



Terms:--Two Dollars Per Annum--In Advance.

BY G. W. BROWN & CO.

"TRUTH CRUSHED TO EARTH SHALL RISE AGAIN."

LAWRENCE, KANSAS, MARCH 20, 1858.

A Family Newspaper--Independent on All Subjects.

NUMBER 32--VOLUME 3.

For the Herald of Freedom. Letter from Mr. Houston. MANHATTAN, K. T., Feb. 22, '58. G. W. BROWN, Esq.--DEAR SIR:--In your issue of the 13th inst. I notice an extract from one of my private letters, which contains an expression or two liable to be misunderstood. The clause to which I refer is in reference to submitting to the Leocompton Constitution, provided it should pass Congress in a modified form. Among the host of intelligent freemen now in our midst, I do not feel that my opinion is worthy of any special weight, still I am not willing to say or do anything that can be construed to favor the Leocompton swindle.

I am in favor of submitting to the Leocompton Constitution rather than have civil war, provided that it passes in such a modified form as will enable us to amend it exactly as we please. But if it passes as it is, then our rights and honor demand that we should resist it with all the energy of freemen. I am unable to see how the Constitution can be altered at any time as the President of the United States asserts. The constitution, when properly ratified by the people and accepted by Congress is virtually a contract between all the parties that its provisions shall be faithfully carried out. If it passes Congress unmodified how can we amend it before the hour of agreement, which is 1864? And if received how can we change the slavery clause at that time? If we adopt the Constitution as our own, we certainly admit it with all its provisions, one of which is that slavery shall never be interfered with. Whether the Supreme Court of the United States would not require us to fulfill all our clearly expressed contracts and obligations, is a question each one can decide for himself. And now sir, in view of these facts and in view of the great primary fundamental right of self-government, I hold that we cannot receive the Leocompton Constitution without the most humiliating degradation. We must lick the dust of unconstituted submission, and like the ancients, "kiss the great toe" of our oppressors.

The freemen of Kansas will do no such thing. They will hear, they have borne enough already to revolutionize almost any other people. They have done it for peace, for the "Union," and from a sense of Christian duty. Are our oppressors never to end? Are we still to be pursued and misrepresented by the very Government which should ever be watchful over every right of all her citizens? Must we tamely submit to the dictation of a foreign power and lick the dust of abject degradation, because the parent government has joined hands with our enemies in overthrowing our liberties? Never, so never. If the purity of the ballot-box, the only safeguard of American liberty, cannot be extended to Kansas in violation, better, far better, for our children and mankind to throw up another Bunker Hill monument. Far better to sleep at the foot of a gigantic column with the sons of freemen, than to yield up our manhood, our rights and our liberties to any earthly power.

It is the unquestionable duty of a republican people to submit to gross wrongs before they resort to physical force to regain their rights, but when the last peaceful means has been exhausted, when the high, the sacred and blood-bought citadel of human freedom has been overthrown, then the decisive hour is at hand.

Until now I have not been without some hope that either in the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States, there would be found generous and patriotic spirits enough to triumphantly vindicate our cause. I fear I am mistaken. We must receive a fraudulent Constitution and that forced upon us. If so, the die is cast and we may as well prepare for the work. The next mail that reaches us will probably tell us that our chains are riveted fast. What is the Union worth if the right of self-government is stricken down? The Union, so dear to every true American, what is its value if the ballot-box is to be trampled under foot? Has it come to this, that our general government has become so corrupt that it is now willing to prostitute its high powers, so sacredly dedicated by the blood of the Revolutionary patriots, to the work of forging on the toll worn sons of Kansas a fraudulent Constitution?

The Organic Act of this Territory confers ample and unusual Territorial powers on the people. It is our Charter, our Constitution. These rights have been most wantonly wrested from us by outside invaders and by the most gross election frauds.

By force and by jugglery tricks has the ballot-box, the only safeguard of American liberty been stricken down, and now the Federal Government sanctions the gigantic wrong by forcing the product of this enormous crime upon us. There is no alternative left. We have done all we could do. The last peaceful measure has been exhausted, and now if pressed to the wall, let us as one man vindicate our rights. Let every freeman in Kansas swear before God and Heaven that no earthly power shall force on us the Leocompton Constitution, until it has first been made the willing sheet of his freemen.

Let us man charge me with excitement and fanaticism. I write deliberately. I am removed from that portion of the Territory so frequently and grossly outraged. No President nor politician can

charge me and thousands of others holding the same sentiment with myself, of Topeka fanaticism and rebellion. I have never had the least confidence in the success of that measure, though as a measure of the party I have twice voted for its adoption. I have ever regretted the adoption of the Topeka movement, not because it was a "rebellious Government," as the President of the United States falsely asserts, but because it would load us with difficulties and fill the mouths of our political enemies with plausible pretexts to overthrow our liberties. In itself, that document is a wholesome one and should long since have been received by Congress as the embodiment of the popular sentiment of a loyal people. This has not been done, and now we are about to be forced to receive it at the hands of the parent Government, the most infamous cheat ever imposed on any people. The Free State men here have differed on the Topeka Constitution, but I believe they will be a unit in resisting to the bitter end any and every attempt to enslave us with an infamous Government.

The question now is not whether we shall have African slavery, but whether we shall be slaves. If the issue is forced upon us I have confidence that the freemen of the Territory will be equal to the hour, and if overwhelmed history will vindicate our cause, and our children and the American people will cherish our memories with the most profound gratitude.

Most Respectfully Yours, S. D. HOUSTON. For the Herald of Freedom. Letter from Fort Riley. FORT RILEY, K. T., Feb. 28, '58.

In examining the Leocompton question, many persons arrive at false conclusions from a too practical investigation. In order to understand the subject correctly, and in all its bearings, it is necessary to carefully look into our political history from the first organization of the Territory.

In our first election we had two parties, one calling themselves pro-slavery, the other free State, and it was between these two parties (or rather factions) that the first contest for political supremacy took place; but one issue divided them, and that issue was the question of slavery. All former political ties were forgotten and disregarded. Democrats, whigs and know nothings were merged together, and arrayed against the alliance of different parties, each party governed solely by a sectional feeling.

We all remember the disgraceful scenes that occurred at our first election, resulting in the complete defeat of the free State party, in all parts of the Territory, by an invasion of Missourians who took possession of the ballot-box, drove from the polls free State voters, substituted other judges in place of those appointed by the Governor, and elected, in many instances, residents of Missouri to the Legislature. This first act of usurpation has been the cause of all our subsequent troubles and led to the many disturbances and the bitter animosity that has distracted the whole nation in reference to Kansas affairs. Had Congress at this time interposed and prevented this illegal body of men from assuming the powers of legislation, ordered another election, and thrown such guards around the ballot-box that a fair and honest expression of the legal voters would have been obtained, then would our troubles have been checked in their incipency, and many painful incidents in our short history, changed to a grateful remembrance of the strong protecting the weak, and a firmer reliance, and a more constant faith in the justice of our government. Such was not the case. Congress recognized as legal, the Legislature and all the laws that were enacted by it, proscribed all who dare question the fairness of the election, or the legality of the laws, and not only demanded obedience from the outraged citizens, but stationed troops among them to compel that compliance. Notwithstanding the strong measures taken by the Administration, a formidable party arrayed themselves against the laws, and openly avowed their determination to resist their enforcement. They attempted to establish an independent government of their own, without any sanction of law or color of right, save what was derived from the consent and support of their adherents. At this time another party sprang into existence, composed of the more conservative men of both parties, but the greater number free State democrats, who admitted the Legislature was not elected by the legal voters of the Territory, but at the same time thought it better to submit to their laws than to rebel against the government, after the recognition of those laws by the Administration. This party have always been in favor of the great principle contained in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, regarding the ballot-box as the only proper and legitimate place to settle practical differences, and have invariably advised the people to participate in the elections of our Territory, to thus secure a redress for past grievances, and attempt a repeal of the laws which were most odious. They have regarded the pro-slavery and Topeka factions in the same light--both striving for sectional triumphs, ready to trample under foot all law and justice for the accomplishment of their peculiar opinion. This party small at first has been gradu-

ally increasing in numbers, but has never yet been strong enough to make a successful resistance against either sectional faction. In reference to the Leocompton question their opinions are decided, and claiming to be conservative and national in their views, should be entitled to some weight. It is asserted by the Administration that the convention which framed the constitution was regularly and legally called into existence. I think the reverse is true. It is from the first Legislature, that all subsequent laws derive their existence and validity, by which the first steps were taken for calling together a convention, and in pursuance of this legislation, the constitution has been finally framed and now submitted to Congress. Admitting as true, that none but legal votes elected the delegates to the convention, it does not necessarily follow that it was a legal body. If the power which called the convention into existence was not a legal power, it must have its validity on other grounds. None other remains but the sanction of the party that called it together. This would give it no stronger basis than the Topeka constitution, because both would be informal, without the sanction of law. The recognition of the first Legislature as a legal body by the Administration, does not make it such. We all know what constitutes a legal Legislature. "It is a body of men chosen by the citizens of a State or Territory to make laws." However potent the Administration may be to enforce the laws, it is impotent to convince us that our first Legislature was elected by the citizens of the Territory.

It is a well known fact that a majority of the voters who elected the delegates were in favor of a submission of the whole constitution to the people; that pledges were required from the candidates; that the Governor most faithfully promised that all his influence should be used to affect such a submission, and that nearly all the papers in the Territory favorable to the constitution, assumed the same ground. Why was the decision held out to the people? Why those pledges made before the election, and violated afterwards? There can be but one reason, it was to keep the opposition, whom they knew were in the majority, from voting for delegates, and beguile them with the hope of defeating the constitution on its final submission. The manner in which the constitution was sent back to the people was a surprise to all parties. The most visionary had never imagined that if referred to the people at all, it would be in this one-sided, half-way measure. To whose fertile brain this evasive scheme first suggested itself yet remains a secret, but the object is obvious. It was well known if the power was granted the people to vote for or against the constitution it would be overwhelmingly defeated, and hence the subterfuge of withholding the substance and submitting the shadow. The motive is too clear to require further comment. Here, then, was a betrayal of pledges, and an evident disregard of the wishes of the people. The friends of this measure claim precedent for it. I have been unable to find any. There are precedents for constitutions submitted, and for those withheld, but none where a vote was only permitted on one side; none where but a single clause was selected as a test for a whole instrument. It was an insult to the people; a mockery of the elective franchise; to call the people to an election, and then deny them a free expression of their opinion; compelled to reflect the sentiments of their despotic masters, or a refusal to express their own. It would have reflected more honor upon the members of this convention, and have been more in accordance with our notions of right and wrong had the whole been withheld. It is now asserted that by a rigid construction, the only thing settled by the Nebraska bill is the slavery question, leaving the implication, that all others remain in Congress or some other power, not clearly defined there, but kept back from the people. It is now discovered that this great charter of squatter sovereignty which democracy has been battling for the last four years, and by the permanent establishment of which they were liberated from all political thralldom, and the only true sovereignty, is at last but a chimera; that they have only gained the right of voting for or against slavery. If this is all we have achieved by our triumph, the conquest has been a dear one to the nation, and will, I am afraid, result in a defeat to democracy. Such was never before the interpretation given to this great principle. We believed--and honestly too--when fighting the strong array of our political enemies, that if successful, we were left not only untrammelled on one question, but all others, and had a different opinion prevailed, our defeat would then have been as complete as it will be in future if the party persists in maintaining this as the true construction of the bill. Our President tells us that was settled, and also advises Congress not to interfere with the affairs of the people. If the president is correct, and the slavery question alone was settled, then all others should remain as unsettled. But why not Congress have this same right to reject the constitution as to adopt it? Must they, too, be forced to vote only on one side? Why should it be presented at all, if its adoption by Congress is but a mere

formula? It is, I apprehend, to meet just such a case as is now before us. When injustice is attempted; when a minority by political trickery have crushed the will of the majority. If adopted, Congress gives us laws; if rejected, none, but leaves us in statu quo. Which then is the best, to force on us a constitution that all admit is opposed by four-fifths of the people (and who were denied the right of expressing that opposition), or leave us without any constitution? To receive the constitution of a party, or send it back and first obtain the consent of the people? Mr. Buchanan also consents us to submit to the constitution for the sake of peace, to yield what he concedes is our right, that tranquility may be restored to Kansas. The advice is bad and the practical results would, I imagine, be different from what he anticipates. If we consent to that which is forced upon us, we surrender not only the vital principle of democracy, but the rights of an American citizen. We acknowledge either our incapacity to govern ourselves or desire to do so. From the experience of the past, can we expect that peace would be the result? That four-fifths of our population would quietly be governed by a constitution surreptitiously passed by a small minority; obnoxious in every feature, placed over them against their wishes or desire? Such an inference would be in conflict with all precedents, and contrary to our knowledge of the character of our citizens. To insure peace, there is but one alternative: to discountenance all past frauds, to resist all sectional strife, to reject both the Leocompton and Topeka constitution, and give the people the right, and leave them free to frame all their laws in their own way. When this is done peace will be restored to Kansas, but not before.

J. B. MCCOY. For the Herald of Freedom. Compensation for Damages. SHAWNEE COUNTY, K. T., March 6th, 1858.

G. W. BROWN, Esq.--DEAR SIR:--A bill was introduced into the House of Representatives at the last session of Congress, providing for the compensation or payment of damages sustained by citizens of this Territory during the turmoil of 1856. As the present will be a long session, if Mr. Parrott would exert himself to a reasonable extent there would probably be no difficulty in securing the passage of a similar bill. What signify Constitutions to the poor settler whose habitation and contents have been consumed by incendiaries aroused by the passions and prejudices of Kansas politics. Principle and patriotism are very pretty topics to talk about and write about, but when the pioneer sees his household goods and the necessities of life consumed amid the demagogic yells of exulting and triumphant foes, he awakens to realities' dark dream.

Your paper is independent of party. You are the recognized champion of the people. Can you not, at least, call the attention of Congress to a subject in which so many of your readers are deeply interested? Mr. Parrott has already introduced a bill granting a quarter section of land to each soldier of the Territorial militia. Let him see that that bill is in accordance with the principles of equity, justice and equal rights. And let him see that the settlers, whose property has been taken and destroyed are compensated without distinction of party, and it will be folly for any man, of any political faith, to run against him, or oppose his re-election.

Liberality to settlers and soldiers is the politician's policy. Settlers and soldiers know their friends and stand by them. They know their enemies, too, and remember them. ELK HORN.

For the Herald of Freedom. The Underground Mail Route. DELAWARE CITY, K. T., Mar. 3, '58. G. W. BROWN, Esq.--DEAR SIR:--Some time since I noticed in your paper an article in regard to the finding of some stolen, or supposed to be stolen, Mail Bags in a well which was attached to the office which was occupied at that time by me. At the time those mail bags were supposed to have been stolen, I have only to say that about that time one Mr. H. Clay Pate, (the hero of Black Jack), seemed to have the exclusive privilege of the Post Office, (Boone was postmaster), and that my letters invariably came broken open, that money was stolen from me out of that office at various times. About the time spoken of, the boys in the office complained that the water in the well tasted of leather, and we quit using it as drinking water. I inquired one evening of a young man who was Boone's employ, if the Lawrence mail had gone out. The reply was: "It has gone to the devil."

There is no doubt but that almost any amount of murders and robberies have been committed in and about Westport. Yours Respectfully, A. W. KING.

Shawnee Resolves. We learn that an order was expected by Col. Moore and Gen. Brindle, of the Land Office in this city, opening up these lands to settlement and entry. They inform us that a letter mailed to them on the 4th of February last, at Washington, has not yet been received. They suppose those lands the order to permit entries on those lands. They have informed the department of his non-arrival, and are now expecting a copy of that order. As soon as the order arrives it will be published.--Leocompton Democrat.

For the Herald of Freedom. The Bank Bill. TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD OF FREEDOM:--In the issue of your paper following the Bank Veto Message of Acting Governor Denver, I noticed that document conspicuously inserted.

I have since learned that one copy, at least, was sent expressly for publication to eastern papers; how many more I do not know. At a period when the executive office was so crowded with business that the Governor had not time to read, even all the bills passed and submit his approval during the last week of the session, it seems a little singular that time should be found to transcribe and transmit to the press copies of a Veto Message of not half the importance of many others sent to the Legislature. The conclusion is unavoidable, that some one was inspired by unusual zeal in the matter; and, as one gentleman whose position "near the throne" gives him great facilities, has boasted that he will yet "kill" the Bank Law, it can be no uncharitable suspicion which points him out as the real party. And if, as is said, that gentleman verily the document in question, personal vanity may have inspired a desire to see it in print. Such weakness is not unusual with young writers.

Were the Message a fair document, however, I should say nothing against its publication. But I deprecate it for the reason that it does great injustice to the institutions about to be established, and makes use of the Executive prestige to create an unfounded prejudice against them in advance. To illustrate the disingenuous character of the Message, I shall notice a few of its points:

1st. The Governor argues that the Territorial Legislature had no power to charter any Bank; he asserts that power is not resident in Congress itself or any State. The argument is indeed a singular one to use at a time when nearly every State in the Union is in the active exercise of these powers, and when Congress itself is at present issuing the most exceptional kind of paper credits known to the financial world--namely: Treasury Notes, specifying no time for payment, and guaranteed by no security, save the good faith of the government. And it is to be hoped that the Governor will not insist that the prohibition of the States themselves to engage in banking is equivalent to a prohibition of individuals exercising those rights by permission of the State.

2d. After a garbled quotation of certain clauses in the charter, he makes the following statement:-- "The Bank of Leavenworth would be authorized to redeem her notes in the notes of the Bank of Lawrence; the Bank of Lawrence to redeem her notes in the notes of the Bank of Leavenworth &c."

Now, what will be thought of the candor and veracity of the high officer making this statement when it shall be known that the charter contains no provision whereby one bank is allowed to redeem her notes with the notes of another.

3d. In stating that the Capital Stock can be increased indefinitely, the Governor conveys the idea that such increase is left with the bank itself to determine; when the fact is, that it cannot be increased a dollar without the consent of the Controller.

4th. By a forced construction of the language of Sec. 18, he endeavors to prop an attempt to make the notes of the banks, and certificates of deposit &c., legal tender in the payment of debts. Any person taking the trouble to read the section will readily discover the injustice done by this charge.

5th. He states that no provision is made "against receiving State or United States Stocks at a premium, when it is well known that a sudden revolution is sure to reduce the current rates of value attached to such evidences of indebtedness &c." In order fully to expose the character of this statement, I will quote from Sec. 13 of the act:--

"In case of the depreciation in value of the securities pledged as hereinbefore described, at the New York Stock Exchange, the Controller shall demand such increase thereof as, at the current rates, shall make them equal in value to the amount of notes in circulation, unless said bank shall prefer to surrender such amount of notes as have already been counter-signed, as will make the whole amount of said notes in its possession equal to the value of the securities pledged, at the current rates as aforesaid."

I will not occupy more of your space with the exposure of this specious Message. Why it should have ever been written is not clear, unless it should prove to be the production of the person previously alluded to, who procured the signature of Mr. Denver, without the latter fully understanding the injustice and indiscretion of the act. This would relieve the honesty of the latter at the expense of his sagacity. As to the factum, it might have been better for the corporators in the beginning to have promised him a "shake in" to disarm his gratuitous hostility; and then again it might not.

HOME CURRENCY. Mr. Wilson, of Massachusetts, in his late speech in the Senate, said: "We are now told by the President that he can change his Constitution before 1864. I have no doubt of that. I believe the people have the right to change their constitution when they please, and just how they please."

For the Herald of Freedom. The Bourbon County Disturbance. BOURBON CO., Feb. 1858. Mr. Editor:--As there has been much speculation and misrepresentation abroad in relation to the Bourbon county difficulties, and believing the public might desire to learn the facts as regards the origin, progress and result, we have concluded to give a plain statement of the facts as they occurred, for publication in the columns of your paper.

Some time during the summer of '56, the Little Osage and Sugar creek country were visited by a gang of marauders under one Clarke and one Fox, whose professed errand was to dispose "Teas and order," by killing or driving off Abolitionists, burning houses and driving off stock, and seizing upon such other property as the inhabitants were obliged to leave in their hurried departure.

Among those who fled, were Mr. S. W. Stone, Solomon Stone, and Mr. Beason. Mr. Stone left forty acres of corn standing, thirty head of hogs, and some other personal property. He stopped in Missouri, awaiting the result of the embargo. A man by the name of Jobe, who had been up to the seat of strife, returned and represented the house of Mr. Stone burned, which was false, and that it was impossible for Stone to return. Under menace he succeeded in purchasing Stone's corn, amounting to over one thousand bushels, and thirty head of hogs, and some household property left behind, for an old horse and two sides of bacon, worth, perhaps, \$40.

Last June, Stone returning to his claim, found it occupied by a pro-slavery preacher, by the name of Southwood. Southwood pretended that he had purchased the claim from Jobe, a distant relative of Southwood's. The facts are that Southwood had bought it on condition that he should pay a stipulated sum in case Stone should not return. Upon the return of Stone the citizens, some sixty in number, turned out and put up another house for him, on the same claim, to enable him to contest the right of Southwood at the land office.

Stone claimed the right to procure water from the well which he had himself previously dug, but it was partially granted with reluctance. On one occasion the Southwoods fell upon Mrs. Stone and whipped her most shamefully. This outrageous conduct becoming known to the neighbors, they ordered Southwood to leave within a specified time.

Southwood next turned up in Fort Scott, before the Grand Jury, and succeeded in getting the citizens, who had ordered him to leave the county, indicted for rebellion. The proper officers from Fort Scott went up and arrested them, and took them to town for trial. They were examined and committed. Some time in August Mr. Beason also returned to the neighborhood, and commenced hunting the hogs which he had left. He soon ascertained that they were now claimed by a man by the name of Gouly, he having bought them from Stout. Beason never had authorized any person to act as his agent, and claimed that he had not transferred his right to the hogs. He went to gathering them up, and as he found them he put them in Mr. Stone's lot. Gouly now brought suit against Beason for theft; warrants were issued against him and he was taken to Fort Scott for trial. Mr. Stone was sick, unable to sit up, but to relieve Mr. Beason he consented to be hauled to the Fort as a witness in favor of Beason. But upon his arrival in town he was arrested for secreting stolen property, and a third rate pro-slavery lawyer demanded \$50 for conducting his defense. Gouly, the prosecuting witness, testified that he had purchased the hogs of Stout, but there was no evidence introduced that Stout had been authorized by Beason or any other man, to sell the hogs.

Stone was held to bail in the sum of \$500. Beason finding that the same evidence would be adduced against him, and that in the opinion of the tool acting as Justice, it was sufficient to commit him, he waived examination and gave bail. Dr. Kimberland, who stood as bail for Beason, next morning found his buggy thrown down a steep bluff adjoining Fort Scott, badly injured. A few days after Kimberland's bay was fired.

These and other outrageous proceedings caused the citizens of Little Osage to become distrustful of the administration of justice on the part of the administration officers at Fort Scott, and a citizens' court was instituted. The members of this court were not residents of Bourbon county, but were selected from various localities. Young Southwood was arrested for threatening the life of Mrs. Stone. Southwood's wife went to the Fort and gave word that her husband was held in duress by this citizens' court. Marshal Little immediately arrested a posse and proceeded to arrest, or rather fight, those engaged in holding the citizens' court. On their way to Osage they arrested a Mr. Stewart, James Denton, and Mr. Anderson, for what, we have not yet learned.

The Marshal and posse proceeded and endeavored to make the arrest, but failed for want of numerical power. Next night runners were sent to Missouri for help, and the whole country was secured for aid. Next day the Marshal and posse, numbering about twenty-five or thirty, left Fort Scott, and being reinforced at

Barnesville by about the same number, made a second bold and daring effort to make the arrest. The "Osages" fled to a log house and prepared to defend themselves, when the Marshal came up and attempted to surround them; but a few shots from the log house caused them to retreat; and after returning a few shots they left for town, with three more prisoners whom they picked up on their way--old Mr. Denton and two others.

During these performances messengers had been dispatched to the Governor for troops, and the appearance of two companies of cavalry put an end to the war.

Old Mr. Denton, next day after his arrest, demanded trial, but no notice was taken of his request until about two weeks after, when he, James Denton, Stewart and Anderson, were examined. The old man was set at liberty, but the others were held to bail. James Denton and Anderson only remaining. All of those prisoners, when first arrested, were closely guarded by two or three men well armed with double barreled guns, revolvers, &c.; but now the business which at first was performed with alacrity, became irksome. The prisoners would not give bail, but opportunity during the day was given them to escape; but they would not leave without their horses and arms, which had been taken from them. They were suffered to go about town alone during the day, but at night guards were set over them.

At length Denton's revolver was given him and two Free State men placed on guard. This was evidently done with the expectation that he would leave by getting his revolver, and that he might, if he chose, shoot the guards; or, if he got away, they would be charged with his escape. But Denton, when he discovered the plot he drew his revolver from his bosom, but declared he would not go, nor attempt to. Next morning he left, and shortly after Anderson followed.

They made a demand for their horses as soon as an opportunity afforded. This was unheeded. Those having them in custody kept them four weeks, using them as they would their own, and charging \$30 for keeping. They were then sold for the keeping. Thus the owners were swindled out of their property without any means of recourse. Thus ended this matter. More anon. RESPECTFULLY, CHEROKEE.

Meeting at Twin Mound. Pursuant to notice, a meeting of the citizens of Twin Mound and vicinity was held at the Twin Mound House, which was organized by appointing E. Smith Chairman, and Miss Caroline Scott, Secretary.

On motion, Resolved, That the Chair appoint a committee of three to prepare business for the meeting.

Whereupon the Chair presented to the meeting the names of Henry Hiatt, Harriet Scott and J. T. C. S. Bellaw, for said committee, who, on retiring for a short time, produced the following resolutions, which, after much discussion, were all adopted, with the following explanation attached to the first resolution at the earnest request of a few:

Namely, that this resolution should not be so construed as to apply to non-residents, minors, or those who were not bona fide citizens of the United States.

Resolved, That all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; therefore, no government has any just right to enforce any law or collect any tax of those whom they exclude from the ballot box.

Resolved, That taxation without representation is just as much at variance with the genuine principles of Democracy and true Republicanism as it was in the days of '76, when it was assigned as one of the principal reasons for the Colonies taking up arms against the British Government.

Resolved, That that government which withholds full and ample protection to the lowest and poorest persons within its boundaries, gives no permanent assurance that the rights of any will be protected, however high or exalted their station.

Gov. Walker. The rumor that Gov. Walker had succumbed to the Administration on the Kansas question is disposed of by his letter to the Anti-Leocompton Convention lately held at Indianapolis, dated Washington, Feb. 20. After a review of Kansas affairs he puts the following significant queries:

Where are we, and in what direction are we drifting? Are we upon the banks of the Bosphorus or Danube, or upon soil consecrated to popular sovereignty by the blood of the Revolution? Is it Executive edicts or sovereign rights that constitute the liberties of our country? Are we freemen, or do we know our rights, and knowing dare maintain, or as we say, "stand up for" slaves, palace slaves, that will wring or change at the stamp of the foot of a master? Is it the people and States, as represented in the Senate and House of Representatives, who are to record their votes as indicated by their unbiased judgment, or do they merely to register executive edicts, under penalties for refusal of denunciation and proscription? Is the President the master or the servant of the people, that he should thus dictate to them or their representatives, under threats of exclusion from the party of their own country, a name and shadow, or a substantial, real, and true power of the people. This is its vital essence. Or has it lost its true significance, or are we moving from it with views not rapid strides towards despotic power, to make and unmake the rules of political life under pains and penalties abhorrent to the sense of freedom? Is this the 82d year of our Independence, or is it the first year of American Monarchy, that is now dawning upon us? Let the people--let the masses composing the true democracy, arouse from their slumbers--

Let them break the chains which would fetter their free thought and free opinion, and assert their blood-bought rights, and especially their right, indefeasible, sovereign right of self-government. We have fallen upon evil times. The liberty of the country is in danger. Let the people in their own name, and State rise in their majesty to the rescue, to resist or corrupt falter as they may; let the Democracy of Indiana, now in mass meeting assembled, proclaim in tones that shall echo throughout our Republic, that the spirit of the Revolution is not extinct in the North, and that the people of the West and Ohio, who, the Democracy of Indiana, will stand as one undaunted column by the great principle of popular sovereignty, sustained by them at the polls in 1854, as embodied in the submission of the constitution for ratification or rejection, and the undersigned citizens of the people of Kansas and of every other Territory,

An Act Declaring certain persons privileged from arrest on civil process. Be it enacted by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Kansas:

Section 1. That the following persons shall be privileged from arrest on civil process, and from obeying any subpoena to testify: First, all officers of the General Assembly, during their attendance therein, and during the time they are going to and returning from the place of meeting; not to any person arrested for twenty-five miles of the usually traveled route; second, all voters during their attendance at, and going to, and returning from elections; third, members of the board of County Commissioners, during the session of their board, and while going to and returning from the same; fourth, Justices, while engaged in hearing or determining any trial; fifth, all persons while engaged in necessary attendance on any court, and in going to and returning from the same; sixth, the Governor, Treasurer, Secretary, Auditor, and Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Territory; seventh, all persons actually engaged in the discharge of military duty.

Sec. 2. That no person shall be arrested in any place of worship during service, or on Sunday, except in cases specified by law, to be in force from and after the first day of July.

Sec. 3. That any writ or process contrary to the provisions of this act, shall be forthwith discharged on motion before the court issuing the process, or on habeas corpus, and shall be entitled to recover from the person arresting, or causing him to be arrested, twenty dollars in damages therefor, or a greater amount in the discretion of the jury.

Sec. 4. That an attachment for contempt in not obeying the command of a subpoena to testify, shall be deemed a civil process, within the meaning of this act. This act to be in force from and after its passage. All laws upon this subject heretofore passed are hereby repealed. Approved Feb. 6, 1858.

Mr. Johnson, from Fort Scott, a pro-slavery man, was here on Tuesday last, regarding the difficulties had broken out anew; that Montgomery with his forces had entered the town and was in possession of it, and that 180 Missourians were marching upon the town to retake it. He had got out an extra at Prairie City, (which we have not yet seen), detailing an account of the affair, representing the Democrat as intimidated, from giving a statement of the facts, and he was beating up for volunteers to go down town Lawrence, to stand up with Montgomery in defending the place from the Missourians. Herald of Freedom.

The Herald of Freedom is a reliable and worthy Free State man. We are assured by Capt. Bayne, Lieut. Wadsworth, and others whom we might mention that the Free State party has no firmer friend than Col. D. B. Johnson. The statement that the extra which was published at our office, detailing an account of rumored difficulties at Fort Scott, was issued at the instance of Col. Johnson, is incorrect. At the request of the settlers on the Osage and Marmaton creeks who were hourly expecting attacks from Missourians, Capt. Bayne proceeded to Lawrence to obtain assistance from the Territorial Militia, and it was while stopping at this place for supper, on his way to Lawrence, that we learned of the existing disturbances at Fort Scott, which we deemed of such importance as to warrant the issuing of an extra. In so doing we are not responsible for it. We trust the Herald will do Col. Johnson the justice to correct the erroneous impression it has created concerning him. --Freedoms' Champion.

A delegation of Pottawatomie Indians residing on the part of the Reservation lying on the South side of the Kansas river, passed through this city on Sunday last--in charge of United States Interpreter Joseph N. Bourman, on their way to Washington, where they expect to make a Treaty in relation to their lands. --Tennessean Settler.