A. O. P. NICHOLSON, Editor and Proprietor.
HUNTER NICHOLSON, Associate Editor.

TERMS:

DAILY, per year $10 00
SEMI-WEEKLY, (published tri-weekly during the session of Congress) 5 00
WEEKLY 1 00

Clubs will be furnished as follows:

Five copies of the DAILY, for 40 00
Five copies of the SEMI-WEEKLY 20 00
Ten copies of the " " 35 00
No deduction for clubs on WEEKLY.

The Daily Union.

VOLUME VI. "LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION." NUMBER 219.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, TUESDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 30, 1856.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

The name of no person will be entered upon our books, unless the payment of the subscription be made in advance.

Distant subscribers may forward us money by letter, the postage of which will be paid by us, and all risk assumed by ourselves in the safe transmission.

The COUNTRY PAPER is published tri-weekly during the sessions of Congress, and semi-weekly during the recess.

Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be received on terms proportioned to the above annual rates.

☞POSTMASTERS are authorized to act as our agents; and by sending us *five* DAILY subscribers, with $50 enclosed, or *five* SEMI-WEEKLY subscribers, with $25 enclosed, will be entitled to a copy gratis.

Proposals for Erecting the Custom-house, &c., at Plattsburgh, New York.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 10, 1856.

PROPOSALS will be received at this department until the 15th day of February, A. D. 1857, at 12 o'clock, noon, for the construction of the custom-house, post office, and court-rooms authorized to be erected at Plattsburgh, New York, according to the plans and specifications prepared at this department; and proposals to be either for the whole building, or separate for the different kinds of work; bills of parcels must in every case accompany each bid, with the amount of each kind of work, and the total amount carried out; the department reserving the right to reject or accept the proposals hereby invited, or any parts thereof, when it deems the interest of the United States requires it; the department also reserves the right to exclude the bids of any person or persons whom there is just cause to believe will not faithfully perform the contracts, or which they have attempted to obtain by indirection; and all bids where there shall be parties in interest who do not join in the bids, and all bids that, upon investigation, are below a fair price for the work.

Bids will not be received in gross, and no contract will be awarded to a bidder unless details are furnished the department of the prices of the different kinds of work and materials, which shall be subject to the revision of the department, so that it may adopt the whole or part of the bid, as the interest of the United States may require.

Ninety per cent. of the amount of work done and materials delivered, according to contract price, [said amount to be ascertained by the estimate of an agent of the department, appointed for that purpose,] will be paid from time to time, as the work progresses, and ten per cent. retained until the completion of the contract, and acceptance of the work, &c., by the agent aforesaid, and be forfeited in the event of non-fulfilment of contract.

Contracts will be awarded only to master builders and mechanics, and the assignment thereof, except by consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, will be a forfeiture of the same.

Each proposal must be accompanied by a written guarantee, signed by two responsible persons, (certified to be so by the United States district judge or attorney of the said district,) in the sum of $5,000, for the whole work, or of a proportionate amount, if for any part, that the bidder will, when required, if his proposal be accepted, enter into a contract and bond, with proper and sufficient securities for its faithful performance.

Form of bond and certificate required will be furnished on application to the department.

Plans, specifications, and working drawings will be ready by the 15th of January, when they can be had on application to the department.

No bid will be considered unless it fully complies in all its details with the requirements of this advertisement.

The proposals must be sent to this department, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, and plainly endorsed "*Proposals for the Plattsburgh Custom-house*," and will be opened at one o'clock, p. m., of the last day named for receiving the same.

JAMES GUTHRIE,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Dec 13—3awt15Feb

Proposals for Erecting the Custom-House, &c., at Galveston, Texas.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 10, 1856.

PROPOSALS will be received at this department until the 15th day of February, A. D. 1857, at 12 o'clock, noon, for the construction of the custom-house, post office, and court-rooms authorized to be erected at Galveston, Texas, according to the plans and specifications prepared at this department; and proposals to be either for the whole building, or separate for the different kinds of work; bills of parcels must in every case accompany each bid, with the amount of each kind of work, and the total amount carried out; the department reserving the right to reject or accept the proposals hereby invited, or any parts thereof, when it deems the interest of the United States requires it; the department also reserves the right to exclude the bids of any person or persons whom there is just cause to believe will not faithfully perform the contracts, or which they have attempted to obtain by indirection; and all bids where there shall be parties in interest who do not join in the bids, and all bids that, upon investigation, are below a fair price for the work.

Bids will not be received in gross, and no contract will be awarded to a bidder unless details are furnished the department of the prices of the different kinds of work and materials, which shall be subject to the revision of the department, so that it may adopt the whole or part of the bid, as the interest of the United States may require.

Ninety per cent. of the amount of work done and materials delivered, according to contract price, [said amount to be ascertained by the estimate of an agent of the department, appointed for that purpose,] will be paid from time to time, as the work progresses, and ten per cent. retained until the completion of the contract, and acceptance of the work, &c., by the agent aforesaid, and be forfeited in the event of non-fulfilment of contract.

Contracts will be awarded only to master builders and mechanics, and the assignment thereof, except by consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, will be a forfeiture of the same.

Each proposal must be accompanied by a written guarantee, signed by two responsible persons, (certified to be so by the United States district judge or attorney of the said district,) in the sum of $5,000, for the whole work, or of a proportionate amount, if for any part, that the bidder will, when required, if his proposal be accepted, enter into a contract and bond, with proper and sufficient securities for its faithful performance. Form of bond and certificate required will be furnished, together with plans, specifications, and working drawings, on application to the department.

No bid will be considered unless it fully complies in all its details with the requirements of this advertisement.

The proposals must be sent to this department, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, and plainly endorsed "*Proposals for the Galveston Custom-house*," and will be opened at one o'clock, p.m., of the last day named for receiving the same.

JAMES GUTHRIE,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Dec 13—3awt12Feb

Office of Egerton & Brother,
EXCHANGE PLACE.

NOVEL LOTTERY.

Maryland lottery, to be drawn on the Havana plan.
GRAND CONSOLIDATED LOTTERY OF MARYLAND,
EXTRA CLASS SEW-S,
To be drawn in Baltimore city on Saturday, Dec 20, 1856.
Prizes amounting to $132,600 will be distributed according to the following splendid scheme:
20,000 numbers—1,900 prizes.
Prizes payable in full, without deduction.
One prize to every twenty tickets.

SCHEME.

1 prize of $40,000 is		$40,000
1 prize of 14,940 is		14,940
1 prize of 10,000 is		10,000
1 prize of 5,000 is		5,000
1 prize of 3,000 is		3,000
1 prize of 2,000 }	are	4,000
1 prize of 2,000 }		
1 prize of 1,500 }	are	4,500
1 prize of 1,500 }		
1 prize of 1,000 }	are	3,000
1 prize of 1,000 }		
197 prizes of 200 are		37,400

APPROXIMATION PRIZES.

4 prizes of $150 approx. to $40,000 prizes are		$600
4 prizes of 100 approx. to 14,940 prizes are		400
4 prizes of 80 approx. to 10,000 prizes are		320
4 prizes of 50 approx. to 5,000 prizes are		200
4 prizes of 70 approx. to 3,000 prizes are		280
4 prizes of 60 approx. to 2,000 prizes are		240
12 prizes of 40 approx. to 1,500 prizes are		480
12 prizes of 30 approx. to 1,000 prizes are		360
248 prizes of 30 approx. to 200 prizes are		7,440
2,000 prizes, amounting to		132,600

Tickets $10—halves $5—quarters $2 50.
Prizes paid in full, without deduction.
All orders addressed to us will be considered as strictly confidential, and meet with an answer by return of mail.
Notes of all good banks taken at par. Address
EGERTON & BROTHER, Regular Licensed Agents,
Box 183 Baltimore Post Office, Baltimore, Maryland.
Dec 13—co4tF

Frederick Female Seminary, Frederick City, Maryland.

SCHOLARS will be received at any time during the year, and will be charged from the date of their entrance to the end of the scholastic year. The 1st of January would be a most appropriate time for them to commence.

This institution has steadily and permanently increased in numbers for the last eleven years, until the present capacious edifice, which is 50 feet front, 50 feet deep, and four stories high, became entirely inadequate to the growing wants of the school.

In August last the trustees commenced another building of the same size and external appearance, on the west side of the present edifice. This building is now under roof, and will be ready for occupancy early in the spring.

This addition will give us the largest and most beautiful exhibition room in the city, six large professors' rooms, eighteen additional high, airy lodging rooms, and the whole of the high basement will be fitted up for a gymnasium for the young ladies to exercise in during inclement weather. These improvements make it one of the most extensive and complete establishments in the United States.

This institution has an able and efficient board of professors and teachers, a good library, excellent musical instruments, an extensive chemical and philosophical apparatus, and it is confidently believed that it offers as many facilities for imparting a thorough, extensive, and refined education as any seminary in the land.

The school is not sectarian; on the contrary, the young ladies are strictly required to attend such church as parents designate, accompanied always by a teacher.

For board and tuition, including furnished rooms, lights, fuel, washing, &c., $200 per scholastic year, payable half-yearly in advance.

For circulars and other particulars address
H. WINCHESTER, President.

References in Washington city, D. C.: Josiah F. Polk, esq., and Benjamin Hills, esq.
Dec 27—d2w

WASHINGTON and ALEXANDRIA RAILROAD.

ON and after Wednesday, December 24, until further notice, a train of cars will leave the depot in Alexandria, at the corner of St. Asaph and Princess streets, for Washington, at 8 and 10, a. m., 2, p. m., and 3 and 4, p. m.

Omnibuses will be in readiness at the Potomac Bridge to convey passengers in the intersection of 7th street and Pennsylvania avenue, to Dexter's Hotel; from this point at the above-mentioned hours.

Omnibuses will leave for the northern end of the bridge, where the cars will be in readiness to proceed to Alexandria.

Passengers will find comfortable sitting rooms at Dexter's Hotel.

BISHROD W. FROBEL,
Superintendent.

Dec 27—d1w

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.—Henry Jr., a colored youth left school near Louisville Kentucky, about the 15th of September last; his family are very uneasy. He is about 14 years old, five feet two inches high, slender form, has light hair and blue gray eyes, teeth good, some of the front ones filled. Forward information as to where he is the above reward will be freely given. Address
WM. G. TRABUE,
Louisville, Kentucky.
Dec 19—1mo(dkcp)

CONGRESSIONAL.

DEFERRED DEBATE.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

IN SENATE, DECEMBER 9, 1856.

The question pending being on a motion to print a number of extra copies of the President's annual message—

Mr. COLLAMER, of Vermont, said: Mr. President, in entering upon my duties as a member of this body, I entertained the notion that legitimate discussion should be confined to questions, especially questions of importance, which were pending before the Senate. But, sir, I was early disappointed in this view. I soon ascertained that senators, with a large measure of age and experience and learning, considered that there were other and perhaps more important duties than those lying within the scope of legitimate discussion, and particularly one was to prepare the public mind. My own opinion was that the public mind should prepare itself, and should not receive its direction from the debates and action of either the Senate or House of Representatives in Congress assembled. Those bodies should rather be the echo than the formation of public sentiment. It seemed to me that it was transforming this body from a deliberative assembly to an arena of political party debate.

But my views, it appears, are mistaken entirely. Experience has shown the fact to be entirely different. That experience has been sustained by the example of men of the first position in the country, and it is now too late to question its propriety. Therefore, even as to subjects that are legitimately before us, and are proper topics of debate, discussion takes a very latitudinous range. Much the largest part of what is said here is not said for the purpose of producing an impression on the body who are supposed to be its auditors; but it is said, as the vulgar and common expression is, for buncombe. I suppose it is now too late for this ever to be corrected. It must go on. Inasmuch as it does go on, all men of all parties must, more or less, participate in it. It is idle for a man to undertake to elevate himself to a position of affected dignity, from which he will not condescend to mingle in these topics. His constituents have been taught to expect other things of him; and they have been so taught by men of such high position that their expectations cannot be disappointed by their representative.

I make these remarks, sir, because some gentlemen have suggested that there is really no important question before us. I think there is not; but there is a *subject* before us that I consider of deep importance; and, inasmuch as discussion has been commenced upon it, I presume it must go on.

This message of the President of the United States, especially all that part of it which relates to the subject we have been talking about—the regulation of slavery in the Territories of the United States—its style and manner, the occasion and the time when it has been presented to us, have made the impression upon my mind that, however exceptionable it might be in my humble judgment, and however in bad taste, that was not a point for us to settle—"*de gustibus non disputandum*;" but I regarded it rather as the ebullition of an impotent sort of rage on the part of a disappointed, ambitious man, worthy of no particular notice. I believe that scarcely a man—perhaps not one—can now be found in this body who would have ever desired that any such matter should be there; but it is there. It comes *ex cathedra*. It comes endorsed by the authority of the highest executive officer of this government. It is sent to the world with that endorsement, backed by that authority. I do not, therefore, wonder that it should be thought worthy of some answer.

Now, sir, what are the leading features of this part of the message? The President seems to have reversed the order in which the constitution puts the schedule of his duties. It provides that the President "shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." What does this mean? It is that he shall lay before Congress the condition of the country, with a view to showing them the necessity of the measures he recommends; but he reverses that order entirely in this message. He says it is his duty to recommend such measures as he thinks proper; and also his duty to lay before Congress the condition of the country, the state of the nation, whether that condition requires any action or not, or whether he recommends any action or not. That is a new version—a new order of things. The leading features of this part of the message, which I regard as worthy of any consideration at all, consist of some extracts which I shall read. Speaking of the recent presidential canvass in the country, he says:

"Under the shelter of this great liberty"—

That is, the liberty of advancing their own opinions—

"and protected by the laws and usages of the government, they speedily associations have been formed in some of the States of individuals who, *pretending* to seek only to prevent the spread of the institution of slavery into the present or future inchoate States of the Union, are *really* inflamed with a desire to change the domestic institutions of existing States."

This is a direct charge of false pretences.

"They seek an object which they well know to be a revolutionary one."

Again:

"Well knowing that such, and such only, are the means and the consequences of their plans and purposes, they endeavor to prepare the people of the United States for civil war by doing everything in their power to deprive the constitution and the laws of moral authority."

Again:

"This attempt has been pointedly rebuked."

What attempt?

"The attempt of a portion of the States, by a sectional organization and movement, to usurp the control of the government."

I wish to call attention to another expression which is not particularly offensive in its manner, but in reference to the subject-matter contained:

"Revolutionary disorder in Kansas had its origin in projects of intervention, deliberately arranged by certain members of that Congress which enacted the law for the organization of the Territory. And when propagandist colonization of Kansas had thus been undertaken in one section of the Union, for the systematic promotion of its peculiar views of policy, there ensued, as a matter of course, a counteraction with opposite views in other sections."

There is one other feature which is too obvious to require quotation, and that is a charge that a regular course of aggression upon the rights and privileges of the southern part of the United States has been undertaken and prosecuted. Such are some of the slight charges which this message contains. They are couched in no equivocal terms; there can be no mistake about them. Shall gentlemen tell us that it is in bad taste now for us to presume to say anything about this subject here? Did we begin it even upon this occasion? The course of gentlemen on this matter really reminds me of a good anecdote that I recollect used to be told by the late Judge McKinley. When some lynching operation was going on in one of our southern States, there happened to be a stranger present, who protested against that kind of violence. He was taken aside by one of the gentlemen present, who said to him: "Stranger, this is a free country, and we shall do as we please about this business, and you shall not say anything about it." [Laughter.] That is their definition of liberty. The President may say and do precisely what he pleases about this business, and we shall not say anything about it. I think we are called upon rightly and fairly to say something.

The President talks a great deal about what he considers settled by this election, and the rebukes which it has dealt out. I do not know what has been settled by this election, except one thing, and that is what was said by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, [Mr. BUCHANAN,] that Mr. Buchanan has been elected President; and I believe that is all that has been settled, by the election. If anything else is settled it should be settled by majorities; and I cannot but observe that gentlemen on the other side, in talking about majorities, always put down, as against the republican party, or their candidate, Mr. Fremont, the whole number of votes cast for Mr. Buchanan, and the whole number of votes cast for Mr. Fillmore. They add them together, and then tell us how we are rebuked. Thus the majority against Mr. Fremont was composed of the votes cast for Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Fillmore united; but the majority against Mr. Buchanan was not the vote of Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Fremont united. That is another thing. You must have it arranged arithmetically, like the old notion of the boys when at copper-play—heads I win, tails you lose. [Laughter.]

What was the leading feature of the vote cast for Mr. Fillmore? What principle did Mr. Fillmore hold? I do not know whether his party had a very full platform of resolutions; but I ask what did Mr. Fillmore hold on this great topic of which we are speaking? What are we talking about? The repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska law, and the principles involved in that measure. What did Mr. Fillmore say of that publicly and openly to the world? That the repeal of the Missouri-Compromise line was the Pandora's box of all our troubles. I take it that those who voted for him thought so. Then, on this very point upon which we are now talking, and which gentlemen say was an issue in the election, the votes for Mr. Fillmore and for Mr. Fremont should be counted together; and they, put together, decide against the doctrines of the Cincinnati platform, and of course against Mr. Buchanan who sustained it. It leaves the vote of Mr. Buchanan more than three hundred thousand in a minority. Is that rebuking the republicans, or approving the doctrines and platform of the democrats? Certainly not at all.

There is another feature of this message to which I wish to call attention before entering upon it at large. The President says, in substance, that whatever degree of success the republican party did attain to any considerable extent must be attributed to the exercise of deception—the use of false pretences. What were the false pretences? The principle they presented to the world was, that the general government possessed the power of sovereignty over the Territories, and ought to exclude the institution of slavery therefrom. He says that was a *pretence*, and the real purpose was to intermeddle with slavery in the States. What is the legal notion of false pretences? It is that men attempt to do a thing by some covert design, and unless you can expose their covert design they will succeed in their object; and the only way to prevent them is to expose their covert purposes. Apply that principle to this case. The President as much as says that the doctrine which they hold—the exclusion of slavery from the Territories of the Union—is a doctrine in which they will succeed, unless he can make it appear that it is a covert design—a trick, a pretence. He admits that on that principle they will succeed. We are told fairly, frankly, honorably, by the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. MASON,] that the candidate, whoever he was, whether a man of straw or not, was entirely immaterial. The question is, what is the principle involved? That senator told us that whenever the principle which I have stated shall be adopted by the majority and asserted, then will come a time for separation. The President tells us that unless he can make out that that is not the design which they have in view, they will succeed in it. Is not this a precious profession? It is an obvious and logical one, though probably not intended.

But, sir, the probable ultimate success of that principle is not simply to rest upon this oblique confession of the President. It rests on some more important basis than this.

Whenever we see a set or a party of men come forward with new doctrines, the advancement of new principles, for the commencement of a new set of measures, we are apt to think, and we suppose we have good grounds for the presumption, that they are made for the occasion, and they are entitled to very little consideration from the fact that they are got up simply for the time being. If that were the character of the principles advocated and sustained by the republican party—if they are the mere creatures of the day—they would be very likely to be of ephemeral existence. If they are mere novelties—if they be the creatures of the hour—the figments of the brain at the moment—then, indeed, it might be supposed that they had some other, and oblique, and covert purpose in view, and they will not be likely to be sustained. Though the republican party is a party which may be a new one, the principles which it sustains, the doctrines on which it is based, the purposes which it announces, may be very ancient. What I insist upon is, that these principles, these purposes, and these objects are as old as, and older, than the history of this government; and, further, that they have been sustained at every stage of this government, until within a very recent period. They are doctrines which entered into the very frame-work of our government. They were not only brought forward and supported by the slaveholding community itself, but they have been re-enacted and re-established and reaffirmed at every stage of our history, from the commencement of this government for more than half a century. The progress of this country under these principles, until within a very recent occasion, and the prosperity which has attended it, go fully to affirm the soundness of those principles. I shall contend, further, that these principles, which are now reaffirmed and declared by the republican party, have been trenched upon only within a short time past, by the action of the southern people, for local purposes, entering upon a system of measures that have now called out and demanded the formation of this republican party, for the purpose of redeclaring and fully sustaining the principles of their fathers.

Sir, when the settlement of this country commenced, the history of the human race in all its civil and social relations commenced a new era of progress; it began from a new starting point. The institutions of government, in all the forms in which they had existed in the European world, were intended and expected to be sloughed off. The idea was that here there should be established a system of equal laws and of happy men. They commenced the settlement of this land with the great idea of a popular system of government—a system of government which implied democracy, if you please—a system of government which implied the elevation of every man in the community to occupy an equal position, and to exercise an equal power in the regulation of its concerns. It has been said by some that their idea was the establishment of a State without a king, and a church without a bishop. Yes, sir; but it was equally clear in their minds that they were to be not only clear of tyrants and of kings, but they were also to discard the whole idea of nobility. There was to be no hierarchy and no oligarchy. All that relationship with which the world in its progress had been embarrassed for centuries—under whatever name, whether patrician and plebian, whether patron and client, whether landlord and tenant, whether lord and vassal, whether master and slave—should cease in this country.

This great idea took form first upon that little piece of paper not bigger than a man's hand, which was written in the cabin of the Mayflower. That contained a great seminal principle; and when they entered upon their colonial course, so far as lay within the circuit of their power they exerted themselves to realize that idea. Their first impression was: every man shall own the land he cultivates, and every man shall himself cultivate the land he owns. They established at once the idea of fee-simple—yes, of allodial title. They struck off all the notions of primogeniture, and they went on in their progress in this way so long as they continued in their colonial condition. When at last, in the ordering of Divine Providence, the time arrived when they were compelled to assert their independence against the government of England, what did they say? We have acquired that position; we have passed into that strength of manhood by which we are enabled to say, "You have no right to make laws for us without our being represented, you have no right to tax us without our consent." The right of government lies in the people of this country. It was for the assertion of this great principle that the declaration was made. These same principles were imbodied more fully and more largely, and in all their latitude, in the Declaration of Independence. When the crisis arrived, our fathers of New England found themselves not standing alone in relation to these principles. They looked down a little south of them, and there were the people from the republic of Holland ripe and ready for sustaining the same principles. A little further on they found all the free, equal principles of the Quakers who established themselves under Penn. A little further on they looked at the liberal provisions which were found in the colony established by the English Catholics under Lord Baltimore. Virginia, with all her high notions of chivalry, then entertained, if not to the same extent, but, I believe, with as good foundation as now, was ready for the same thing. The institution of slavery had been pressed upon them by another country. It constituted one of their grounds of complaint against the mother country. Society had not formed itself with any reference to dependence upon that institution and condition of things at that time.

Passing further south, they came to North Carolina, where the Presbyterians of Mecklenburg had put forth the first declaration of independence, in anticipation of that of the 4th of July, 1776. The free, liberal notions of the Huguenots were deeply implanted in the feelings of the people of South Carolina. All these colonies rose up in a body of men ripe and ready to sustain the people of New England in all those great principles and theories of civil government. They imbodied them in the Declaration of Independence. They together hazarded their lives upon the high places of the battle-field, in common to assist them; and they succeeded. When we came to the formation of our constitution of government, we are told that the people of the then States, recently colonies, were slaveholders. Yes, sir, so they were. I believe Massachusetts had adopted her constitution, which the court afterwards said, in its bill of rights, abolished slavery; but at that time they were hardly conscious of it. We may say that all of them, or all except Massachusetts, if you please, were slaveholders. What if they were? So much the better for my argument. I want to know what they who actually held slaves, one and all, did upon that occasion? What they did then, I take it, was not a war aimed at the South. It was not a narrow, mean prejudice against the local institutions of some particular State. They acted in common together. What did they do in forming the constitution of the United States? And, after forming it, in exercising the powers which they created under it. They held slaves; they understood the evils of slavery. They understood what the system was. They were recently out of the great struggle for independence, and they then said, one and all, this institution is of that kind; it is so inconsistent with those great principles which we have declared to the world, and for which we have fought and bled; it is so illy adapted to the prosperity of the nation at large; it is so at war with the first principles of liberty within us, that we here deliberately say it shall not go into those parts of the Union which are beyond the jurisdiction of any particular States, and within the jurisdiction of the general government.

I am aware that the ordinance of 1787 was adopted before the present government came into operation; but, after the adoption of the constitution, it was immediately re-enacted, and established in perpetuity by an act of the First Congress. The title by which the United States held the territory beyond the Ohio, now making the five States on that side of the river, was of the same tenure precisely as that by which they acquired Louisiana from France. Both rest on the same footing. Every essential provision was the same in the two grants; the one from Virginia, and the other from France. I shall, therefore, in all I have to say of them, treat the conduct of the United States, in relation to these different Territories which they possessed, as being precisely the same, resting on the same principles, and identical in character.

What has been the effect? I shall hereafter show more fully, and at large, why the power of prohibiting slavery in the Territories has been exercised, and repeated, and continued by an unbroken succession of acts from that time up to a very recent period—within the last ten years. Congress enacted them because the institution of slavery was one which they considered should cease; for, if it continued, it would produce a social and political condition of society incompatible with the great principles they had adopted. Now, what has been the progress of events? What has been the result and the fruit of that course? After the First Congress had declared the Territories which they then owned to be consecrated to freedom—after they had fully provided and declared that no slavery should exist there forever—as soon as they ended the Indian difficulties by the treaty of Greenville, and opened up that country for peaceable possession—then commenced that great wave of emigration, that great exodus of civil life, which has astonished and commanded the admiration of the world. Even within my recollection, I can remember almost the very commencement of that great emigration. The people of New England and the East, looking to the West, commenced the first emigration, as I remember, into Western New York; they went on to the Genesee; and they then went on to the Holland purchase. The next wave passed on to Ohio. Then they passed over the great lakes into Michigan, and Illinois, and Wisconsin, and Iowa, and Minnesota. In the mean time all along the borders of the Atlantic, from Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, and North Carolina, and Virginia, you saw the boating across the Ohio, leaving the now much-eulogized institution of slavery, going with the West to swell the great tide of emigration, and add to the success of the great experiment in the cause of civil liberty.

We cannot but see in this a new phase in the history of the world. Nothing like it has ever been witnessed before. I know there had been irruptions at times of men passing from the north of Europe—the Goths and Vandals, the Huns and Scythians—to the south; but they were great hordes of barbarians marshalled by ministers and kings. There was no such thing in these tides of emigration. There was no Tamerlane, no Ghengis Khan; there was no Attila of the Huns. It was not an irruption visiting the wrath of God on the degenerate people. No, sir; it was the human family led out to possess its great patrimony. Who could look with indifference upon an experiment like this?

We saw in it not merely an enlargement of our numbers and an increase of population; we admired it not merely because the forest was cleared away, and farms, houses, and dwellings, towns and cities, churches and schoolhouses, were everywhere erected; but as it spread over the great fertile valleys of the West, its prairies and its fields and its mountains, we saw in it an enlargement and expansion of the great theory of government for which our fathers first landed here, which had been reasserted in the Declaration of Independence, which had been sustained by the acts prohibiting the extension of slavery.

These people carried with them their household gods away to the foot of the Rocky mountains; and we saw in it a manifestation to the world at large of the great principles we held dear. Every man, especially every man in New England, realized that the best of his own blood was beating in their veins. Every man felt in duty bound to continue of his example, his encouragement, and his substance, for the purpose of advancing and encouraging this great experiment in the cause of civil liberty and humanity; and if any man in New England should withhold his exertions, or withhold his means, his tongue would cleave to the roof of his mouth. And yet, sir, in all this the President can see nothing but a fanatical propagation of our peculiar domestic theories. It was spreading over the Territories those ameliorating conditions and influences that are spread over New England. He thinks that any man, and especially any set of men, who associate to assist in this experiment, are entitled to nothing but disapprobation and executive reprehension.

I fancy, sir, that those much-abused members of Congress—I know not who they were, but I suppose they were of both houses—who presumed to undertake to advance their aid towards the extension of this great institution over the Territories were, in the President's view, doing nothing but "abolitionizing Kansas"—that such is all we have been doing, and that is all our fathers have been doing in what they have labored and suffered, and fought, and bled, for these two hundred years. We are daily abused for starting new theories of government, new views of the constitution; and very ingenious riddles are put out for us. Those who view the subject in anything like the light in which I have attempted to present it feel very much as if we are doing a great work, and cannot stop at the suggestion of others who do not appreciate it.

Now, sir, I proceed to another point. I wish to inquire why this prohibition of slavery in the Territories was enacted, and why it has been continued? I propose in the next place to show who has done it—by what authority it has been done; and, in the third place, to show that some measures have been taken within the last ten years to interrupt that course, for local and sectional purposes, and for political causes, by the southern people; which have occasioned the necessity for, and called forth the existence of, and thus far prompted, the exertions of the republican party.

I have said that the title and jurisdiction which the United States government had over the Territories were precisely the same in those which were derived from France and in those which were derived from Virginia by her cession of the region beyond the Ohio. The two grants contain no difference in their stipulation, and no difference in anything which is essential. First, let me advert to the title obtained to Louisiana, as the President has quoted from the treaty of cession. In that treaty it is declared:

"The French republic has an incontestable title to the domain and the possession of the said Territory. The First Consul of the French republic, desiring to give the United States a strong proof of his friendship, doth hereby cede to the United States, in the name of the French republic, forever, *and in full sovereignty*, the said Territory."

This is the first article. The second goes on to provide for islands, &c., and the delivery up of the muniments of title. The third is:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the mean time they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess."

The provision in relation to the protection of their property is inserted *ex abundanti cautela*. The result would be the same whether it was inserted in this article or not; but no matter for that—it was inserted. What was provided was, that they should become a part of the United States, and be admitted into the Union at a proper time, according to the terms of the constitution, and in the mean while should be protected in their persons, property, and religion.

Let us now look at the grant from Virginia. It is a grant to the United States "as well of soil as of *jurisdiction*," upon condition that

"The territory so ceded shall be laid out in States of convenient size"—

describing them—not exceeding so many, "or as near thereto as circumstances will admit"—

"and that the States so formed shall be distinct republican States, and admitted members of the federal Union, having the same rights of sovereignty, freedom, and independence as the other States."

The grant was made in the year 1784; and all the inhabitants then in that Territory were there at the few French settlements which had been taken by the expedition under General Clarke, established there before the treaty of 1763. It is further provided:

"The French and Canadian inhabitants and other settlers of Kaskaskia, and of St. Vincennes, and the neighboring villages, who have professed themselves citizens of Virginia, shall have their possessions and titles confirmed to them, and be protected in the enjoyment of their rights and liberties."

Now, we see the features of the two grants. The grant was of the territory, its soil, and the entire sovereignty, in both cases, on the condition that it was to be made into States in due time, and that the people then there should be protected in their property and liberties. There is no difference between them. I have made these remarks on this matter because I consider that whatever I shall show has been done in relation to the one applies with equal force to the other; and I will now briefly call attention to what was done, and why it was done. In 1785 the ordinance of 1787, enacted for all the country beyond the Ohio, and which forbade slavery from ever entering into it at all, was confirmed by an act of Congress, which was approved by General Washington, then President. It was done mainly by the exertions of the people of the southern States. But no matter for that; it was at a period when a large portion of the people were slaveholders. What was asserted by that enactment? That we owned that Territory in sovereignty, and we forbade the extension of slavery into it. We have the power and the right to do so—nay, we judge it our duty to do it. In the regular chronological order of time, we next find the act for the organization of the Territory of Tennessee, which was ceded by North Carolina to the United States, with a condition in the deed of cession that Congress should not abolish slavery. But in Mississippi, which was ceded by Georgia, a slaveholding State, on like condition, what did they do? Did they not intermeddle with the subject of slavery? Did they not exercise power over it? I take it that a power to regulate is a power to prohibit, and it has often been so decided. They did regulate it there. Congress had no power to prohibit the importation of slaves into States then existing until 1808, but, in 1798, they prohibited the importation of slaves into the Territory of Mississippi.

The next in the order of time is the act forming the territorial government of Indiana in 1800. In the formation of that Territory the same provisions which were contained in the ordinance of 1787 were redeclared, re-enacted, and made operative upon that Territory. That act was approved by the elder Adams.

In 1803 was formed the first government for Orleans Territory, a part of the Louisiana purchase. What was done then? What sort of sovereignty did the United States exercise in that case? Did they leave anything to the people there? Did they put into that act any feature of squatter sovereignty, or popular sovereignty, for the people there? So far from it, the first provision was, that the governor should be appointed by the President; and he had a council of the inhabitants of the Territory appointed by the President, who had the making of all the laws, and the exercise of all legislative authority. That was not all; the did something on the subject of slavery. Slaves were existing there. Congress did not interfere with that state of things, as they had not attempted to do so in Tennessee. They did not attempt to disturb it in Mississippi, for it was already there. They were prohibited by the terms of the cession from doing so. But what did they do in Louisiana? They did that which they then supposed would work ultimately an entire abolition of slavery there. They all the time supposed, that as for the slaves then in the country, the people owning them would soon provide for them by abolishing slavery, if Congress could cut off the foreign supply. That was their idea; and therefore in Mississippi they prohibited the importation of slaves from abroad; and in Louisiana they not only prohibited the importation of slaves from abroad, but actually said, "You shall not carry your slaves from other States there at all for sale." If the people have a right to carry their property into Territories, they have a right to carry it both to use and to sell—as much the one as the other. But there Congress declared that slaves should not be carried into Louisiana, except as members of families for settlement; and if carried in any other way, the act of so taking them should work emancipation, and the parties offending should be subject to penalties.

Further, they declared this to the world: We told you, said the government of the United States, as early as 1798, in relation to the Territory of Mississippi, and we told you as early as 1788, in relation to all territory beyond the Ohio, everything then within our jurisdiction, that no slaves should be imported at all: now, if you have imported any into your States from 1798 up to 1808, they shall not be carried there, either for sale or as members of families. Those which had been imported into Georgia, the Carolinas, or elsewhere, were as much the property of their owners as any they owned; and yet, they were absolutely prohibited from carrying them at all into the Territory of Louisiana. Who did this? It was done by the united exertion and undivided action of the whole Congress; and the act was approved and signed by Mr. Jefferson.

The next in date is the case of Michigan. That was formed into a Territory in 1805, and there the same ordinance was re-enacted. That is, all the laws appertaining to the Territory of Indiana, from which it was taken, were declared operative in the Territory of Michigan. That was a reaffirmance of the same principle, and a re-exercise of the same authority. That act was approved by Mr Jefferson.

Illinois in 1809 was formed in the same way, and there was another redeclaration of the same principle which was approved by Mr. Jefferson.

In the act for the admission of Missouri—which I do not choose to go into particularly—one of its essential features was the one of which we are mainly talking; Congress there provided by a majority, and especially by the action of the southern people themselves, that no slaves should be allowed north of the latitude of 36 deg. 30 min. If Congress had the power to prohibit it at all in one section, they had the power to prohibit it in any section. It was an exercise of the act of sovereignty which had been exercised from time to time up to that period. The Missouri line was affirmed by Mr. Monroe and his cabinet.

The next is the case of Wisconsin, which in 1836 was organized as a Territory, lying upon both sides of the Mississippi, covering part of the same territory which we had acquired from France, and some which we had obtained from Virginia. Yet the same ordinance of 1787 was extended all over it by an act of Congress, I believe, without division and without objection. That was approved by Gen. Jackson.

In 1838 the Territory of Iowa was established beyond the Mississippi, and there again it was provided that the same laws should be enforced, and the same rights exercised as in the Territory of Wisconsin, of which Iowa had once been a part. This act was approved by Mr. Van Buren.

In 1846 the Territory of Oregon was established, and for that country the ordinance was re-enacted in terms, because it had not been extended there before, and slavery forever prohibited. That act was approved and signed by Mr. Polk.

In 1847 and 1848, and in 1850, repeated attempts were made in Congress to extend the Missouri-Compromise line to the Pacific ocean, so as to cover the territories which we had then recently acquired from Mexico.

Mr. BUTLER. Who objected to running that line?

Mr. COLLAMER. Undoubtedly we did; but not for the want of power. The question of power is the point which I am now discussing.

Mr. CASS. I objected to it for the want of power.

Mr. COLLAMER. I will not say that there was not an individual exception to be found; but this I say, that the great body of the southern representatives, those who now complain of the exercise of this power, were the very people who advanced and voted for that proposition, and who complained because it was not adopted.

Mr. BUTLER. I cannot be mistaken on that subject, for I was here and took an active part in that controversy. We were willing, for the sake of peace, if the gentlemen from the North would consent, to run that line. We thought that perhaps we might make peace by such a line; but you refused it.

Mr. BRODHEAD. It was only offered as a peace measure.

Mr. BUTLER. It was presented simply as a peace measure. We were willing to agree to it for the sake of peace; but on the other side the proposition was openly maintained—"We will extend the Wilmot proviso North and South, East and West." The only power which northern gentlemen would then consent to exercise was that of prohibition everywhere, and they would not apply the Missouri rule anywhere.

Mr. COLLAMER. If the gentleman had listened to me with the powers of apprehension which I know he possesses, and the candor which he ought to exercise