Kansas.

Shall the system of Slavery be fastened on Kansas.

It is plain as the noon day sun to every one who takes the pains to reflect on the subject, that the success of the administration party in the coming Presidential election must fasten slavery upon Kansas, thus wresting that vast empire from free men and free labor, and giving it into the hands of the slave proprietor and his African bond servants. Though this is doubted or denied, a few words must make it evident even to the unthinking. —

The Democratic party at the South universally maintain, that the citizen of a slave State has an equal right with the citizen of a free State, to take his property (meaning negroes) into the territories which belong to all States in common, and retain them there in the condition of slaves. We do not stop to discuss the question, whether it is right even in Congress to make a wrong use of the national domain, to allow governments to be established in it that are not republican and free, and systems to be set up in it that are "morally, socially and politically evil," that thwart, as much as an hereditary monarchy and nobility would, the very ends and purposes for which we became a nation and took our proud preeminent place among the nations of the earth. Liberty, we hold, is the grand idea of our government, its foundation, superstructure and top stone; not liberty and slavery, in equal and perpetual alliance for all ages to come. Liberty was the doctrine of the founders and fathers of the Republic, who regarded slavery as restricted to its then existing limits, and united in prohibiting it from all the national domain lying beyond the boundaries of the States. But whatever may be its merits, this is the Southern Democratic doctrine; the slave holder may take his slaves to any portion of the territories of the United States and keeps them there. Congress has no right to interfere with the system by any legislation whatever. Neither has the territorial legislature any right to interfere in the way of prohibiting it, any more than it has a right to forbid the free citizen from going into the territories with his horses and cows, his chattels and merchandize. If this doctrine prevails of course slavery becomes at once established there. Nothing farther is necessary than for a few proprietors to proceed to the territories, taking their slave gangs with them, and the institution is set up, and no earthly power can say, why do you so?

Is that the doctrine of the Administration and of the Cincinnati Convention? Is it the Democratic doctrine here at the North? It is not squatter sovereignty in the abstract sense of that phrase; which, by its terms, intimates that the people of the territory are to decide the question for themselves, whether they will have slavery or not. The non-intervention principle gives them Hobson's choice. They can accept slavery, but they cannot reject it; which is very much like the sovereignty of a slave, who is at liberty to work when he is bidden, but has no liberty to refuse to work. It is obvious, that this is the kind of squatter sovereignty which the people of Kansas have enjoyed, and which the federal administration and the Cincinnati Convention have practically recognised, and are now seeking to maintain by moral influence and by force and arms. The territorial legislature, (itself chosen by the sovereigns of Missouri, and not of Kansas) adopted this interpretation of squatter sovereignty, for they immediately set about the enactment of laws, of the most horrid nature, to protect slavery in the territories; taking it for granted that the citizens of the South had a right to come there with their slaves, and to retain them there in bondage. They did not enact a law to establish slavery. For according to the non-intervention doctrine, that institution, without the creation of positive law, had an existence, and a legal existence, in the territory. The laws which they framed only professed to secure to the immigrant from the South, what they termed his pre-existing, constitutional right, to hold slaves there. Nay, so confidently did they maintain this doctrine, that they passed a statue, by which it was made an offence, punishable with two years' imprisonment at hard labor, with a heavy chain and ball attached to the limbs, for an individual to proclaim that slavery had no legal existence in Kansas, but was an usurper of the soil.

That is squatter sovereignty in practice.—It is sanctioned by the administration. It is the universal Democratic creed; held, theoretically, throughout the whole South, and at least practically throughout the Northern wing (fortunately a small wing, growing beautifully less) of that once great party. Nay, in conversing with the partizans of Democracy among us, we find that at least nine out of every ten of them are zealous advocates of the non-intervention principle, maintaining that the citizens of the South have the same right to take their slaves into Kansas as the citizens of the North to go there with their horses and cows, their chattles and merchandise. In that proportion of instances, we run a narrow chance of being called disunionists and abolitionists, and we venture to dissent from this doctrine;—a doctrine which our fathers did not know, and which is of quite recent invention.

It follows from this, that the success of the administration party in the coming presidential election, will inevitably fasten the institution of slavery upon Kansas. And we leave it to the common sense of all men, who know anything about the nature of the institution and the character and purposes of its propagandists whether it would be possible to uproot it, after it had become fast rooted in the soil? It is considered highly fanatical, merely to follow the creed of our fathers, and of both the old parties in the North, by trying to prevent the intrusion of slavery upon the free territories of the nation; would it not be considered an immeasurably greater display of fanaticism to attempt to remove it, when it had acquired full possession there? Then the cry would rend the heavens that we were interfering with slavery where it existed; we were depriving men of their property; we were expelling them from the soil where they were engaged in a legitimate business. If the excitement runs high now, what would we not have reason to expect under such circumstances. No, the propagandists who invented this new principle, are well aware that possession is nine-tenths of the law; and that if the fangs of slavery were once fastened on its coveted prey, all earth could not rescue the ill-fated territory from its power. This is the question at issue; shall Congress have the right, always accorded to it, and exercised by it, heretofore, to prohibit slavery in the free territories of the United States; or shall this principle of non-intervention prevail which gives up Kansas, Nebraska, and all our territories alike, to the system of human bondage and slave labor? It is the most momentous question ever laid before a great nation. On its decision hangs the continued freedom, the glory, and the perpetuity of our Republic. —*North American.*

Miscellaneous.

ORDINANCE IN REFERENCE TO THE LAYING OF PAVEMENTS, &C.

SEC. 1. Be it enacted and ordained by the Town Council of the Borough of Carlisle, and it is hereby enacted and ordained by the authority of the same. That hereafter it shall not be lawful for any mason or other person, at the instance and request of the owner of any property, to lay, make, or construct any pavement in any street or alley, in the Borough of Carlisle, unless the height and breadth of said pavement shall have been first previously fixed and settled by the Borough regulators, and a certificate given by them to that effect, and any mason or other person laying, making or constructing, or assisting in laying, making or constructing, any such pavement without such certificate being first previously procured, shall be liable to a fine of Twenty Dollars

SEC. 2. That any one who shall maliciously and wilfully throw water from any hose attached to any wash pave, upon any person, or upon any Horse, Carriage, Wagon or any other vehicle, shall be liable to a fine of Ten Dollars for each and every such offence.

SEC. 3. That the owner of any Cow or other cattle that shall be found trespassing on the public streets of this Borough between the hours of 8 o'clock, P. M., and 6 o'clock, A. M., throughout the year, shall be liable to a fine of Five Dollars for every such trespass.

SEC. 4. The fines and penalties imposed by this Ordinance shall be recoverable as provided by the 32d Section of the Act of Assembly, passed the 3d day of April, 1851.

A. NOBLE, Chief Burgess.
Attest—WM. H. WETZEL, Secretary to Corporation.
Sept. 3, 1856—2w.

Drug Stores.

Miscellaneous.

ORPHANS' COURT SALE.—In pursuance of an order of the Orphans' Court of Cumberland county, will be sold at public sale, on SATURDAY, the 27th of September, 1856, on the premises, in Monroe township, Cumberland county, on the Lisburn road, about two miles east of Churchtown,
SIX ACRES OF LIMESTONE LAND,
more or less, all under good fence, and in a good state of cultivation. The improvements are a story and a half LOG HOUSE, Frame Shop, Barn, Corn Crib, Smoke House, &c. There is also a good Apple Orchard on the premises, together with a great variety of other choice fruit trees. There is a never-failing well of water convenient to the door of the dwelling. The above described property will be sold as belonging to the estate of Daniel Kline, deceased. Sale to commence at 2 o'clock, P. M., when terms will be made known by
SAMUEL KLINE,
August 20, 1856—ts. Administrator.

Stores and Shops.

Gas Fitting and Machinery.

Philadelphia.