

THE EAGLE

H. L. PHILLIPS, EDITORS & PROPRIETORS.
W. G. SPENCER,

DECATUR, INDIANA.

FRIDAY MORNING, APRIL 9, 1858.

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
DANIEL MCCLURE,
of Morgan.

AUDITOR OF STATE,
JOHN W. DODD,
of Grant.

TREASURER OF STATE,
NATHANIEL F. CUNNINGHAM,
of Vigo.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
SAMUEL L. RUGG,
of Allen.

ATTORNEY GENERAL,
JOSEPH E. McDONALD,
of Montgomery,

FOR SUPREME JUDGES,
SAMUEL E. PERKINS,
of Marion.

ANDREW DAVISON,
of Decatur.

JAMES M. HANNA,
of Vigo.

JAMES L. WORDEN,
of Whitley.

LeCompton Defeated in the House.

The Senate bill providing for the admission of Kansas into the Union, as a sovereign State, under the Constitution which was framed at LeCompton, has failed as was expected, in the House of Representatives.

An amendment similar to the one offered by Mr. Crittenden in Senate, passed the House by a decided vote of 120 to 112, and then the bill, as amended, passed by the same vote, and was immediately sent to the Senate for their concurrence.

The probability is, the Senate will reject the amendment, and will adhere to the original bill; and the House with equal certainty, will refuse to recede, and a Committee of conference will necessarily have to be appointed by both branches of Congress, and unless a compromise can be effected, which will be satisfactory to the Democratic party, Kansas will be refused admission during the present session.

The main feature of the amendment is contained in the following section:

"That the State of Kansas be and is hereby admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; but in as much as it is greatly disputed whether the constitution with which Kansas is now admitted was fairly made, or expresses the will of the people of Kansas, this admission of her into the Union as a State is hereby declared to be upon this fundamental condition, precedent, namely: that the said constitutional instrument shall be first submitted to a vote of the people of Kansas and assented to by them or a majority of the voters at an election to be held for the purpose; and as soon as such assent shall be given and duly made known to the President of the United States, he shall announce the same by proclamation, and thereafter and without any further proceedings on the part of Congress the admission of the said State of Kansas into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever shall be complete and absolute. At the said election the voting shall be by ballot, and by indorsing on his ballot, as each voter may please, 'for the constitution,' or 'against the constitution.' Should the said constitution be rejected at the said election by a majority of votes being cast against it, then, and in that event, the inhabitants of said Territory are hereby authorized and empowered to form for themselves a constitution and State government by the name of the State of Kansas, preparatory to its admission into the Union according to the Federal Constitution, and so that end may elect delegates to a convention as hereinafter provided."

It will be seen by reference to the proceedings of Congress, as published to-day that Messrs. Davis, English, and Foley voted for the amendment, whilst Messrs. Higgs, Gregg and Niblick voted against it.

County Nominations.

The Primary Election for the purpose of selecting the several candidates to be placed on the Democratic ticket for the ensuing fall election, went off on Monday last; the election was warmly contested by the friends of the several candidates, but notwithstanding the spirited contest all things was amicably adjusted to the satisfaction of the Democracy, and they will unite as one man in sustaining the nominations made by them on that day. This is as it should be, Democrats may differ, but should never divide.

Kirkland, French and Hartford townships are to hear from, but we think there will be no material change. The following is the result as far as heard from: Jonathan Kelly, Sen., Representative 87; David Showers, Treasurer, 110; W. J. Adelsperger, Recorder, 278; George Frank, Sheriff, 141; R. Miller, Commissioner, 43.

The above are the majorities.

True Eloquence.

Rufus Choate has recently delivered an oration in Boston on the character of Jefferson, Hamilton and Burr. Of Mr. Jefferson he said:

The great and learned man had some specialty by which he moved the people, yet were they all centred in one clarion cry, which animated the age of the Declaration of Independence—by which the whole rising people spoke out their full heart, their long yearning to be free. The specialties of eloquence and wisdom of James Otis, John Adams, Hawley, Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams and Washington, were all embodied in that Declaration. Yet we cannot criticise it. Understand it, interpret it, love it we can, but criticise it we cannot. I hold it for expression almost unrivaled by the productions of uninspired men. I would not add to it if I could, or take from it by a single word. I would not pitch it on a tune higher or a tune lower. I would not alter it, if I might, in argument, exceptation, epithet. On the morning of every Fourth of July, it should be read and meditated anew, as the wisest expression of our wisest men, speaking for Congress, speaking for man, speaking for America in her sublimest moments.

The eloquent orator thus concludes:

Where now would these three men stand in these crises, which are thought to have come upon us, if they were alive? How do they look upon them and upon us, if they descend from their homes of light, and calm, and love? That Farewell Address of Washington—how would it appear if its counsels and expostulations were made to-day?

Their counsel would be: "The Union—it must be and shall be preserved, just as we left it to you." To them these strifes of party, these debates about LeCompton and Topeka, this array of South against North, and East against West, this fanaticism for freedom, and this fanaticism against freedom, seem now as the shadow that passes, as the ripple upon the depths unsounded and sunless, as the small disturbance and perturbation that cannot change the course or hasten the doom of stars. They, all three of them, stand together and rejoice to see our true civilization, our better liberty, our people, boundless as the waves, one as the sea, one sun, rising, yet going forth as a bridegroom from his chamber, as a strong man beginning only to run his race.

The Alleged Murder of Five Americans.

The Placerville, (Cal.) Index publishes as from a correspondent in Mariposa, the following information touching the recent murder of five American citizens by the Mormons, as to which alleged event various accounts have already appeared in our columns:

"The party of American citizens recently murdered by the Mormons were from Mariposa county. They were much respected, had many friends in this vicinity, and were useful and worthy members of society. The names of two of the party, brothers, are John and Thos. Aiken. They were formerly from Texas. A Mr. Eichard, another of the party, once kept a livery stable at Agua Fria, a few miles distant from this place. Honesty Jones, still another of the party, was constable of this township in 1854-5. All of them had means, (one of the Aikens \$7,000,) the accumulations of years of sweat and honest toil. They left here about the first of October last, as they stated, for the purpose of buying cattle for the California market, or if they found prospects unfavorable, with the intention of applying for a contract to furnish Col. Johnson command with beef and other supplies.—

Failing in this they designed proceeding to the States. Letters from some of the party were received here about a month since, stating they had been arrested, robbed and were then confined by the Mormons, ostensibly on the allegation of being spies of the Federal Government, but likely upon the real ground of the crime of having money; and doubtless they were afterwards murdered upon the principle that "dead men tell no tales." A general indignation prevails here at this flagitious outrage, and especially at the manner of the assassination of the two survivors of the Indian (!) attack after they had fled for refuge into the Salt Lake settlement.

The Turk Getting His Eye-Teeth Cut.

The Turkish Admiral, now a guest in Washington, is getting his eye teeth cut. He had not been in town a day till, as it has been before stated, his room was entered and one of his trunks robbed of \$2,000 in gold, and the jeweled decorations of honor of the Pacha. But the worst trick upon him is thus told by the States of the 17th inst:

"He will, of course, be lionized by the men, admired by the women, and treated with distinguished consideration by the officers of Government. These courtesies and attentions he will bear hence with feelings of gratitude and happy remembrance; but certain other acts he will look upon with contempt and disgust. It is reported that, since his arrival in this country, on a certain occasion, a lady was admiring an elegant cashmere shawl worn by the Admiral. He gallantly took it from his shoulders and laid it upon her own, to witness its effect, or perhaps momentarily to gratify her vanity. The shawl was a magnificent one, costing \$4,000 or \$5,000. Imagine the surprise of the Admiral, when she blushingly courtesied to him, and moved gracefully off with the coveted shawl as—a present.

Report of Hon. T. L. Harris.

The views of the minority of the select investigating committee of the House are presented in a lengthy paper by Hon. T. L. Harris, of Illinois. We shall endeavor to convey a succinct analysis of it. The majority of the select committee, which was very unfairly selected, adopted a report, based not on facts, but on speculations, and delivering sharp criticisms upon distinguished men, rather than sound reasons for the admission of the LeCompton measure. At this majority did not seek reliable information, they prevented the minority from having it also; so the latter have been obliged to follow the example of the former, and give their own views, rather than authentic data collected by the committee. It is held that this is the first time any President of the United States has taken sides for or against the action of Congress in regard to the admission of a State.

There is ample evidence to show that since October last the people of Kansas are in complete harmony with the Territorial government. If there has been any hostility to it, it has been on the part of the LeComptonites. It is true that the people protest against the LeCompton constitution, by vote and otherwise; but this is not rebellion, as no attempt has yet been made to enforce LeCompton.

The organic act did not provide that Kansas should come into the Union whenever the people desired. If it did, Kansas is a State now, and our differences are without foundation. The President says the organic law recognized the right of the people of the Territory, without any enabling act from Congress, to form a State constitution. This, in his opinion, was too clear for argument.

The report differs with him. It says, if the President be correct, why is not Kansas in the Union as a State?

The members of the LeCompton constitution did not consider they had a right to form a State without the assent of Congress, for that instrument denies to itself any validity or force until the State shall be admitted by Congress.

Certain clauses show that the Convention claimed no right to exercise any power as a State, but having framed their constitution, they sent it to Congress as a petition, and they now ask us to recognize that constitution as creating a State, by the admission of such State into the Union.

* * * * *

Touching the question of population and the rights based upon it, the report gets the following figures together:

Under the law of February 17, 1857, to take a census, there were 9,251 registered voters.

The census was completely taken but in twelve of the thirty-four counties, leaving twenty-two in which no census was taken. In the twelve counties there were 25,321 inhabitants.

In the same counties there were found and registered 7,854 votes. Thus the ratio of voters to the whole population would be one to three and twenty two hundredths.

The returns of the October election for delegate to Congress, show there were polled in the counties not registered 1,693 votes, which, on the ratio above ascertained, would give for their population 1,451 inhabitants, the vote and the population being about one-seventh of that of the entire Territory, while eight of the thirty-four counties returned no votes at the October election, and are left out of the estimate. This number of unregistered votes would have been entitled to at least nine delegates in the Convention. The total vote of the Territory for Congress in October last was 11,687, and the total vote for Governor in January last was 13,420, from which at least 3,000 illegal votes should be deducted; but, considering the entire vote as legal, we shall then have, upon the ratio above ascertained, taking the October election as the basis, 37,400, and taking the entire January vote as the basis, 42,945 as the whole population of the Territory. It would be necessary to make every allowance, that 45,000 is as large a number as can possibly be claimed by any one upon any basis of estimate.

With these facts before them, it is unaccountable that the committee should refuse to consider the subject of population.

They say that it is one of the usual subjects of inquiry. Why, then, not consider it now?

The report goes over the usual ground on the facts known. It believes with us that the election of January 4, 1858, was legal. But whether ordered to be held by Secretary Cass, or recognized by the President and the majority of the select committee, the vote at that election was a just vote, and expressive of the will of the people. The only difference between the majority committee and the President is that the former thought the vote came too late, and the latter that it ought not to come at all.

Messrs. Harris and Adriant hold that we are under no obligation to admit Kansas. Twenty-five hundred persons in

Kansas ask us to do it; ten thousand petition us not to do it. The doctrine of the committee is, that the twenty-five hundred obeyed, and the ten thousand slapped the face and told to 'begone;

that Congress recognises the doctrine of popular sovereignty, and therefore the minority must rule.

It is even urged by some parties in Congress that minorities ought to rule and make constitutions.

It will thus be seen the ground on which Messrs. Harris and Adriant are op-

posed to LeComptonism, and claim for the fraud a thorough investigation, such as they have not been able to get, but such as is more than sufficient to warrant all State rights men in opposing it.

With these facts before them, it is un-

accountable that the committee should refuse to consider the subject of population.

They say that it is one of the usual sub-

jects of inquiry. Why, then, not consider it now?

The report goes over the usual ground on the facts known. It believes with us

that the election of January 4, 1858, was legal. But whether ordered to be held by

Secretary Cass, or recognized by the President and the majority of the select committee, the vote at that election was a just vote, and expressive of the will of the people. The only difference between the majority committee and the President is that the former thought the vote came too late, and the latter that it ought not to come at all.

Messrs. Harris and Adriant hold that we are under no obligation to admit Kansas. Twenty-five hundred persons in

Kansas ask us to do it; ten thousand petition us not to do it. The doctrine of the committee is, that the twenty-five hundred obeyed, and the ten thousand slapped the face and told to 'begone;

that Congress recognises the doctrine of popular sovereignty, and therefore the minority must rule.

It is even urged by some parties in Congress that minorities ought to rule and make constitutions.

It will thus be seen the ground on

which Messrs. Harris and Adriant are op-

posed to LeComptonism, and claim for the fraud a thorough investigation, such as they have not been able to get, but such as is more than sufficient to warrant all State rights men in opposing it.

Congressional News.

WASHINGTON, April 1.

SENATE.—Business unimportant.

The Army bill was debated at great length, and finally passed—yeas 41, nays 31.

The Kansas bill as amended by the House was brought up.

Mr. Green moved that the amendment be disagreed to.

The Senate having previously resolved to adjourn till Monday, rescinded the resolution, and will vote on the bill to-morrow. Adjourned.

House.—Mr. Niblick, of Indiana, favored the admission of Kansas under the LeCompton Constitution.

Mr. Ward, of New York, expressed similar views.

Mr. Groesbeck, of Ohio, said he would not vote for the Senate bill. He maintained that the Constitution, under its own provisions, could not be changed till 1864 without a revolution. The instrument does not express the popular will of the people. Congress should now authorize proceedings toward the formation of a proper Constitution.

Mr. Marshall, of Illinois, looked upon those who framed the LeCompton Constitution as conspirators. He would never vote to sanction such a fraud and gross outrage upon the rights of the people. He condemned the attempts to ostracize and brand as traitors and rebels those who will not bow their knee to power and lick the hand raised to whip them into submission. He had a higher respect for the President, but he was not a Spaniard. He would speak and act as a representative of a free people should; as one who owes nothing to the President or his Cabinet.

Mr. Hughes, of Indiana,—"Who has made attempts to read men out of the Democratic party?"

Mr. Marshall—"It is done notoriously by the present Administration, and it is known throughout the country that the term of office depends entirely upon whether a man can compel his conscience and judgement to sanction this thing or not.

Mr. Hughes—"Have you ever been excluded from a Democratic caucus?"

Mr. Marshall—"It so happens that a Congressional caucus has no power to read men out of the party."

Mr. Lawrence, of Ohio—"Does the gentleman from Ill., know how soon after tomorrow he will be excluded from the Democratic caucus?"

Mr. Marshall—"That does not disturb me in any particular. A man is a good Democrat who votes for the benefit of the party. Is it not known that the Union newspaper forgets the Know Nothings and Black Republicans, and descends to the sewer for filth and defamation to heap on Democrats as good as any others in the country, stigmatizing them as traitors and rebels."

Mr. Marshall spoke of Administrative presses both here and elsewhere as dirty puppies, strewing forth their filth; they must be muzzled. (Laughter) He said there were millions of men who considered the LeCompton movement not only infamous but damnable.

Mr. Hughes defended his political record, against which, he said, Marshall and English had thrown out insinuations. He had simply to say that the man or peasant, leader or follower, who imputed to him in the past any sympathy with the Free State or Abolition party, was a liberal.

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Marshall had made a rabbling speech peculiarly bitter in character, and lower than the usual standard of Congressional debates. Mr. Hughes, after alluding to the dialogue with Mr. Marshall about this, said that the Black Republican party was the bitterest substance of political chemistry ever produced. (laughter)

Mr. Letcher defended the majority of the Kansas select committee from the charge that they determined to shrink from investigation.

Mr. Walton opposed the extension of slavery and LeCompton.

Mr. Stephens said that one o'clock having arrived, moved to take up the Senate bill.

The bill was read once.

Mr. Giddings objected to the second reading under the rule.

The question occurred, "Shall the bill be rejected?"

Mr. Stephens demanded the yeas and nays.

</