitants, and by their own votes, elected a large majority of the members of both Houses of said Assembly. On the returns of said election, being made to the Governor, protests and objections being made to him in relation to a part of said districts, and, as to them, he set aside such, and such only, as, by the returns, appeared to be bad. In relation to others, covering a majority of the two Houses, equally violent in fact, but apparently good by formal returns, the inhabitants thereof, borne down by said violence, and intimidated, scattered and discouraged, and laboring under apprehensions of personal violence, refrained and desisted from presenting any protest to the Governor in relation thereto, and he, then, uninformed in relation thereto, issued certificates to the members who appeared by said formal returns to be elected."

In relation to those districts which the Governor set aside, orders were by him issued for new elections. In one of these districts the same proceedings were repeated by men from Missouri, and in others not, and certificates were issued to the persons elected."

This Legislative Assembly so elected assembled at Pawnee on the 24th day of July, 1855, and, changing the place for holding said meetings, as fixed by the Governor by authority of law. On assembling, the said houses proceeded to set aside and reject those members so elected on said second election, except in the districts where the men from Missouri had, at said election, chosen the same persons they had elected at the said first election, and admitted all of the first-elected members."

A Legislative Assembly, so created by military force, by a foreign invasion, in violation of the organic law, was but a usurpation. No act of its own—no act or neglect of the Governor, could legalize or sanctify it. Its own decisions as to its own legality are, like its laws, but the fruits of its own usurpation, which no Governor could legitimize. The Governor, by assenting to the place of the temporary seat of Government to the Shawnee Mission on the border, and in near proximity to Missouri. This Act the Government regarded as a violation of the organic law establishing the Territory, which fixed the temporary seat of Government and prohibited the Legislative Assembly from doing anything inconsistent with said Act. He therefore, and for that cause, vetoed said bill, but said Assembly re-passed the same by two-third majority, notwithstanding said veto, and removed to said Shawnee Mission. They then proceeded to pass laws, and the Governor in writing, declined further to recognize them as a legitimate Assembly sitting at that place. The continued passing laws there from the 16th day of July to the 31st day of August, 1855.

On the 15th day of August last the Governor of said Territory was dismissed from office, and the duties devolved upon the Secretary of the Territory; and how many of the laws passed with his official approbation does not appear—the laws, as now presented, being without date or authentication."

As by the law of Congress organizing said Territory it was expressly provided that the people of the Territory were to be "left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," and among these institutions Slavery is included, it was of course implied that that subject was to be open and free to public and private discussion in all its bearings, rights and relationships. Among these must, of course, be the questions of what was the state of the existing laws, and the modifications that might be required on that subject. The law had declared that its "true intent and meaning was not to legislate Slavery into the Territory or exclude it therefrom." This would, of course, leave to that people the inquiry, What then are the existing rights under the Constitution? Can slaves be held in the absence of any law on the subject? This question, about which so much difference of opinion exists, and which Congress and the Courts have never settled, was thus thrown over to the people there to discuss and settle for themselves."

This Territorial Legislature, so created, by force from Missouri, utterly refused to permit discussion on the subject, but assuming that Slavery already existed there, and that neither Congress nor the people in the Territory under the authority of Congress, had or could prohibit it, they passed a law, which, if enforced, utterly prohibits all discussion of the question. The 11th and 12th sections of that act are as follows:

Sec. 11. If any person print, write, introduce into, publish or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing or circulating into this Territory, any book, magazine, handbill or circular, containing any statements, arguments, opinions, sentiments, doctrine, advice or innuendo, calculated to promote a disorderly, dangerous or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in this Territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority, he shall be guilty of a felony, and be punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than five years.

Sec. 12. If any free person, by speaking or by writing, assert or maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory, or shall introduce into this Territory, print, publish, write, circulate, or cause to be introduced into this Territory, written, printed, published or circulated, any book, magazine, any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet or circular containing any denial of the right of persons to hold slaves in this Territory, such person shall be deemed guilty of felony, and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term not less than two years.

This act further provides that no person "consentingly appearing to hold slaves" shall sit as a juror in the trial of any case founded on a breach of the foregoing law. The

act further provided "that all officers and attorneys shall be sworn not only to support the Constitution of the United States, but also to support and sustain the organic law of the Territory and the Fugitive Slave law; and that any person offering to vote shall be presumed to be entitled to vote until the contrary is shown; and if any one, when required shall refuse to take the oath to sustain the Fugitive Slave law, he shall not be permitted to vote."

Although they passed a law that "none but an inhabitant, who had paid a tax, should vote," yet they required no time of residence necessary, and provided for the "immediate" payment of a poll-tax, so providing in effect, that on the election should be held in October, 1855, and the State could come in in unlimited numbers, and by taking up a residence of a day or an hour, pay a poll-tax, and thus become legal voters, and then, after voting, return to their own State. They thus, in practical effect, provided for the people of Missouri to control elections at their pleasure, and permitted such only of the real inhabitants of the Territory to vote as are friendly to the holding of slaves.

They permitted no election of any of the officers in the Territory to be made by the people thereof, but created the offices and filled them, or appointed officers to fill them for long periods, and provided that the next territorial election should be held in October, 1856, and the Assembly to meet in January, 1857, so that none of these laws could be changed until the lower House might be changed in 1856; but the Council, which is elected for 2 years, could not be changed, so as to allow a change of the laws or officers until the session of 1858, however much the inhabitants of the Territory might desire it.

These laws, made by an Assembly created by a foreign force, are but a manifestation of the spirit of oppression which was the parent of the whole transaction. No excuse can be found for it in the pretense that the inhabitants had carried with them into said Territory a quantity of Sharp's rifles. First, because that, if true, formed no excuse. Secondly, it is untrue, as their Sharp's rifles were only obtained afterward and entirely for the purpose of self-defense, the necessity for which this invasion and other acts of violence and threats clearly demonstrated.

These laws were obviously made to oppress and drive out all who were inclined to the exclusion of Slavery, and, if they remained, to silence them on this subject, and subject them to the will and control of the people of Missouri. These are the laws which the President says must be enforced by the laws and whole power of this nation.

The people of Kansas thus invaded, subdued, oppressed and insulted, seeing their Territorial Government (such only in form) perverted into an engine to crush them in the dust, and to defeat and destroy the professed object of their organic law by depriving them of the "perfect freedom" therein provided, and finding no ground to hope for rights in that organization, they proceeded, under the guarantee of the United States Constitution, "openly to assemble to petition the Government for the redress of [their] grievances." They saw no earthly source of relief but in the formation of a State Government by the people, and the acceptance and ratification thereof by Congress.

In this view of the subject, in the first part of August, 1855, a call was published, "on the public papers for a meeting of the citizens of Kansas, irrespective of party, to meet at Lawrence, in said Territory, on the 15th of said August, to take into consideration the propriety of calling a Convention of the people of the whole Territory to consider the subject." That meeting was held on the 15th day of August last, and proceeded to call a Convention of the people of the Territory, to be held at Topeka, on the 19th day of September, 1855, not to form a Constitution, but to consider the propriety of calling formally a Convention for that purpose. The proceedings of this meeting of the 15th of August were as follows: [Here is inserted the official report of proceedings as published at the time.]

Agreeably to these proceedings, the people of the different districts did, as therein recommended, proceed to appoint Delegates to this meeting at Topeka, to be held on the said 19th day of September, 1855. The Delegates so appointed did assemble at Topeka, on said day, and proceeded to consider the subject, and they took the following proceedings: [The official report of proceedings at the Convention is here set forth.]

Delegates were elected agreeably to the proclamation so issued, and they met at Topeka on the fourth Tuesday in October, 1855, and formed a Constitution, which was submitted to the people, and was ratified by them by vote in the districts. An election of State officers and members of the State Legislature had been held, and a Representative to Congress elected, and it is intended to proceed to the election of Senators, with the view to present the same, with the Constitution, to Congress, for admission into the Union.

Whatever view individuals may at times, or times, have expressed, and whatever public determination may have been entertained, in the result of being spurned by Congress and refused redress, is now entirely immaterial. That cannot condemn or give character to the proceedings thus far pursued.

Many may have honestly believed that usurpation could make no law, and that if Congress made no further provisions, they were well justified in forming a law for themselves; but it is not now necessary to consider that matter, as it is to be hoped that Congress will not leave them to such a necessity.

Thus far, this effort of the people for redress is peaceful, constitutional and right. Whether it will succeed, rests with Congress to determine; but clear it is, that it should not be met and denounced as revolutionary, rebellious, insurrectionary, or unlawful—nor does it call for or justify the exercise of any force, by any department of this Government, to check or control it.

It now became proper to inquire what should be done by Congress. For it is asserted by the President, in substance that he has the power to correct usurpations, and that the laws even though made by usurped authority, must be by him, enforced and executed, even with military force. The measures of redress should be applied to the true cause of the difficulty. This obviously lies in the repeal of the clause for Freedom in the act of 1820, and therefore the true remedy lies in the entire repeal of the act of 1854, which effected it. Let this be done with frankness and magnanimity, and Kansas be organized anew as a Free Territory, and all will be put right. But if Congress insists on proceeding with the experiment, then declare all the actions by this spurious foreign legislative assembly utterly inoperative and void, and direct a re-organization providing safeguards for legal voting and against foreign interference. There is another way, however, to put away all this trouble there and in the nation, without retracing steps or committing violence, or by force compelling obedience to tyrannical laws, made by foreign force, and that is, by admitting that Territory as a State with her Free Constitution. Then, indeed, her numbers are not such as gives her a right to demand admission, being, as the President informs us, probably only about twenty-five thousand. The Constitution fixes no number as necessary, and the importance of never shifting this question will justify Congress in admitting this as a State at this time, especially, as we have a great reason to believe, if admitted

as a State, and controversy ended, it will immediately fill up with a numerous and successful population. At any rate, it seems impossible to believe that Congress is to leave that people without redress, to have enforced upon them, by the Army of the nation, those measures and laws of violence and oppression.—Are they to be disgraced into submission? Is that a pleasant experiment to execute on our own free people? The true character of this transaction is matter of extensive notoriety. Its essential features are too obvious to allow of any successful disguise or palliation, however complicated or ingenious may be the statement, or however special the pleadings for that purpose. The case requires some quieting, kind and prudent treatment by the hands of Congress to do justice and satisfy the nation.

The people of this country are peacefully relying on Congress to provide for competent measures of redress which they have the undoubted power to administer. The Attorney-General, in the case of *Arkansas*, says: "Congress may, at pleasure, repeal or modify the laws passed by the Territorial Legislature, and may at any time abrogate and re-model the Legislature itself, and all the other departments of the Territorial Government."

Trusting this grievance in Kansas with ingenious excuses, with neglect or contempt, or riding over the oppressed with an army and dragging them into submission, will make no satisfactory termination.

Party success may at times be outwardly secured, by adroit devices, plausible pretenses, and partisan address; but the permanent preservation of this Union can be maintained only by frankness and integrity.

Justice may be denied where it ought to be granted; power may perpetrate that vassalage which violence and usurpation have produced; the subjugation of white Freemen may be necessary, that African Slavery may succeed; but such a course must not be expected to produce peace and satisfaction in our country, so long as the people retain any proper sentiment of Justice, Liberty, and Law."

REPUBLICAN LANDMARKS; or the Views and Opinions of American Statesmen on Foreign Immigration. By JOHN P. SANDERSON, PHILADELPHIA: J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., No. 20, N. Fourth St. Price \$1.50.

The above work is largely commended by the leading Journals of the country, and should be found in the hands of every man. It is a review of the views and opinions of American Statesmen on Foreign Immigration, the Naturalization of Aliens, their tendencies and influences, and the legislative action thereon, with a critical examination into the character of the United States Government, and its policy on these subjects. It contains forty-one chapters, embracing one on the White and Free Colored Population of the country—two on Foreign Immigration and its advantages—two on Pauperism—Crime—Intemperance—Juvenile Vagrancy—Education—two on Pauper and Convict Immigration—Internal Police Power of Congress—Colonial Naturalization Laws—six on the United States Naturalization Laws, and the efforts to amend them—one on Naturalization Frauds in the Cities—Qualifications of Electors in Territories—Premigration Rights to Public Lands—Homestead Bill—Causes of Opposition to Foreigners—Mistaken Views of the United States Government—three on the Executive and Legislative branches of Government—one on the conditions of Eligibility to Office—Term and Tenure of Office Qualifications of Electors—Basis of Representation—Negative Power of the Executive—Mode of Amending Constitutions—Other Safe guards—Nonintervention—America for American Nationality—Cultivation of American Feelings and Sentiment. The scope of the work is very comprehensive, and it embodies a vast mass of practical discussion on all the subjects which are discussed. It will prove an invaluable text book which will become a necessity to every public man, and which, we predict, will have a wide-spread circulation. A work like this has long been needed.

The well-informed correspondent of the *Philadelphia North American*, writes from Washington as follows:—"The result of the election in New Hampshire is by no means acceptable in the Court circles. This inauspicious beginning damages prospects which were cheered by a different anticipation. There is now practically demonstrated, what was somewhat doubtful before, that the presence and exhortations of Mr. Orr and M. Cobb, did not materially help to enlighten Northern opinion, or to recall the errant Democracy, who, in the former contest, deserted their old quarters. Such an indication from that quarter is ominous, and gives some sanction to the singular belief, so often verified, that the political complexion of the Speakership preceding a Presidential election, was but the certain precursor of an equally certain result. This is a saw of the Washington southsayers, who, surpassing the Roman divines, draw their auguries without the flight of birds."

THE WORLD SURROUNDED BY THE STARS AND STRIPES.—The American tonnage of this country now figures up 5,400,000 tons, and will make up the very respectable fleet of 5,400 ships of 1,000 tons each. And if the tonnage of the fleet be figured out in Yankee clippers of 200 tons each, and placed on the equatorial line around this globe, each skipper may speak the next in line, by raising his voice a little above the ordinary pitch on ship board, round the whole circumference of the globe. War would be a terrible calamity to this immense fleet, and England would not fare better with her commercial marine of 5,200,000 tons; but little less than our own.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—There are in the English language 20,500 nouns, 40 pronouns, 9,200 adjectives, 8,000 verbs, 2,600 adverbs, 39 prepositions, 19 conjunctions, 63 interjections, and 2 articles—in all above 40,000 words. According to Webster's Dictionary there are 100,000 words.

THROTTLED.—Although the Democracy of the lower House of our State Legislature did so far yield to the demands of the Jesuits as to pass the bill for the incorporation of the "Franciscan Brothers" in Cambria county, the project is likely to be defeated in the Senate, the committee to which it was referred having reported it with a negative recommendation.