

THE WEEKLY REVIEW.



CRAWFORDSVILLE, IND.

Saturday, March 13, 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. PAVES, 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 157 SUBSCRIBERS.

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.
For Secretary of State, DANIEL MCLURE, 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.

RESIDENCE TO QUALIFY A VOTER.
The Statute regulating the qualifications of voters is very lame, in that the term to constitute a residence in a precinct is not defined. The Constitution is the governing law, of course; but that is too vague and general. We are satisfied that a great many citizens voted illegally from ignorance of the law, while the omission of the Statute has been taken advantage of by the Republicans for the perpetration of such frauds as are being re-exposed in Fountain county.

To make the matter worse, it has been held that a statute requiring a period of residence in a township, say for thirty days prior to an election, would be in conflict with the Constitution. Still there is law regulating the matter, and that everybody honestly desirous of maintaining the purity of the ballot-box may be duly posted, we propose next week to publish an extract from the recent decision of Judge Bryant in the case of Lighty vs. French. A clearer exposition of the law of residence can nowhere be found than in that very able opinion. And that it may be generally read and studied, and put into the hands of every judge of elections, we ask attention to it in advance.

NO CIRCUIT COURT.
The affairs of Montgomery county have been thrown into confusion by the detention of Judge Bryant in Fountain. Boarding houses in town have been well patronized by a Grand Jury and a Petit Jury, which is well enough, if the county treasury did not have to foot the bill. Clients and a cloud of witnesses have thronged our streets, and from the length of their contentances we judge they are seeing "the elephant." Seriously speaking, the bill of costs for this "default" of our Circuit Court would scare every tax-paying citizen. Whose fault is it? Not Judge Bryant's, who is discharging his duties well and patiently in Fountain. If the Republicans had not attempted their wicked frauds in the last election, we in Montgomery would not suffer as we now are; and if they will only quit their wholesale importation of illegal voters hereafter, we will guaranty the public everywhere from such loss, expense and confusion.

SIGNS.
The Lafayette Daily Argus, a Lecompton paper, has been discontinued for want of patronage.

The Laporte Times, another of the "same sort," has passed into the hands of Hon. JOHN C. WALKER, an anti-Lecompton man. Col. WALKER, will make the Times an able advocate of Popular Sovereignty.

Both these papers received the government mail-letting advertisement, which prolonged their Lecompton existence a few brief weeks. When the Treasury tent was taken from their mouths, they at once gave up the ghost. Peace to their ashes!

ARRIVAL OF SPRING AND SUMMER GOODS.—We notice that the firm of Campbell, Galey & Harter are receiving their stock of spring and summer goods. Their stock this year will be the largest ever brought to Crawfordsville.

It is amusing, just now, to hear the whine of the Lecompton papers against making Lecompton a test of party faith. But the beauty of the thing is, that while they are crying out against the new test, the President is removing every office-holder under him who is the least refractory, as to that measure.

Now is the time for the farmers to bring in their bacon. There is a great demand for the article.

HON. JESSE D. BRIGHT.
Wrote a letter to the late administration meeting in New York. In it he very plausibly says:
"The only value of such a principle as runs through the Kansas and Nebraska act, is its entire consistency and coherence. If violated, even remotely, its virtue is gone forever."

That sounds very anti-Lecompton; as much so, we think, as anything that has been said or written against the President's policy. "If violated, even remotely, its virtue is gone forever." Such language, while very true, would seem to commit Mr. Bright to Mr. Douglas; but reading the letter out, such an idea is speedily dispelled. Right away the Senator hurries to set up the old arguments in favor of Lecompton; failure of the majority to vote, and the power of the people to change the Constitution at any time after its establishment.

Let us look at these arguments a moment. The first one is that if a majority fails to vote, by usage and law in our country, it is bound by the minority that does vote. Mr. Bright states it in this wise:—"I plant myself upon the incontrovertible fact, that never in the history of this or any other country, where suffrage is known, has the neglect of the right to vote by ever so large a majority been considered as any ground of objection to a return made by a minority ever so small."

Notice how broad and unqualified is that language. Turn then and see how Mr. Buchanan stated the proposition. In his Lecompton Message he uses the following: "absentees are as much bound under the Constitution, where there is no fraud or violence, by the act of the majority of those who do vote, as if all had participated in the election."

Every one, by noticing the words we have italicized for the President, will at once see that there is a very material difference between the statements of the two. Mr. Bright makes no exception in case of fraud or violence; Mr. Buchanan does. The latter was not going to put himself in a position to be quoted by the Know-nothings as endorsing the bloody elections at Louisville, St. Louis, and Baltimore. He is too wise for that. Mr. Bright, we are sure, would be equally prompt to repudiate those lawless affairs; but his unguarded language subjects him to the dilemma we have denied for the President.

Mr. Bright when writing his letter, on the other hand, evidently tried to steer clear of a conclusion which the President either did not see or did not care for. The latter, by his language, admits, that if there was fraud or violence in the elections in Kansas by which delegates to the Convention were chosen, the majority would not be bound by the voting minority. Right there Mr. Douglas attacks him, and says and proves that the whole thing was a fraud and swindle; proving it, he gets the better of the President and his argument. To avoid this rock, we say, Mr. Bright scanned the President's language and adopted it with some nicety, but carefully left out the qualifications as to fraud and violence, in doing which he unwittingly ran headlong into Know Nothingism.

Our position on the point is this—we agree with Mr. Buchanan—if there was fraud or violence in the election for delegates to the Lecompton Convention, then the absentees were not bound by the majority. Advancing a step, we further agree with Mr. Douglas—there actually was fraud in the election; hence, by no possible reasoning, can that minority bind the non-voting majority.

So much for Mr. Bright's point; now for the next. Hear the Senator:—"I fully agree with you, gentlemen, when you say that the Constitution of Kansas, if displeasing to a majority of her people, can be changed within a brief period. At the pleasure of the power which made it, it can be unmade."

That sounds very fair. It is the compromise lately offered to mollify the anti-Lecomptonites in Congress; it is "the soft word" now being everywhere proclaimed by the Lecomptonites to lull the suspicion and alarm of the people at the attack upon the liberties of Kansas. Mr. Bright knows full well he dares not vote for Lecompton without holding out some way by which the great majority can rid themselves of it. The sagacity of his constituents would unerringly detect the despotism.

The proposition is seductive, but truthless. There is, also, a great fact in the connection which Northern men in this crisis should not overlook, and that is that Southern men repudiate the theory. We have given Mr. Bright's statement; adversely, take Mr. Keitt's opinion, which we clip from a telegraphic column as follows:

"Keitt, discussing the Constitutional power to admit new States, defined his views on political government contrary to some of his friends. He believed the people of Kansas could not change their Constitution prior to 1864.

Clements asked how Keitt reconciled that declaration with the expression in another part of the Lecompton Constitution, that the people have that power?
Keitt replied: That a general declaration in a bill of rights is like a preamble, and is restrained by the body of the bill."

Keitt is the man who lately ran his face against Grow's fist; Keitt is a representative Southern man; his opinion may be relied upon as that of the South. If Kansas should be admitted, and the free State men attempt to change the Constitution before 1864, they will be resisted. The whole South will cry, "Revolution, Revolution!" the Secessionists will accuse the North with interfering with slavery in a Slave State; the bitter feelings of the Sec-

tions will be more than ever aroused; the appeal to arms will be made; one side to put down revolution, the other to maintain it. The dogs of war will be loosed.

In such a controversy, what a dilemma would Northern men find themselves in? Without a doubt our sympathies would be with the outraged, down-trodden majority; but we would find ourselves sympathizing with revolutionists, and in that respect be thrown into wrong. In short, we cannot be humbugged by such a plea into the support of Lecompton, nor do we believe the mass of the Democracy can. Far from offering a point of compromise, it is in effect only strengthening the ultra South in the efforts it will make to maintain Slavery in Kansas. Let Mr. Bright resort to another ruse.

MINNESOTA.

In 1820, when Missouri asked admission into the Union, the objectors tied Maine to it, and declared one should not be admitted without the other. In 1850 the same policy was attempted with California.

The American people, since then, have time and again condemned such a proceeding as inequitable and unjust. All parties have united in that judgment. More than that, the Senate of the United States itself rejected the policy, by refusing to pass Mr. Clay's Omnibus Bill. Mr. Benton deserves a place in good men's memory for defeating that measure if for nothing else.

Once more a similar injustice is being perpetrated. Driven to resort to every thing likely to advance the project, Senator Mason and Green have declared that Minnesota shall not become a State unless Kansas is admitted at the same time with the Lecompton Constitution. A more shameless project was never conceived.

In another column we give the main letter of Gen. Shields. We ask for it a reading. It will open people's eyes to a fact which, as a Democrat, we are sorry to be compelled to admit and notice; viz.—that Mr. Buchanan has been guilty of gross partiality as between Minnesota and Kansas. Surely, respect for the people of Minnesota required him to at least recommend compliance with their petition. That he did not do; and the failure becomes more suspicious and noticeable when connected with a long, labored, and dangerous argument in favor of the prayer of the Lecomptonites of Kansas.

Look closely into this affair. Compare the circumstances attending the applications of the Territories. For Minnesota Congress passed an enabling Act; a convention was pursuant called; the Constitution framed was submitted to the people and ratified by an overwhelming majority; a State government was completely organized; forthwith two U. S. Senators—Shields and Rice—appeared in Washington, and demanded their seats; and against them was not one living protestant or plausible objection.

How is it with Kansas? For her there was no enabling act; one half of her counties were disfranchised in the election of delegates to the Lecompton Convention; the President promised the people an opportunity to reject the Constitution if should frame; so did the delegates; but they swindled the people by submitting it in such a way that no man could vote against it; the Legislature then gave the people the opportunity the Convention denied them; an election was held on the 4th day of January last, at which the swindle was voted down by a vote of over 10,000 to 262. Forthwith application was made for admission into the Union. Against her Constitution is a protesting majority of ten thousand citizens. Against her admission under such circumstances stands the North almost undivided. Yet she is set side by side with Minnesota, and her admission made the condition for the admission of the latter.

As a Democrat we protest against an injustice so totally without apology as the U. S. Senate committed when it refused the demand of Gen. Shields. Minnesota is entitled to take her place among the States. She is a State de facto. Bright and Fitch, as we understand, voted against her, and in so doing they misrepresented Indiana.

Yesterday spring made a fair commencement with its cloudless sky and bright warm sun. During the day millions of wild pigeons passed over our town on their journey northward.

Cox & Co. are now receiving a splendid stock of groceries.

Among the cases disposed of by Judge Naylor, who is at present officiating in the absence of Judge Bryant, was the granting of a divorce in favor of John W. Pead.

HEALTH OF JEFFERSON DAVIS.—A Washington despatch of the 6th says:

His physicians think that Mr. Jefferson Davis can hardly resume active duty before two months hence. He is now confined to a dark room under a severe regimen.

The Legislature of Texas is a remarkable body, and its labors without a parallel. They have a large amount of business on hand, and for sometime have been holding three sessions a day—forenoon, afternoon and night. To these they have added a fourth, a session before breakfast. The Austin Gazette says the House now meets at 4 o'clock A. M., and goes to work.

An exchange paper tells of a parson who preached his sermon with, "My friends let us say a few words before we begin." This is about equal to the chap who took a short nap before going to sleep.

For the Review.
AN IMPOSITION.—It has long been the habit of that class of spavined, purse-brokers, who always infest the "Star City," to come here with the remnants of some "Peter Funk" Stock, for the purpose of swindling our people. We say kick them out of community! Let them get their goods where their interests are—where they get their bills printed. Their 'head-quarters' seem to be at the Auction Room.—Journal.

Simply because we did not bribe the puppy editor of the Journal by a small job of printing, and for no other cause or provocation, his puppyship publishes the above insinuation against us, who are resident merchants—citizen tax-payers of the State of Indiana—and transacting a lawful business in a lawful business house in this place. Now we distinctly say to his dogship, that he is a LIAR, and a sycophantic poltroon.—We are not "Peter Funk" Auctioneers, nor swindlers, but doing a legitimate business, sanctioned by the laws of the land. The terms of our sales are too plain and unmistakable to be misunderstood, i. e., That if articles sold are not, on examination, what they are represented, or even if the purchaser was deceived in his own judgment in regard to the article bought, he should have the privilege of returning it and getting his money back—the sale not being binding without the purchaser was fully satisfied he was getting a bargain.

We are sorry that such a contemptible sheet should be tolerated in the enlightened town of Crawfordsville—one that stands pre-eminent in education, enterprise and morality—and we hope to see that liberal party to whom his cringing puppyship is indebted for his bread and butter kick him out of the community, and replace him with a high-minded, liberal journalist.
DODD & CO., Auctioneers.

MARRIAGES OF ENGLISH PRINCESSES GENERALLY UNHAPPY.

"Give me neither riches nor poverty," said a wise and good man. The unfortunate character of the marriages of most princesses, the very persons who might be supposed to have the greatest chances of happiness, is one out of many proofs of the deep knowledge of life embodied in that saying.

Especially have English Princesses, as we are reminded by the late marriage of the Princess Royal, been unlucky in their matrimonial connections. More particularly is this true of the Princesses of the House of Hanover. To go back to Sophia daughter of George the First, who married the first William Frederick of Prussia, she, poor thing, was almost daily beaten by her husband, a man whose brutality amounted almost to insanity. Once she was nearly killed by him, with her daughter; and often was in imminent fear for her life. He denied her, sometimes, even the common necessities of life. She used to say, sarcastically, in her old age, that the only kind words he ever addressed to her were: "Sophia, get up and see me die."

The eldest daughter of George the Second made a match only less unhappy. She was twenty-four before she married at all; and then had to take the deformed Prince of Orange, because he was the only Protestant Prince in Europe of suitable rank. Her father expostulated with her on the inhumanity of her proposed bridegroom. "Were he a Dutch baboon," she answered, tired out with his position at home, "I would marry him." It was the custom of that coarse age for the bride and groom, on the nuptial evening, to sit up in bed, in costly night-dresses, to receive the compliments of their friends. On this occasion, as the royal family and nobility dined past the Prince and Princess, who were magnificent in lace and silver, the Queen, the bride's own mother, declared that when she looked at the bridegroom from behind he seemed to have no head, and when she looked at him in front, she could not, for the life of her, tell where his legs were. Walpole or Henry, we forget which, records the anecdote. The Princess lived to regret her maiden condition at her father's court, even with all the neglect that attended it.

Another daughter of George the Second married the Landgrave of Hesse, the same who afterwards sold his soldiers to England in order to assist in conquering the colonies. He was so brutal that his wife, at last, had to desert him and seek refuge in her native country. A third married the King of Denmark, who abused her shamefully, openly insulting her in the presence of an unprincipled woman, who shared what he had of affection. She died partly of a broken heart, partly of a cruel disease, at the early age of twenty-seven. The melancholy story of the Princess Charlotte, only child of George the Fourth, is of so long a date, that it is familiar to all. Her marriage, however, was unfortunate only in its early and fatal termination; for while she lived, the conduct of her husband, we believe, was blameless.

Not as a Princess, but as a young and innocent girl, of whom every one speaks well, the new bride ought to have the best wishes of every one, at least those of her own sex, in favor of a happier lot than fell to her predecessors. In every respect, however, Prussian marriages have been unfortunate for both English and Prussian Princesses. The gloomy day on which the bride left London, for it was snowing heavily, has been cited as a bad omen.—But the belief in omens, luckily, is past.

The Augusta (Me.) Age, a Democratic paper of great influence, has taken high ground against forcing Lecompton upon the people of Kansas. Hear it:

Now, what we desire to say is: if the establishment of popular sovereignty in 1854, a measure admitted by almost everybody to have been right in principle—brought the Democracy from its height of strength and power down to the very verge of political ruin, how much less disastrous will be the results of the overthrow of that policy at this time—which is generally conceded to be wrong in principle—when political parties are so evenly balanced as now? Should the Democracy lose by Lecompton one-half, or even one-eighth of the strength it lost by the Nebraska act, its defeat in 1860 is inevitable. But should it suffer in the same ratio now as it did then, that defeat would be overwhelming.

FROM WASHINGTON.
Correspondence of the New Albany Ledger.

WASHINGTON, March 1, 1858.
It is now understood that the Kansas admission bill is to be this morning taken up in the Senate, and passed through to a vote as early as a day as possible. Minnesota and Oregon must stand aside and wait impatiently, outside of the Union, until the door has been opened and Kansas dragged in by the hair of the head. Ah! it is not a pitiable sight to see struggling Senators in the strong grasp of Southern Senators, assisted by a few Northern Democrats, bound hand and foot, dragged along at the mercy of her despots? But it suits the South, and this violence must be committed. But all this time, while the unnatural struggle is going on, those other two sisters—orderly, chaste, well-disposed sisters—clothed in all the proper wedding garments, ready for the solemnization of the banns of union, must stand back and wait until the wedding ring is forced upon Miss Kansas. What is more, every Democrat who will not stand by, applaud, and assist in this act of tyranny is to be read out of the party.

This thing of a few office holders and pensioned newspaper editors arrogating to themselves all the democracy of the land, denouncing all who may not be able to agree with the President in his present Kansas policy as "renegades," "apostates," "Black Republicans," "Abolitionists," &c., and proceeding formally to "read them out" of the Democratic party, is to supremely ridiculous to excite any other feeling than that of contempt. Their arrogance is only exceeded by their impotence. If the Democratic party belonged to these would-be leaders, God knows, it would be an honor to be "read out," and the sooner the better. But it is a fortunate circumstance, connected with this question, that their power is not equal to their arrogance and pretensions, and instead of their being the Democratic party, they are nothing but its pensioned lackeys, the camp followers who feed and fatten upon the public plunder which is left scattered in its rear as it marches on to new victories and triumphs. Bah! The idea of these men constituting themselves the Democratic party makes me sick.

They read men out of the party? We have no privileged classes; no consorships; no high priests; no Lord Dictators, in the Democratic party; every man stands the peer of his fellow Democrat; the highest and the lowest in position in its ranks are equal before the law of our union and common brotherhood. The one can no more dictate new terms or impose new tests of faith upon his brothers than the other.—The humblest Democrat in the land has as much right to impose a new test of Democratic fidelity upon the party as has the President of the United States. They both stand alike, the one the peer of the other, upon a perfect equality of privileges and franchises, and must stand or fall as they have squared their political lives by that standard of Democratic faith, the fundamental law of the great National Democratic party, the embodied wisdom of the unthought masses, the Cincinnati Platform.

The people made that platform for their servants to stand upon, and by which to square their political conduct—not the office holders, for the people to stand upon, and no office holder has any right to add a new plank to or remove a single board from the structure; but it must remain as it is, and those who think it too broad or too narrow for their convenience, must accommodate themselves to it, as its makers left it, or get off of it; and there is nothing to hinder or prevent "all the world and the rest of mankind," if they should fall in love with its beauty and harmony and its universal adaptation to the wants and necessities of our Government and the perpetuity of the Union, from getting on it. It is the fundamental political basis of Democratic Liberty. It is the "law and the gospel" of our Democratic faith, upon which all are alike amenable before the assembled sovereigns who made it. Talk about the Lecompton fraud, being made a test of Democracy, and all who cannot be tested of Democracy, and who cannot be made to fall down and worship the beast made to be communicated from our politician church! Where is the sentence, line, or syllable in the law to justify so monstrous an assumption of power? "I appeal from Atrippa unto Cesar." Show me the law, or stand forth convicted of a fraudulent usurpation of power. I find there the authority for admitting Kansas when she shall present herself with a constitution embodying the will of the people, "legally and fairly expressed," but there is nothing there that commits the Democracy of the land to the wholesale frauds and villainies which have been perpetrated there under the sacred name of law. The Lecompton constitution is not the "legally and fairly expressed" will of the people of Kansas, and the National Democracy of the land are in no wise responsible for it; nor can Mr. President Buchanan make them so. Those who think as he does have that right, and are individually and personally responsible before the country when the people come to make up the great assizes of public opinion at our annual election, and so are those who may choose to think differently. Before this tribunal the President and his Lecompton followers, and those who spurn the foul thing, must be tried, in an issue is to be forced upon the latter by the former; for I feel sure that nothing but absolute necessity—nothing short of that first law of nature, self-preservation—will ever drive those of the Democratic party who oppose Lecompton into a political antagonism; so that the preservation of the Democratic party in its harmony and strength, or its disrapture, ruin, and defeat, is in the hands of the Administration party, and with them rests the responsibility. If they are willing to stand to our ancient faith in all its length and breadth, "agreeing to disagree" upon this question of only temporary importance and of doubtful expediency at best, all in the future will be well; if all who can't swallow John Calhoun and his infamous frauds are to be denounced, proscribed, and forced in self-defense to organize and stand to their arms, I for one, am ready for the contest; and then, I say,

"Lay on, Macduff,
And damn'd be he who first cries 'Hold enough!'"
Things are drifting to a dangerous pass; we have fallen upon evil times. Danger is lurking at the very threshold of the temple of our Liberty, and the abhorrent question is forced upon us, in the strong language of Gov. Walker to the chairman of the Indiana committee, "Is this the eighty-second year of our Independence, or is it the first year of American Monarchy, that is now dawning upon us?"

Let the people look to it, and all may yet be well.

Tuesday Morning, March 2.
The above letter I had prepared for yesterday's mail, but by some inadvertence it was not taken to the office; I avail myself of the opportunity to add a few lines by way of postscript.

As was anticipated, the Kansas bill was taken up in the Senate yesterday. Mr. Green, the chairman of the Committee, made the opening speech. He advanced no new arguments, but assumed the position taken in his report, relying upon that to sustain the action of the committee. During the course of his remarks he alleged that the reason why so many of the federal officers of Kansas are in this city is that they are here to escape the assassin's knife in Kansas—that their lives, while there, are in danger. It is more likely they are here to evade legal process, under charges of fraud, perjury, and rascality generally. But suppose that they are fugitives from an insulted and greatly incensed people, whose rights they have, without scruple trampled upon, what chance would these men have in the hands of the people under the double aggravation of the last act of the drama, and the most infamous of all, of being forced into the Union under a constitution abhorrent in itself, but doubly abhorrent because forced upon them. I wouldn't give much for their chances of a peaceful and quiet death.—Mr. Collamer continued the debate, but before he had concluded, he gave way to a motion to adjourn. It may be of interest to add that Mr. Green stated that at the proper time he intended to move an amendment to the bill so as to attach Minnesota thereto, and thus link their destinies together.

MILITARY ARDOR OF THE CALIFORNIANS.

The hard-fisted miners of California are extremely desirous of assisting Uncle Sam in his operations against the Mormons, and several volunteer companies have been partially organized for the purpose of offering their services to the government.—The intelligence of the burning of the supply trains by the Mormons created much excitement among the "roughs" and some of them wanted to post right off to Salt Lake on their own hook. In illustration of this spirit, the San Francisco Globe relates the following laughable incident:

"Immediately upon the reception of the news, a tall but rather handsome specimen of the far West backwoodsman, completely boiled over with military ardor, he moved about with restless spirit, making inquiries at every step concerning the whereabouts of the proper person to apply to for a commission, and was finally informed that Gen. Clark was the man he was seeking. Fortunately, however, for the General, he could not be found, and our patriotic friend was subsequently compelled to make known his business to the first pair of epaulets that crossed his path. This happened to be Lieut.—of the French man-of-war now in our harbor.—He had dressed himself to the top of his rank, for the purpose of being presented at a little re-union, and was moving quite majestically along Montgomery street, when he was accosted by the Mormon-killing individual with—

"Kumel, my name's Jinks, and I'm death on Mormons—I am. You kin bet them things up thar (pointing to the epaulets) that I'm one of 'em."
The officer drew back in amazement. He was for a moment puzzled how to act; but his good sense prevailed, he maintained a pleasant countenance and appeared anxious to learn more. He gave his ear, but said nothing. The gentleman from Pike, all anxiety, continued.

"Come, old hoss, don't throw a feller off cause you're dressed in regimentals. You suit me, you do, and I tell you I'm one of 'em."
The French officer politely asked what was desired of him.

"Well, Kumel," resumed our hero "all I want is an affidavit and a few muskets to go and take them tarred Salt Lake critters. I kin do it quicker than a hungry nigger kin swallow a slice of fat bacon."

By this time the conversation had drawn together quite a crowd. The member from Pike, however, had the floor on the Mormon trouble, and was pouring his wrath upon them thick and fast, when he was interrupted by a gentleman who informed him in relation to his mistake with the French officer.

"Death and destruction!" he exclaimed, "It's just my luck. Uncle Sam is always hard to find in these Mormon wars. I couldn't find him when we cleared 'em out of Missouri and Illinois." Then pulling his cap down over his eyes, and added, or rather shouted, "Never mind, Kumel, no harm done, I reckon. But I'm bound to circulate among them Mormons in this fight as sure as the Jinks family lives!"

Saying which he pushed himself as deeply as possible into his "brogans" and walked off.

The French officer enjoyed the joke as much as any present, and is doubtless impressed more than ever with the truth of our remark; that ours is a great people in a time of war.

WASHINGTON TERRITORY—A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE AND MAKE MONEY.—We find in the last number of the Carthage Republican a letter from J. C. Head, (a brother of David E. Head, Esq.) dated Olympia, Washington Territory, Dec. 4th, 1857, from which we take the following interesting extract:

If I had my health, I could make money here with but little trouble. It is an easy country to make money in. If your debt is paid off this winter, it will average five thousand dollars to the head of every family in the Territory. Now, while I am in my office, there are some six or eight Indians barefooted and half-naked, bothering me to buy oysters from them; they wear no shoes here in winter; they take things in general as nature made them. When they kill a deer, duck or fish, or take a basket of oysters or clams they make a fire on the spot and eat it—no particular place to cook, nor do they have anything to cook in. They use a stick for broiling, frying and boiling; and when night overtakes them, all right. They are great lovers of money; the price for their labor is one dollar per day, and they will starve five days before they will work for less; 25 cents for each salmon, and they destroy and throw away hundreds before they will take a cent less. You may feed them and use them well, give them clothes, &c., and if you ask the smallest favor of them, you must pay for it before they move a peg. I have often kicked blazes out of them.

[From the Bardonia Gazette.]
A VOICE FROM A KENTUCKY DEMOCRAT.

The following letter is from a prominent Democrat of an adjoining county, a gentleman who was more than once entrusted with office by his party before he eschewed politics and devoted himself exclusively to his profession. In publishing his letter we do not, of course, mean to endorse his views. Any good Democrat can be heard through our columns, whether he agrees with or dissents from our own individual notions.

DEAR MAC—I have just read your paper of the 20th, and there is so much good common sense (a rare article now-a-days) in the communication signed "N." I cannot refrain from tendering him, whoever he may be, through you, the gratification I feel at knowing every person in the South is not crazy.

"N." expresses my sentiments exactly. He does it calmly, wisely, and gentlemanly. No ridiculous and contemptible threats to read out of the party, all who may differ with him.

Let the friends of the administration attempt reading out of the party those who will not bow down and worship the Lecompton swindle, and they had as well burn. If Lecompton has become the test of Democracy, the party is dead sure enough. I am opposed to such a test. Let us differ if necessary, and do so without quarreling or fighting. Douglas is right, as sure as the sun shines. Harney is right and Wise is right, and so is N. The South seems mad. Pass Lecompton, and all faith in Southern honor in the North is destroyed. Read Douglas & Co out of the party, and we are as much sectionalized as was Sam in '56.

But, say the Lecomptonites, Douglas is acting with the Black Republicans! Demolishing logic! Black Republicans eat good dinners; ergo, Douglas must confine himself to sawdust pudding or he is not a good Democrat. Freeholders drink good wine; ergo, poor Douglas & Co. must confine themselves to cistern water, or they excite suspicion. Pshaw! for such sophistry, and pshaw! for the asses that use it. Let us stand by the right, whether the Black Republicans are for or against it. We are pledged by our platform, by our solemn promise to the North, to leave this cursed question of slavery to the people of the Territory—this, as well as all others.

An overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas are opposed to the Lecompton Constitution. Then, as a Democrat, I am opposed to it—opposed to forcing it upon a protesting people—even if they are free sollers.

One word by way of prophecy. Pass Lecompton and not insult Douglas & Co., and we may survive. Pass Lecompton and ostracize Douglas & Co., and the Democratic party is broken down; and when it perishes, our glorious Union perishes too.

But I did not set down to bore you, or to write one word for publication; I just wanted to tell you to say to "N," whoever he may be, he is the right kind of a Democrat; that if such counsels as his were more prevalent, it would be much better for our country.

Most truly, your friend,

A DOUGLAS OPINION ON THE CHANCES OF LECOMPTON.

A Washington letter in the Chicago Times the home organ of Senator Douglas, has this significant paragraph in regard to the Lecompton scheme:

Flippant letter-writers and journalists whose pens are employed in the interests of Lecompton, keep asserting that the admission of Kansas under the unsubmitted Constitution is a fixed fact, a thing already as good as accomplished, that the Administration can and will press it through Congress immediately. Let not the public be humbugged by these assertions. Winter will close, and Spring will come and go, and Summer too, for that matter, before the abolition will have passed over the Senate. The opposition will dispute every inch of ground. The debate will be the most scorching which ever took place in Congress. I predict that before it is closed the most violent Lecomptonist will be ready and willing to withdraw from the conflict. The issue which will be presented to the American people will awaken the popular indignation to a height which will make it uncomfortable to face.

The Lecomptonites held a meeting in New York on Thursday night. The President was Gen. John A. Dix, the Barnburner candidate for Governor of New York in 1848; and the principal speakers were John Van Buren, and John Cochrane, the two most active Wilmot Proviso, Free Soil orators in favor of the election of Martin Van Buren to the Presidency in 1848, against Gen. Cass. These Van Buren abolitionists are now engaged in the gracious business of reading Douglas, Bancroft, Walker, Stanton, Forney, and other old and long tried National Democrats out of the party. The Democracy of Indiana are willing to accept no such leaders. Let them remain in the ranks till the abolition taint is removed from their garments.

AN ACTIVE OLD GENERAL.—It is said that Sir. Colin Campbell, in twenty-one days, traveled 900 miles; forced an entrance into a city defended by 60,000 fighting men, relieved a garrison besieged for five months, withdrew 900 women and children in the face of an overwhelming force, relieved his detachment at Cawnpore, twice defeated an enemy three times his own strength, and finally stripped them of every vestige of artillery.

RATS.—When a house is infested by rats which refuse to nibble at toasted cheese and the usual baits, few drops of the highly-scented oil of rhodium, poured on the bottom of a cage-trap, will almost invariably attract it full of the "mischievous rodents" before morning. We have known this to be tried with most extraordinary success.

Senator BRODERICK says, that of 120 papers published in California, 111 oppose Lecompton, and the nine that favor that measure subsist on patronage.

A girl living in service in Cleveland, gave birth to four children at one pop the other day, pretty much of an achievement—as she wasn't married.

Most of our farmers have made extensive preparations for sugar making.