TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The *National Era* is published every Thursday, on the following terms:

Single copy, one year $2.00
Three copies, one year 5.00
Five copies, one year 8.00
Ten copies, one year 15.00
Single copy, six months 1.00
Ten copies, six months 8.00

Voluntary agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each yearly, and 25 cents commission on each semi-yearly, subscriber, *except in the case of Clubs.*

A Club of five subscribers, at $8, will entitle the person making it up to a copy for 6 months; a Club of ten, at $15, to a copy for one year. When a Club has been forwarded, additions may be made to it, on the same terms.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. X. WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1856. NO. 487.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Ten cents a line for the *first* insertion, *five* cents a line for each subsequent one. Ten words constitute a line. Payment in advance is invariably required.

☞ Money may be forwarded, by mail, at *my risk.* Notes on Eastern banks preferred. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit.

☞ Subscribers wishing their papers changed, will give the name of the post office changed *from*, as well as the post office they wish it hereafter sent *to.*

☞ All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to

G. BAILEY, *Washington, D. C.*

WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

THE OLD QUADROON;

OR,

A National Version of *The Virgin Martyr.*

"Mutato nomine de te
Fabula narratur."

"If she must live to womanhood, oh may she never know,
Upheaved by mother's happiness, the mother's depth of woe!
And may I lie within my grave before that day be here,
When she sits, as I am sitting, with a slave-child on her knee!

"She cannot bear to know her child must be as she hath been,
Yet she sees but one deliverance from infamy and sin."
Maria Lowell.

"It is very painful, indeed, to contemplate this sufficient The mind instinctively shrinks from it, but still it is a very serious question whether it is not our duty to encounter this pain, that our sympathies may be quickened into more active exercise."—*Harriet Beecher Stowe.*

"And though you are unmoved to see my death,
Hereafter, when my story shall be read,
As they were present now, the hearers shall
Say this of Dorothea, with wet eyes,
She lived a virgin, and a virgin died!"
The Virgin Martyr.

PART I.

"Flowers, master?" "Yes; that snowy globe,
With all Arabia pent within
Its spicy cup, and stem set round
With small rose-buds, and myrtle green."
"This?—what!—oh, this memento, child?"
"Yes, that. I did not know its name."
"No? Master is a stranger here."
"Yes; from the North last week I came."
"They say folks there are good and free?"
"Some good, some bad. How are they here?"
"Why, much the same. My master's good;
But then"—"Speak out. They cannot hear."
"What could I have to tell? But then
He's from the North, and looks so kind;
And speaking out for once might ease
A poor old creaky body's mind."
"Why, what's the matter?" "There, don't cry.
You must be very old!" "Fourscore;
But God could never let me die;
For, ever half's conjured, ever floor,
Once were I in the other world,
With singing feet, you know I should
Keep going and going, just as I did
When I was younger, through the wood—
No matter how-never far
Apart they put us, till I found
Heaven and my little Rose, and then
Should long her sick so lightly round.
The angels could not pull me off,
Because they have no knives up there,
And they would blush to see me in
Among them all so sore and bare!"
"Oh, no, they would not! Poor old soul,
Your mind's full of whimsies! Come,
Let's talk of something pleasant—flowers,
Or of your youth and early home."

"Oh, master, no! My master's good!
I've all I want. Put up your purse.
I'm bad, and trouble you. They say
That kindness always makes us worse.
My home? Ah that was long ago—
A lovely land, and far from here.
So lovely that the mountains crowd,
And o'er each other's shoulders peer,
Pawing, for as eye can see,
All straining for a tip-toe peep
Of grassy plains, and sporting swallows,
And merry rills that glance and leap,
And cabins snug and stately halls.
In sleep I still those mounts behold—
The same as when a child I used, the far
Mere sunset films of cloud and gold.
Ah, there we led a merry life,
Without a trouble or a care.
I used dance the livelong day,
And decked and twined my mistress's hair.
While at my kitchen tricks she laughed,
Till oft, she said, I made her ache,
And often, to make me laugh, she
She bade me share, her fruits and cake.
She made for me a new pink gown,
And, on the day I was fifteen,
She let me give a birthday feast,
And ball, with fiddlers on the green.
Oh, 'twas the wildest, sweetest night.
We danced as happy as in all our lives.
The very trees seemed dancing round;
The sun went dancing down the west,
And on his threshold up and down,
Till some one the moon off turned him out.
And danced with all her stars o'erhead,
For joy to see our merry rout.
The fire-flies scarce their lanterns lit,
But without any use' was their light;
While her grand golden lamp shone down
On faces dark and kerchiefs bright.

"They said I was the finest girl
In all the State, in those old days,
For all I was so withered now;
And I was vain, and spoiled with praise;
And so I let the other lads
Come round and beg and pray, their fill,
And scarce would give a single turn
To any but my master Will.
(He used to be my little nurse,
And carried me till I could walk.
And after, when my feet were tired,
And night had come, he sing and talk.)
I knew he liked me more than most.
I knew I liked him most of all.
'I want to stop for breath,' he said,
'I mean' (—that was very hall),
Just in my ear. Well, Willy, what?
'Why, don't you know?' You know,' said he,
'To marry you now. Think I could?'
I told him I would run and see.
I slid behind my mistress's chair,
And whispered, and she gave consent,
And then—I don't remember where,
Where Willy waited, softly went.
We did not care for dancing more,
But walked beneath the linden trees
Along the cool, sweet lane, hand in hand.
And breathed the soft delicious breeze.
The music stopped—too soon we thought;
And we were ordered all to bed.
He to the quarters, to the hall
I turned, but chanced to turn my head,
And saw him o'er his shoulder watch,
And lag and stumble to be sent.
Yet see me to the threshold safe.
Then wave farewell, in full content,
And hurry in.

As in I stepped,
Young master met me in the door,
And stopped and gazed. I shrank from him,
I had never shrunk before.
He seized my arm. His eye glowed red.
His breath was reeking hot with wine.
He pomaded our rich silks and rings,
His mother had now half no line;
And then—" You yielded! Death and shame!
Oh, woman-hood!" "No; not so soon;
But, when I saw my young master
He bade them lash me to the bone.
They made me scream my voice away,
Then mean till all my breath was gone,
But not the whip. It rose and fell,
The endless strokes went on and on,
Though the skin, on through the flesh,
Oh, Up through nerve and bone;
But soon. I have felt them since,
But not, at. Well, I was laid
Stretched round, my heart, or cut my brain.
I could not speak to tell them so,
But thought that not. My good be worse;
Because as yet I had not tried
To bear silent an endless curse.
Why did they take me gasping down?
Oh, had I died, or never been!
I was so wicked, ignorant,
And foolish, and but just fifteen!"

PART II.

"When those cure generous souls He sees,
Who in His service dare
The worst that flesh can do to fare,
Oh, joyful still, to bear,
Unto the rescue flies the Lord,
And thrusts their foes aside,
Or lets them taste the glorious cup
Quaffed by the Crucified.
Most favored then, and bears them back
Thrice blest through conquered woes,
To reign with him; and even so
It was with little Rose.
But mean and craven spirits, when
They trouble, cringe, and shrink,
And relent in unworthy prowess
That sacred draught to drink,
Then to the rescue Satan comes,
And takes their pain away,
To pay it back with interest,
Upon some future day.

If this long river rose up right,
That here doth writhing lie,
And plunged head foremost through the earth,
Down from the topmost sky,
And down upon the other side,
If other side there be,
Its depths were shallow to the deeps
Of agony in me;
Black, fearless deeps of woman's shame!
How dares a soul to live
Down into like these, and diving so
How it can rise alive!

"I think they bound and pinioned me
At first; for I was wild.
The next I know, I held upon
My breast a little child—
A little lovely sleeping girl!
I had not dared to pray,
Till then, that God would pity me.
And take my guilt away.
For fear the angels round the throne
Would hear me call His name,
And look in pity down to see
Who in such torment came,
Then hide their quick enlighted eyes
From me and from my shame.
But when I saw her little face,
It seemed to chase away
In part the thoughts I had before;
For her I had to pray:
And when, soon quiet, I was left
Alone, unbound, at last,
I crowded my poor knees, while in
My arms I held her fast;
I wrapped myself from head to foot—
My guilty cheek and brow
Within a covering—and dared
To plead for her; for now—
She was so good and beautiful—
They all would spared to see
And smile on her, I thought, and none
But Jesus notice me.
And I thought the blessings showered on her
Fell scattering on me, too.
From the lily's brimming dropping cup,
As the bee dust tastes the dew.

"Oh, God! poor lily, opening fair
Upon a midwived stem!
A little child's white silver soul!
So fine and frail the gem,
That but a breath could tarnish it!
Its casket should have been
A sacred home and holy heart!
And how should hands unclean
As mine were keep and carry it,
Without a spot or stain,
Safe through the wicked world and back,
All bright to heaven again?
I think as, when a fruit tree dies,
Its gentle, the country over,
Are struck with dwindling death, how'er
They throve and grew before,
On children of the dead in sin,
Sin's blight is apt to fall;
And thus their crimes are visited,
But God is over all!

"Oh, God! I was so much worse
In women than in men!
And he was sorry afterward,
And made Will marry me.
Poor lad! he always loved again.
But was not harsh to me.
I did my baby when I could.
He never seemed to see
When she came toddling in his way.
He languished by my side,
I nursed him; but we seldom spoke.
He kissed me when he died.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

For the National Era.

SIGN THE PLEDGE, AND MAKE A ROSE OF NETTIE BREST.

One of a Series of Temperance Sketches.

The night was dark, and the wind so shrill and ferocious that it really seemed to have gone mad; and yet the streets of our little village were lined with life, and all appeared to be flocking to the Town Hall, which stood (nobody knew why or wherefore) upon the top of our very bleakest hill, and quite apart from all other buildings. One young man—a huge fellow, with the step and strength of a giant—elbowed his way through the crowd, and seemed bent upon gaining the *very best* seat in the Hall.

He carried a large bundle in his arms, and it was noticed, even amid the excitement and darkness, that he ever and anon bent his shaggy head and whispered—or appeared to whisper—quite tenderly to it. There was to be a *Temperance lecture.* And the man who was to deliver it was, or had been, one of the very ringleaders in all the bacchanal proceedings that had for years disturbed the otherwise quiet village of N.

He was a young and slender man, but with a face of *wonderful* power of expression. His limbs were lithe as those of the leopard, and as he moved hither and thither, swayed by the emotion that heaved at his bosom, and burst in tides of eloquence from his lips, there arose a mighty shout from the assembled crowd, such as was never heard before, at least by *those* old walls.

"Gad," cried the stout fellow that had been most eager to get to the house. "Gad, its *Gough*, and no mistake! But, he won't stick to his preaching, *I'll* be bound. Nett, Nett, do you see him? He's the very *prince* of good fellows and hard drinkers. No, I'll never believe it, John. You *are* not—you *cannot* be one of the Cold Water Army! Stay here, Nett; I'll speak to him, if he has got through with it, and I believe he has.

"I say, John!" "John! Gad! I can hardly believe my eyes and ears—I say, have you really and truly signed the pledge, John; and do ye mean to keep it, my boy?"

"Yes, Bill," whispered Gough, as the big fellow stood beside him, with one huge fist laid on his shoulder. "Yes, Bill, I am going to *keep it.*"

"What makes you, John—what makes you do this thing? Why, you—I will not be too low you. Not a mother's son of us all can sing a song or tell a story like you! *O don't—don't, John, give us up!* What *makes* you do it?"

"Wretchedness, rage, misery!" replied Gough. "I am not a happy man—I never have been happy in the life I have led—aye, even up to this night. I vowed only three days since to give it up, and to speak to my old friends here against the whole thing. But I drank *last night.* Don't preach, Bill, I can't tell any one but you I *did* drink; but I *swear*, God helping me, I will never do it again—never!"

"Don't say so, *don't*," said Will; "I can't hear it—I *can't* give up yet," and he almost burged him in his agony.

"I don't want you to give me up," whispered Gough. "I don't want you to do it, man. You shall sign the pledge too; and we'll fight the devil together. Come, Will!"

"Me! Me!!" "Are you stark staring mad, John? *I sign the pledge?* Ha-ha-ha! Never."

"Don't say that, Will Brest, for you *shall* sign it; you shall, and make a *rose* of little Nettie—Nettie Brest my there. She's a lily, now you know, a very lily. She's a beauty, Will—a beauty in spite of her paleness. You love her dearly; and yet you are allowing her to grow up in ignorance and rage, for the sake of indulging your appetite, which has nearly ruined us both. Turn about, man, with me, and come and *sign the pledge.* See, Nett is looking at you with her large, gray eyes. See how they glisten. *I know she* wants you to."

"Nettie," called out Will, in a loud voice, "Nettie, come down here!"

The child, with a timid step, walked slowly through the benches and along the aisle to her brother's side. She was a beautiful girl, as Gough had said. Beautiful! Beautiful as a lily, too, as we half said—a very lily in slenderness and purity. There was scarcely a dry eye amid those looking on, as Will opened his arms and she sprang within their close embrace, and hid her pretty head, with its wealth of golden curls, beneath his coat.

"Take me home, Will," she whispered.

"In a moment," he returned—"in a moment. But first say if you wish me to sign this thing. Where is the confounded pledge, Gough? Where is it?"

"O, here! Say, Nett, should *you* like me to sign it? Would ye *love* me more if I did?"

"No," said Nettie; "I *couldn't* love you more; I love you now so much—O, so much, Will!" and she clasped his stout neck with her little hands. "Only let us go now."

"There, you *see*," said her brother, "you see Nett is happy and contented with me, as I am. She's a little angel. And when mother died, she *trusted* her to *me.* Mel Drunkard that I was, and am. I have half a mind to stay that thing now, just to see how it would scour."

"Don't do it," whispered a score of voices; "you'll never be able to keep it."

"Brother *Will* never breaks his *word*," whispered little Nett, as she put forth one pale hand to stroke his rough face.

"Nett," said Gough, close to her ear, "Nett, ask him to sign that pledge at once—now."

"Would it make *him* happier?" asked the child.

"A thousand times," he answered. "He'll have the finest house, the finest horses, and the best-dressed sister, as well as the handsomest, in less than no time, Nett. He is the noblest fellow in the world, only *don't* let him ruin himself with that one fault of his. It's a bad thing, Nett, to drink as he does, and as I did, but shall do no more; and you must not think it's right, because *he* does it, for it's all wrong."

"Brother Will," putting her tender lips close to his ear, "Brother Will, I think I would sign that 'thing,' for it will make *him* happy, and you know you *love* him—next to me. Besides, he says, by and by, you will be ruined if you do not, and that, you know, would ruin me, too. Wouldn't, it Will?"

"Ah, John, you are up to your old tricks. You know well I can't resist you—and then to get Nett on your side, too! Well, here goes my name. See now if I don't keep to that pledge, as long as you do, John."

They all three left the house together, and I couldn't tell which face radiated most love, as the darkness closed upon them.

Correspondence of the Era.

MINNESOTA TERRITORY—INTERESTING FACTS.

St. Anthony, Min. Ter., *March* 28, 1856.

To the Editor of the National Era:

Having a leisure moment, I am tempted to add a word respecting our Territory. The Republican party here organized, partially, last fall. They elected a strong and able minority to the Legislature, whose straight-forward and judicious action, during the Legislature just closed, has left a favorable impression on the community. It is a significant fact that the great majority of the Democratic party repudiate the Kansas and Nebraska act, as well as the present Administration. Resolutions in its support received but a meagre vote, though strongly urged by the Governor and other United States incumbents. The impression is quite prevalent that Minnesota henceforth will be strongly Republican in politics.

Our Territory is now in the full tide of advancement and prosperity. We have already reached a very respectable position. Our population a year since was estimated at 30,000. From the time of last June, and from the most reliable information to be obtained, it cannot now be less than 80,000, it is believed—an increase in one year of 45,000, or more than 128 per cent. Thousands and tens of thousands of letters from our settlers have been sent, bearing a knowledge of facts and favorable impressions of our Territory, to friends in every section of our country. From the East and from the West, we hear of large numbers coming. The emigration the present season will doubtless exceed that of any former year. And *now* is emphatically *the favorable time.* The land (but an inconsiderable quantity) is not in market, and the most desirable points and fertile soils are waiting for an occupant at $1.25 per acre. Many sections of the Territory are considerably settled, and enjoy now the advantages of good roads, good schools, churches, good neighborhoods, and nearly all the comforts and luxuries to be found in the old States. Want of easy communication in winter with the world outside, and the little cultivated fruit to be had, are perhaps the deprivations most felt; but these we shall have, ere long, in common with the world. The great drawback to actual settlers to make Minnesota their future home, is the fact that a large portion of the Territory, all the better sections, will unquestionably be nearly all preempted by speculators, long before it can come into market, leaving but poor gleanings for the speculator. This fact is very important, especially as regards our future, both individually and as a Territory, and will be in marked contrast with the North Western States, and especially Illinois and Northern Iowa, where immense tracts of the choice lands have been and are now being plastered over and bound up with the speculator's warrants—the lech that sucks the life, the sinews, and blood, of the pioneers, scatters their settlements, and stays the hand of public and private improvement. *Here* the settler, living on his broad acres, will be surrounded by a solid and compact settlement, where each mutually advances the interests of other's interests, and who will build roads and bridges, construct railroads, establish schools, found churches, enjoy the society and all the rich benefits which flow from combined labor and wealth, in a closely populated community.

All seem to enjoy a very uncommon degree of health. We have had no epidemics, neither are we subject to malarious diseases. We have many settlers from Illinois, Iowa, &c., &c., who there were broken down in health, with fever and ague, heavy doctors' bills to pay, little strength, and no disposition to labor, who here are enjoying a strength, vigor, and energy, well, I hope, to appreciate the term. This is the substance of the language of *many* that I have talked with, and I have not learned of one instance of a different experience. Some of the best physicians, of longest practice here, confirm these statements, and also say they have known of no case of consumption which has first developed itself here; also state that they have seen, in their practice, many persons who, on reaching the Territory, had decided consumptive appearances, and who are now free of bronchial affections, &c., and in every instance an entire recovery followed a residence here of a few weeks or months, with only the exception of cases where the lungs were partially consolidated, where it was impossible—with the disease, the lungs seemed unable to bear our stimulating atmosphere, and the disease but hastened on the more quickly.

We are abundantly supplied with excellent pure water, from numerous lakes, springs, and running streams, many of which contain trout, pickerel, pike, and other fish. Our water power is unsurpassed, and we have the confident prediction of intelligent mechanics that this

legislate for the Territories without restriction, so far as the subject of Slavery was concerned, and absolutely to reject or admit new States on such terms and for such reasons as to Congress might seem proper.

Mr. Maxwell, of Florida, then obtained the floor, when the Committee rose.

And then, at three o'clock, the House adjourned.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Office, No. 501 Seventh street, between D and E, one square south of City Post Office.

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1856.

THE NATIONAL ERA FOR THE CAMPAIGN.

Extension of Time.

We propose to issue the *National Era* for the Campaign, from the 1st of May, instant, to the 1st of January, inclusive, comprising thirty-six numbers of the *Era*, covering the whole period of the Presidential canvass, election, and returns, for $1 a copy, in clubs of five or more.

☞ The Poem on our first page will attract attention. It will be continued through two more numbers more of the *Era*.

☞ Unfortunately, part fourth of "*What it Costs to Know a Countess,*" was lost; and, the writer not having time to prepare another copy for this week, it will not appear till next week.

Mrs. Emily P. Lesderhier, a lady of position in the literary circles of the North, and a highly successful elocutionist, proposes giving a public reading in Washington, on Monday, May 5th. Mrs. Lesderhier is recommended to the people of Washington by the press of the North, and by the commendations of numbers of the most intelligent and influential ladies and gentlemen of New York and Boston. We doubt not that she will be warmly welcomed and highly appreciated by the people of this city.

THE ELECTION BILL FOR THE DISTRICT.

Last Friday, the Senate passed a bill relating to Elections in the District of Columbia—the same as that agreed upon by the Committee of the House, but not yet reported. It proposes no change of the existing law defining the qualification of voters, but regulates the duties of Commissioners, proscribes penalties for neglect of duty, and provides for additional precincts for voting, and opening the polls at seven o'clock, instead of ten. The bill is intended to correct existing evils, to secure the purity of the elective franchise, and is unexceptionable. As our annual election will take place the first Monday in June, we trust that the House will pass the bill without delay. It is a fair and just measure, and we do hope that every Anti-Nebraska member will resist any attempt to mix it up with general politics or with any of the questions in controversy between parties. The are some questions which concern us in the District alone, and this is one of them. Let it be decided on its merits, apart from extraneous considerations.

RADICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION.

Gerrit Smith and a considerable number of Abolitionists who believe with him that, under the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Judiciary has the power to abolish Slavery in the States, and ought to exercise it, and are opposed to the Republican Party, because it declines to take that ground, have called a Nation Radical Abolition Convention, *to meet at Syracuse, New York, Wednesday, the* 28th of next May, "for the purpose of nominating men, for President and Vice President of the United States, who have the ability, the integrity, and the courage, to assert their principles, and who will wield their official powers for the deliverance of every American slave, for the deliverance of every American slaveholder, and for the salvation of the whole country."

The Scheme Won't Work.—It is stated as an item of interest, that Col. Fremont dined at Dr. Bailey's, on Saturday last, with Giddings, Sumner, Banks, Tappan of New Hampshire, &c.—*Worcester Daily Spy, 5th inst.*

This is copied into the Wisconsin *Free Democrat*, with comments implying that we are connected with the movement for bringing forward Col. Fremont as a candidate for the Presidency. Certainly it would be no discredit to give a dinner to the gentlemen named, or any of them, but, it so happens that said correspondent is entirely mistaken. Furthermore—we are connected with no movement in Washington or elsewhere for bringing forward any man as a candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. Benton has been nominated for Governor of Missouri by the Benton Democracy of that State, T. Peck the Atchison candidate, and R. C. Ewing, the Know Nothing. Two sets of delegates to the Cincinnati Convention have also been chosen.

The Pennsylvania Legislature adjourned last Tuesday week, after having passed six hundred and seventy-one acts.

Maine Liquor Law in Massachusetts.—On the 22d April, in the Senate of Massachusetts, majority and minority reports on the Maine Liquor Law being under consideration, the whole subject was indefinitely postponed, by a nearly unanimous vote.

Republican Congressional Committee.—The Anti-Nebraska members of Congress have appointed Messrs. Collamer and Wilson of the Senate, and Messrs. Mace, Covode, Mott, Dodd, and Norton, an Executive Committee, to superintend the work of the canvass.

Important Decision.—Judge Nelson, of the Supreme Court, on the 21st April, delivered the opinion of the Court in the case of the State of Pennsylvania, complainant, against the Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Company, and others, dissolving the injunction granted by the Circuit Judge, overruling the motion of the complainant for writs of assistance and attachments, and granting the motions for taxations of costs, and the process therefor.

Disrespect to Mr. Buchanan.—April 24th, after a heated and personal discussion, resolutions tendering the use of Independence Hall to Mr. Buchanan, for the purpose of allowing him to receive his friends publicly, were defeated in the City Councils of Philadelphia.

The Backbone.—This is the title of a Republican paper for the campaign, to be issued by John R. French, from the office of the *Morning Leader*, Cleveland, Ohio, commencing early in the month of May. It will be "of respectable and new type," published weekly at $1 in advance a single copy; in packages of twenty or more, at fifty cents a copy. Success to it.

Rock Island Bridge Completed.—The first passenger train of cars crossed the Mississippi bridge, at Rock Island, on the 22d.

Mount Vernon Estate.—John A. Washington writes to the *National Intelligencer* that he *was* willing to sell Mount Vernon to either Virginia or the United States, but, both declining to purchase, the property is not now for sale.

THE PRINCIPLE TO BE ESTABLISHED.

Under the head, "*Correspondence of the Era,*" may be found some indications of a growing apprehension among Anti-Slavery men concerning the ultimate direction of what is called the Republican movement. It is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that not a few of those whom we have been accustomed to consider the most earnest epponents of the Slave Power are dissatisfied and distrustful.

Their suspicions were first awakened by the proceedings of the Pittsburgh Convention. The Address adopted was a good one, but the language used in defining the objects of the movement then initiated, was rather vague and ambiguous.

"We do therefore declare to the People of the United States"—so runs the declaration—"as objects for which we unite in political action—

"1. We demand and shall attempt to secure the repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of Slavery into Territories once consecrated to Freedom, and will resist by every constitutional means the existence of Slavery in any of the Territories of the United States.

"2. We will support by every lawful means our brethren in Kansas in their constitutional and manly resistance to the usurped authority of their lawless invaders, and will give the full weight of our political power in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas to the Union as a free, sovereign, and independent State.

"3. Believing that the present National Administration has shown itself to be weak and faithless, and that its continuance in power is identified with the progress of the Slave Power to national supremacy, with the extension of Freedom from the Territory, and with increasing civil discord, it is a leading purpose of our organization to oppose and overthrow it."

Opposition to the Administration, and support of the admission of Kansas as a free State, are declared in terms sufficiently explicit; but *the great Principle*, which was waived by the North in 1850, and in the waiver of which the South in 1854 claimed to find warrant for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, we mean the *Principle of Slavery-restriction by positive act of Congress*, is really evaded. The first paragraph makes a show of asserting something; but whatever that may be, it is not *the* Principle indicated above, or, indeed, any Principle at all. The sixth article of the Ordinance of 1787, in relation to the Northwest Territory, is brief and explicit: "There shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude therein, otherwise than in punishment of crime." These few lines are plain, manly, unmistakable, effectual. The Wilmot Proviso as briefly and clearly re-affirms the same Principle, in regard to United States Territories—"Provided there shall be therein neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude otherwise than in punishment of crime." With like simplicity and directness the liberal Conventions held in the Free States pending the controversy in regard to the Territories of the United States in 1848–'50, affirmed *the right and duty of Congress to prohibit Slavery in all those Territories.*

The question arises, Why did not the Pittsburgh Convention boldly re-affirm the same Principle, in terms equally unambiguous? "We demand and shall attempt to secure the repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of Slavery into Territories once consecrated to Freedom"—it says. What does this mean? Federal laws? or Territorial laws? "Territories once consecrated to Freedom!" Which are they? Kansas and Nebraska? Or, not only these, but New Mexico and Utah? "*Once* consecrated to Freedom?" We suppose, then, that if there be Territories of the United States which have not once been consecrated to Freedom, they are to be suffered to remain under a slave code, should it exist! Is this what the Convention meant?

The "repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of Slavery?" Pray, what are they? There may be no law at all; and then Slavery says, "I will go and take possession—what prevents?" That is just the way Slavery does get foot-hold. What would the policy of your negative resolve effect in such case? You cannot repeal laws that have no existence.

Again: "And will resist by every constitutional means the existence of Slavery in any of the Territories of the United States." Wonderful! "Every *constitutional* means?" What is constitutional? General Cass says it is not constitutional to resist it by Congressional action—and so says the South. What says the Pittburgh Convention? Nothing at all. It dodges the issue—it refuses to assert the Principle—"Slavery prohibition by Congressional act in the Territories of the United States."

Instead of this vague, meaningless declaration, the Convention ought to have said, in plain, bold words—

"We insist upon the right of Congress to prohibit Slavery by positive law in all the Territories of the United States, and upon the immediate duty of exercising this right."

It was the vague and evasive character of these declarations of the Pittsburgh Convention that first awakened the suspicions of vigilant Anti-Slavery men. They saw in it a concession to the Northern Know Nothings; for, bear in mind, the characteristic feature of the Anti-Slavery platform of these men is, the restoration of the Missouri Compromise, in terms *or substance*—that is, if the Compromise could not be restored in form, then the territory once consecrated by it to Freedom, should be organized into free States. This, in general, is the sum and substance of their platform on the question of Slavery; and this, we see, was all that was really embodied in the Pittsburgh declarations.

To these, at the time, we took no exception; although, had we been at the Convention, we should have exposed them. The Convention, however, was not called to make a platform, and we were content to await the action of the Philadelphia Convention. But events have transpired, since then, which awaken the apprehension that a similar policy may be attempted at Philadelphia.

First, we have the action of the Executive Committee appointed by the National Republican Convention at Pittsburgh. It issues a call to the People of the United States, "who are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, to the policy of the present Administration, *to the extension of Slavery into the Territories*, in favor of the admission of Kansas as a free State, and of securing the action of the Federal Government to the Principles of Washington and Jefferson," to meet in Convention, &c.

The liberality of the call is praiseworthy, nor do we object to its harmless rhetoric about the principles of Washington and Jefferson; but in the multitude of words, we find no distinct statement of the *Principle* on which the next Presidential contest ought to turn. Instead of the general and unmeaning phrase, "*opposed to the extension of Slavery into the Territories,*" the committee should have said—*in favor of the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories by act of Congress.* We should take a positive, and not negative, position; assert a principle, and not proclaim a mere sentiment.

Again, the committee, doubtless with the best intentions in the world, simply subscribes itself—"*National Committee.*" National Committee of what? By whom constituted? Acting by authority of whom?

Let us say, most respectfully, there is a want of ingenuousness in such conduct, which is not in keeping with the character of a great political movement.

These are not the only indications that have produced dissatisfaction. The question of the admission of Kansas is of great importance, but we should remember that it is a temporary question; one which has arisen within a year, and may be disposed of within a year; and one which, if disposed of simply on its own merits, without reference to the great principle of Slavery prohibition, will leave the country just where it was after the adoption of the compromises of 1850. Now, the tendency of the policy of conciliation, as it is called, so popular among our politicians, is to resolve the Republican movement *into a mere effort to admit Kansas*, and so intent are many of our friends on this particular point of policy, that they seem ready to forego any declaration of Principle whatsoever; in fact, to leave the whole policy of the compromise of 1850 undisturbed, as the settled policy of the country. Look at the columns of the Republican press, and you would hardly know whether the doctrine of Slavery-prohibition by Congress is entertained by it or not. And so with expressions of opinion by prominent men who have become associated with the Republican movement. For example, we have read several letters of Mr. Banks, in reply to invitations to attend Republican meetings, but how studiously he omits the slightest word suggestive of a conflict with Slavery or the Slave Power! The terms are not used, while much is said about conciliation, union, power, &c. And let us not be thought captious when we note with regret a similar omission in the letter of Col. Fremont, lately published in the *Era*, and so greatly eulogized by the New York *Evening Post* and the *Tribune*. That letter shows that the sympathies of the writer are with his old friend, Governor Robinson, and with the people of Kansas, in their effort to establish a free Government, but nothing more. It states no principle, lays down no line of policy, defines in no respect Col. Fremont's position in regard to the question of Slavery. In fact, that question is not named in the letter.

We refer to these things, not wantonly, not because we like to find fault, but for the purpose of suggesting to our friends that if they would succeed in the coming contest, they must recognise Slavery-Domination as the real Evil of the country, openly confront it, and plant themselves on a comprehensive and permanent Principle, not a temporary Question. We do not wish them to multiply issues—to construct a platform of multitudinous planks—but we do ask them to affirm, as the basis of their action, the Principle, disgracefully waived by the North in 1850—the Principle of Slavery-Prohibition by Congress in all United States Territory. Let there be no dodging, no evasion, no clamorous declamation about Freedom in Kansas alone, no clap-trap about "opposition to the Administration," "opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise," "the principles of Washington and Jefferson." Washington and Jefferson differed on many principles—Jefferson practiced on some principles we by no means admire—we are opposed to the Administration, chiefly, on account of its pro-slavery policy—we *were* opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, but that is a fact accomplished—we are in favor of Freedom in Kansas—BUT, no less anxious for Freedom in Utah, New Mexico, and whatever Territory may be hereafter acquired. For one, we cannot be drawn into a fight merely on transient or incidental questions. Much we will concede for the sake of uniting the People of the Free States in the coming Presidential contest, but we will not concede the Principle of the sixth article of the Ordinance of 1787, the original Policy of the Government, the Wilmot Proviso, the Principle of Slavery-Prohibition by Congress. This was the Principle in Controversy in 1848–'50—this is the Principle in Controversy now. Let the Convention at Philadelphia resolve—

1. That Congress has the right to prohibit Slavery in all Federal Territories, and ought to exercise it.

2. That Kansas is of right and in fact free, and ought to be admitted at once as a free State:

Then, nominate men for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, who will be just as explicit and emphatic in their declarations as these resolves are—

And then, we can all work together, heart and hand. Let it dodge the great Principle, in its resolves or nominees, and we see not how any honest, clear-sighted man, who understands the real Evil of the country, and the exigencies of the crisis, can take any special interest in the contest. Let the Principle, we have indicated, be established and settled, as the Fundamental Law of all Territory, and Kansas is not only saved, but so are New Mexico and Utah, and the rule of the Slave Power is broken. Thenceforth, other reforms would follow naturally, easily, beneficently, without violence or dangerous discord.

ANOTHER PECULIAR INSTITUTION IN UTAH.

A Fugitive Slave Advertised There.

From the Washington Correspondence of the New York Evening Post

WASHINGTON, *April* 21, 1856.

The workings of popular sovereignty in Utah are recently shown by the introduction of Slavery and the slave trade. The Mormons of that Territory, not content with polygamy, desire to extend the application of Douglas's new gospel to its legitimate results, as may be seen by the following extract of a letter addressed to a Congressman in this city:

"——, Utah Territory, *January* 30, 1856.

"Dear Sir: Knowing you to be 'sound' on the Negro Question, as well as on Polygamy, and our brethren here are soon to apply for admission as a State, we just send you a note to let you see we are all right on the Main Question. Judge Drummond has gone a little into the negro slave trade, as the enclosed handbill will show. Judge Kinney is also in the slave trade, as well as the principal men of the Territory. Secretary A. W. Babbitt has renewed his Mormonism, and is a loud preacher. He wants to be Senator."

The handbill referred to in the above letter commences, in staring type, as follows—the slave Cato appears to have been "sold running:"

"*Take Notice.*—As I have sold my Negro Man Cato to the Hon. W. W. Drummond, of this city, and the reward recently offered one hundred dollars reward for his delivery to me; I now take this method of informing the public that as I am now about to leave this Territory, I will no longer be held liable for the said reward—he may take Cato being the property of the said Judge Drummond.

"J. A. Harkereder.

"Dated at Great Salt Lake City, the 21st day of July, A. D. 1855."

These facts show the necessity of making the issue in the coming Presidential election—*Freedom to the Territories by Act of Congress.* Slavery must be excluded not only from Kansas, but from all the Territories.

Southern Emigration.—The Charleston *Patriot* and Winnsboro' (S. C.) *Register* deprecate Southern emigration to Kansas. They think the South cannot compete with the North in the work of Colonization, that it is really weakened by the drain of its population, and that in the case of Kansas, slave-property would only be placed in jeopardy.

Messrs. Howard and Sherman, of the Kansas Investigating Committee, reached Fort Leavenworth on the 16th inst. Mr. Oliver had not arrived.

WASHINGTON.

It is popular to abuse Washington. Members of Congress from the West, with its overflowing granaries, rail against it because they cannot get board at so cheap a rate as they can at home. They forget that prices here are no higher than in Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New York. Members from the North, accustomed to the finish of New York and Boston hotels, which depend on no transient custom, grow melancholy over the poor accommodation of Washington hotels, which are crowded to overflowing at one season of the year, and starved out at another. Members from all sections growl whenever they feel indisposed, laying the blame on the climate: it is too warm, too cold, too damp, too dry, too still, or too windy. The truth is, they are *not at home*—and Eden would please them no better than Washington, if they were only sojourners there. As to their ailments, we can give them a hint or two. Let them use less tobacco, drink less liquor, avoid late and heavy suppers, attend not more than one party an evening, let champagne alone, and go to bed at a decent hour—in other words, be as simple in their habits here as at home, and they will be better beth in health and temper. Having resided in Washington nine years, and brought up a large family of children, we know that there is no healthier city in these United States.

But, the abuse of Washington is not confined to members. The Press abroad joins in the popular clamor. Editors and letter-writers, who live in hotels or boarding-houses, write home harrowing descriptions of Washington life. And pray, whom do they find in their circles? Adventurers, contractors, place-hunters, lobby men, claimants, claim agents, pleasure-seekers, clerks dependent upon a Pro-Slavery Administration with which they are expected to sympathize, and some respectable folk sojourning here for one purpose or another—but all of them, with few exceptions, from abroad. Now, it must be understood that our amiable letter-writer, when he lampoons Washington, is in fact abusing his own associates. It is New York, or Boston, or Cincinnati, or Richmond, imported, and squatting here for a time, which he mistakes for Washington. It is to be regretted that he has been so unfortunate in his associations.

"O, this is a vile Pro-Slavery spot." We do not wonder you think so, when you see around you only a crowd of Northern doughfaces. But, we have no less freedom of discussion here, and a little more toleration than you can boast of in some Northern communities. Three presses on which we once printed an Anti-Slavery paper in Cincinnati, a free city, were pulled down by mobs, dragged, in face of the Sheriff, the Mayor, the Military and Civil Power, to the Ohio river, and thrown into it—and then, when the mean deed had been completed, order was restored, and a wonderful regard manifested for the preservation of property! In this much-abused city of Washington, some eight years ago, a great mob, encouraged by certain members of Congress, attempted to destroy our press, and was on foot for three days—but, the civil authorities interposed, bravely struggled to maintain order, and at last put down the mob, and prevented the overthrow of the press. And since then, a young clergyman has stood up in his place in a Washington pulpit, and preached on Slavery to his congregation, in a way which would have split many a conservative church at the North. But, he has lost neither caste nor position—the majority of his church, while dissenting from his views, recognise the independence of the pulpit. So much for security of person and opinion in this terrible spot.

"But, Washington is a great borer—it is always boring the Public Treasury." H. G., of the *Tribune*, says:

"It has no commerce but that which ministers to its immediate wants; no manufactures but the manufacture of claims on the Treasury; no arts but the art of boring gimlet-holes into the public chest, and enlarging them to auger-holes as rapidly as possible."

We do not see how H. G., who seems to think commerce a nuisance, and would have each continuent and each State hermetically sealed against every other by the protective policy, can find fault with Washington because it carries on only a *necessary* commerce. As to the manufacture of claims, Washington has just nothing at all to do with it, except to give board and lodging to the manufacturers, pouring from New York and other States; and the art of boring is pretty well monopolized by the experts from that great hive of borers. We are under the impression that a New Yorker has been revelling for some years in the fat job of public printing—one of the biggest "auger-holes" we know anything about. The binding, a very lucrative business, is assigned, we believe, to a citizen of Ohio—(we wish all the jobs were given to men as worthy as he!)—and, we should like to know, who does the engraving, such engravings, for example, as those in the Pacific Railroad Exploration, costing nearly a quarter of a million of dollars? Washington is not favored with such jobs—it cannot get near enough to the Treasury to bore it.

The *New York Times* joins in the general cry, "Stop thief!" Congress, which owns here 4,117 acres, while individual citizens own only 1,508, and in addition is the proprietor of buildings, &c., valued at fifty millions of dollars, while the real and personal property of the citizens by the last assessment—and a high one it was—amounted to but twenty-five millions; after having expended more than half a million of dollars in printing twenty-three thousand copies of the Pacific Railroad Explorations, elegantly engraved, for the use of members, and such of their constituents as they may favor, has just refused an appropriation of $300,000 to continue the Washington Aqueduct, intended to furnish to the city an ample supply of water. The chief objection to the work, we presume, is, that it is not in the hands of some foreign contractor, but has been placed under the superintendence of Captain Meigs, an officer of the United States service. Not intending, however, to discuss the question whether a proprietor, who owns more land, more real and personal estate, here, than all of Washington besides, and is moreover exempted from all taxation, while the affairs will enter largely into the political conflict which is just opening up before us; and knowing that there is an increasing desire in the minds of men of all parties *to know the facts in relation to Kansas*, and to learn them from the lips of one whom we have heard and known in other days of trial and conflict, and who has taken an active part in the affairs of Kansas, both in Congress and in the Territory itself, we have felt it to be our duty to ask you to revisit a county which gave you the largest majority it ever gave any man for a State office, and address us on these deeply interesting matters, at as early a day as to you may be convenient.

John T. Vawter,
James Ritchey,
George W. Riddell,
and thirty others.

Gen. James H. Lane.

Col. Lane, April 13th, replies in an excellent letter, closing as follows:

"I will be with you at Franklin on Saturday, the 26th of the present month, and will address as many of your fellow-citizens as can make it convenient to meet me, at any hour which will be deemed most suitable.

"I will thank you specially to invite my old companions in arms, which will include all Indiana's volunteers. I was associated with the chivalric but disappointed first regiment, amid the pestiferous marshes of the Rio Grande; with the noble but unfortunate second, at Buena Vista; saw them when they moved forward to that exposed position, which they so unflinchingly maintained amid a front and flank fire of small arms from more than ten times their own force, at the same time exposed to an enfilading fire of grape and canister from four pieces of artillery, until every third man had fallen, killed or wounded, and the order to 'cease firing and retreat' was three times repeated. I was with the impetuous fourth at Puebla; and those of the steadfast third and gallant fifth, whe stood by me in the hour of peril, are engraven on my heart, and will never be erased. Te take these noble spirits, and the relatives of the gallant dead, again by the hand, is my fervent wish.

"Accept, gentlemen, my sincere wishes for your welfare. Very truly, your friend,

"J. H. Lane."

EDUCATION IN THE CANADAS.

Annual Report of the Normal, Model, Grammar, and Common Schools in Upper Canada, for the year 1856. With an Appendix. By the Chief Superintendent of Schools. Printed by order of the Legislative Assembly.

Whether or not the Canadas are to become a part of our Union, and to form two or more States of this Republic, is a question which time and circumstances must decide. We have thought that such might be the case, but the prehabilities of an event like this are much lessened, and we confess to our doubts if it shall soon, even if ever, be reached. Our views rest on the comparatively little desire of our Canadian neighbors—and even of that portion once so strenuous for it, the Canadian patriots—to be incorporated with us, and the determined opposition the proposal will meet with from the South. The Canadians, witnessing the strides Slavery has been making among us, its arrogant claims for nationality, and prizing the blessings rather of Freedom, intact and unsullied, will be far more likely to set up for themselves, and take care of themselves, than to place their rights and institutions within reach of the grasp of so insatiable a monster. Especially will this be true, if they may, as doubtless they yet will, enjoy the blessings of free trade and reciprocal commerce to its fullest extent with the States more immediately on their borders. Such an intercourse will lead to a closer one of connections in families and kindred, and thus assimilated, if the propitious era shall arrive when Freedom among these States shall be triumphant, and the Slave Power be humbled, they may willingly cast in their lot, and be one with this then really free people. But, whether such be the result or not, we cannot regard without deep interest every advance in all that prepares a State for independence, and constitutes its glory among our Canadian brethren. It were better for us were we more acquainted with this progress, and if we understood their means and resources in this respect. The pamphlet furnishes us with no inconsiderable amount of information on the subject of education, one of deep, practical interest, and bearing on the welfare of any community. It is an official document, full of important statistics, and, like every such public paper, affording materials of comparison and proof as to the efficiency of systematic education for training up a people for the enjoyment of the highest privileges of a State or Nation.

The present Report relates only to Upper Canada, or, as it is now more frequently termed, Canada West. This portion of the whole country, while it contains, no doubt, a large part of the most cultivated and best citizens, next to Lower Canada, includes some, too, of the most debased, and probably, likewise, of the most bigoted in all the British Provinces. Certainly, some as degraded and shameless as we have ever seen among the human race, we saw years ago, among the mongrel population of Canada, of the mixed races of Canadian, French, and Indian blood. We hope things are better now; at least, if we may augur anything from the facts in the pages before us, we are sure the light is beginning to penetrate the dark places, where, in their chambers of imagery, superstition, and ignorance, had gathered their abominations. No doubt the influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood has rested like an incubus on the country—we embrace now, in our remark, all of Canada—and the report before us gives evidence that this power is exerted still to prevent the diffusion of a purer and more free effort to rise. But it is no matter of wonder that Canada, in a great degree, for many long years only a sort of military colony, settled originally by the French, and the Roman Catholic religion, in the most despotic form, wrought into the elements of its national being, and thus moulded into a country where all kinds of prejudices and passions adverse to a truer Gospel have been fostered and gathered into giant strength—it is what was to be expected, that Canada, thus born and nurtured, should be long in learning the secret of its power, and cast away from itself the bonds in which it has been held. The day of its deliverance from this vassalage is approaching. Efforts and successes like those here recorded, are to bear no small part in ushering in, as they now herald, that day.

We can only throw together a few of the statistics and facts here given. The whole pamphlet contains some 250 pages, 8vo, and is divided into the General Report, Statistical Report, and Appendix, full of interesting papers and matters relating to the subject of schools, and education generally.

The General Report gives nine tables, and discusses the important question of religious instruction in the schools. On this question, the report takes strong ground against the schools being allowed to become sectarian or denominational. There seems to be a desire, on the part of some of those belonging to the national churches, to secure this result; but it has not succeeded in impressing such a character on the schools hitherto. As decided an advocacy, too, is maintained in the Report in favor of general religious instruction, such as is prevalent in the best school systems of New England. Mr. Ryerson, the chief Superintendent of the Schools, quotes largely from his report of 1851, in which he fully discussed this subject, and he says, "I believe the number of persons in Upper Canada who would theoretically or practically exclude Christianity, in all its forms, as an essential element in the education of the country, is exceedingly small, and that more than nine-tenths of the people regard religious instruction as an essential and vital part of the education of their offspring. On this, as well as on higher grounds, I lay it down as a fundamental principle, that religious instruction must form part of the education of the youth of our country, and that religious instruction must be given by the several religious persuasions to their youth, respectively." The bearing of the Report is evidently in favor of the Bible in schools, leaving it, as their law does, to the trustees and parents to arrange for themselves the form of practice in reading it as a school-book.

The Statistical Report contains twenty-one tables of minute details as to the number of schools, teachers, scholars, books used, amount of money expended, &c., and covers some sixty pages of the Report. There is much interesting matter here, but it can hardly be compressed so as to be of use in our present column. As a total it is stated that "there are in Upper Canada 1 normal school, 2 model schools, (boys and girls,) 64 county grammar schools, and 3,244 common schools," making, in all, 3,311, besides the Provincial University, and nine colleges, three of which are endowed with university powers. A grand total of nearly a million of dollars, or one dollar for each inhabitant of Upper Canada, is stated as the cost. The attendance of pupils between the ages of 5 and 21, at the public schools in 1854, was 208,455; at the academies, private schools, and colleges, 214,634, or, in all, 423,000 and over, being one for every four inhabitants, and an increase, in a year, of 24,486 pupils, leaving about 60,000 children who never attend school at all in Upper Canada, which, indeed, is 20,000 less than reported the previous year. Did our limits allow, we should like to make some comparisons here with the results of our own census, and especially as to schools in some of the largest slaveholding States, in proportion to the population. The result would be not surely in their favor, alongside of our Canadian neighbors. The selection of books evinces that a thorough course of instruction is the aim. The Appendix contains numerous extracts from the subreports, embodying a variety of particulars in relation to the conduct and proficiency of the scholars, and management of the schools, which will be useful as matters of reverence and after comparison. A most interesting portion of this Report is the replies of several distinguished gentlemen of Massachusetts, to questions on the operation of the Common School system of that State. Among them we find the names of Bishop Eastburn, Edward Everett, Daniel Webster, Robert C. Winthrop, George Bancroft, George S. Hilliard, Jared Sparks, George Ticknor, Prescott the historian, and Longfellow the poet. One and all concur in high praise of the system. We should be glad to quote largely from this document, if we could, but can only give a few extracts here and there, as to the operation of the system, as a whole. Says Daniel Webster: "I have been familiar with the New England system of Free Schools for fifty years, and I heartily approve of it. * * And, in my own case, I can say, that without these early means of instruction, ordained by law, and brought home to the small villages and hamlets, for the use of all their children equally, I do not see how I should have been able to become so far instructed in the elements of knowledge as to be fit for the higher schools."

Says Edward Everett: "This would be good in any country; in ours, it is an essential part of our general social system. I send my son to the public school in Cambridge, because it is the best within my reach."

Says Mr. Bancroft: "The Common School system of instruction in New England has been of incalculable service to morality, and makes the whole population susceptible of a far higher degree of knowledge on subjects connected with religion. I could hardly use language strong enough to express my sense of the benefit done by it, to the character, vigor of enterprise, morality, industry, general self-respect, love of liberty, respect for law, and attainments in religious knowledge, of the people of New England."

Says Mr. Winthrop: "I should find it almost as difficult to state the main grounds for my unqualified approbation of our Common School system, as I should to state the reasons for cherishing the common bounties and blessings of Providence—the light, the air, or the seasons. I cannot conceive of our getting along without them, under a political system like ours. They are a vital part of our Government; they are our most efficient police; our institutions would not enable us to provide any substitute for them. * * If New England has made rapid strides in anything good, or great, or valuable, since its settlement, I think it has been primarily owing to the Common School system."

Mr. Prescott also says: "I believe no other system of instruction would be so favorable to the great body of the people; and such an education is of the last importance to a republican Government like ours."

Similar is the testimony of Dr. Sparks: "A system may be fairly judged by its results. In this respect, the system of Common Schools in New England claims unqualified approbation. It has existed two hundred years, and I am not aware that the people of any country or community have exhibited the fruits of moral and religious culture in a higher degree than the inhabitants of New England."

Mr. Ticknor, after giving his commendation in general, says: "And I will add—having lived two or three years in Germany, and longer in other parts of Europe—that I believe this New England system to be more effectual than any system of teaching has been made elsewhere, to secure the well-being of a State."

Such—and more might be cited—is the testimony given in 1851, by men who certainly cannot be charged with fanaticism, to the high intellectual and moral training of the States of New England. We had adverted to this topic not merely as evincing the efforts of our friends in Canada to acquaint themselves with the best systems and select the best models, but for still another reason. It is men brought up under *such* training—her best, her chosen sons, carrying with them their experience of such means of mental and moral culture, and at once to establish them there, who are pressing from New England into Kansas. Are such men likely to be what they have been called by their enemies? It is to *keep out* such men, to fix upon that soil a curse that will blight *such elements of the strength and glory of our Republic*, that lawlessness and political frenzy are combined to make Kansas a slave State. Do not our readers see what *must* be, and what *is* the contrast now, in these respects? and can any true lover of his country, with his eyes open, hesitate one moment as to the alternative of Slavery or Freedom in Kansas?

Philadelphia Steamboat Disaster.—On the 24th April, the Directors and Superintendent of the Camden Ferry Company and the officers of the steamboat New Jersey, with the Inspectors of Boilers and Machinery, were all arrested by the Sheriff of the city of Camden, and held to bail in the sum of $3,000 each, to answer in the matter of the loss of life by the burning of said ferry boat.

Republicanism in Michigan.—The Detroit *Tribune*, of April 22d, says:

"We have received sufficient returns of the result of the township elections in this State to leave no doubt that the large majority of the counties have gone overwhelmingly Republican.

"Of the thirty-two principal counties of the State, the Republicans have certainly carried twenty-one by decided majorities, and probably twenty-three, while the doughfaces have carried but nine certain, with a poor chance for two more! Of the five hundred and odd Supervisors elected by these thirty-two counties, the Republicans have carried at least 275 to the Loofocos 230, giving them a majority of not less than *forty-five*."

The Coolie Business.—The impropriety of this traffic is fully proved by the fact that our merchants, who were induced by plausible statements to allow our vessels to be engaged in it, upon the first representation of the manner in which it was actually carried on, investigated the subject carefully, and, being convinced of its liability to gross abuse, determined to withdraw from all participation in it at once, at whatever pecuniary sacrifice; and such have been their orders to their agents abroad, at the risk of prosecutions for violations of contracts. This course is certainly honorable to their sense of justice, and entitles them to the approbation of the community.—*Boston Post.*

The Review.

NEW BOOKS.

In the struggle now going on in this country between the systems of Free and Slave Labor, the fairness of the actual working of the latter, its evils and its compensations, its domestic, social, moral, economical, and political phenomena, are of primary importance to the statesman and moralist; and, in fact, to every man who desires to act wisely and understandingly upon the questions growing out of this conflict. After all that has been written on both sides, it has been difficult for a sincere seeker of the truth to obtain a clear and satisfactory knowledge of the actual results of Slavery, as developed in the daily life of planters and slaves, poor whites, and free blacks. We have seen nothing so well calculated to meet this want, as "A JOURNEY THROUGH THE SEABOARD SLAVE STATES," by F. L. Olmsted, well known as the author of "*Walks and Talks of an American Farmer in England.*" The author writes without passion or prejudice, and is uniformly genial and good-humored. He has the rare faculty of seeing things as they are, undistorted and uncolored. His book is a daguerreotype of the South. So far as we can judge, the picture is accurate. Every phase of Southern life and manners is delineated with a minuteness of detail which leaves no room for critical regrets. The story of his rambles, winding brightly through the statistical facts and philosophical reflections of the volume, is so admirably told, that it has more than the interest of romance.

He enjoyed rare opportunities for studying the character of the people of the South, both broad and free; and his portraits of travelling companions and chance acquaintances, of all colors and conditions, are manifestly true to the original. The conversations which he relates with planters and others, are never simulated or imaginary; you are as sure of their actual occurrence, as if you had listened to them in the pine barrens of Virginia, on the sand hills of the Carolinas, or while steaming up the Red river. Nothing richer in humor can be well conceived than his accounts of interviews with negro-drivers, poor whites, uncouth spoken planters, and their shiftless, slatternly housekeepers and helpmates.

While, as we conceive, no candid Southern reader can take offence at the author's manner of stating the facts which fell under his observation, no Anti-Slavery man can rise from their perusal without a deeper and more intense abhorrence of the baleful institution, which curses not only master and slave, but the very soil on which they tread.

The volume is published by Dix & Edwards, New York. 12mo., pp. 725. It certainly deserves, and can scarcely fail of, a wide circulation. J. C. W.

"WOLFDEN" is the title of a noticeable book from the publishing house of Phillips, Sampson, & Co., Boston. As a work of art, it is manifestly open to criticism. The plot is not particularly ingenious, and its pictures of city life and Southern scenes might have been omitted without any real loss of interest. The style, often vigorous, terse, and picturesque, is sometimes careless and in bad taste, although never dull or commonplace. Viewed, however, as a picture of New England rural life, it has a merit which we have rarely met in our literature. The story of the child-hunt in the wild Maine woods, the winter sleigh rides and singing parties, and path-breakings, in Wolfden, the intensely-wrought tragedy of the Blacksmith and his temptor, and the tender pathos and simple beauty of some of his descriptions of the Mother Nature, show the ability of the author to take a high rank as a writer of fiction. J. C. W.

"EDITH HALL," from the same publishers, is a spirited and graphic New England story. It is said to be from the pen of a gifted correspondent of the *Era*; and we are glad to learn that her first essay at book-making is likely to be a successful one. J. C. W.

EMMA SOUTHWORTH's admirable Anti-Slavery tale, so well known to the readers of the *Era* under the name of *Mark Sutherland*, in winning golden opinions, in its book form, with the title of "INDIA." It is unquestionably the finest production of her pen. J. C. W.

GRACE GREENWOOD, always welcome as a lively, earnest writer, who gives her heart as well as her fine intellect to her work, has a new volume from the press of Ticknor & Fields, in "*The Footsteps of Life*." It is a story of great dramatic power, and the minor sketches which make up the residue of the book are in the author's best manner. J. C. W.

Our readers, we feel certain, will thank us for calling their attention to Ticknor & Fields's new and revised edition of Bayard Taylor's POEMS OF HOME AND TRAVEL. All the admirable characteristics of the author's prose are reproduced in these picturesque and most felicitous poems. We have suggested in a previous notice that the Poet's Home, with its wide rambles have for us a peculiar interest. Their pictures are from life—clear, vivid, genial, and truthful. They have the breadth, freedom, and resonance, of air, and sky, and ocean—the pine forests of Monterey answering the eolean roll of the Pacific—the wild Styrian mountains and lindens—the sweet home life. In this volume, as in all the writings of the author, one feels the healthful warmth and vigorous pulsations of a strong, brave, and beautiful life, in which romance and adventure are tempered by an abiding sense of moral obligation, and that charity and kindly sympathy with human life, in all its phases, which make the travelled gentleman and Christian, and politian. J. C. W.

THE HEART OF MARGUERITE. A ROMANCE. New York: J. C. Derby. Cincinnati: H. W. Derby. Sold by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C. Pp. 311.

This graphic delineation of the workings of a human heart is from the pen of a master's hand, and is fraught with all the tragic interest of "The Scarlet Letter." The characters are naturally and powerfully drawn; and the eye that penetrates the surface of society, rends the veil over the heart, and gazes into its depths, will recognize the truthfulness of the portraiture. It is the thrilling yet common tale of sin, and its certain terrible punishment.

Yet, while the author has done this faithfully and well, he has told it in such a manner as to make sin attractive and alluring—in such a manner that we seem to hear the subtle temptation of the Serpent in the Garden of Eden, "*Think and eat, and ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil.*" In proof of this, turn to Chap. xxiv, p. 299. The lover of Mabel has killed the injured husband, and the guilty pair are flying from avenging laws.

"It was pleasant, after the great toil and turmoil of such a night—the crowning turmoil of her perturbed married life—for Mabel to see the shores go by, and know that it was her duty to watch the ceaseless march of the long-ranked billows; and to feel about her the bracing embraces of the invigorating breeze. Philip, too, seemed moved by the same benign influences. His manners were not now reserved, as they were wont to be, but joyous as a boy's. His glances were full of love; his voice musical and happy. They were not old, these two, but, after the maturing experiences of the recent past, they now seemed to grow young every day. They were not sorry when the retarding winds or the hindering calms came and checked their course, for they had still each, in all."

"Nor were the sweet moods of happiness which now, every day, and all day long, possessed them, marred by the black shadows of their crime. The cloud of shame and remorse, which rises when any great wrong is wrought, to hide the pleasant sun away, leans far forward; and many unshadowed days intervene between the sin and the drear shade of it. Hardness of heart and unkindness—both of which are the fruit of vice, springs not up at once to wretched fruition. The seed, like other seed, lies hid in the mould of the heart's garden, and sometimes, it may be, that more than a fragrant blossom—and later, a little germ—and later, a bitter crawling. Long years ripen it to poison maturity, and other years—years also—bring decay and death. *It is not true that all the ways of sin are thorny ways, and all her uses bitter.* It is not true, that all the great temptations, which assume the white names, of heart's ease and soul's loss, of charges undischarged, and duties unheeded, and lies daringly swept asunder, that have been forged in the fire of selfishness, and mean unworthy barter, of purities for infamies, and of faith's serenity for integrity, flawed and shattered beyond repair, that have been purchased—have prices wherewith, since the world begun, so many sweet and noble, aye, and loyal hearts, have been ready to purchase absolutness of pleasure; it is not true, that all these grave and heavy prices have been paid down for naught—trafficked for a fair promise never fulfilled. *Who of them all, wrecked, departing, dying, would go calmly back, resign the thrilling purchase, and be forevermore without the sweet memory of it, if so they might even be back again in their early days?*"

What is this, in which passion is addressed, and the discriminating sense of right and wrong cast aside, but calling "darkness light, and evil good? It is the last injury that can be inflicted upon the minds of the young, to paint pictures in which vice is made to wear the colors of loveliness, and virtue is made to appear in any of its relations as a hateful bond to be broken at all hazards. Mabel Ware and her seducer are pictured in this extract as floating over a sea of happiness, glad, even at the cost of the life of a husband, the desertion of family and country, to drink to the full the cup of passion and sensual joy.

Nor is this all. The author, having thus confounded all the teachings of Christ as to the nature of sin and its consequences, then develops the religious nature of Mabel Ware. There is much pretty sentiment expressed of God, seen in his works, and the communion of Mabel's soul with the beautiful. But there is none of that repentance which "needeth not to be repented of." As might be expected, the author, in thus delineating the naturalistic view of piety, does not fail to pour out his contempt on revealed religion, and those forms of worship in which Christians have sought to give permanency to the religion of the Bible.

LONDON CORRESPONDENCE.

LONDON, *April* 11, 1856.

To the Editor of the National Era:

The Central American question was brought up in Parliament last Friday night—and indeed the Crampton difficulty. Viscount Goderich wished to know if a despatch of the British Minister to Mr. Crampton, which had found its way into the English papers through the medium of the American press, is authentic; for it appears, from the despatch in question, that Mr. Crampton neglected to communicate at once the offer of arbitration made to our Government by Lord Clarendon—and the reason he gives is, that "he overlooked it."

Mr. Gladstone defended the Viscount in a pretty severe review of the conduct of the English Government in reference to the American question. Long since, Lord Clarendon had promised soon to lay before the House the correspondence on the subject, but nothing had been heard of it; and now, upon being pressed for a reason, he replies that the Foreign Office seems to be busily engaged on other matters, that it could not get time to prepare the papers for the House! Mr. Gladstone said:

"The subject was of too much importance for any mere mechanical obstacles to be allowed to interfere with the production of these papers. Although the correspondence of last year was concluded, he trusted they might understand from his noble friend that the subject itself had not passed out of the hands of the Government—[hear]—that no ultimatum had been exchanged between the United States Government and ours, and that they might hope that still maintained that these difficulties would receive a speedy and an amicable termination. [Hear, hear.] A great misfortune, if it had the House, should it remain silent on this question. Other voices had gone forth respecting it, which he must say had sounded in tones the most unfriendly to the hopes that had led to peace, and to those friendly relations which he was certain every man in that House desired to maintained between Great Britain and the United States. [Cheers.] It was commonly reported that the Minister of America, who had recently arrived in this country, was armed with powers for the final settlement of the difficulty (Mr. Gladstone) did not wish to press his noble friend for the production of the papers, but simply to inform the House that it was being done, and so put it in a position to judge of its duties. [Hear, hear.] He had alluded to the unwise and inflammatory language used by public speakers, and rumor had got abroad calculated to create uneasiness in the minds of members of that House. For instance, it was said that addresses were made to the effect that our military force in Canada. [Hear, hear.] He hoped, before any such addition was made, that House would have an opportunity of utterings its sentiments upon the subject, for he was convinced that that voice would be heard in a manner calculated to promote the interests, friendship, and mutual good will of the two Governments."

Mr. Gladstone speaks the minds of five-sixths of the English people. The *Evening Star*, the very best of the cheap dailies, says:

"After Lord Palmerston's speech, which will no doubt increase the irritation of the people of the United States, it is to be hoped, for the sake of the great mercantile marine of the two countries, no longer employed in supplying their mutual wants, would be converted into instruments of warlike destruction. There would be a maritime war in every sea. Our West India Colonies, dependent, in a great measure, for food and lumber, on the States, would be exposed to great privations and to great depredations, and might take it into consideration whether they should not declare themselves a neutral State. Our own case would lead to numerous attacks, and we should assuredly suffer, as we have not suffered for many centuries, the horrors of partial invasion and actual warfare.

"May God forbid that the language of any politicians, or of any portion of the Press of England, should ever bring about a civil war between us and our transatlantic kinsmen."

I make these extracts to show the real state of feeling here, notwithstanding the war cries of the *Times*.

The Paris *Patrie*, in one of its issues of last week, contains a singular article upon the subject of cotton cultivation in Algeria. It declares that, now the war is over, the French Government will bestow great attention to the subject. It states the sterling fact that, during the war, Algeria has supplied the army with provisions and forage, and yet has France large quantities of corn at the same time. The following extract is worth noticing:

"The English are the largest consumers of American cotton; and that circumstance, by-the-by, will be for a long time the chief obstacle to a rupture between the two countries. Manchester and Liverpool on this side of the Atlantic, New York and New Orleans on the other, are powerful enough to prevent the evil, which are the fruit of vice, springing not up at once to wretched fruition. The seed, like other seed, lies hid in the mould of the heart's garden, and sometimes, it may be, that more than a fragrant blossom—and later, a little germ—and later, a bitter crawling. Long years ripen it to poison maturity, and other years—years also—bring decay and death. *It is not true that all the ways of sin are thorny ways, and all her uses bitter.* It is not true, that all the great temptations, which assume the white names, of heart's ease and soul's loss, of charges undischarged, and duties unheeded, and lies daringly swept asunder, that have been forged in the fire of selfishness, and mean unworthy barter, of purities for infamies, and of faith's serenity for integrity, flawed and shattered beyond repair, that have been purchased—have prices wherewith, since the world begun, so many sweet and noble, aye, and loyal hearts, have been ready to purchase absolutness of pleasure; it is not true, that all these grave and heavy prices have been paid down for naught—trafficked for a fair promise never fulfilled. *Who of them all, wrecked, departing, dying, would go calmly back, resign the thrilling purchase, and be forevermore without the sweet memory of it, if so they might even be back again in their early days?*"

Mr. Bright.

The Crimean investigation proceeds at Chelsea, and Lord Lucan, who had charge of the cavalry, is on his trial. Lord Lucan is a gentleman with bold grace; flies angrily without cause; protests against the severe comments of the *Times* newspaper; and, in short, bids fair to come out of the investigation with a soiled reputation.

A statistical abstract for 1855 has just been published here, and it quote on this side, I think, will possess interest for your readers. The raw cotton imported into the country during the last year amounts to 896,153,872 pounds. The exportations of cotton manufactures were 284,505,788. In 1853, they were only about 231,000,000, showing a great increase on account of the war. The taxes have not increased nearly one hundred and fifty thousand—so that England has not prospered during the war.

The news regarding the peace is not important this week. Rumors are afloat respecting the Principalities, is to be immediately withdrawn. The Russian blockade is terminated, and merchant vessels, from that port, are France, are free to enter there. The Peace Congress, it is said, is discussing the future condition of the Principalities. Turkey claims that the Christian provinces shall be dropped. Other Powers will hardly consent to such a doctrine. A commission is to proceed to the spot, and ascertain the wishes of the people. Russia wishes the Congress to consider the Italian question, fearing that Russia may revenge itself upon her hereafter, through Austria.

The Russian Imperial Peace Ukase which has just made its appearance here, and excites some severe criticism. It, of course, charges the commencement of the war upon the Allies, and makes the best use of its facts, but it is a lame defence.

The two steamers sent out by the Government to search for the Pacific have returned, without hearing anything of her, and the conviction that she is lost is growing fixed.

Truly yours, AMERICAN.

THE PRESIDENCY.

Special Correspondence of the N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, *April* 25, 1856.

It is absurd to suppose that any strength can be lent to the Republican cause in the coming Presidential contest, by the idea that the Union has got to be carried on the strength of the cause, or not at all. Who the candidate is, is a matter of much consequence, so he be a man, and a man not specially obnoxious to any wide-spread existing popular prejudice. Among the individuals who come within this category, there is not one, who, if he be the man, the floating vote on the other, at any sacrifice whatever, will this time, we feel convinced, prove to be a grave and mortifying error. We understand the Democratic party is in the last extremity, and that resort was a dead failure, which we ought to profit by. Our chances, in doing it, seemed to be good, and they could hardly be far better than they are likely to be again. These are times when the currents of opinion on public affairs have no decided set any way, and when the rolling about to be met with purposeless drifts, a slight thing gives them direction and force. This has been the case in our political history more than once, and it will not do to confound such epochs with the present. Such is not the condition of the public mind. In the North and in the South there is a strong and determined set of public sentiment and opinion upon the great question of the day. These currents are not in any degree under the control of, or even in any considerable degree, by the power of any man in this nation. Personal popularity adds nothing to their force, and diminishes nothing of their strength. They set straight on to a plain point. Any man, or any men, except where the specific strength or weakness to a decided extent can be clearly pointed out, the sooner we shall approach the true condition of the Republic, the sooner we shall be in a position to balancing little considerations, or figuring up personal differences. Least of all, it is time to be estimating the value of imaginary individual advantages.

We think the election of Mr. Chase as Governor of Ohio, last year, strikingly illustrates the point we make. The candidate, at that time, held the position of a Whig, not repugnant to popular prejudice, and was borne into office by the simple name of Whig, which he had on the canvass—hostility to the removal of the Missouri restriction, and Freedom for Kansas. Another man might have done as well, or better, perhaps, but no other could have done more well, unless he had fully and entirely represented the vital idea of the contest. That election furnishes the Republicans a clear chart of their policy on the national theatre, and it disclosed a clearer view of the real power of the issue on which they are to fight the Presidential battle than they can easily and cheaply.

J. S. S.

A BRIEF MEMOIR OF THE LATE COL. BARON DE WEISSENFELS.

One of the heroes of the Revolution. Compiled from authentic documents by his daughter and only heir, the late Mrs. Harriet De la Paige, Baltimore, Md.

Baron de Weissenfels was a native of Elbing, in the Kingdom of Prussia. A town in Germany bears the name of his family. He was educated for the army under Frederick the Great, and peace having been conquered by that great captain, Weissenfels sought employment in the British service, in North America, in 1756. Strong side of emigration which at this time drove Wolfe, and saw him expire in the arms of victory. He was an officer in the Royal American regiment, at the attack on Fort Ticonderoga, and participated in the descent upon and capture of Havana in 1762.

In then peace was concluded with France, in 1763, Weissenfels was among the reduced officers, and settled in New York. He had served in the same regiment with St. Clair.

When the war of the Colonies, in 1775, raised the standard of liberty and struck for their rights, Weissenfels was one of the first who embarked in the cause, though it was in strong opposition to his interests and the wishes of his relatives. He was the subject of a noble family, and an officer of the King's army, titles and honors which lay in his path before him. But he hesitated not a moment, but enrolled on the altar of Liberty. While others, more prudent, paused to stipulate for indemnification against the loss, he left sight of them all in his dazzling brightness that invested the *principles* which he flew to sustain. His military science and tact, together with his dauntless courage, rendered his services a great acquisition, and shortly after wards he was again at Quebec, Brigade Major with Montgomery.

Retreated from that disastrous expedition, he received from the American Congress, in March, 1776, a commission of Lieutenant Colonel, commandant of the third New York battalion.

"The Colonel who commanded the second regiment of the New York line, to which he then belonged, having deserted, Lieut. Colonel Weissenfels, was invested with the command by Gen. Washington, and bravely fought the enemy at White Plains."

After the battle at White Plains, he accompanied Washington with the army over the Hudson, and across New Jersey, to Trenton, in the period, circumstances may arise—circumstances, in fine, of a nature to interrupt that commercial intercourse which causes the prosperity of both nations, and the peace of France between England and the United States.

"Were Manchester able to procure cotton in Algeria, at any great increase of the present price, to price and abundance of supply, as in America, a great step would be made towards the peace of the world and a stable balance of power."

The annexation of Oude is completed, and the *Times*, which does not disdain to accuse no the Cape River, charges the Governor General, justly, says very coolly, in an article upon the subject, "*We cannot give India freedom*, but we can give her progress and material prosperity."

The Crimean investigation proceeds at Chelsea, and Lord Lucan, who had charge of the cavalry, is on his trial. Lord Lucan is a gentleman with bold grace; flies angrily without cause; protests against the severe comments of the *Times* newspaper; and, in short, bids fair to come out of the investigation with a soiled reputation.

A statistical abstract for 1855 has just been published here, and I quote on this side, I think, will possess interest for your readers. The raw cotton imported into the country during the last year amounts to 896,153,872 pounds. The exportations of cotton manufactures were 284,505,788. In 1853, they were only about 231,000,000, showing a great increase on account of the war. The taxes have not increased nearly one hundred and fifty thousand—so that England has not prospered during the war.

The news regarding the peace is not important this week. Rumors are afloat respecting the Principalities, is to be immediately withdrawn. The Russian blockade is terminated, and merchant vessels, from that port, France, are free to enter there. The Peace Congress, it is said, is discussing the future condition of the Principalities. Turkey claims that the Christian provinces shall be dropped. Other Powers will hardly consent to such a doctrine. A commission is to proceed to the spot, and ascertain the wishes of the people. Russia wishes the Congress to consider the Italian question, fearing that Russia may revenge itself upon her hereafter, through Austria.

The Russian Imperial Peace Ukase which has just made its appearance here, and excites some severe criticism. It, of course, charges the commencement of the war upon the Allies, and makes the best use of its facts, but it is a lame defence.

The two steamers sent out by the Government to search for the Pacific have returned, without hearing anything of her, and the conviction that she is lost is growing fixed.

Truly yours, AMERICAN.

THE PRESIDENCY.

Special Correspondence of the N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, *April* 25, 1856.

It is absurd to suppose that any strength can be lent to the Republican cause in the coming Presidential contest, by the idea that the Union has got to be carried on the strength of the cause, or not at all. Who the candidate is, is a matter of much consequence, so he be a man, and a man not specially obnoxious to any wide-spread existing popular prejudice. Among the individuals who come within this category, there is not one, who, if he be the man, at any sacrifice whatever, will this time, we feel convinced, prove to be a grave and mortifying error. We understand the Democratic party is in the last extremity, and that resort was a dead failure, which we ought to profit by. Our chances, in doing it, seemed to be good, and they could hardly be far better than they are likely to be again. These are times when the currents of opinion on public affairs have no decided set any way, and when the rolling about to be met with purposeless drifts, a slight thing gives them direction and force. This has been the case in our political history more than once, and it will not do to confound such epochs with the present. Such is not the condition of the public mind. In the North and in the South there is a strong and determined set of public sentiment and opinion upon the great question of the day. These currents are not in any degree under the control of, or even in any considerable degree, by the power of any man in this nation. Personal popularity adds nothing to their force, and diminishes nothing of their strength. They set straight on to a plain point. Any man, or any men, except where the specific strength or weakness to a decided extent can be clearly pointed out, the sooner we shall approach the true condition of the Republic, the sooner we shall be in a position to balancing little considerations, or figuring up personal differences. Least of all, it is time to be estimating the value of imaginary individual advantages.

We think the election of Mr. Chase as Governor of Ohio, last year, strikingly illustrates the point we make. The candidate, at that time, held the position of a Whig, not repugnant to popular prejudice, and was borne into office by the simple name of Whig, which he had on the canvass—hostility to the removal of the Missouri restriction, and Freedom for Kansas. Another man might have done as well, or better, perhaps, but no other could have done more well, unless he had fully and entirely represented the vital idea of the contest. That election furnishes the Republicans a clear chart of their policy on the national theatre, and it disclosed a clearer view of the real power of the issue on which they are to fight the Presidential battle than they can easily and cheaply.

J. S. S.

A BRIEF MEMOIR OF THE LATE COL. BARON DE WEISSENFELS.

One of the heroes of the Revolution. Compiled from authentic documents by his daughter and only heir, the late Mrs. Harriet De la Paige, Baltimore, Md.

Baron de Weissenfels was a native of Elbing, in the Kingdom of Prussia. A town in Germany bears the name of his family. He was educated for the army under Frederick the Great, and peace having been conquered by that great captain, Weissenfels sought employment in the British service, in North America, in 1756. Strong side of emigration which at this time drove Wolfe, and saw him expire in the arms of victory. He was an officer in the Royal American regiment, at the attack on Fort Ticonderoga, and participated in the descent upon and capture of Havana in 1762.

In then peace was concluded with France, in 1763, Weissenfels was among the reduced officers, and settled in New York. He had served in the same regiment with St. Clair.

When the war of the Colonies, in 1775, raised the standard of liberty and struck for their rights, Weissenfels was one of the first who embarked in the cause, though it was in strong opposition to his interests and the wishes of his relatives. He was the subject of a noble family, and an officer of the King's army, titles and honors which lay in his path before him. But he hesitated not a moment, but enrolled on the altar of Liberty. While others, more prudent, paused to stipulate for indemnification against the loss, he left sight of them all in his dazzling brightness that invested the *principles* which he flew to sustain. His military science and tact, together with his dauntless courage, rendered his services a great acquisition, and shortly after wards he was again at Quebec, Brigade Major with Montgomery.

Retreated from that disastrous expedition, he received from the American Congress, in March, 1776, a commission of Lieutenant Colonel, commandant of the third New York battalion.

"The Colonel who commanded the second regiment of the New York line, to which he then belonged, having deserted, Lieut. Colonel Weissenfels, was invested with the command by Gen. Washington, and bravely fought the enemy at White Plains."

After the battle at White Plains, he accompanied Washington with the army over the Hudson, and across New Jersey, to Trenton, in the period, circumstances may arise—circumstances, in fine, of a nature to interrupt that commercial intercourse which causes the prosperity of both nations, and the peace of France between England and the United States.

"Were Manchester able to procure cotton in Algeria, at any great increase of the present price, to price and abundance of supply, as in America, a great step would be made towards the peace of the world and a stable balance of power."

The annexation of Oude is completed, and the *Times*, which does not disdain to accuse no the Cape River, charges the Governor General, justly, says very coolly, in an article upon the subject, "*We cannot give India freedom*, but we can give her progress and material prosperity."

The Crimean investigation proceeds at Chelsea, and Lord Lucan, who had charge of the cavalry, is on his trial. Lord Lucan is a gentleman with bold grace; flies angrily without cause; protests against the severe comments of the *Times* newspaper; and, in short, bids fair to come out of the investigation with a soiled reputation.

A statistical abstract for 1855 has just been published here, and I quote on this side, I think, will possess interest for your readers. The raw cotton imported into the country during the last year amounts to 896,153,872 pounds. The exportations of cotton manufactures were 284,505,788. In 1853, they were only about 231,000,000, showing a great increase on account of the war. The taxes have not increased nearly one hundred and fifty thousand—so that England has not prospered during the war.

The news regarding the peace is not important this week. Rumors are afloat respecting the Principalities, is to be immediately withdrawn. The Russian blockade is terminated, and merchant vessels, from that port, France, are free to enter there. The Peace Congress, it is said, is discussing the future condition of the Principalities. Turkey claims that the Christian provinces shall be dropped. Other Powers will hardly consent to such a doctrine. A commission is to proceed to the spot, and ascertain the wishes of the people. Russia wishes the Congress to consider the Italian question, fearing that Russia may revenge itself upon her hereafter, through Austria.

The Russian Imperial Peace Ukase which has just made its appearance here, and excites some severe criticism. It, of course, charges the commencement of the war upon the Allies, and makes the best use of its facts, but it is a lame defence.

The two steamers sent out by the Government to search for the Pacific have returned, without hearing anything of her, and the conviction that she is lost is growing fixed.

Truly yours, AMERICAN.

THE PEACE CONGRESS.

Halifax, April 24.—The foreign files by the Canada contains the following additional items:

The Sultan has issued a proclamation of the Hatti Humayoun, which ensures to the natives, in which the Christians, and the property of individuals residing near the station, was destroyed; and all the baggage in the freight-house burned.

The passengers upon whom this outrage was committed were those which left San Francisco on the 20th March, in the steamer Cortez, for the San Juan del Sur, in Nicaragua, passing in consequence of the Nicaraguan troubles.

The *Opinione* of Turin gives, upon good authority, the conditions contained in the Treaty of Peace lately concluded at Paris. They are affirmed to be as follows:

First—The neutralization of the Black Sea; Russia not to keep there more than ten ships of war armed, for the defence of her coasts. Second—Nicholself is to be reduced to a merchant port, with an engagement that no ships of war shall be constructed beyond the number agreed to as above. Third—Russia is to allow consuls from all the Powers in the ports of the Black Sea and the Baltic. Fourth—The fortifications of Bomarsund are not to be reconstructed. Fifth—Russia cedes part of the territory of Bessarabia, comprising the fortress of Ismail. Sixth—Russia renounces the exclusive protectorate in the Danubian Principalities. Seventh—Russia renounces the exclusive protectorate of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire. Eighth—The free navigation of the Danube is guaranteed to all the States, without exception. Ninth—Turkey agrees to make a declaration which is to be sent into the Principalities, to study the questions of the frontiers and the mode of government.

LIVERPOOL MARKET, APRIL 12.

Breadstuffs.—Messrs. Richardson, Spence, & Co., report the market to-day, with a good inquiry for flour, and changes in quotations. All other kinds selling at 25s. For the week, the Brokers Circular reported heavy importations of breadstuffs, with a weak market. Wheat 2d. lower and flour 1s. Baltimore 34s. (@ 35s. Ohio 35s. (@ 35s. 6d.; white wheat 10s. 3d. (@ 10s. 10d. Some circulars report good flour and wheat disengaged, but inferior description continued to lay lower. They quote a decline in corn of 2s. 6d., and buyers demanding a reduction. The weather had been very favorable for agricultural purposes. In the Liverpool market, breadstuffs had undergone a considerable decline.

Ashes—A moderate business at unchanged prices; pots 34s. 6d. (@ 35s. 6d. (@ 36s. Rosin, in limited request at 4s. 7d. (@ 4s. 9d. (@ 6s. Turpentine in some request, but none in market. Nothing done in tar. Spirits of turpentine continued quiet at 34s. (@ 34s. 6d. Tea firm at 9½d. for Congou. Sugar opened with a large, speculative demand, but closed at firmer rates with a limited inquiry. Molasses firm. Coffee unchanged in every respect. Rice unchanged—market quiet. Tallow firm—good North American 50s. Cheese, of average quality, selling at 55s.—market again bare.

ARRIVAL OF STEAMER ARABIA AT BOSTON.

The Assassination in Parma—Collision between the Turks and Christians in Nicomedia.

Boston, April 25.—The steamship Arabia, from Liverpool, via Halifax, arrived here about 10 o'clock this morning. Her mails will reach Baltimore to-morrow (Saturday) morning.

The foreign papers contain the following:

The state of Parma is not much improved. Dr. Magliani, a Government officer, has been assassinated at Milan, and that city is in a state of great excitement.

There is reason to believe that the Neapolitan Government intend to reduce the export duty on corn still further by at least one-half.

Sixty thousand men are said to be in arms in Arabia, and Mecca, and Medina, in complete insurrection. The new Governor, just appointed from Constantinople, is the cause of the revolt.

It is reported here that the Allies are to commence the evacuation of Turkey within forty days after the ratification of the treaty of peace, and that the troops will be wholly withdrawn in six months. This is not credited in the best informed circles.

A letter from Constantinople, dated the 31st ultimo, says: "At Nicomedia, a collision had taken place between the Turks and Christians. The latter, assisted by the English who were there, made the attempt, after the publication of the 'Hatti Hennavon,' to place bells in their churches. Immediately upon this demonstration, the Turks made an indiscriminate attack upon all Christians, of exceeding fury. Eighty of the Christians were killed or wounded; but the English, in exasperation, laid hands upon the Governor, and forced him with some two hundred Turks besides, despatched him to Constantinople."

FOUR DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

New York, April 29.—The Cunard steamer Persia, with Liverpool and London dates of the 19th, arrived at her dock this morning. The passage was performed in nine days and a half.

The civic banquet was given in London to Mr. Dallas.

Lord Panmure had made an explanation why the troops were kept among our Canada. He said it was not in anticipation of hostilities with the United States, but to supply the place of those withdrawn at the commencement of the war.

A slight difficulty occurred between the Germans, in a note against a grant to Maynooth College, which strengthened the rumor that Parliament will shortly be dissolved.

The Conference at Paris continued on Thursday. The treaty ratifications will be promulgated at the end of the month.

Immediately after the promulgation of the general treaty, the protocols will be published, and will make known the labors of the Peace Congress.

It was reported at Paris, that diplomatic movements were on foot respecting Italy. The Austrian Ambassador was to go immediately to Rome on the subject. It was also reported that the mission has reference to the Concordat, but the Italian journals say it relates to the general state of Italy.

The Lord Mayor of London entertained Mr. Dallas, on Tuesday, at the Mansion House, in honor of his arrival as Minister from the United States. The Lord Mayor, in honoring Mr. Dallas, prefacing his toast with a speech full of generous sentiments toward America, regretting that any question should arise between the two countries threatening the dreadful alternative of war. The toast was, "Health to Mr. Dallas, and prosperity to the great Republic to which he has the honor to be sent."

Mr. Dallas made a felicitous reply, reciprocating the generous sentiments of the Lord Mayor.

Other speeches were made, at the conclusion of which Mr. Dallas gave, "The Health of the Lady Mayoress."

The Lord Mayor responded, telling Mr. Dallas that he was authorized by that lady to say, that, if his diplomacy equally his gallantry, there could be no fear as to the success of his mission.

A splendid fete was given in Paris on Monday, in honor of the peace plenipotentiaries.

Accounts from the manufacturing districts were unchanged. The demand for yarns and goods was extremely limited, and prices were not improving. Breadstuffs had further declined in sympathy with the market, and also continue to decline, owing to heavy receipts.

The Cabinet at Vienna are bent on occupying every corner of Italy where a political excitement exists, and the Austrians are in the presence of the military. Events in Italy are daily increasing in interest. It is quite possible that the Grand Duke of Tuscany by the aid of Austria, may be compelled to demand the assistance of German troops. An additional Austrian force are under orders for the Roman States. The garrison of Ancona has been increased. The Austrian Government has taken 1,000 men, when Governor Shannon ordered out the military.

The foregoing story is considered doubtful.

FROM KANSAS.

St. Louis, April 28.—A dispatch from Kansas city to the *Republican* states that the United States troops made several arrests yesterday, and that Sheriff Jones, while guarding the prisoners, was shot. We have no further particulars.

THE PEACE CONGRESS.

Halifax, April 24.—The foreign files by the Canada contains the following additional items:

The Sultan has issued a proclamation of the Hatti Humayoun, which ensures to the natives, in which the Christians, and the property of individuals residing near the station, was destroyed; and all the baggage in the freight-house burned.

The passengers upon whom this outrage was committed were those which left San Francisco on the 20th March, in the steamer Cortez, for the San Juan del Sur, in Nicaragua, passing in consequence of the Nicaraguan troubles.

The *Opinione* of Turin gives, upon good authority, the conditions contained in the Treaty of Peace lately concluded at Paris. They are affirmed to be as follows:

First—The neutralization of the Black Sea; Russia not to keep there more than ten ships of war armed, for the defence of her coasts. Second—Nicholself is to be reduced to a merchant port, with an engagement that no ships of war shall be constructed beyond the number agreed to as above. Third—Russia is to allow consuls from all the Powers in the ports of the Black Sea and the Baltic. Fourth—The fortifications of Bomarsund are not to be reconstructed. Fifth—Russia cedes part of the territory of Bessarabia, comprising the fortress of Ismail. Sixth—Russia renounces the exclusive protectorate in the Danubian Principalities. Seventh—Russia renounces the exclusive protectorate of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire. Eighth—The free navigation of the Danube is guaranteed to all the States, without exception. Ninth—Turkey agrees to make a declaration which is to be sent into the Principalities, to study the questions of the frontiers and the mode of government.

LIVERPOOL MARKET, APRIL 12.

Breadstuffs.—Messrs. Richardson, Spence, & Co., report the market to-day, with a good inquiry for flour, and changes in quotations. All other kinds selling at 25s. For the week, the Brokers Circular reported heavy importations of breadstuffs, with a weak market. Wheat 2d. lower and flour 1s. Baltimore 34s. (@ 35s. Ohio 35s. (@ 35s. 6d.; white wheat 10s. 3d. (@ 10s. 10d. Some circulars report good flour and wheat disengaged, but inferior description continued to lay lower. They quote a decline in corn of 2s. 6d., and buyers demanding a reduction. The weather had been very favorable for agricultural purposes. In the Liverpool market, breadstuffs had undergone a considerable decline.

Ashes—A moderate business at unchanged prices; pots 34s. 6d. (@ 35s. 6d. (@ 36s. Rosin, in limited request at 4s. 7d. (@ 4s. 9d. (@ 6s. Turpentine in some request, but none in market. Nothing done in tar. Spirits of turpentine continued quiet at 34s. (@ 34s. 6d. Tea firm at 9½d. for Congou. Sugar opened with a large, speculative demand, but closed at firmer rates with a limited inquiry. Molasses firm. Coffee unchanged in every respect. Rice unchanged—market quiet. Tallow firm—good North American 50s. Cheese, of average quality, selling at 55s.—market again bare.

ARRIVAL OF STEAMER ARABIA AT BOSTON.

The Assassination in Parma—Collision between the Turks and Christians in Nicomedia.

Boston, April 25.—The steamship Arabia, from Liverpool, via Halifax, arrived here about 10 o'clock this morning. Her mails will reach Baltimore to-morrow (Saturday) morning.

The foreign papers contain the following:

The state of Parma is not much improved. Dr. Magliani, a Government officer, has been assassinated at Milan, and that city is in a state of great excitement.

There is reason to believe that the Neapolitan Government intend to reduce the export duty on corn still further by at least one-half.

Sixty thousand men are said to be in arms in Arabia, and Mecca, and Medina, in complete insurrection. The new Governor, just appointed from Constantinople, is the cause of the revolt.

It is reported here that the Allies are to commence the evacuation of Turkey within forty days after the ratification of the treaty of peace, and that the troops will be wholly withdrawn in six months. This is not credited in the best informed circles.

A letter from Constantinople, dated the 31st ultimo, says: "At Nicomedia, a collision had taken place between the Turks and Christians. The latter, assisted by the English who were there, made the attempt, after the publication of the 'Hatti Hennavon,' to place bells in their churches. Immediately upon this demonstration, the Turks made an indiscriminate attack upon all Christians, of exceeding fury. Eighty of the Christians were killed or wounded; but the English, in exasperation, laid hands upon the Governor, and forced him with some two hundred Turks besides, despatched him to Constantinople."

FOUR DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

New York, April 29.—The Cunard steamer Persia, with Liverpool and London dates of the 19th, arrived at her dock this morning. The passage was performed in nine days and a half.

The civic banquet was given in London to Mr. Dallas.

Lord Panmure had made an explanation why the troops were kept among our Canada. He said it was not in anticipation of hostilities with the United States, but to supply the place of those withdrawn at the commencement of the war.

A slight difficulty occurred between the Germans, in a note against a grant to Maynooth College, which strengthened the rumor that Parliament will shortly be dissolved.

The Conference at Paris continued on Thursday

WASHINGTON, D. C.

ADMISSION OF KANSAS.

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES HARLAN,

OF IOWA,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 27, 1856.

After a brief recital of facts concerning the invasion of Kansas, Mr. HARLAN proceeded:

Believing Congress (if competent) a more desirable tribunal for the establishment of great questions of State than arises from an on the battle-field, I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I inquire—

1. *Whether the Congress of the United States has power to exclude Slavery from the Territories.*

2. *Whether this power ought to be exercised in the organization of Territorial Governments where Slavery did not previously exist.*

In support of these propositions, I desire to cite, *first*, the declaratory acts of Congress following each acquisition of territory by the United States.

In the year 1784, previous to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, Virginia ceded to the Confederacy all of her territory lying northwest of the Ohio river. All other States claiming any interest in this territory made a similar conveyance, with a few comparatively unimportant reservations. This was the first, and comprised all the territory owned by the Confederacy.

In the year 1787, an Ordinance was adopted by the thirteen old States, containing a provision styled, "*Articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the Northwest Territory*," which provides, unless changed by mutual consent, was "*to remain unalterable forever.*" This compact provides that

"There shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

This was the act of the thirteen sovereign States, who met together for the purpose of deliberation. It had all the moral force of a regular treaty between independent nations. It was in form a mere "law of Congress," subject to repeal or modification at the will of the majority; but had all the moral elements of a "compact," *a bargain*, concluded, signed, and sealed, between high contracting parties—unchangeable in its very nature, without the consent of all the parties in interest. And thus it was published and acquiesced in by the people of all the States and Territories. None were then found to complain of the restriction, and to demand the right to carry their property in men and women into those Territories. So completely contented were all the original States, North and South, with this settlement of our Territorial policy, that in the formation of the Constitution of the United States, adopted in the year 1789, conferring on the central Government all the essential elements of nationality, nothing is said on this subject, only that

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

The *government* of the Territories is not even named. This had been provided for by the Ordinance of 1787, a provision older than the Constitution, which provision remained.

By an act passed at the First Congress, the Ordinance was modified, and declared to be in full force; and to its provisions all the subsequent legislation of Congress quietly conformed for more than thirty years.

I am aware that an objection to the conclusiveness of this declaratory act of Congress has been urged, upon the ability by the honorable Senator from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] on this floor, a few days since, and also in a speech recently delivered by him in Boston. That I may do him no injustice, I have taken the liberty to quote it. I think his views are represented with more clearness, precision, and strength, than in his recent impromptu reply to the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. HALE.] He says:

"From these facts it is clear that this legislation for the Northwest Territory does not conflict with the principle I assert, and does not furnish a precedent for hostile legislation by Congress against Slavery in the Territories. That such was neither the principle nor the policy upon which this act of Congress in 1789 was based, is further shown by the subsequent action of the same Congress upon the same subject. On the 26 of April, 1790, Congress, by a formal act, accepted the cession by North Carolina of her Western lands, (now the State of Tennessee,) with this proviso in the deed of cession: 'That no regulations made, or to be made, by Congress, shall tend to emancipate slaves' in the ceded Territory; and on the 20th May, 1790, passed a Territorial bill for the government of all the territory claimed by the United States, south of the Ohio river. The description of this territory included all the lands ceded by North Carolina, which formed a great deal more. Its boundaries were left indefinite, because there were conflicting claims to all the rest of the territory. But this act put in whole force and effect the Ordinance, claimed by the Federal Government, under this Pro-Slavery clause of the North Carolina deed. The whole section of the First Congress in relation to Slavery in the Territories, is simply this: It acquiesced in a Government for the Northwest Territory, based upon a pre-existing Anti-Slavery Ordinance, established a Government for the country ceded by North Carolina in conformity with the Pro-Slavery clause in her deed of cession, and extended this Pro-Slavery clause to all the rest of the territory claimed by the United States. This legislation shows that the First Congress from all imputation of having established the precedent claimed by the advocates of legislative exclusion. On the 7th of April, 1792, during the administration of President John Adams, the next Territorial act was passed; it was the first act of Territorial legislation resting solely upon primary, original, unfettered, constitutional power over the Territory. It established a Government over the Territory included within the boundaries of a line drawn due east from the mouth of the Yazoo river to the Chattahoochee river, thence down that river to the thirty-first degree of north latitude, thence west on that line to the Mississippi, then up that river to the beginning. This Territory was within the boundary of the United States, as defined by the treaty of Paris; and was held to be within the boundary of any of the States. The controversy arose out of this state of facts.

"The charter of Georgia limited her boundary on the south by the Allahamaha river; and, (after the surrender of her charter,) her limits were extended on the south, by the Crown of Great Britain, to the St. Mary's river, and thence in a direct line westward, parallel of latitude to the Mississippi river. In 1764, it was claimed, that on the recommendation of the Board of Trade, the boundary was again altered, and that portion of territory lying within the limits of Florida described was annexed to West Florida, and that thus it stood at the Revolution and treaty of peace. Therefore, the United States claimed it as a conquered country, and in 1798 passed the act now under review for its government. In that act, Congress neither claimed nor exercised any power to prohibit Slavery. The question came directly before the Ordinance of 1787, in the terms, excluding the Anti-Slavery clause, was applied to this Territory. This is a precedent directly in point, and is directly against your position. In the act now under claim, in 1802, Georgia ceded her Western lands, protecting Slavery in her grant, and the Federal Government observed the stipulation."

The honorable Senator argues against the conclusiveness of this Ordinance of 1787, as a legislative precedent, by citing the organic law passed in 1790, for the territory south of the Ohio river, to which the clause of this Ordinance excluding Slavery was applied; and the organic law of the Territory of Mississippi, approved in 1798, to which all this Ordinance was applied in *terms*, except the clause excluding Slavery.

To this I reply, that the act of 1790, although general, was immediately made to apply to the Territory ceded by North Carolina—now the State of Tennessee. Tennessee was an inhabited country. As early as 1785, she had made an effort to secure a separate State organization. The organic law, master and slave had previously been established, under the laws of North Carolina; who, in her deed of cession, had stipulated that Congress should not pass any emancipation laws in the ceded Territory. This in no way conflicts with the Ordinance of 1787, which prohibited the *introduction* of Slavery into *new Territories* under the paramount control of Congress.

The same was substantially true of the Territory of Mississippi, organized in 1798. It was all claimed as a part of Georgia, whose boundary, by virtue of her charter granted in 1732, extended to the Mississippi river. Georgia, however, the settlements on this river were under the control of France until 1763, when they were formally ceded to Great Britain, and thus continued until 1783, when all north of the thirty-first degree of north latitude became, by treaty, the property of the United States, over which Georgia asserted her previous rights. Slavery had been established; the application of that clause of the Ordinance which says, "there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory," would have been to *abolish* Slavery, and not simply to prevent its establishment.

In the acquisition of Louisiana in 1803, and of the Floridas in 1819, the jurisdiction of the United States was extended over vast territories in which Slavery had existed under the laws of French and Spanish laws. The right of the people to hold slaves in these provinces, it was supposed, had become vested, and was not unsettled by the transfer of them to our Government. Hence, Slavery was silently suffered to exist in that part of these Territories in the actual occupancy of slave property. Congress enacted no law on the subject. Here it was neither approved nor discarded. But in the enactment of the Missouri Compromise, in the year 1820, Congress provided that neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude should ever be permitted north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes. The principles of the Ordinance of 1787 were extended over the territories now embraced within the limits of Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska—then mostly unpeopled. From the history of these transactions, the conclusion is irresistible, that Congress intended that all of the immense territories ceded by France and Spain to the Government, not in the common sense of slaveholding communities, should remain forever free; and here our Territorial policy again rested for about a quarter of a century.

In the "joint resolution," passed by Congress in the year 1845, "for annexing Texas to the United States," it was provided that

"New States of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient populations, may hereafter, and by the consent of said States, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36° 30′ north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without Slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire. And in such State or States as shall be formed north of said compromise line, the act of Missouri Compromise line, Slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited."

In the event of the division of this vast domain of Texas, it was provided that one or more of these four new States should be absolutely free, and that all the remaining States thus formed might be admitted as free States, should the people desire it. And here again the subject rested until the year 1850.

But in the adjustment of the difficulties growing out of the acquisition of large territories from Mexico, as trophies of war, Territorial Governments were established for Utah and New Mexico, with a conditional provision for each:

"That when admitted as a State, the said Territory, or any portion thereof, shall be received into the Union with or without Slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."

Here, for the first time, the Territorial policy of the Government, settled and uniform for nearly three quarters of a century, was changed. All the machinery of the State of State here begun to revolve in a direction, that, if the Territory, now embraced within the limits of five large and powerful States, was originally *slave territory*, by virtue of the laws of Virginia, (and tolerated under the laws of France,) it should remain so as the Territory of Kentucky, once held as a part of her dominions. But, by the Ordinance of 1787, it was all dedicated to Freedom.

The territory now embraced within the limits of Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas, was doubtless *slave territory*, by virtue of French and Spanish laws. But by the enactment of the Missouri Compromise it was dedicated to Freedom.

All the vast domain of Texas was, without dispute, slave territory, by virtue of her own laws, enacted and enforced during her nationality. But, by the joint resolution, it was dedicated to the Union, a large part of this, too, is prospectively dedicated to Freedom. But the Territories of New Mexico and Utah were, by virtue of Mexican laws, a country where, when, by the legislation of the Congress of the United States, they were thrown upon to Slavery.

I am aware that an objection to the conclusiveness of this declaratory act of Congress has been urged, upon the ability by the honorable Senator from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] on this floor, a few days since, and also in a speech recently delivered by him in Boston. That I may do him no injustice, I have taken the liberty to quote it. I think his views are represented with more clearness, precision, and strength, than in his recent impromptu reply to the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. HALE.] He says:

"From these facts it is clear that this legislation for the Northwest Territory does not conflict with the principle I assert, and does not furnish a precedent for hostile legislation by Congress against Slavery in the Territories. That such was neither the principle nor the policy upon which this act of Congress in 1789 was based, is further shown by the subsequent action of the same Congress upon the same subject. On the 26 of April, 1790, Congress, by a formal act, accepted the cession by North Carolina of her Western lands, (now the State of Tennessee,) with this proviso in the deed of cession: 'That no regulations made, or to be made, by Congress, shall tend to emancipate slaves' in the ceded Territory; and on the 20th May, 1790, passed a Territorial bill for the government of all the territory claimed by the United States, south of the Ohio river. The description of this territory included all the lands ceded by North Carolina, which formed a great deal more. Its boundaries were left indefinite, because there were conflicting claims to all the rest of the territory. But this act put in whole force and effect the Ordinance, claimed by the Federal Government, under this Pro-Slavery clause of the North Carolina deed. The whole section of the First Congress in relation to Slavery in the Territories is simply this: It acquiesced in a Government for the Northwest Territory, based upon a pre-existing Anti-Slavery Ordinance, established a Government for the country ceded by North Carolina in conformity with the Pro-Slavery clause in her deed of cession, and extended this Pro-Slavery clause to all the rest of the territory claimed by the United States. This legislation shows that the First Congress from all imputation of having established the precedent claimed by the advocates of legislative exclusion. On the 7th of April, 1792, during the administration of President John Adams, the next Territorial act was passed; it was the first act of Territorial legislation resting solely upon primary, original, unfettered, constitutional power over the Territory. It established a Government over the Territory included within the boundaries of a line drawn due east from the mouth of the Yazoo river to the Chattahoochee river, thence down that river to the thirty-first degree of north latitude, thence west on that line to the Mississippi, then up that river to the beginning. This Territory was within the boundary of the United States, as defined by the treaty of Paris, and was held to be within the boundary of any of the States. The controversy arose out of this state of facts.

"The charter of Georgia limited her boundary on the south by the Allahamaha river; and, (after the surrender of her charter,) her limits were extended on the south, by the Crown of Great Britain, to the St. Mary's river, and thence in a direct line westward, parallel of latitude to the Mississippi river. In 1764, it was claimed, that on the recommendation of the Board of Trade, the boundary was again altered, and that portion of territory lying within the limits of Florida described was annexed to West Florida, and that thus it stood at the Revolution and treaty of peace. Therefore, the United States claimed it as a conquered country, and in 1798 passed the act now under review for its government. In that act, Congress neither claimed nor exercised any power to prohibit Slavery. The question came directly before the Ordinance of 1787, in the terms, excluding the Anti-Slavery clause, was applied to this Territory. This is a precedent directly in point, and is directly against your position. In the act now under claim, in 1802, Georgia ceded her Western lands, protecting Slavery in her grant, and the Federal Government observed the stipulation."

The honorable Senator argues against the conclusiveness of this Ordinance of 1787, as a legislative precedent, by citing the organic law passed in 1790, for the territory south of the Ohio river, to which the clause of this Ordinance excluding Slavery was applied; and the organic law of the Territory of Mississippi, approved in 1798, to which all this Ordinance was applied in *terms*, except the clause excluding Slavery.

To this I reply, that the act of 1790, although general, was immediately made to apply to the Territory ceded by North Carolina—now the State of Tennessee. Tennessee was an inhabited country. As early as 1785, she had made an effort to secure a separate State organization. The organic law, master and slave had previously been established, under the laws of North Carolina; who, in her deed of cession, had stipulated that Congress should not pass any emancipation laws in the ceded Territory. This in no way conflicts with the Ordinance of 1787, which prohibited the *introduction* of Slavery into *new Territories* under the paramount control of Congress.

The same was substantially true of the Territory of Mississippi, organized in 1798. It was all claimed as a part of Georgia, whose boundary, by virtue of her charter granted in 1732, extended to the Mississippi river. Georgia, however, the settlements on this river were under the control of France until 1763, when they were formally ceded to Great Britain, and thus continued until 1783, when all north of the thirty-first degree of north latitude became, by treaty, the property of the United States, over which Georgia asserted her previous rights. Slavery had been established; the application of that clause of the Ordinance which says, "there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory," would have been to *abolish* it should conform to the provisions of the Ordinance of 1787.—(*Statutes at Large* vol. 3, p. 430.)

On December 3, 1818, Illinois was by resolution admitted into the Union as a sovereign State, on the ground that her Constitution, thus formed, did conform to the provisions of the Ordinance of 1787.—(*Statutes at Large*, vol. 3, p. 536.)

In the year 1820, as we have before stated, Congress declared, in the law providing for the admission of Missouri into the Union,

"That in the territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, *Slavery* and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby, forever prohibited."—(*Statutes at Large*, vol. 3, p. 548.)

In 1836, in the passage of the organic law of the Territory of Wisconsin, which embraced what is now the States of Wisconsin and Iowa and the Territory of Minnesota, Congress again extended and applied the provisions of the Ordinance of 1787 to an immense country beyond the limits of the Northwest Territory.—(*Statutes at Large*, vol. 5, p. 235.)

In 1838, Congress again endorsed this Ordinance of 1787, in the passage of the organic law of Iowa, by extending to the people of this Territory "all the rights, privileges, and immunities, hitherto enjoyed by the people of Wisconsin."—(*Statutes at Large*, vol. 5, p. 239.)

In 1845, Congress declared, (as we have before stated,) in the act providing for the admission of Texas as a member of the Union, that Slavery should be prohibited in any State or States thereafter to be formed out of the territory north of the Missouri Compromise line established in 1820.—(*Statutes at Large*, vol. 5, p. 797.)

In 1848, (March 3,) Congress extended the provisions of the Ordinance of 1787 to all the territory of the United States west of the Rocky Mountains, lying north of thirty-six degrees of north latitude, known as the Territory of Oregon, in the following words:

"*And be it further enacted*, That the inhabitants of said Territory shall be entitled to all the rights, privileges, and advantages, granted and secured to the people of the Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio, by the articles of compact contained in the Ordinance for the government of said Territory, on the 13th of July, 1787; and shall be subject to all the conditions, and restrictions, and prohibitions, in said articles of compact imposed upon the people of said Territory."—(*Statutes at Large*, vol. 5, p. 329.)

This embraced both Oregon and Washington Territories. In 1849, the same provision was enacted in regard to Iowa was incorporated into the organic law of Minnesota.—(*Statutes at Large*, vol. 9, p. 407.)

In all this mass of consecutive legislation, except the act of 1820, is ignored by the President. He tells us that this provision of the Ordinance of 1787 ceased to remain as a law, being *absolutely repealed by the Constitution*. It is unfortunate for the correctness of this statement, that the Statutes at Large of the United States have been published from session to session by authority of Congress, and have been received by the courts of these States; it is unfortunate for its credence, that so many millions of the freemen of this Republic can read plain English!

But the honorable Senator from Georgia takes precisely the opposite tack. He denies the position of the President, and says that this Ordinance

"Purported on its face to be a perpetual compact between the State of Virginia, the people of the Territories, and the then Government of the United States. It was unalterable except by the mutual consent of the parties, and provided for in the Ordinance itself. The original compact was 'void (or void) at the option of the Government to make it, as Mr. Madison supposed, Congress may not have been bound to accept it—it certainly had no power to alter it."

The honorable Senator from Georgia arrives at an erroneous conclusion, only because his premises are untrue. This Ordinance does not purport on *its face* to be a compact between *Virginia* and the people of the Territories, and the United States, but a "compact between *the original States*, and the people and States in the said *Territory*." Virginia was no party to the bargain, "on its face;" nor were the people and States in said Territories contracting parties. There were no States in the said Territory; the people had no organization; they had no power to bargain until after the Ordinance was passed; and the Ordinance bears the signature of no representative of Virginia, nor of the Territory—and of no one but "William Grayson, chairman" of Congress, by the unanimous consent of the "States," in other words, it was a law of the United States, passed in the usual form, containing a solemn declaration of the future policy of the Government in the subject of Slavery in the Territories. It was no more irrepealable than the Missouri Compromise. Like the latter, it had all the moral elements of a perpetual covenant; but, in fact, it was a mere act of Congress; and that, too, of a Congress under the Confederation, with fewer elements of sovereignty, with less power to bind the individual States, than is now possessed by the Government of the Constitution. Hence, if Congress had the power to repeal the Missouri *Compromise*, which literally means an agreement, a bargain, a "compact," it had the power to repeal the Ordinance of 1787. They were both declaratory acts of Congress—nothing more. The veracity and honor of the nation were at stake. She had solemnly declared that Slavery should be prohibited north of the Northwest Territory; and that in the Louisiana Territory north of 36° 30′ Slavery should be *forever* prohibited. This was the voice of the supreme power of the Confederacy, spoken in the presence of the enlightened nations of the earth. But it was "a nude compact"—it bound no one but herself. If she chose to violate her plighted faith with her own citizens, and to stand a giant liar among the nations, who could call her to account?

But be this as it may, these legislative precedents are not confined to subdivisions of the Northwest Territory. They have constantly followed the organization of Territory in the territory. It was first applied to Ohio; when the title of population rolled across the Miami, it was applied to Indiana; when it crossed the Wabash, it was applied to Illinois; when it surged to the Northern lakes, it was applied to Michigan; when it hugged the western shore of the lakes up to the British possessions, and dashed across the great bend of the Mississippi, it carried to Wisconsin, including Iowa and Minnesota, both of which were beyond the boundaries of the Northwest Territory; and when it overlapped the Rocky Mountains, it rolled down upon the people of the world, it was applied to Oregon and Washington, bounded by the Pacific Ocean. These consecutive legislative precedents, commencing in 1787, and continuing to the present time, are clear and unimpeachable by any conclusive reasoning.

I observe, in the third place, *there is no adverse decision of the Supreme Court.*

In 1820, Congress passed the Missouri Compromise, on the ground of its unconstitutionality. The power of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories was then for the first time denied. The Territorial Governments were then said to be unconstitutional. He says, on the subject of the organization of the Territories of Utah and New Mexico:

"In the councils of Congress, there were manifested extreme differences of opinion and action between some Representatives, who desired the unconstitutional employment of the legislative power of the Government, to impose, in the condition of the inchoate States, and to impose their own social theories upon the latter, and other Representatives, who repelled the interposition of the Federal Government in this respect, and maintained the self-controlling rights of the States.

"Once more the Constitution of the United States intervened to settle the strife. Two Territories were organized without restrictions upon the disputed point, and were thus left to judge in that particular for themselves."

He says, that the right of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories were said "to desire the exercise of unconstitutional power;" and when Congress enacts laws throwing open territory, before free, to the occupancy of Slavery, he tells us "that the Constitution of the Union carried it signally."

But, Mr. President, I desire here to inquire whence the President of the United States derived the power to adjudicate upon the validity of the laws which had previously passed through all the usual forms of legislation? I had supposed that such adjudications were duly belonged to the judicial department of the Government. But the framers of the Constitution originally conferred this power on the Supreme Court.

Under the Constitution, Congress may enact laws, the *courts* may adjudicate them, and the President may execute them. These three departments of the Government should remain distinct, because their union tends to a despotism.

But I neither the President nor Congress may expound the laws without a usurpation of powers never conferred by the Constitution, I inquire for the opinions of the Judiciary on which the declarations of the President and of Congress are based. For if these laws were in fact unconstitutional, it would be strange if none of the courts of the country, State or National, in all the complicated adjudication that has arisen since 1789, had found occasion to pronounce them void. The President pronounces these laws unconstitutional. Senators say they were unconstitutional. Congress repealed the Missouri Compromise because it was unconstitutional; and all who opposed this repeal are denounced as enemies to the Constitution. And yet the *courts*, the only *constitutional* tribunals on earth that have the right to adjudicate such questions, have never, I believe, even intimated such an opinion!

If I am in error in this, let old and experienced Senators here, whose knowledge must be perfect on this subject, correct me. Does no one answer? I hear no reply. Shall I infer there are no such decisions, well authenticated, of any court of the country, State or National. Then, sir, what becomes of these charges of "treason against the Constitution and the Union," so liberally fulminated against the opponents of Slavery in Kansas? Before I am condemned as an enemy of my country, as a political traitor to her fundamental law, I desire to know that some court of competent jurisdiction has decided that my opinions are in conflict with the Constitution.

I will not detain the Senate with the presentation of political and constitutional objections and unconstitutionality of the uniform legislation of Congress, which I have cited. The honorable Senator from Illinois [Mr. TRUMBULL] discussed this point to some extent, yesterday. I will not, therefore, repeat for my argument; for the entire absence of any judicial opinion, State or National, in conflict with the constitutionality of these laws, in all the adjudication that has arisen during more than forty years, amounts to a negative pregnant, as potent in its convincing efficacy as the most elaborate adjudication.

In the next place, I argue the existence of power in the Congress of the United States to legislate on the subject of Slavery in the Territories, from the relation which they sustain to the Government.

In each of the States of the Union, the power of the General Government is restricted. Here the sovereignty is divided between the State and the United States. The powers of the United States are all derived from the State; but the powers of Congress in the Territories are not thus derived from a local Government—the order is reversed, and the Territorial Government derives all its powers from the Government of the United States.

The Government of the United States acquired all her rights in the Northwest Territory, not by virtue of an act derived from the State, but by the Constitution, but by deed from Virginia; in the Territory of Tennessee, from North Carolina; in the Southwest Territory, including Mississippi and Alabama, from France, from Great Britain, in the Floridas, from Spain; in the Louisiana Territory, from France. The United States was the successor of each of these; and it is well established that the Constitution of the United States, in conferring on the Congress of the United States, "the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," gave to Congress the entire sovereignty in the Louisiana Territory (including Kansas and Nebraska) was vested in France. The Government of the United States, by the express stipulations of the treaty, all the rights and sovereignty originally possessed by the grantor; and hence became the actual, full, complete, and exclusive sovereign of the Territory. It succeeded to all the rights of France, if ever had any right, title, claim, or interest, in or to any part of the Louisiana Territory. No one of them had ever exercised any jurisdiction over it. It was a mere "political" possession, in which she was its absolute sovereign. Hence the Government of the United States must have succeeded to the same unrestricted rights, and may hold, exercise, and enjoy these rights of sovereignty in whatever manner the sovereignty. If France, previous to the cession, could have excluded Slavery from Kansas and Nebraska, this Government may do so now, subject only to the prohibitions of the Constitution. Let it be borne in mind, we are dealing with the original compact, we are "old (or void) at the option of the Government to make it, as Mr. Madison supposed, Congress may not have been bound to accept it—it certainly had no power to alter it."

The honorable Senator from Georgia arrives at an erroneous conclusion, only because his premises are untrue. This Ordinance does not purport on *its face* to be a compact between *Virginia* and the people of the Territories, and the United States, but a "compact between *the original States*, and the people and States in the said *Territory*." Virginia was no party to the bargain, "on its face;" nor were the people and States in said Territories contracting parties. There were no States in the said Territory; the people had no organization; they had no power to bargain until after the Ordinance was passed; and the Ordinance bears the signature of no representative of Virginia, nor of the Territory—and of no one but "William Grayson, chairman" of Congress, by the unanimous consent of the "States," in other words, it was a law of the United States, passed in the usual form, containing a solemn declaration of the future policy of the Government in the subject of Slavery in the Territories. It was no more irrepealable than the Missouri Compromise. Like the latter, it had all the moral elements of a perpetual covenant; but, in fact, it was a mere act of Congress; and that, too, of a Congress under the Confederation, with fewer elements of sovereignty, with less power to bind the individual States, than is now possessed by the Government of the Constitution. Hence, if Congress had the power to repeal the Missouri *Compromise*, which literally means an agreement, a bargain, a "compact," it had the power to repeal the Ordinance of 1787. They were both declaratory acts of Congress—nothing more. The veracity and honor of the nation were at stake. She had solemnly declared that Slavery should be prohibited north of the Northwest Territory; and that in the Louisiana Territory north of 36° 30′ Slavery should be *forever* prohibited. This was the voice of the supreme power of the Confederacy, spoken in the presence of the enlightened nations of the earth. But it was "a nude compact"—it bound no one but herself. If she chose to violate her plighted faith with her own citizens, and to stand a giant liar among the nations, who could call her to account?

But be this as it may, these legislative precedents are not confined to subdivisions of the Northwest Territory. They have constantly followed the organization of Territory in the territory. It was first applied to Ohio; when the title of population rolled across the Miami, it was applied to Indiana; when it crossed the Wabash, it was applied to Illinois; when it surged to the Northern lakes, it was applied to Michigan; when it hugged the western shore of the lakes up to the British possessions, and dashed across the great bend of the Mississippi, it carried to Wisconsin, including Iowa and Minnesota, both of which were beyond the boundaries of the Northwest Territory; and when it overlapped the Rocky Mountains, it rolled down upon the people of the world, it was applied to Oregon and Washington, bounded by the Pacific Ocean. These consecutive legislative precedents, commencing in 1787, and continuing to the present time, are clear and unimpeachable by any conclusive reasoning.

I observe, in the third place, *there is no adverse decision of the Supreme Court.*

In 1820, Congress passed the Missouri Compromise, on the ground of its unconstitutionality. The power of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories was then for the first time denied. The Territorial Governments were then said to be unconstitutional. He says, on the subject of the organization of the Territories of Utah and New Mexico:

"In the councils of Congress, there were manifested extreme differences of opinion and action between some Representatives, who desired the unconstitutional employment of the legislative power of the Government, to impose, in the condition of the inchoate States, and to impose their own social theories upon the latter, and other Representatives, who repelled the interposition of the Federal Government in this respect, and maintained the self-controlling rights of the States.

"Once more the Constitution of the United States intervened to settle the strife. Two Territories were organized without restrictions upon the disputed point, and were thus left to judge in that particular for themselves."

He says, that the right of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories were said "to desire the exercise of unconstitutional power;" and when Congress enacts laws throwing open territory, before free, to the occupancy of Slavery, he tells us "that the Constitution of the Union carried it signally."

But, Mr. President, I desire here to inquire whence the President of the United States derived the power to adjudicate upon the validity of the laws which had previously passed through all the usual forms of legislation? I had supposed that such adjudications were duly belonged to the judicial department of the Government. But the framers of the Constitution originally conferred this power on the Supreme Court.

Under the Constitution, Congress may enact laws, the *courts* may adjudicate them, and the President may execute them. These three departments of the Government should remain distinct, because their union tends to a despotism.

But if neither the President nor Congress may expound the laws without a usurpation of powers never conferred by the Constitution, I inquire for the opinions of the Judiciary on which the declarations of the President and of Congress are based. For if these laws were in fact unconstitutional, it would be strange if none of the courts of the country, State or National, in all the complicated adjudication that has arisen since 1789, had found occasion to pronounce them void. The President pronounces these laws unconstitutional. Senators say they were unconstitutional. Congress repealed the Missouri Compromise because it was unconstitutional; and all who opposed this repeal are denounced as enemies to the Constitution. And yet the *courts*, the only *constitutional* tribunals on earth that have the right to adjudicate such questions, have never, I believe, even intimated such an opinion!

If I am in error in this, let old and experienced Senators here, whose knowledge must be perfect on this subject, correct me. Does no one answer? I hear no reply. Shall I infer there are no such decisions, well authenticated, of any court of the country, State or National. Then, sir, what becomes of these charges of "treason against the Constitution and the Union," so liberally fulminated against the opponents of Slavery in Kansas? Before I am condemned as an enemy of my country, as a political traitor to her fundamental law, I desire to know that some court of competent jurisdiction has decided that my opinions are in conflict with the Constitution.

I will not detain the Senate with the presentation of political and constitutional objections and unconstitutionality of the uniform legislation of Congress, which I have cited. The honorable Senator from Illinois [Mr. TRUMBULL] discussed this point to some extent, yesterday. I will not, therefore, repeat for my argument; for the entire absence of any judicial opinion, State or National, in conflict with the constitutionality of these laws, in all the adjudication that has arisen during more than forty years, amounts to a negative pregnant, as potent in its convincing efficacy as the most elaborate adjudication.

In the next place, I argue the existence of power in the Congress of the United States to legislate on the subject of Slavery in the Territories, from the relation which they sustain to the Government.

In each of the States of the Union, the power of the General Government is restricted. Here the sovereignty is divided between the State and the United States. The powers of the United States are all derived from the State; but the powers of Congress in the Territories are not thus derived from a local Government—the order is reversed, and the Territorial Government derives all its powers from the Government of the United States.

The Government of the United States acquired all her rights in the Northwest Territory, not by virtue of an act derived from the State, but by the Constitution, but by deed from Virginia; in the Territory of Tennessee, from North Carolina; in the Southwest Territory, including Mississippi and Alabama, from France, from Great Britain; in the Floridas, from Spain; in the Louisiana Territory, from France. The United States was the successor of each of these; and it is well established that the Constitution of the United States, in conferring on the Congress of the United States, "the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," gave to Congress the entire sovereignty in the Louisiana Territory (including Kansas and Nebraska) was vested in France. The Government of the United States, by the express stipulations of the treaty, all the rights and sovereignty originally possessed by the grantor; and hence became the actual, full, complete, and exclusive sovereign of the Territory. It succeeded to all the rights of France, if ever had any right, title, claim, or interest, in or to any part of the Louisiana Territory. No one of them had ever exercised any jurisdiction over it. It was a mere "political" possession, in which she was its absolute sovereign. Hence the Government of the United States must have succeeded to the same unrestricted rights, and may hold, exercise, and enjoy these rights of sovereignty in whatever manner the sovereignty. If France, previous to the cession, could have excluded Slavery from Kansas and Nebraska, this Government may do so now, subject only to the prohibitions of the Constitution. Let it be borne in mind, we are dealing with the original compact, we are "old (or void) at the option of the Government to make it, as Mr. Madison supposed, Congress may not have been bound to accept it—it certainly had no power to alter it."

The honorable Senator from Georgia arrives at an erroneous conclusion, only because his premises are untrue. This Ordinance does not purport on *its face* to be a compact between *Virginia* and the people of the Territories, and the United States, but a "compact between *the original States*, and the people and States in the said *Territory*." Virginia was no party to the bargain, "on its face;" nor were the people and States in said Territories contracting parties. There were no States in the said Territory; the people had no organization; they had no power to bargain until after the Ordinance was passed; and the Ordinance bears the signature of no representative of Virginia, nor of the Territory—and of no one but "William Grayson, chairman" of Congress, by the unanimous consent of the "States," in other words, it was a law of the United States, passed in the usual form, containing a solemn declaration of the future policy of the Government in the subject of Slavery in the Territories. It was no more irrepealable than the Missouri Compromise. Like the latter, it had all the moral elements of a perpetual covenant; but, in fact, it was a mere act of Congress; and that, too, of a Congress under the Confederation, with fewer elements of sovereignty, with less power to bind the individual States, than is now possessed by the Government of the Constitution. Hence, if Congress had the power to repeal the Missouri *Compromise*, which literally means an agreement, a bargain, a "compact," it had the power to repeal the Ordinance of 1787. They were both declaratory acts of Congress—nothing more. The veracity and honor of the nation were at stake. She had solemnly declared that Slavery should be prohibited north of the Northwest Territory; and that in the Louisiana Territory north of 36° 30′ Slavery should be *forever* prohibited. This was the voice of the supreme power of the Confederacy, spoken in the presence of the enlightened nations of the earth. But it was "a nude compact"—it bound no one but herself. If she chose to violate her plighted faith with her own citizens, and to stand a giant liar among the nations, who could call her to account?

But be this as it may, these legislative precedents are not confined to subdivisions of the Northwest Territory. They have constantly followed the organization of Territory in the territory. It was first applied to Ohio; when the title of population rolled across the Miami, it was applied to Indiana; when it crossed the Wabash, it was applied to Illinois; when it surged to the Northern lakes, it was applied to Michigan; when it hugged the western shore of the lakes up to the British possessions, and dashed across the great bend of the Mississippi, it carried to Wisconsin, including Iowa and Minnesota, both of which were beyond the boundaries of the Northwest Territory; and when it overlapped the Rocky Mountains, it rolled down upon the people of the world, it was applied to Oregon and Washington, bounded by the Pacific Ocean. These consecutive legislative precedents, commencing in 1787, and continuing to the present time, are clear and unimpeachable by any conclusive reasoning.

I observe, in the third place, *there is no adverse decision of the Supreme Court.*

In 1820, Congress passed the Missouri Compromise, on the ground of its unconstitutionality. The power of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories was then for the first time denied. The Territorial Governments were then said to be unconstitutional. He says, on the subject of the organization of the Territories of Utah and New Mexico:

"In the councils of Congress, there were manifested extreme differences of opinion and action between some Representatives, who desired the unconstitutional employment of the legislative power of the Government, to impose, in the condition of the inchoate States, and to impose their own social theories upon the latter, and other Representatives, who repelled the interposition of the Federal Government in this respect, and maintained the self-controlling rights of the States.

"Once more the Constitution of the United States intervened to settle the strife. Two Territories were organized without restrictions upon the disputed point, and were thus left to judge in that particular for themselves."

He says, that the right of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories were said "to desire the exercise of unconstitutional power;" and when Congress enacts laws throwing open territory, before free, to the occupancy of Slavery, he tells us "that the Constitution of the Union carried it signally."

But, Mr. President, I desire here to inquire whence the President of the United States derived the power to adjudicate upon the validity of the laws which had previously passed through all the usual forms of legislation? I had supposed that such adjudications were duly belonged to the judicial department of the Government. But the framers of the Constitution originally conferred this power on the Supreme Court.

Under the Constitution, Congress may enact laws, the *courts* may adjudicate them, and the President may execute them. These three departments of the Government should remain distinct, because their union tends to a despotism.

But if neither the President nor Congress may expound the laws without a usurpation of powers never conferred by the Constitution, I inquire for the opinions of the Judiciary on which the declarations of the President and of Congress are based. For if these laws were in fact unconstitutional, it would be strange if none of the courts of the country, State or National, in all the complicated adjudication that has arisen since 1789, had found occasion to pronounce them void. The President pronounces these laws unconstitutional. Senators say they were unconstitutional. Congress repealed the Missouri Compromise because it was unconstitutional; and all who opposed this repeal are denounced as enemies to the Constitution. And yet the *courts*, the only *constitutional* tribunals on earth that have the right to adjudicate such questions, have never, I believe, even intimated such an opinion!

If I am in error in this, let old and experienced Senators here, whose knowledge must be perfect on this subject, correct me. Does no one answer? I hear no reply. Shall I infer there are no such decisions, well authenticated, of any court of the country, State or National. Then, sir, what becomes of these charges of "treason against the Constitution and the Union," so liberally fulminated against the opponents of Slavery in Kansas? Before I am condemned as an enemy of my country, as a political traitor to her fundamental law, I desire to know that some court of competent jurisdiction has decided that my opinions are in conflict with the Constitution.

I will not detain the Senate with the presentation of political and constitutional objections and unconstitutionality of the uniform legislation of Congress, which I have cited. The honorable Senator from Illinois [Mr. TRUMBULL] disc