

Rafferty's Weekly

BY S. B. ROW.

CLEARFIELD, PA., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1856.

VOL. 3.—NO. 17.

KINDRED SOULS.

Why may not the spirit hold communion
With kindred spirits here below—
Souls bound by no earthly bonds of union,
Nor ever hope such bonds to know?
Why must we quench this higher nature,
The souls' divinest, noblest feature,
The loftiest gift of our Creator—
Ah! why must this be so?
Oh, how a glance of recognition
From earnest eyes, when souls have met,
Fills all our life with joys Elysian,
And joy we never can forget!
Yet we must check the fountain's gushing,
Which oft from soul to soul is rushing,
While its rich waters ought be flushing
O'er a heart alone as yet.
Ah! why this ever restless longing
To meet a soul whose every tone,
The hopes and fears around it thronging,
Are but a reflex of your own?
Oh, is it wrong—this ceaseless yearning,
The hidden soul's volcanic burning?
May not that soul, in all its turning,
Be to another known?
Oh, God! why deep within thy spirit,
This subtle essence hast thou placed,
If none its fullness may inherit—
If we must wander through life's waste,
With none to know the fount of feeling
Which seeks for eye its own revealing,
And longs from echoes backward stealing,
One little draught to taste?
It is not life—this constant aching,
The soul unnumbered and unknown,
Oh, Father! when the heart is breaking,
Which feels of earth alone—alone—
Where can it flee but up to Heaven,
Hoping, its latest earth-troth given,
To dwell whose nevermore are given,
Spirits of kindred tone!

DR. FRANKLIN'S ONLY SON.

While the name of Dr. Franklin has been so prominently before the public late, in connection with the celebration at Boston, it may not be uninteresting to give some account of his only son, William, about whom we think little is known by the community at large. Unlike his father, whose chief claim to veneration is for the invaluable services he rendered his country in her greatest need, the son was, from first to last, a devoted loyalist. Before the Revolutionary war he held several civil and military offices of importance. At the commencement of the war he held the office of Governor of New Jersey, which appointment he received in 1763. When the difficulties between the mother country and the colonists were coming to a crisis, he threw his whole influence in favor of loyalty, and endeavored to prevent the Legislative Assembly from sanctioning the proceedings of the General Congress at Philadelphia. These efforts, however, did little to stay the tide of popular sentiment in favor of resistance to tyranny, and soon involved him in difficulty. He was deposed by the Whigs to give place to William Livingston, and sent a prisoner to Connecticut, where he remained for two years in East Windsor, in the house of Capt. Ebenezer Grant, near where the Theological Seminary now stands. In 1778 he was exchanged, and soon after went to England. There he spent the remainder of his life, receiving a pension from the British Government for the losses he had sustained by his fidelity. He died in 1818, at the age of eighty-two. As might be expected, his opposition to the cause of liberty, so dear to the heart of his father, produced an estrangement between them. For years they had no intercourse. When, in 1784, the son wrote to his father, in his reply Dr. Franklin says: "Nothing has ever hurt me so much, and affected me with such keen sensations, as to find myself deserted in my old age by my only son; and not only deserted, but to find him taking up arms against me in a cause wherein my good fame, fortune, and life, were all at stake." In his will also he alludes to the part his son had acted. After making him some bequests, he adds: "The part he acted against me in the late war, which is of public notoriety, will account for my leaving him no more of an estate which he endeavored to deprive me of." The patriotism of the father stands forth all the brighter when contrasted with the desertion of the son.—*Newburyport Herald.*

HOW TO GET RID OF BATS

There is a public house on the St. John, called Rat Tavern. The name originated thus: An American was travelling up the river during a thaw in winter, when snow and water were nearly knee deep. Late in the afternoon he came to this tavern, cold, wet and hungry, and called for dinner. He was told rather roughly by the landlord that the dinner hour had passed, and he must wait till tea. He then asked for a cold lunch, as he was faint and hungry. After some grumbling this was brought on. The stranger ate and asked for his bill. "Fifty cents," was the reply, in a growling tone—"Dinner is a quarter, but a lunch is out of season, and you must pay fifty cents." The traveller paid the bill, and sat down to dry himself. Soon a cheese was brought in by the maid very much mutilated by the rats. The whole race of rats received a volley of abuse from the enraged landlord. "And why do you keep rats?" said the Yankee; "I can give you a recipe that I can warrant you will keep every rat away." "Ah! and how much will you charge?" "Oh, about fifty cents." The landlord, somewhat complacent, returned the half dollar, and "now," said he, "for the recipe." "Well, sir," said the Yankee, "whenever a rat comes to your house, cold, wet and hungry, give him a cold lunch and charge him half a dollar, and I'll be bound he'll never come again."

SINGULAR AND MELANCHOLY CASE.

MAID, WIFE AND WIDOW IN 20 MINUTES.—Dr. James H. Bogardus, of Kingston, Ulster county, New York, died at the Girard House, in New York City, on Sunday, after a very short illness, under singular circumstances.—The Herald says: The deceased was 43 years old, of the highest respectability, and ranked the first in his profession in the country in which he resided. For about two years he had been engaged to Miss Isabella Hamilton, a young lady, also a resident of Kingston, and on two occasions, days were fixed for their nuptials, on each of which death presented a barrier to the consummation of their wishes. On the former instance, the death of his brother's child rendered a postponement of the day of their contemplated marriage necessary, and both the doctor and his affianced bride attended the funeral. On the second occasion fixed for their union, Miss Hamilton's sister lost a child, and again they attended a funeral service instead of their own marriage-ceremony.

On Monday of last week, Dr. Bogardus came to the city and put up at the Girard House, in Chambers street, and on retiring complained to Mr. Davis, with whom he was well acquainted, that he was quite unwell. The following day, not feeling able to leave his bed, Doctor Sayer and other eminent physicians were called in and consulted. After several days' attendance, they came to the conclusion that there was something more than disease of the body in the case of their patient, and they intimated to him the fact, whereupon Dr. Bogardus frankly informed his medical advisers that he was deeply attached to a young lady, whom he was to be married on Tuesday, (yesterday) that their marriage had been twice frustrated by death, and that he now feared that his own illness would prove a third interposition to his happiness.

Dr. Sayer, perceiving the sad effect which the fear of another disappointment had upon his mind, suggested the propriety of sending a telegraphic despatch to Miss Hamilton to come to New York without delay, for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of Dr. Bogardus. The despatch was accordingly sent, and Miss Hamilton arrived about four o'clock on Sunday morning, and, as early as possible, some of their friends residing in Newark were sent for to attend the marriage ceremony. At one o'clock the same day, Dr. Sayer, visited his patient, and found him so much better that he considered that it would be unnecessary for him to attend again. At half-past 2 o'clock, the parties were united, and Dr. Bogardus expressed his thankfulness at being enabled to carry out his intentions of marriage to the lady in question.—Their friends then retired for a few moments, for the purpose of partaking of some refreshments. He then remarked that he felt so much better that he would get up, and at once proceeded to raise himself in bed. His bride, perceiving his efforts to rise, went to assist him, only to discover that he was expiring in her arms. She instantly sprang to the bell and rang for assistance, but before their friends could reach the room he was a corpse, and yesterday afternoon his remains were taken to Kingston, on board the steamer North America, for interment.

THE FULL TICKET.—While waiting for a car recently, we overheard the following dialogue: A half-dozen native Greeks were discussing the chances of the election, when a seventh, fresh from the polls joined them. "Ah! here comes Mike," cried one, "Mike have you voted?" "Is it voting you mean, an' I after voting the full ticket?" replied Mike, showing his teeth in an elongated smile, full of fun and self-approbation. "Well, Mike, an' who were you after voting for?" "The full ticket, didn't I tell you?" "The full ticket? But what full ticket? Did you vote for Fillmore, Buchanan, or Fremont?" "Yes, shure, an' I suppose I did. It was the full ticket, I tell you; shure an' it must've been for them all.—*N. Y. Dispatch.*

A good anecdote is told of a Methodist preacher, who rode a circuit a few days ago. While going to one of his appointments he met an old acquaintance, who was one of the magistrates of the county. He asked the minister why he did not do as the Savior did—ride an ass. "Because," said the divine, "the people have taken them all to make magistrates of."

"How do you get along with your arithmetic?" asked a father of his little boy. "I've cyphered through addition, partition, subtraction, division, abomination, justification, hallucination, derivation, amputation, creation, and adoption." He'd do for an engineer on a short line railroad.

Here is the last "good thing" about the hoops: Little Boy.—"Ma, what is 'shush'?" Mother.—"Why, my dear? why do you ask?" Little Boy.—"Because I asked sister Jane yesterday, what made her new dress stick out so, and she said 'shush.'"

—PASS HIM ROUND.—A disappointed old bachelor, out West, says—"It makes little difference whether a man commits suicide or matrimony! What an ugly daguerreotype the fellow must have."

LAST ANNUAL MESSAGE OF

FRANKLIN PIERCE,
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Read in Congress, Tuesday Dec. 2, 1856.
Fellow Citizens of the Senate and
of the House of Representatives:

The Constitution requires that the President shall, from time to time not only recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he may deem necessary and expedient, but also that he shall give information to them of the state of the Union. To do this fully involves exposition of all matters in the actual condition of the country, domestic or foreign, which essentially concern the general welfare. While performing his constitutional duty in this respect, the President does not speak merely to express personal convictions, but as the executive minister of the government, enabled by his position, and called upon by his official obligations, to scan with an impartial eye, the interests of the whole, and of every part of the United States.

Of the condition of the domestic interests of the Union, its agriculture, mines, manufactures, navigation and commerce, it is necessary to say, that the internal prosperity of the country, its continuous and steady advancement in wealth and population, and its private as well as public well-being, attest the wisdom of our institutions, and the predominant spirit of intelligence and patriotism, which, notwithstanding occasional irregularities of opinion or action resulting from popular freedom, has distinguished and characterized the people of America.

In the brief interval between the termination of the last and the commencement of the present session of Congress, the public mind has been occupied with the care of selecting, for another constitutional term, the President and Vice President of the United States. The determination of the persons who are of right, or contingently, to preside over the administration of a nation, is, under our system, committed to the States and the people. We appeal to them, by their voice pronounced in the forms of law, to call whomsoever they will to the high post of Chief Magistrate. And thus it is that as the Senators represent the respective States of the Union, and the members of the House of Representatives the several constituencies of each State, so the President represents the aggregate population of the United States. Their election of him is the explicit and solemn act of the sole sovereign authority of the Union.

It is impossible to misapprehend the great principles, which, by their recent political action, the people of the United States have sanctioned and announced. They have asserted the constitutional equality of each and all the States of the Union as States; they have affirmed the constitutional equality of each and all of the citizens of the United States as citizens, whatever their religion, wherever their birth, or their residence; they have maintained the inviolability of the constitutional rights of the different sections of the Union; and they have proclaimed their devoted and unalterable attachment to the Union and to the constitution, as objects of interest superior to all subjects of local or sectional controversy, as the safeguard of the rights of all, as the spirit and the essence of the liberty, peace and greatness of the Republic.

In doing this, they have, at the same time, emphatically condemned the idea of organizing in these United States mere geographical parties; of marshalling in hostile array toward each other the different parts of the country, North or South, East or West. Schemes of this nature, fraught with incalculable mischief, and which the considerate sense of the people has rejected, could have had countenance in no part of the country, had they not been disguised by suggestions plausible in appearance, acting upon an excited state of the public mind, induced by causes temporary in their character, and it is to be hoped, transient in their influence.

Perfect liberty of association for political objects, and the widest scope of discussion, are the received and ordinary conditions of government in our country. Our institutions, framed in the spirit of confidence in the intelligence and integrity of the people, do not forbid citizens either individually or associated together, to attack by writing, speech or by any other methods short of physical force, the Constitution and the very existence of the Union. Under the great shelter of this great liberty, and protected by the laws and usages of the government they assail, associations have been formed, in some of the States, of individuals, who, pretending to seek only to prevent the spread of the institution of slavery into the present or future incalculable States of the Union, are really instigators of existing States. To accomplish their objects, they dedicate themselves to the odious task of deprecating the government organization which stands in their way, and of calumniating, with indiscriminate invective, not only the citizens of particular States, with whose laws they find fault, but all others of their fellow-citizens with them in their assaults upon the Constitution, framed and adopted by our fathers, and claiming for the privileges it has secured, and the blessings it has conferred, the steady support and grateful reverence of their children. They seek an object which they well know to be a revolutionary one.

They are perfectly aware that the change in the relative condition of the white and black races in the slaveholding States, which they would promote, is beyond their lawful authority; that to them it is a foreign object; that it cannot be effected by any peaceful instrumentality of theirs; that for them, and the States of which they are citizens, the only path to its accomplishment is through burning cities, and ravaged fields, and slaughtered populations, and all there in the terrible, foreign, contemplated with civil and servile war; and that the first step in the attempt is the forcible disruption of a country embracing in its broad bosom a degree of liberty, and an amount of individual and public prosperity, to which there is no parallel in history, and substituting in its place hostile governments, driven at once and inevitably into mutual devastation and fratricidal carnage, transforming the now peaceful and felicitous brotherhood into a vast permanent camp of armed men like the rival monarchies of Europe and Asia.—Well knowing that such, and such only, are the means and the consequences of their plans and purposes, they endeavor to prepare the

people of the United States for civil war by doing everything in their power to deprive the Constitution and the laws of moral authority, and to undermine the fabric of the Union by appeals to passion and sectional prejudice, by indoctrinating its people with reciprocal hatred, and educating them to stand face to face as enemies, rather than shoulder to shoulder as friends.

It is by the agency of such unwarrantable interference, foreign and domestic, that the minds of many, otherwise good citizens, have been so infatuated into the passionate condemnation of the domestic institutions of the southern States, as at length to pass insensibly to almost equally passionate hostility towards their fellow-citizens of those States, and thus finally to fall into temporary fellowship with the avowed and active enemies of the Constitution. Ardently attached to liberty in the abstract, they do not stop to consider practically how the objects they would attain can be accomplished, nor to reflect, that, even if the evil were as great as they deem it, they have no remedy to apply, and that it can be only aggravated by their violence and unconstitutional action. A question, which is one of the most difficult of all the problems of social institution, political economy and statesmanship, they treat with unreasoning intemperance of thought and language. Extremes beget extremes. Violent attack from the North finds its inevitable consequence in the growth of a spirit of angry defiance at the South.—Thus in the progress of events we had reached that consummation which the voice of the people has now so pointedly rebuked in the attempt, of a portion of the States, by a sectional organization and movement, to usurp the control of the government of the United States.

I confidently believe that the great body of those, who inconsiderately took this fatal step are sincerely attached to the Constitution and the Union. They would upon deliberation, shrink with unaffected horror, from any conscientious act of disunion or civil war. But they have entered upon a path, which leads nowhere, unless it be to civil war and disunion, and which has no other outlet. They have proceeded thus far in that direction, in consequence of the successive stages of their progress having consisted of a series of secondary issues, each of which professed to be confined within constitutional and peaceful limits, but which, as they proceeded, led to a point where men were willing to do directly, that is, to act aggressively against the constitutional rights of nearly one half of the 31 States.

In the long series of acts of indirect aggression, the first was the strenuous agitation, by citizens of the Northern States, in Congress and out of it, of the question of negro emancipation in the Southern States. This was followed by the second step, which consisted of acts of the people of the Northern States, and in several instances of their governments, aimed to facilitate the escape of persons held to service in the Southern States, and to prevent their extradition when reclaimed according to law and in virtue of express provisions of the Constitution. To accomplish this object, legislative enactments and other means were adopted to take away or defeat rights, which the Constitution solemnly guaranteed. In order to nullify the then existing act of Congress concerning the extradition of fugitives from service, laws were enacted in many States, forbidding their officers, under the severest penalties, to participate in the execution of any act of Louisiana to the effect of such a nature. In this way that system of harmonious co-operation between the authorities of the United States, and of the several States, for the maintenance of their common institutions, which existed in the early years of the Republic was destroyed; conflicts of jurisdiction came to be frequent; and Congress found itself compelled, for the support of the Constitution, and the vindication of its power, to authorize the appointment of new officers, charged with the execution of its acts, as if they and the officers of the States were the ministers, respectively, of foreign governments in a state of mutual hostility, rather than fellow magistrates of a common country, peacefully subsisting under the protection of one well constituted Union. Thus, here, also, aggression was followed by reaction; and the attacks upon the Constitution at this point did but serve to raise up new barriers for its defence and security.

The third stage of this unhappy sectional controversy was in connection with the organization of new States into the Union. When it was proposed to admit the State of Maine, by separation of territory from that of Massachusetts, and the State of Missouri, from a portion of the territory ceded by France to the United States, representatives in Congress objected to the admission of the latter, unless with conditions suited to particular views of public policy. The imposition of such conditions was resisted. But at the same period, the question was presented of imposing restrictions upon the residue of the territory ceded by France. That question was for the time, disposed of by the adoption of a geographical line of limitation.

In this connection it should not be forgotten that France of her own accord resolved, for considerations of the most far-sighted policy, to cede to the United States, and that accession was accepted by the United States, the latter expressly engaged that "the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union with the same rights and immunities as if they had originally been and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and the religion which they profess"—that is to say, while it remains in a territorial condition, its inhabitants are maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, with a right then to pass into the condition of States on a footing of perfect equality with the original States.

The enactment which established the restrictive geographical line, was acquiesced in rather than approved by the States of the Union. It stood on the statute books, however, for a number of years, and the people of the respective States acquiesced in the re-assertion of the principle as applied to Texas; and it was proposed to acquiesce in its further application to the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico. But this proposition was successfully resisted by the representatives of the Northern States, who, regardless of the statute law, insisted upon applying the restriction to the new territory generally, whether lying north or south of it, thereby repealing it as a legislative compromise, and on the part of the North, persistently violating the compact, if compact there was. Thereupon this enactment ceased to have binding virtue in any sense, whether as respects the North or the South; and so in effect it was treated on the occasion of the admission of the State of California, and the organization of the territories of New Mexico, Utah, and Washington.

Such was the state of this question, when the

time arrived for the organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. In the progress of constitutional inquiry and reflection, it had now at length come to be seen clearly that Congress does not possess constitutional power to impose restrictions of this character upon any present or future State of the Union. In a long series of decisions, on the fallow argument, and after the most deliberate consideration, the Supreme Court of the United States had finally determined this point. In every form under which the question could arise, either as affecting public or private rights—in questions of the public domain, of religion, of navigation, and of servitude.

The several States of the Union are, by force of the Constitution, co-equal in domestic legislative power. Congress cannot change a law of domestic relation in the State of Maine; no more can it in the State of Missouri. Any statute which proposes to do this is a mere nullity; it takes away no right, it confers none. If it remains on the statute-book un repealed, it remains there only as a monument of error, and a beacon of warning to the legislator and the statesman. To repeal it will be only to remove a perfection from the statute-book without affecting, either in the sense of permission or of prohibition, the action of the States, or of their citizens. Still, when the nominal restriction of this nature, already a dead letter in law, was in terms repealed by the Congress in a clause of the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, that repeal was made the occasion of a wide-spread and dangerous agitation. It was alleged that the repeal was a violation of the compact of perpetual moral obligation, its repeal constituted an odious breach of faith.

An act of Congress, while it remains un repealed, more especially if it be continually cited in the judgment of those public functionaries whose duty it is to pronounce on that point, is undoubtedly binding on the conscience of each good citizen of the Republic. But in what sense can it be asserted that the enactment in question was invested with perpetuity and entitled to the respect of a solemn compact? No distinct contending powers of the government, no separate sections of the Union, treating as parties entered into treaty stipulations on the subject.

It was a mere clause of an act of Congress, and like any other controverted matter of legislation, received its final shape and was passed by compromise of the conflicting opinions or sentiments of the members of Congress. But if it had moral authority over men's consciences, to whom did this authority attach? Not to those of the North, who had repeatedly refused to confirm it by extension, and who had zealously striven to establish other and incompatible regulations upon the subject. And if, as it thus appears, the supposed compact had no obligatory force as to the North, of course it could not have had any as to the South, for all such compacts must be mutual and of reciprocal obligation.

It has not unfrequently happened that lawgivers, with undue estimation of the value of the law they give, or in the view of imparting to it peculiar strength, make it perpetual in terms; but they cannot thus bind the conscience, the judgment, and the will of those who may succeed them, invested with similar responsibilities, and clothed with equal authority. More careful investigation may prove the law to be unsound in principle. Experience may show it to be imperfect in detail and impracticable in execution. And then both reason and right combine not merely to justify, but to require its repeal.

The Constitution, supreme as it is over all departments of the government, legislative, executive, and judicial, is open to amendment by its very terms; and Congress or the States may, in their discretion, propose amendment to it, solemn compact though it in truth is between the States of the Union. In the present instance, a political enactment, which had ceased to have legal power or authority of any kind, was repealed. The position assumed, that Congress had no moral right to repeal such a repeal, was strange enough, and singularly so in view of the fact that the argument came from those who openly refused obedience to existing laws of the land, having the same popular designation and quality as compromise acts—nay, more, who unequivocally disregarded, and condemned the most positive and obligatory injunctions of the Constitution, to deprive a portion of their fellow-citizens of the equal enjoyment of those rights and privileges guaranteed alike to all by the fundamental compact of our Union.

This argument against the repeal of the statute law in question, was accompanied by an offer of correlative character, and equal with the former destitute of foundation in reason and truth. It was intimated that the measure originated in the conception of extending the limits of slave labor beyond those previously assigned to it, and that such was its natural as well as intended effect; and these baseless assumptions were made, in the northern States, the ground of unceasing assault upon constitutional right.

The repeal in terms of a statute, which was already obsolete, also null for unconstitutionality, could have no influence to obstruct or to promote the propagation of conflicting views of political or social institutions. When the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska was passed, the inherent effect upon that portion of the public domain thus opened to legal settlement, was to admit settlers from all the States of the Union alike, each with his convictions of public policy and private interest, there to found in their discretion, subject to such limitations as the Constitution and acts of Congress might prescribe, new States, hereafter to be admitted into the Union, and to leave it a free field open alike to all, whether the statute line of assumed restriction were repealed or not. That repeal did not open to free competition of the divers opinions and domestic institutions, a field, which without such repeal, would have been closed against them; it found that field of competition already opened, in fact and in law. All the repeal did was to relieve the statute book of an objectionable enactment, unconstitutionality in its effect and injurious in terms to a large portion of the States.

Is it the fact that, in all the unsettled regions of the United States, if emigration be left free to act in this respect for itself, without legal prohibitions on either side, slave-labor will spontaneously go every where, in preference to free labor? Is it the fact that the peculiar domestic institutions of the Southern States possess so much of vigor, that whereoever an avenue is freely open to all the world, they will penetrate to the exclusion of those of the Northern States? Is it the fact that the former enjoy, compared with the latter, such irresistibly superior vitality, independent of climate, and all other accidental circumstances, as to be able to produce the supposed result, in spite of the assumed moral and natural obstacles to its accomplishment, and

of the more numerous population of the Northern States?

The argument of those who advocate the enactment of new laws of restriction, and condemn the repeal of old ones, in effect avers that their particular views of government have no self-extending or self-sustaining power of their own, and will go nowhere unless forced by act of Congress. And if Congress do but pause for a moment, in the policy of stern coercion; if it venture to try the experiment of leaving men to judge for themselves what institutions will best suit them; if it be not strained up to perpetual legislative exertion on this point; if Congress proceed to act thus in the very spirit of liberty, it is at once charged with aiming to extend slave labor into all the new Territories of the United States.

While, therefore, in general, the people of the Northern States have never, at any time, arrogated for the federal government the power to interfere directly with the domestic condition of persons in the Southern States, but on the contrary have disavowed all such intentions, and have shrunk from conspicuous affiliation with those few who pursue their fanatical objects avowedly through the contemplated means of revolutionary change of the government, and with acceptance of the necessary consequences—a civil and servile war—yet many citizens have suffered themselves to be drawn into one evanescent political issue of agitation after another, appertaining to the same set of opinions, and which subsided as rapidly as they arose when it came to be seen, as it uniformly did, that they were incompatible with the compact of the Constitution and the existence of the Union. Thus, when the acts of some of the States to nullify the extradition law imposed upon Congress the duty of passing a new one, the country was invited by agitators to enter into party organization for its repeal; but that agitation speedily ceased by reason of the impracticality of its object. So, when the statute restriction upon the institutions of new States, by a geographical line, had been repealed, the country was urged to demand its restoration, and the projected cry of alarm from the North against impudently Southern encroachments, which cry sprang in reality from the spirit of revolutionary attack on the domestic institutions of a few months, has been rebuked by the voice of a patriotic people.

Of this last agitation, one lamentable feature was, that it was carried on at the immediate expense of the peace and happiness of the people of the Territory of Kansas. That was made the battle field, not so much of opposing interests or interests within itself as of the conflicting passions of the whole people of the United States. Revolutionary disorder in Kansas had its origin in projects of intervention, deliberately arranged by certain members of that Congress which enacted the law for the organization of the Territory. And when propagandist colonization in Kansas had been undertaken in one section of the Union, for the systematic promotion of its views of policy, there ensued, as a matter of course, a counteraction with opposite views, in other sections of the Union.

In consequence of these and other incidents many acts of disorder, it is understood, have been perpetrated in Kansas, to the occasional interruption, rather than the permanent suspension, of regular government. Aggressive and most reprehensible incursions into the Territory were undertaken, both in the North and in the South, and entered in on its northern border by the way of Iowa, as well as on the eastern by way of Missouri; and there has existed within it a state of insurrection against the constituted authorities, not without countenance from inconsiderate persons in each of the great sections of the Union. But the difficulties in that Territory have been extravagantly exaggerated for purposes of political agitation elsewhere.

The number and gravity of the acts of violence have been magnified partly by statements entirely untrue, and partly by reiterated accounts of the same rumors or facts.—Thus the Territory has been seemingly filled with extreme violence, when the whole amount of such acts has not been greater than what occasionally passes before us in single cities to the regret of all good citizens, but without being regarded as of general or permanent political consequence.

It is intimated that irregularities in the elections had in Kansas, like occasional irregularities in the same description in the States, were beyond the sphere of action of the Executive. But incidents of actual violence of organized obstruction of law, pertinaciously renewed from time to time, have been met as they occurred, by such means as were available, and as the character now remains to reflect the general peace of the Union. The attempt of a part of the inhabitants of the Territory to erect a revolutionary government, though sedulously encouraged and supplied with pecuniary aid from active agents of disorder in some of the States, has completely failed. Bodies of armed men, foreign to the Territory, have been prevented from entering or compelling to leave it. Preliminary lands, engaged in acts of rapine, under cover of the existing political disturbances, have been arrested or dispersed. And every well disposed person is now enabled once more to devote himself in peace to the pursuits of prosperous industry, for the prosecution of which he undertook to participate in the settlement of the Territory.

It affords me unmingled satisfaction thus to announce the peaceful condition of things in Kansas, especially considering the means to which it was necessary to have recourse for the attainment of the end, namely, the employment of a part of the military force of the United States. The withdrawal of that force from its proper duty of defending the country against foreign foes, or the suppression of the peculiar domestic institutions of the Southern States, is, when the exigency occurs, a matter of the most earnest solicitude.

On this occasion of imperative necessity it has been done with the best results, and my satisfaction in the attainment of such results by such means is greatly enhanced by the consideration that, through the wisdom and energy of the present Executive of Kansas, and the prudent firmness and vigilance of the military officers on duty there, insubordination has