in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. Popular sovereignty and the right of self-government in the people of Kansas, then, is not an open question now. It was closed by the positive enactment of this law, declaratory of their rights. True, the people were, of course, to exercise this sovereignty of self-government in a practical and usual mode. They were not left to primary assemblies, to mobs, or aggregate meetings. The American mode of self-government is by conventional, representative, or municipal bodies. But all these bodies are but agents, and representatives. When they "form and regulate," they still form and regulate for the people, and not for themselves. Their acts, at last, are but the acts of the people, and their deeds but the deeds of the people. When, therefore, a Convention send a Constitution to Congress to be approved, and it goes up *not as their* act and deed, but as the act and deed of the people, done and performed by them as their agents; the question, then is always—not whether the act and deed is the act and deed of a Convention, but is it the act and deed of the people? and this, no matter whether the instrument goes up from the Convention proclaiming, or from the ballot-box of the people voting it. By the very Kansas act itself, it is obliged to be the act and deed of the people—theirs, theirs, and none others—Whether it proceed from them directly, or through their representatives.

And for these reasons, I had no difficulty in determining that the act of 1854, the Kansas and Nebraska law was an *"enabling act."* It created no right not pre-existing—for popular sovereignty is self-existing—but declared and admitted and recognized in the people the right of self-government, to form and regulate all their domestic institutions in their own way, consistent with paramount law.

Under this law they were formed into an organized Territory; and under territorial law they formed a Convention to make a Constitution of State Government, with a view to admission into the Union. All this was legitimate; and, as to how the election of members to the Convention should be held, and how contested elections were to be determined—all matters of this sort were left to themselves, without the right of intervention from any quarter. I avoid inquiring into the frauds which may have been perpetrated and which, doubtless, were perpetrated on both sides, in the election to constitute a Convention.

But that body, however legitimate or however fairly or unfairly constituted, was *not* empowered to make a constitution and to proclaim it, without submitting it to the people before it was submitted to Congress as the act and deed of the people of Kansas. And herein is the first point of difference with the President. He says that if the Convention was not prohibited from proclaiming it without submission to the people, they had authority to proclaim it. I say that it is a settled Democratic principle of American institutions *"that the powers not delegated by the people are reserved to them."* But this point of difference does not arise in this case; for, as I will show presently, whatever power the Constitution had in this respect, they did not pretend to exercise it or to claim it, but as a representative body and not a primary, submitted the work of their agency, their Constitution, to their principals, the people.

In my letter dated the 19th November, addressed to the editors of the Richmond *Enquirer*, I took the ground that there was no authority delegated by the people to the Convention of Kansas to proclaim a Constitution without submitting it to the people for ratification or rejection by them; "yet," said that, "if upon precedent, the Convention of Kansas adopted a republican form of State government, and reported it to Congress, *without submitting it to the people*," I agreed in "accepting it, and in receiving in Kansas as a State, slave or free, into the Union." This letter was written on the 19th of November, 1857, and on the 24th of the same month, five days afterwards, I saw for the first time, published in the Richmond *Enquirer*, the schedule of the Lecompton Constitution.

The publication of this document presented the subject under a new phase, adverted to by the President in his message of December, 1857. The result of the election in Kansas had still to be ascertained, and certainly it could not be clearly said what were the President's conclusions on the affairs of that Territory. His argument fairly admitted and claimed for the people the right of passing on the work of the Convention, and his conclusion seemed to be reserved. His counsel was not "dark," or "double," or dubious; but he was uncommitted to any practical conclusion by his December message, and I suppose that the friends of the administration would be left free to take ground according to their conscientious convictions, on a full development of the whole subject.

More than a month had elapsed since the publication of the schedule. I had full time to understand the provisions of this submission to the people, and was prepared to take the grounds occupied in my letter to the Tammany Society, dated the 30th December last.

That letter was deliberately written, was kept in my possession for days, was re-written, and put forth with a firm purpose to serve the Administration and the country. I saw a formidable opposition, thoroughly organized, in the Democratic ranks of those opposed to Mr. Buchanan's nomination, bent on driving from his support every Northern Democrat on the Kansas question, and every Southern Democrat on the fillibustering Puenta Arenas question. I saw a faction of extremists who are bent on rushing the South, slavery, Democracy, and the Union, on the basses of the buckler of popular sovereignty and upon the moral sense of the whole country, and losing the moral prestige of a minority of the Union who are demanding justice and equality to a majority against a minority of people in Kansas. I felt that I might interpose a timely blow to save the Administration from the dilemma of holding its Northern friends to the hard necessity of denying popular sovereignty and of withholding justice and equality from the people at the polls, in a Territory where self-government and perfect freedom of election were guarantied by the very act organizing it. No Northern man could strike that blow with effect, and I felt the moral obligation to strike for "justice, even to my own hurt." I saw what would be the effect upon me, personally; that misrepresentation and abuse would follow, and many of my best friends would condemn the apparent rashness of the act. In all this I have not been disappointed. But now that the thunders have rolled over my head, and I see the full effect, even beyond my anticipations—the effect of a special message from the President—his authority wielded against the position which I devotedly assumed for his defense—I calmly survey the subject again, and instead of retreating, advance on the position I have assumed. In November I said that if the Convention had proclaimed the Lecompton Constitution without submitting it all to the people, I would accept it as a legitimate and *de facto* instrument. But now that it has been submitted in the manner and form of the eleventh and fourteenth sections of its schedule, I repeat the position of my Tammany letter, and would adopt it only subject to a fair and legal vote of the people of Kansas, to be prescribed by their Territorial Legislature—not by Congress.

In reviewing the message, I pass over all that is said respecting the rebellion and usurpation of the Topekaites. Their course has been violent and unlawful in the extreme. I claim, on the other hand, that their opponents in Kansas have acted under lawful authority; that they have proceeded under the act of Congress and of territorial organization, and that up to the point of the schedule of submission of the Lecompton Constitution to the people, their acts were *de jure* and *de facto* rightful in the legitimate sense. But what has that to do, legally or logically, with the issue—Is the Lecompton Constitution the act and deed of the people?—Is its schedule republican?

If insurrection and rebellion were arraying themselves against law and order in a Territory, all I can say is that they ought to have been arrested and punished long ago by the Federal Executive of the United States. When the whiskey insurrection broke out in Pennsylvania, would it have authorized a lawful Convention in that State to have submitted a Constitution to the people in such a schedule as allowed men to vote *for* it, but not *against* it; as allowed one man to vote down 1,000 men; all having equal rights as pretended to submit one question alone, and yet submitted it in such a way that in order to vote for or against *that*, the people were obliged to vote *for* and *not against* something else which might be obnoxious or odious to them—as insulted and oppressed them with a *test oath*, the most odious instrument of tyranny, to support a Constitution, if adopted, *before it was adopted*, and then, after being forced to gulp the oath in order to vote at all, to have the vote not counted because it was against and not for what he was sworn to support, if adopted against his will? No. Gen. Washington put down the insurrection, and he would have made it no excuse for fraud, injustice, inequality or oppression on the part of others who were acting under the color of lawful authority. So the Topekaites ought to have been made to submit to lawful authority; but no one can contend that they forfeited their elective franchise or their freedom of choice to approve or disapprove, to ratify or reject, an organic law when submitted to them. But were Topekaites alone opposed to the Lecompton Constitution?—No. Some pro-s avery men were opposed to it; and this schedure deprived them of their sovereign rights as well as the Topekaites. Law-abiding citizens, as well as rebels, were compelled to vote for and not against this Constitution, or not to vote at all. The wrong of the Topekaites will not justify the wrong of the Lecompton Convention, nor cure the defects of the Lecompton schedule. What is that schedule?

Its 11th section reads:

"Before *this Constitution* shall be sent to Congress for admission into the Union as a State, *it* shall be submitted to all the white male inhabitants of this Territory, for *approval* or *disapproval*, as follows:—The President of this Convention shall, by proclamation, declare that on the 21st day of December, 1857, at the different election precincts now established by law, or which may be established as herein provided, in the Territory of Kansas, an election shall be held, over which shall preside three judges, or a majority of three, to be appointed as follows: The President of this Convention shall appoint three commissioners in each county in the Territory, whose duty it shall be to appoint three judges of election in the several precincts of their respective counties, at which election *the Constitution framed by this Convention* shall be submitted to all the white male inhabitants of the Territory of Kansas in the said Territory upon that day, and over the age of twenty-one years, for *ratification* or *rejection*, in the following manner and form,"

Now, it must surely be admitted that is a plain submission of the *whole* Constitution framed by the Convention. The submission of the whole Constitution is repeated twice in this clause, in a way not to be mistaken. And yet is it not strange that Mr. Buchanan should have made the mistake of saying in his message that the whole of the Lecompton Constitution was not, and that a part, the slavery clause alone, was submitted to the people? Will it be said in reply that the whole was submitted only *sub modo*, after a specified manner and form? Well, let us look at the manner and form; the manner and form is:

"The voting shall be by ballot. The judges of said election shall cause to be kept two poll-books by two clerks by them appointed. The ballots cast at said election shall be endorsed *'Constitution with slavery,'* and *'Constitution with no slavery,'* &c. There is no other form touching this point but this; and is it not plain still that the whole Constitution *was* submitted by the form as well as by the preceding clause embodying the principle of entire submission. The whole was submitted in *form* as substance, but the *form* of submission was made to contradict the principle of submission. The principle was submission of the whole for *"approval"* or *"disapproval,"* for *"ratification* or *rejection,"* but the form was for "approval" and "ratification" alone, and there was *no form* for *"disapproval* or *rejection."*

Is it answered that this was in substance but a submission of a part, for there was a form approving or disapproving, ratifying or rejecting slavery? I beg pardon, and won't repeat that it was an odious discrimination to me to allow *slavery* alone to be disapproved and rejected, and nothing else. But, passing that by, is it not plain, I reply, that no one was allowed to vote for or against slavery, a part, unless he would also vote *for* the Constitution, the whole of it without exception? Any one might vote to reject or adopt slavery, provided he would vote to adopt the Constitution, and no one was allowed to vote for or against slavery who did not vote for the whole Constitution. Is it not plain, then, that the object was not to submit a part only, but to force the adoption of the whole?

The whole was not fairly submitted.—One thousand voters went to the polls:—nine hundred and ninety-nine voters might desire to vote against the Constitution, and one for it; the one would be counted, and nine hundred and ninety-nine would not be counted.

The part as to slavery, which was submitted for alternate voting, for and against was not fairly submitted. One thousand pro-slavery men might go to the polls, desiring to vote for slavery, but against the Constitution their votes could not be counted, and one free-soiler, who voted for the Constitution and against slavery, would be counted, and over-come the nine hundred and ninety nine. It is idle to say that this was as fair for one side as the other; for, though this be equally true as to the ninety-nine free-soil voters against the one pro-slavery voter, yet this would only prove the case to be one of a double instead of a single injustice. It proves only it was a wrong, injuriously affecting both sides and the whole people, and not a part only.

The truth is, there was obviously a sinister and anti-republican purpose in thus giving an unfair election as a part, coupled with no election as to the whole. It was to force the people to adopt the Constitution framed by the Convention. No man was allowed to vote for slavery who did not also vote for the Constitution; and no man was allowed to vote against slavery who did not vote for the Constitution.—He might reject slavery or adopt it, provided he would vote for the Constitution; and if he voted against the Constitution, his vote for or against slavery was not allowed to be counted.

This was not all. The 14th section is worse than the iniquity of the 11th:

Section 14th. "Every person offering to vote at the aforesaid election, upon the said Constitution, shall, if challenged, take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and to support this Constitution, if adopted, under the penalties of perjury under the territorial laws.',

The Democratic party had just come out of severe and doubtful conflict with the Know Nothing secret society, the most odious feature of which was a "test oath."—Now behold an honest, peaceful, law-abiding citizen approaching the polls in Kansas under the schedule; I imagine myself an ultra under this clause of this schedule: I am anxious, Southern slaveholder put to the ordeal of a challenge very anxious, to record my vote for my right to hold the chief part of the little property I own; I am told that I have the right, by the grant of the high Lecompton Constitution, to vote for or against property in slaves; I approach the polls to exercise the right: I am challenged; the Bible is held out to me to swear first to "support the Constitution of the United States; I ask, why impose on me that oath; I urge that the obligation is binding on me without the oath—that I love and obey the Constitution of the United States, and that it is made the supreme law of the land, binding of itself, but being unwilling to support that instrument, and anxious to vote for my property, I assent to swear to support it. But I am told I must, in the second place, swear also to support the Lecompton "Constitution, if adopted, under the penalties of perjury under the Territorial laws." I redden into wrath under the insult of such an oath tendered to a freemen at the polls—to support a constitution, if adopted, *before its adoption*. I denounce the obstacle to my freedom of election. It is in vain; I must take it or leave my property unprotected. I suppose—the supposition is almost intolerable—I take the oath; I am then, and only then, granted the privilege of voting. I vote for slavery, but against the Constitution, I am then told that my vote cannot be counted, yet I am sworn to support, if adopted, what I have voted against. Stung by insult and then disfranchised, I go away maddened to violence by injustice, inequality, and insult and injury. Is that my act and deed? Is that republican? If Caligula was a tyrant for posting laws too high to be read by the Roman people, what does this deserve to be called, which puts the whole and a part together, so that a minority *for* the whole may prevail over a majority for or against the part? Is it not the very hocus-pocus and legerdemain of keeping the promise to the ear of the people and breaking to their hopes? I tell you that no proud, free people will stand insult and outrage like this, and such despotism is enough to drive peaceful and good-citizens to violence for a redress of grievances.—But the question is not whether the Lecompton Constitution has been opposed unlawfully, but is it the act and deed of the sovereign people, whose it purports to be—and is it republican in its submission by the schedule of the Lecompton Constitution? And mark, too, that this test oath is applied when the constitution is to be sent to Congress from a Territory for approval. After taking this oath, the casuist may determine whether he could, if the constitution be adopted, oppose it before Congress, though he voted against it at the polls.

But it is urged in the message that the people, if opposed to slavery, might have voted it out of the Constitution on the 21st of December. I deny that they could have voted for or against slavery under this schedule, unless they voted also for the Constitution. As I have said, nine hundred and ninety-nine might have gone to the polls and voted for or against slavery, and yet have been out-voted by one man, if they voted against the Constitution and the one voted for it. In a word, no one who voted against the Constitution could vote at all. How unfair, then, to urge that those who were opposed to the Constitution, though for or against slavery, staid away from the polls on the 21st of December, and let the election go by default! *Could* they have *voted at all* if they were *against* the Constitution?—Could they be counted for or against slavery, unless they voted for the Constitution? Why hold the people responsible for not attending the polls, when, if they had attended them, they were not allowed to vote but in one way, not all allowed to vote their own way, and the minority of one was given the majority of one over a thousand?—Do you call this election? Election has which of the *two* "at least to choose."—But here there was no alternative, but in respect to slavery, and that was not allowed unless you voted the one way on the Constitution. Such monstrous injustice and inequality never offended the moral sense of freemen before in this country.—I cannot agree with the President, therefore, when he says: "It is impossible that any people could have proceeded with more regularity in the formation of a Constitution than the people of Kansas have done." The people of Kansas have not been allowed to hold a fair, free and full election at all, though the whole Constitution was pretended to be submitted to them. No, not upon the part which the President says was alone submitted to them.

You see, gentlemen, that I arrive at these facts from the face of the record—from the schedule itself. I don't go into Kansas for evidences of fraud or any other fact. I don't go behind the schedule which is annexed to the Lecompton Constitution itself. It shows on its face a fact stronger than any proof, that the people *did* not vote—it shows that it was *impossible* for them to vote their sovereign will in a fair, free and full election. Such an election cannot possibly be held under such a schedule. This, Congress is bound to look at. I am bound in certain cases to cause the seal of this State to be affixed to papers for the purpose of authentication.—I have no election. If the paper is proper to be certified, I must affix the seal. But suppose that in the act of authentication, by affixing the seal, it appears to me that there is a doubt whether the paper is the act and deed of the party whose act and deed it purports to be: Must I not inquire whether it be the act and deed of the party?—If I affix authentication to what is not his, I may do him irreparable damage. But suppose that it appears on the face of the paper itself that it *couldn't* his act and deed—that he was not left a free agent.—Am I bound to certify that to be his act and deed, which not only is not, but could not be his act and deed? Now, as I said in November, if the Convention had proclaimed this Constitution, and sent it to Congress, *without submitting it at all to the people*, then Congress would have simply the evidence of the Convention, the representative and agent, that this was the authorized instrument of their principals—the people. Evidence to the contrary wouldn't have appeared in the record and on the return itself. And we wouldn't have been authorized, if you please, to go behind the return of the Convention or to have taken evidence *aliunde*, or admitted a plea to matter debars the record. But the Lecompton Convention submitted their Constitution to popular approval or disapproval, ratification or rejection. It purports to be the act of the people—not of the Convention only, but the people also. The Convention did not fully and finally adopt it, and this schedule shows that the people did not, because they could not, as it was proposed. It is, then, neither the act of the Convention nor of the people.—It is, in fact, adopted by neither, and couldn't be by the latter.

If Congress receives and adopts it as a State Constitution for Kansas under these circumstances, will not Congress be *intervening* to impose a Constitution upon a people which is not theirs? Will they not arbitrarily intervene to decide a question which belongs to the people of Kansas alone—to all and all alike allowed by law to vote. Have all and all alike been allowed to vote? Were those who did vote allowed to vote *against* the Constitution as well as *for it?*

We are told that we are to shut our eyes to the record. What evidence have we, then, that it is a Constitution at all? We are told then, that this is *not the time* to raise the question, *de facto*, whether it is the act and deed of the people of Kansas. When would be the time, when was the time if it be not the time now, to inquire whether this is a genuine Constitution of the people of Kansas, and whether it is or not republican, when these, and these only, are the questions before Congress?

Why, it is asked, has the issue of fact been delayed so long? I answer, how could the issue be made up before the returns were made, and the evidence appeared on the record submitted to Congress?

Ah! but we are told that it is *inexpedient* to raise this question at all; that expediency requires Congress to decide the question. When was it morally determined that the policy of this nation should be governed by expediency rather than by justice or right? But what right has Congress to set up its decrees of expediency over and above the sovereign rights of a people to free and fair elections? Is expediency to be carried so far as to allow Congress to intervene so as to set its will over the will of the people of Kansas, or to substitute its will for theirs, and to give a minority Constitution to a majority?—This would be intervention with a vengeance, in the teeth of non-intervention, so much claimed for by those who advocate this Constitution?

But the President offers an inducement to the anti-slavery party in Kansas by saying: "If a majority of them," (the people of Kansas) "desired to abolish domestic slavery within the State, there is no other possible mode by which this can be effected so speedily, as by prompt admission." This hint is somewhat dangerous in point of policy. It cuts both ways. It might be asked whether this commends itself to pro-slavery gentlemen who are advocating the "prompt admission." Some of them once repealed laws protecting and establishing slavery in Kansas. They had better not make it too apparent in the South that "prompt admission" would most speedily unmake the slavery there which was restored by the Dred Scott decision. But this was not the President's fair meaning. He meant to say only that it was in his opinion the speediest way to obtain a fair vote by the people. In other words, Congress is to do a thing in order that it may be immediately undone! Why do it to be undone? Is Congress to give the Territory a Constitution obnoxious to a majority in order that that majority may have State sovereignty to put it to the tortures of its indignation? Why not rather allow the sovereign people directly and at once to select for themselves the form of government they prefer, instead of submitting to their passions an instrument which the argument admits they abhor? Would it be less trouble, or take less time, to refer the matter back to their decision, and to avoid the issues which might and would arise under an adopted and admitted Constitution which undertakes to bind the sovereignty of the people not to change their form of government before anno Domini 1864?—By authenticating this instrument by the arbitrary intervention of Congress, every sort of question of vested right and bounden sovereignty would arise. By "leaving the people perfectly free" to elect their own form of government without fear, force, fraud, or intervention, those issues and worse would be avoided. The agitation in Kansas would be intense, to adopt this Lecompton instrument, and the excitement there would be roused to a new and more fearful form than ever, and remain still in Congress, the Cabinet, and the country universally. I proposed, on the contrary, in my Tammany letter, that Congress sho'd not decide the question of fact, but refer it back to the Territorial Legislature for submission under territorial law, to the whole of the legal voters, under a fair, free and full election. This was done both in the case of Wisconsin, and of Michigan, under cases involving the principles of this case of reference and submission. This imposes no condition of admission, but receives the State into the Union provisionally—provided only that the Constitution is the will of the people, fairly and legally polled.

And why impose this Constitvtion of a minority on a majority? *Cui bono?* Does any Southern man imagine that this is a practicable or sufferable way of making a slave State? Who believes now that Kansas will be made a slave State, or kept one for any time, by the admission of this Constitution? Who will carry a slave there now to become a bone of contention in a border war? the sport of violence and fraud and force like that which has so long endangered person and property, and political franchise in that unhappy battle ground of sectional feuds? To what end is this thing to be done, if speedily it is to be undone with State authority, created to drive slave property from the Territory.

We have proudly, heretofore, contended only for equality and justice; but if this be wantonly done without winning a stake—the power of a slave State hereby—it will be worse than vain. It will be snatching power *per fas aut ne fas*, to be lost "speedily" with the loss of something of far more worth than political votes—*our moral prestige*. If we are not willing to do justice, we can't ask for justice; if we can't agree to equality, we must expect to be denied it. It is our bull goring this anti-slavery ox. Suppose we had had a majority of slaveholders in that Territory; suppose a minority of abolitionists had gotten the census and registry into their hands and had kept fifteen out of thirty-four counties out of the Convention; suppose they had formed a Constitution with a clause prohibiting slavery, and had sent it to Congress without submitting it to a majority of the legal voters; or suppose they had submitted all parts of the Constitution to the popular vote, *except the one clause* prohibiting slavery, knowing it would be voted down if submitted to the majority of the people; suppose "such a boot on the other leg" had been submitted to Congress and we had then heard the absoluteness of a Convention contended for by Black Republicans, demanding of Congress to sustain the doctrine of *"legitimacy."* I tell you that every Southern man would have been in arms and would have been roused to the shedding of blood, rather submit to Congress fastening upon a majority of pro-slavery people an arbitrary rescript of a mere Convention, unauthorized to proclaim its Constitution without an express grant. This is the same principle, accompanied by trickery and fraud. "We are willing to do unto others as we would have them do unto us." The Southern people ask for no injustice, no inequality.

We are told that "prompt admission" of Kansas as a State will end the agitation in Congress and localize it in Kansas. What is the Kansas question? Is it local in Kansas? No. It never can be local again. It has pervaded all places and all classes in our country. Let Congsess endorse this schedule of legerdemain, let the South insist on it, let the Northern Democracy be required to consent to the injustice, and the precedent becomes of universal application and citation against us for all time. Not only will the example plead, but it will be a plea in continuous cases of similar import and danger, rising successively as long as our vast territories to the Pacific shall be filling up. It comes up again and again, every year, for territories extending from Messilla Valley to Dacotah. Flatter not ourselves, then, that any mode of adjustment will do because it is the "speediest" for Kansas. It is all essential that the settlement shall be just and right and equal. If not, it is sure to be mischievous to that party which has snatched power without right, and done wrong that good may come of it. To do justice is always the best policy. If all would "demand only what is right and submit to nothing that is wrong," injustice and oppression could never be perpetrated or tolerated. The ulterior effects of adopting the Lecompton Constitution, with its schedule annexed, will be worse than referring back the question to the Territorial decision. It will arraign the Administration and the Democracy and the South for demanding more than is right, and for forcing resistence to wrong. It will be jagging the lion of a majority whilst the hand of a minority is in its mouth. It will return the chalice to our own lips when the Kansas question again and again arises in North Texas, in New Mexico, in Mesilla Valley, and in all our boundless domain of unsettled and fast settling territory. It will drive from us thousands of honest Democrats in the North, who can willingly stand by us for justice and equality, but who must leave us when we demand more and refuse justice and equality to others. It will raise the Black Republican flag over the Capitol in the next struggle for power, and that, then, will raise the last dread issue of union or disunion! Are not some aiming to drive us to such extremities as will raise that issue past being relaid?

For my part, gentlemen, I address you as the friend of Mr. Buchanan and his Administration. They have my best wishes and warmest friendship, and I would save both from danger and defeat. I trust in their pure and patriotic motives, but I regard much more the Democracy, the South and the Union, and I am anxious for their fate. As for myself, I fear nothing when firmly standing on the right, in spite of friends or foes.

I received your letter yesterday morning, and have written this in great haste, to be in time for the mail this evening.—You will please see that it is correctly published. I have not time to revise and condense it. Very truly, yours,

HENRY A. WISE.

To John W. Forney, David Webster, Daniel Dougherty, E. G. Webb, Esqrs., Committee.

YOUNG AMERICA.—A few days since a mother in the poor-house at Taunton gave birth to a child weighing eight pounds, the mother being eleven years old, and the father but fourteen. The mother herself was born in the poor-house.

THE REVIEW.

CRAWFORDSVILLE

Saturday Morning, Feb. 20, 1858.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY
CHARLES H. BOWEN.

☞ The Crawfordsville Review, furnished to Subscribers at $1,50 in advance, or $2, if not paid within the year.

S. H. PARVIN, South East corner Columbia and Main streets, Cincinnati, Ohio; is our Agent to procure advertisements.

CIRCULATION
LARGER THAN ANY PAPER PUBLISHED IN Crawfordsville!
Advertisers call up and examine our list of ☞ SUBSCRIBERS. ☜

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

For Secretary of State.
DANIEL McCLURE, of Morgan.
For Auditor of State,
JOHN W. DODD, of Grant.
For Treasurer of State,
NATHANIEL E. CUNNINGHAM, of Vigo.
For Superintendent of Public Instruction,
SAMUEL L. RUGG, of Allen.
For Attorney General,
JOSEPH E. McDONALD, of Montgomery.
For Judges of the Supreme Court.
SAMUEL E. PERKINS, of Marion.
ANDREW DAVISON, of Decatur.
JAMES M. HANNA, of Vigo.
JAMES L. WORDEN, of Whitley.

GOV. WISE and HON. GEO. BANCROFT.

We present this week the able and convincing letters of these two distinguished men on the Lecompton Constitution, to the exclusion of our usual variety. Mr. BANCROFT was Secretary of the Navy under Mr. Polk, and afterwards Minister to England under the same administration, and his views are but in anticipation of history. The letter of Gov. Wise is full, complete and unanswerable. *He* also held high office under Mr. Polk, being Minister to Brazil under that administration.

It is becoming very fashionable in certain quarters to stigmatize as Black Republicans every man who raises his voice against this unparalleled swindle—the Lecompton Constitution. In order to expose the full enormity of such unmeanins slang, it is only necessary to ask—is HENRY A. WISE, *the Governor of Virginia*, a Black Republican?

The Lecompton Constitution can never get through under these mighty protests.

THE TERRE HAUTE JOURNAL.

This paper is pursuing a very singular course in not hoisting the Democratic State ticket. If it designs leaving the party and repudiating the nominations of the 8th of January last it should have the manliness to avow it in place of observing a neutral and an ominous silence. We are as much opposed to the Lecompton swindle as Cookerly, yet we have never dreamed of repudiating the ticket or throwing in the way the slighest obstacle to its triumphant election. As much as we differ with Mr. Buchanan in regard to his policy upon the Lecompton Constitution, we are nevertheless a supporter of his administration upon every other measure, and if the presidential election were to occur again to-morrow we should as cheerfully vote for him as we did in 1856. We trust that friend Cookerly will not allow his zeal in his opposition to Lecompton to overcome his judgment. If he persists in his present course he will only give aid and comfort to the common enemy—Black Republicanism.

☞ It is now stated that since the discovery of the forged election returns (under Calhoun's wood-pile) that the Regent intends giving certificates to the free State candidates. But he still persists in refusing to make them out until Kansas is admitted under the Lecompton Constitution. A correspondent of a Southern paper, referring to this fact, says that the Senate Committee on Territories, notwithstanding, intend recommending the admission, as the question as to whether Kansas shall be a free or a slave State, is presumed will not influence Southern men in the way they shall vote on the question of admission.—Now, in the name of common sense, what other beauties are there in the Lecompton Constitution to enlist Southern votes, if it is not its ultra pro-slaveryism? The true state of the case is about this: Calhoun is holding out the idea that he intends to give certificates to the free State men, to calm down Northern opposition, and, at the same time, has a secret understanding with Southern men, that when the State is admitted, he will give certificates to the pro-slavery party, and thus defeat the will of the people. This is much more likely, than that Southern men are not influenced by the slavery question.

☞ The present winter has been the most singular for years. December and January were warm and spring-like. The present month is cold with excellent sleighing.

SINGULAR STATE OF PARTIES.—The wing of the Democratic party in New York, known as the "softs," who went off after Van Buren and the abolitionists in 1848, are now the supporters of the Lecompton Constitution; while the Hon. DANIEL S. DICKINSON, and the party then known as the "hards," who have always been the firmest and soundest of National Democrats, are advocating the other side of the question.

☞ It has always been a Democratic doctrine that all power, not *expressly* granted to any representative body, is reserved to the people. This maxim seems of late to have been reversed. The Lecomptonites contend that as the act of the Legislature which brought the Constitutional Convention of Kansas into being, did not *expressly provide* for the submission of the Constitution to the people, it was therefore not binding upon the Convention to submit their work to the popular approval.—Try this view of the question by the above quoted Democratic maxim, and see where you will land! We hold that it was the duty of the Convention to make provision for submitting the Constitution to the people, unless the law which created them expressly conferred upon them the power to make and put in force a Constitution independently of the people's will. It is true, the Legislature had no authority to do any such thing—but they certainly had more right to do it than the Convention had, for the Legislature created the Convention, and the creator is always superior to the thing created. The truth is, sovereign power resides alone with the people in a free country, and any attempt to deprive them of it, is not warranted by the genius of our institutions, and is the first step towards despotism.

INSURANCE.—We wish to call the attention of the community to the Statement in our paper of the Phœnix Insurance Company, for which our friend James Heaton is Agent. The Phœnix Insurance Company is one of the most reliable of the Hartford Companies, and has maintained a reputation of the highest character for its integrity, promptness and liberality in settling losses, and offers to the public undoubted security.

☞ We notice that the firm of Campbel, Galey & Harter have engaged the services of that clever gentleman, JESSEE W. CUMBERLAND. He will be found in the hardware department of their extensive establishment.

☞ Two "Democratic Committees"—one in New York and one in Boston—have passed resolutions endorsing 'Lecompton.' New York gave Fremont 80,126 majority and Massachusetts gave him 49,324 over Mr. Buchanan. These chaps in New York and New England are very forward in making "platforms" on which to place the Democracy of such states as Indiana, Illinois, New Jersey, and California, but when you ask them to help elect a democratic President they ain't about. Not they!

☞ Senator Brown thinks Douglas has left the Democratic party. It would be well to examine carefully if he has not carried off the platform and principles of the party. We don't see any thing of them amongst his opponents at Washington.—*Louisville Democrat.*

SCIENCE IN SALVATION.—It is said that in San Francisco the rites of baptism have been performed with the parties going into the water in India rubber suits.

THOS. L. HARRIS.—Major Harris of Illinois, whose resolution, referring the President's special Kansas message to a select committee of fifteen, was adopted by the House on Monday, was a gallant soldier in the Mexican war, is a gentleman of decided ability and eloquence, and has ever been a most ardent Democrat. He represents the Springfield district. It is amusing to hear the Washington Union call him a "renegade," because he insists that the people of Kansas shall be permitted to make their own constitution.—*Detroit Free Press.*

☞ The prostitution of immigrant girls at sea, by the officers and crews of our packet-ships, has become so frequent that the Commissioners of Emigration have been impelled to a thorough investigation of the subject. They find, after carefull examination, that since the establishment of steam communication with Europe, the number of cabin passengers in sailing ships has greatly diminished, and in proportion to this diminution, the Captains and officers of sailing ships, freed from restraint, have become more licentious and depraved.—It is now a matter of frequent occurrence for the master of a packet-ship to select from among his female passengers some unprotected girl, take her into his cabin, and by various artifices induce her to yield to his wishes. Following the example of their superior, the subordinate officers and crew do likewise; and thus it frequently happens that a score or more of young women, who went on board the ship with unblemished characters, are turned adrift when they arrived here, to meet a fate more dreadful than death itself.—*New York Tribune.*

A MAN OF MIXED TASTES.—Bayard Taylor in a recent letter to the New York *Tribune*, says: 'I wish it understood that I never set up for an ideal. Quite the contrary. My tastes are really of the realest kind, including rocking chairs, oysters, fast horses, Christy's Minstrels, lager bier, macaroni, Havana cigars, Flemish artists, sausages, salt-bathing, pickeled herrings; the raising of vegetables, New foundland dogs, camp fires, sailors, lumbermen, uneducated men, and sinners generally,

BERNHISSEL.—The Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia *Press*, says that Mr. Burnhissel, the Utah delegate, gives a flat contradiction to the rumor that he has made any proposition to the President, or anybody else, that the Mormons should be allowed peaceably to remove to some island in the Pacific. Even if the rumor were true, there is not an island in the Pacific ocean capable of occupancy, which is not covered by some sovereignty, which must be taken into consideration in this matter, before any action is taken by this Government, and it is hardly probably that other nations will care to have removed into their midst an evil which has given us a great deal of trouble.

☞ It is mentioned as a remarkable fact that the amount of paper money now in circulation issued by the banks of New York, is less than it was twenty years ago.