THOMAS RITCHIE,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS.

DAILY,	per year,	$10 00
SEMI-WEEKLY, (published tri-weekly during the session of Congress)		5 00
WEEKLY,		2 00
Clubs will be furnished as follows:		
Five copies of the DAILY, for		40 00
Five copies of the SEMI-WEEKLY,		20 00
Ten copies of the " "		35 00
Five copies of the WEEKLY,		8 00
Ten copies of the "		15 00

The Daily Union.

VOLUME IV. "LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION." NUMBER 245

CITY OF WASHINGTON, TUESDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 20, 1849.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

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

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

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

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

☞ POSTMASTERS are authorized to act as our agents; and, by sending us FIVE DAILY subscribers, with $50 enclosed, or five SEMI-WEEKLY subscribers, with $25 enclosed; or five WEEKLY subscribers, with $10 enclosed, will be entitled to one copy of the same edition as they furnish us subscribers for, *gratis*.

IN CONGRESS OF THE U. STATES,

Thirtieth Congress—Second Session.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1849.

SENATE.

MEMORIALS AND PETITIONS.

Mr. DIX presented a memorial signed by a large number of persons, asking such amendment of the patent laws as will the more effectually give to patentees the benefit of their inventions; which was referred to the Committee on Patents and the Patent Office.

Also, a petition signed by a large number of citizens of the State of New York, asking for a reduction in the rates of postage, and that the franking privilege may be abolished; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Also the petition of Duncan Bradford and J. Syney Henshaw, late professors of mathematics in the navy, asking to be allowed arrears of pay and the benefits of the act of 3d March, 1801, granting four months' extra pay to discharged officers; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also the petition of the Hurl Gate pilots, steamboat captains, port wardens, and others, of the city of New York, asking that the light on Sand's Point, Long Island, may not be discontinued; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. D. at the same time gave notice of his intention to introduce a bill to continue said light.

Mr. ATCHISON presented the memorial of A. B. Ralph and other citizens of the United States, asking that military escorts may be placed on the route between the valley of the Mississippi and California, and a permanent military post established at some point convenient to the gold region in that territory; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS of Massachusetts presented a petition from citizens of Massachusetts, asking that the rates of postage may be reduced, and the franking privilege abolished; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Also a memorial from the President of Amherst College in Massachusetts, asking that a new and enlarged edition of the works of the exploring expedition may be published, and copies deposited in the libraries of colleges and other public institutions; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRIGHT presented the petition of citizens of Blackford county, Indiana, asking the establishment of a post office at Ransom's Store, in that county; which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a petition from citizens of Indiana, asking the establishment of a mail route from Smithfield to Montpelier, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. WESTCOTT presented the petition of the legal representatives of Henry Pawling, deceased, an officer in the revolutionary army; which was referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. KING presented the memorial of John C. Riddle, D. H. Carter, and E. Simonds, proposing to construct a turnpike road across the isthmus of Panama, and asking that a contract may be entered into with them for transporting the mails and other property of the United States over said road; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

On motion by Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana,

Ordered, That the petition of Thomas P. Harrison and A. T. H. Duval, on the files of the Senate, be referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES.

Mr. NILES, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to whom were referred additional documents in the case of S. F. Butterworth, reported back the bill for the relief of Samuel F. Butterworth without amendment.

Mr. DOWNS, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, to whom was referred House bill (No. 759) for the relief of Charles McLane of Missouri, reported back the same without amendment, and recommended its passage.

Mr. FELCH, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred House bill (No. 517) for the relief of Mary G. Leverett, reported back the same without amendment, and recommended its passage.

Mr. ATCHISON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the petition of Thomas Snodgrass, asking remuneration for his services in removing certain Cherokee Indians, asked to be discharged from the further consideration of the same, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. YULEE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the petition of John Collins, asking the difference of pay between boatswain and boatswain's mate, asked to be discharged from the further consideration of the same; which was agreed to.

Also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the petition of Julia Martin, asking a pension for her brother, Luther Martin, late a midshipman in the navy, asked to be discharged from the further consideration of the same, and that the petitioner have leave to withdraw her papers; which was agreed to.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be instructed to inquire whether the laws regulating the coasting trade do not require amendment or alteration to meet the case of vessels sailing to our Pacific coast.

On motion by Mr. WESTCOTT,

Ordered, That one thousand additional copies of the report of the superintendent of the coast survey be printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. NILES moved a reconsideration of the vote by which the bill for the relief of Henry Vincent, administrator of James Le Caze, was rejected.

The motion to reconsider was ordered to be entered upon the journal.

SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. YULEE presented resolutions of the legislature of Florida, declaring that Congress possesses no power to prohibit slavery in any territory of the United States, and that any attempt on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia should be resisted by the South, as the exercise of a power not conferred, and in violation of the constitution of the United States.

Mr. Y. said: I deem it proper to bring to the knowledge of the Senate certain resolutions which were recently passed by the General Assembly of Florida. It will be seen that they are not addressed to the federal Congress, nor designed, I presume, for influence here. They contain simply an expression of the opinions and feelings entertained by the people of Florida upon the subjects they relate to, and a declaration to her sister States in the South of her willingness to co-operate with them in resisting, if they cannot avert, apprehended aggressions, and her readiness to follow in their lead and to share in their fortunes. Inasmuch as they have been transmitted by the Executive of the State to her representatives here, and as they will guide my course, and, I believe, that of my colleague, and as I deem it to be important at this juncture that the States of the Union should understand each other distinctly, we propose to place a copy of them among the files of the Senate.

There are circumstances which give to these resolutions a marked significance. Florida is one of the States whose vote was announced a few days since in support of the nominees of the whig party for President and Vice President. It is claimed, I believe, that she was the banner whig State. The legislature which enacted them comprised among its members many of the leading spirits of both parties, and contained a decided majority in each branch of the friends of the incoming President. They were all fresh from the people, and from an active canvass. They had just consummated the election of a gentleman to represent the State upon this floor, who is a member of the whig party. This assembly, thus composed, have declared that, "knowing no party names or political divisions" upon the subject of the resolutions, they "are ready, heart and soul, with a united front, to join Virginia, the Carolinas, and other southern States," in asserting and defending their common rights. In token of their sincerity, the resolutions containing this pledge were passed with a unanimous vote in each branch, and received the prompt approval of the Executive.

The people of Florida, sir, compose a portion of the people of the South, and are, therefore, acted upon by similar influences and sympathies with the rest. These proceedings, then, signify that however reluctant representatives here may be to take the responsibility of decided action, or to precipitate the questions now impending between the northern and southern sections of this Union, the people of the South and the States of the South mean to assert their due rights, and will be found at the proper time acting together to this end, without faultering, heart and soul, with a united front.

The State from which these resolutions emanate has not long occupied a place in the confederacy; but her title to that place was found in her due estimate of the value of liberty and dignity of independence. To maintain these, she joined the Union; and if necessary, she must retire from the Union to maintain them. Her population is not numerous; but her jurisdiction covers a large area, possessing unusual advantages of climate, soil, and position. In this early day of her history, the duty devolves on her of giving shape to the destinies of the powerful Commonwealth which must one day occupy her boundaries. She feels her responsibility, and will not shrink from it. She dare not omit the duty of maintaining unimpaired the freedom of her people, and she must defend at all hazards their political equality with the rest of the Union; for without equality neither the liberty of the individual nor the independence of States can exist. The issue involves her sovereignty, and this she must defend and preserve—happy if in doing so the Union can be preserved.

The resolutions, Mr. President, speak for themselves; they declare the united voice of Florida; they deliberately assume a posture and announce a pledge from which the State cannot recede with honor, and from which, therefore, I feel warranted to say she will not recede.

It remains only for me to say that I approve cordially the course which my State has indicated for her citizens, and shall humbly but faithfully aid in giving effect to her will.

I move now that the resolutions be read, and printed for the information of the Senate.

The resolutions were then read follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida in General Assembly convened, That, as friends of the Union, we view with most serious alarm the course of our northern brethren in relation to the question of slavery—a course which, marked by unkindness, wrong, insult, and injury, has already, to a most unfortunate extent, weakened the bonds which unite them and us; which, if persisted in, in the same spirit, can only terminate in further alienation, and in the inevitable dissolution of the confederacy.

Resolved, That the recently acquired territory having been purchased by blood and treasure of which her full proportion was contributed by the South, she and her sons are entitled, equally with any other portion of the Union, to the enjoyment of the same; this General Assembly, therefore, believing that Congress possesses, under the constitution, no power to pass such a measure, adopting similar language to that of the legislature of Virginia, hereby declare it as their opinion, "that, under no circumstances, will the people of this State be willing to recognise as binding any enactment of the federal government which has for its object the prohibition of slavery in any territory south of the line of the Missouri compromise, holding it to be the natural and independent right of each citizen of each and every State of the confederacy to reside with his property, of whatever description, in any territory acquired by the arms of the United States, or yielded by treaty with any foreign power."

Resolved, That the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, involving, as it does, an exercise of power not granted by the constitution, and designed, as it is, as a means of affecting the institution of slavery in the States, against which it is aimed as a blow, should be resisted on the part of the South, by whatever means are best adapted to the protection of the constitution, the defence of herself, and the preservation of the Union.

Resolved, That, knowing no party names or political divisions, on questions involving in their settlement and consequences the character, property, and lives of those whom we represent, we are ready, heart and soul, with a united front, to join Virginia, the Carolinas, and the other southern States, in taking such measures for the defence of our rights, and the preservation of ourselves, and those whom we hold dear, as the highest wisdom of all may, whether through a southern convention or otherwise, suggest and devise.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the governor of each of the slave States, with a request that they be laid before the legislatures of such as are now in session.

Mr. WESTCOTT. Mr. President, I trust I may rely upon the indulgence of the Senate to listen to a few remarks which I deem it my duty to my State and to myself to make on this occasion.

The resolutions presented by my colleague were adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Florida on the 4th of last month. Copies of them were received by my colleague and myself about the middle of January. It will be noticed they do not indicate to the governor of the State the transmission of them to the senators and representative of the State in Congress. They do not contain any *instructions* to the senators or any request to the representative. They are not directed to be laid before either house of Congress. The governor is directed merely to transmit a copy of them "*to the governors of each of the slave States with the request that they be laid before the legislatures of those States.*"

I presume the direction thus given was because the resolutions treat of a question of local and domestic policy of the slave States *exclusively*, with which the non-slaveholding States have rightfully no concern, and to avoid affording any pretext (in reply to those resolutions) for what might be offensive, and tend to increase the unkind feelings already existing.

My colleague in this body, upon consultation with me, has deemed it proper to submit these resolutions to the Senate of the confederacy, of which the State we represent here, although one of its youngest members, is, under the constitution, the equal of the eldest and proudest. We have regarded it as due to Florida, and as due to her sister States, that her feelings and her determination upon this momentous question should be expressed here, and placed on record; and though the terms of the resolution do not enjoin it upon us to present them and ask for their printing, under the precedent of the resolutions of the New York legislature, made a few days since, we cannot doubt the motion will be acceded to.

Mr. President, I am egotist enough to regard the forbearance of the legislature of Florida, to give any instructions to those who represent the State in Congress to the confidence reposed in them by the legislature that, on the subject referred to in those resolutions, such instructions were unnecessary. If I know myself, sir, that confidence is not misplaced. I may differ with some from the South as to the best course to be adopted to protect and defend successfully the constitutional rights of the southern States and of their citizens on this subject; but I will not yield to any in sincerity of purpose to maintain those rights to the last extremity. There is one thing that I will not do. I will not consent to make this a mere party question. I will do my utmost to prevent it being prostituted to such degenerate purpose. This question shall never, with my aid, be made a football for political aspirants here or elsewhere. I am rejoiced to see that the legislature of my State, in the resolutions now laid before the Senate, (which I learn were adopted unanimously,) express the same opinion; and I can freely declare that every sentiment, every word and letter of these resolutions, find an echo in my feelings, and an approval in my deliberate judgment.

Mr. President, in these resolutions there is no menace. There are no words of "sound and fury signifying nothing" to be found in them. They are in grave but earnest language, becoming a sovereign State, whose free citizens feel that they have been and are insulted and wronged by those who seem to regard power only as the limit of right.

Sir, the first resolution declares that the people of the State of Florida, "AS FRIENDS OF THE UNION, view with most serious alarm the course of our northern brethren in relation to the question of slavery—a course which, marked by unkindness, wrong, insult, and injury, has already, to a most unfortunate extent, weakened the bonds which unite them and us; which, if persisted in, in the same spirit, can only terminate in further alienation, and in the inevitable dissolution of the confederacy."

Would to Heaven, Mr. President, that I could impress my fellow-citizens of the other sections of the Union, with the conviction that the sad prediction there made will be verified, if the voice of insult is not hushed—if the hand of aggression is not stayed, and if sectional faction is not checked in its selfish encroachments upon the constitution, and upon the equal rights of the South under that compact.

That prediction, Mr. President, is "THE INEVITABLE DISSOLUTION OF THE CONFEDERACY."

What true American is there who can look upon such catastrophe but with horror? There may be those who can. I am not of that number. I have ever held, and while I live I shall hold, that the preservation of the federal Union, upon the principles which were adopted as its basis, by those who made the constitutional compact, ought to be the controlling dictate of the political conduct of every good citizen. I repeat, sir, the Union and its perpetuity, upon the principles of the constitution, should be the polar star of every patriot. I look to the dissolution of this confederacy as the political extinction of a respectable power among the nations of the earth—of the people of all this continent.

When that flag which has so often led American freeman on land, and on sea, to victory and honor—that flag which is now a sure protection to American citizens wherever it waves throughout the world—whose stripes remind us, that within a century, *thirteen* dependent and oppressed, but United colonies won their independence as sovereign States—whose stars remind us that *seventeen* other States, their offspring, but equally sovereign, have since sprang into existence, and that, united, they form the mightiest confederacy of republican States the world has ever beheld; when that glorious flag is torn to shreds, in the terrible conflict that must be the prelude to the dissolution of this Union, I ask the North and East what other banner will you adopt in its stead? What other constitution than that signed by Washington, will secure the dissevered sections equal freedom, equal security, and equal prosperity to that which all have hitherto enjoyed, and which all could still enjoy, if the compact of union was by all sought to be faithfully adhered to? If the different sections of the Union become independent and separate governments, disconnected from each other, and holding each other as *foreign*, regarding each other as "*enemies in war*," and, if it can be, "*in peace friends*," who cannot foresee that each section may successively become the victim of aggression by European powers, now our jealous rivals, and whose hostility is only restrained by the consideration that the "United States of America" possess the power to redress wrong, though perpetrated by the mightiest of them, or by all combined, and that indignity to the "star-spangled banner" cannot be committed with impunity?

And now, Mr. President, how is the dissolution of the Union to be compassed? What are the means of which it is to be the result? I ask those who seem bent on goading the South to extremities to pause and reflect. Can any one be so infatuated as to imagine that the bonds of this confederacy can be *peacefully* dissolved? No, sir. What, then? CIVIL WAR! This is the practical process by which the dissolution of the Union is to be accomplished. Are you prepared for this? Are you resolved on this? Will you enforce your arbitrary, your insulting, your degrading edicts against the Southern States and their citizens, at this hazard? There have been taunts. It has been said "the South dares not resist." We have been defied and threatened, and boasts have been made of the superior power of the North and East. I would, Mr. President, implore those who thus act to listen to the voice of humanity, if that of justice and if the guaranties of the constitution are still unheeded. As our fathers of the revolution appealed to the people of Great Britain, they are appealed to: their "nature, justice, and magnanimity are invoked;" they are "conjured by the ties of our common kindred to disarm these usurpations" of which the South so justly complain, and which will "inevitably interrupt our connexions and correspondence." As our fathers of the revolution "warned" the people of Great Britain as to the usurpations of the British Crown and parliament, they have "from time to time" been "warned of the attempts," by the legislature of the confederacy, "to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction" over the South and its domestic institutions. They have been "reminded of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement" on this continent; of the struggle which effected our common independence; of the formation of the constitutional compact, and of the unparalleled prosperity we have all enjoyed under it; and can it be that history is to record that, disregarding all those appeals, as the people of Great Britain were in 1776, "they, too, are deaf to the voice of justice and consanguinity?" I ask them, are your feelings towards the South so embittered that you wish to drive the southern States from the Union? Can there be any whose prejudices are so overwhelming as to desire the Union to be severed? Is their hatred of the South so intense that it can only be slaked by a CIVIL WAR? Can it be possible that any intelligent citizen of the United States has such feelings? Shut your eyes, if you can, to all the horrors of such strife; to the disruption of the ties of kindred; to the rending asunder of the bonds of society; to the devastation and carnage which will be its attendants—hope, if you can, that it may be conducted by humane commanders, and according to the rules of modern civilized warfare, and I ask you, what will there be of profit or of honor to you if you should be victorious? What boots it if you succeed in *subjugating* these who are now *your fellow-citizens* of the southern States? Could you exult in such victory? Could it be crowned with glory? Could heroes spring up among you in such conflict? And what dictate of permanent political or commercial or other interest can you find to induce any desire to subvert the constitution and Union? There is none. Fanatics and demagogues may seek to mislead you, but you will ultimately find that your welfare and prosperity depend upon the harmonious preservation of the Union, and the constitutional rights of all.

Suppose in the effort to subdue the South you have the aid of the machine called the federal government; do you imagine this will sanctify the outrages you may perpetrate in its name? Suppose that by arms it compels the South to submit. In a few years your boasted supremacy of numbers will cease to exist. It is destiny that the "Great West" is soon to control this government, and then in your disregard of the guaranties of the constitution, and in your aggressions on the South, may perhaps be found its justification for returning the "poisoned chalice to your lips." I will not present a picture of your condition if the South should, under Providence, defeat you in the conflict of arms which must precede the severance of this Union. Whoever triumphs, no true-hearted patriot—no friend of republican liberty—no friend of humanity—no true philanthropist, but will revolt with abhorrence from the scene presented by such conflict, and its issue, no matter what section is victorious. Those who may cause such deplorable war, and those who, having power, do not strive to prevent it, will be detested while living, and their memory execrated as long as constitutional republican freedom has a disciple on earth. If you should subjugate the South—if you should by force compel them to submit to your arbitrary edicts, bitter and scalding will be the tears of remorse that you will shed for your unhappy success.

Am I asked, Mr. President, why I speak thus to the East and North, and why I do not address similar exhortations to forbearance to my own section? I will cheerfully answer. The South are not the aggressors. They are the assailed—they are the defensive party. Sir, the South knows well that she could not, if she would, hesitate as to her course on this subject. She feels that she is forced by the dictate of self-preservation, and at every hazard, to resist the unconstitutional course pursued towards her. She feels that it is her political death if she passively yields. She has no alternative. She must resist. The questions involved are of vital character. Not merely CIVIL WAR, but, what is still more dreadful, *servile war* is one of the consequences of submission to the attempted encroachments upon her constitutional rights; and [this will come upon her] if she does not at once unite and take a firm stand against the incendiary intermeddling of other sections with the domestic institutions and local policy of the southern States. Sir, the South does not seek a dissolution of the Union. The imputation that she does is an infamous calumny. The people of the South are not merely attached to, but they are devoted to the Union. They are as national in their feelings as those of any other section. But the Union to which they are bound is the Union of the constitution. By that compact, all the States of every section are equals. The bastard Union that sectional and fanatical faction would force upon the South instead of that formed by our fathers, has not, and never will have our affection or our respect. The South never can admit the doctrine that the federal government possesses the power in anywise, or to any extent, to legislate with a view to exclude the institution of domestic servitude from the territories. Followed up as it would be by attempts to enforce kindred doctrines as to the rightfulness of interfering with the local affairs of the States, they would soon be degraded to the position of inferiors; they would cease to be equals and become the dependent vassals of an arbitrary sectional majority in Congress. Such were not the terms of the Union agreed upon sixty-two years ago by the southern States when they ratified the federal constitution.

I repeat, the South cannot yield. She is resisting a principle which, if established, seals her political doom under this confederacy. It is her political death to acquiesce in its establishment. It is not so with those sections that are striving to force this principle upon her. Those sections are contending for a mere political abstraction—what they believe to be a philanthropic sentiment—for a principle that does not affect them locally, and relates wholly to the government and domestic institutions of other and distant political communities. The advocates of the anti-slavery restriction are striving not only to exclude southern institutions by coercive means from the new Territories, but they seek by the power of arbitrary legislation to force the people of those Territories to adopt their principles, their prejudices, and their institutions.

Will the North and East jeopard the Union? Are they prepared to meet all that must occur before that Union is dissolved, merely to carry out an abstract political sentiment which is not to operate on themselves, and in which, if carried out, those sections can have little interest? I will, however, present the question in so simple a form, that every intelligent citizen in the Union can understand it truly, and see its injustice at once. If the South had majorities in both houses of Congress, and should propose with respect to these Territories a law of Congress declaring that no citizen of a non-slaveholding State should go to the Territories unless he brought and took with him a negro slave, and held such slave in servitude there, would the north and East submit? This is the other side of the question presented by those who seem determined to insist on the exclusion from the territories of the southern citizen with his slave property. It is a bad rule that will not work both ways. Why, sir, the whole non-slaveholding States would rise up at once, *en masse*, to resist by arms, if necessary, their exclusion by such law of Congress. If southern majorities here should enact such a law, the North, and East, and West would be united, and would withdraw from the confederacy, and fight rather than submit to such coercive exclusion. And, sir, they would act rightly. And yet, for daring to speak of resistance to the exclusion now sought to be imposed upon the South, its citizens are denounced as "southern fanatics," "agitators," "disunionists," and "traitors," seeking a severance of the Union!

Mr. President, the whole history of this country stamps all these accusations with falsehood. Before and since the adoption of the federal constitution the Southern States have shown their devotion to the Union. Their sacrifices in the revolutionary struggle were at least equal to those of the other sections. Her sons, though slaveholders, were not laggards in that contest. There is not a battle-field in that war, from Maine to Georgia, but was moistened with the blood of some of her sons. In the councils of that era her sages were among the wisest and firmest patriots. And how was it after our independence was gained? Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia voluntarily restricted their respective western boundaries, and gave to their sister States as "a common fund," their vast domain, extending westward to the Mississippi. Virginia gave the Northwest Territory before the constitution was ratified. *All that region was tributary to her laws, and under them slavery existed there.* In the establishment of the government for that territory it was provided that it should be what is now called "free soil." She did not resist the usurpation of power. Six non-slaveholding States have grown up under the restriction thus imposed. Virginia, in that cession, had no degrading jealousy; the South were not influenced by any pitiful sectional feeling in the other cessions I have referred to. And how has the confidence and generosity of the South been requited? By illiberal suspicion, jealousy, abuse, and attempted outrage. The gift made by Virginia of the Northwest Territory, and her not resisting the restriction upon it as to slavery, have been made a pretext for assailing her institutions as "revolting to the spirit of the age." Her voluntary cession and acquiescence in the restriction of the ordinance of 1787 has been advanced as an "admission," and urged as a "precedent" to sustain the exclusion now threatened as to California and New Mexico.

Mr. President, in her devotion to the Union the South has, since the constitution was formed, in 1787, submitted again and again to the partial and sectional legislation of Congress to advance the interests of the eastern and middle States; and, with but one exception, without any attempt to resort to the rightful remedies reserved to the States against federal usurpation, or aggression, or injustice, and often without a murmur.

Congress since 1787 has repeatedly enacted laws for the protection of the navigation interests of New England and New York. The South has yielded to the navigation States of the East and Middle sections all her carrying trade. Those sections enjoy it exclusively. Have selfish feelings influenced the South in this? The monopoly of the entire coasting trade of the Union is given to the navigating States upon an old and obsolete principle of the restrictive policy of Europe. Have the South sought to be allowed to employ foreign vessels in their domestic or coasting trade, or claimed the advantage of their competition with the vessels of the Eastern and Middle States? So far from it, sir, at this very time acts of Congress for the benefit of Northern vessel owners oblige the Southern States, whose citizens have little navigating interest, to procure the products of Cuba and Porto Rico they consume via the Northern Atlantic cities. My own State and Georgia get two-thirds of what they use of the products of those islands from the North, though we are within a short distance from both islands. Under the operation of your navigation laws, and laws respecting commerce, Eastern ships monopolize the carrying of most of our foreign cotton trade. Few foreign vessels now visit Southern ports, though they can generally carry freight profitably for prices below what vessels of the United States obtain. The South has submitted to all this.

Look at your fishing bounty laws for the benefit of the eastern States. It would be an instructive lesson as to the value of the Union to those States, and the pecuniary profit it has been to them as a mere speculation, to have a statement of the *immense*—yes, sir, the *immense*—sums annually paid for many years under these fishing bounty laws.

And, sir, all the difficulties we have had with foreign powers have been chiefly on account of interests of the citizens of the eastern States. That with France at the commencement of this century; those with the Barbary powers, about the same time; the war with England of 1812; the quarrel with Algiers, and the difficulty with France since, mostly originated in the efforts of this government to protect the commercial and navigating interests of New England and New York, and Philadelphia. Eight-tenths of all the claims for foreign spoliations are from those cities and New England. Why, sir, I learn six-tenths of the claims on Mexico are from the same quarters, and are the very claims which the refusal by Mexico to pay was urged by the President as a just cause of War.

The expenditures of your revenue, military, naval, and civil, are chiefly in the Middle and East. Look at your fortifications, navy-yards, docks, arsenals, lighthouses, and your public custom-houses in the Middle and Eastern States, and then look at those in the South. Of your local officers of any consequence, in number and in amount of emolument, eight-tenths are to be found in New England, and including as far south as Pennsylvania. You even deny the frontier southern and western States the small prestige of neighborhood mails, if it occasions a few dollars of expense; while millions are spent for the benefit of Atlantic cities, and to carry on intercourse between them and foreign countries.

I will not recur in detail to the iniquitous tariff laws that you have in past times imposed upon the South for the protection of the manufactures of the eastern and middle States, and by the effect and operation of which the South were compelled to bear the chief burden of all the taxes on imports. With your federal bank as an engine in former times, and your laws respecting the currency, and affecting exchanges, trade, and commerce in the ten thousand ways so well understood by shrewd commercial men, you have done more than natural causes to occasion a concentration of business in New York—make it a great monetary focus, and render the South and the agricultural interests of the country generally tributary to it. After the explosion of the federal bank, (and General Jackson was aided in his movements against the bank by New York, as it was then located in Philadelphia,) the effects I have mentioned were produced as much by the administration of the laws by the powers here as otherwise, until that was checked in some degree by the subtreasury act, though still the entire power of the federal government is continually exercised for the benefit of the Atlantic cities of the eastern and middle States, to the prejudice of the other sections. I know this cannot always be the case. In a few years New Orleans will outstrip even the empire city; and, if ever Canada is annexed, the opening of the St. Lawrence to the commerce of the Northwest and West will rear up another formidable rival to her on the shores of that river.

I will not on this occasion recapitulate the course of the East with respect to slavery. Some of that course is detailed in a document recently published in this city by southern members of Congress, in the form of an address to the South; but, in my judgment, much of outrage has been omitted in that detail.

The Missouri compromise act, as it is called, is in my opinion the leading aggression; and it is scarcely noticed in that paper, and certainly not in terms of becoming reprehension and denunciation. Nor are the subsequent parodies of that outrage, called a compromise, in my judgment, properly condemned. The agency of some in the eastern States in causing the attempts to revolt by the slaves in Charleston, South Carolina, within two years after the Missouri agitation, and the fact that the insurrection in Southampton, Virginia, some ten years afterwards, was occasioned by incendiary abolition publications made in Boston and clandestinely circulated among the slaves, and speeches in Congress from 1819 to the session preceding the outbreak, is entirely unnoticed in that address. The evidence of the truth of what I state to be facts is in the books on the desk before me. I have before alluded to it in this chamber.

So, too, the course of the federal government with respect to foreign governments on the subject of slavery has not been fair or just to the South. It has not exercised its constitutional powers or fulfilled its constitutional duties on this subject. It has failed to do justice to a foreign government from prejudices respecting slaves and slavery. I allude to the case of L'Amistad, and to the refusal of this government to meet the demands of Spain honorably. Sir, is it not notorious that our refusal to do justice has well nigh occasioned Spain to recall her minister home, and put an end to all diplomatic intercourse between the two governments? She would have been justified in so doing. How can the miserable neglect of the federal government to insist upon the rendition by Great Britain of indemnity to the owners of the lost vessel (I believe she was called the Enterprise) that was taken into the Bahamas by the slaves on board of her, who had revolted and committed murder and piracy, and were protected in those islands, be excused? How can its unpardonable omission and neglect to insist upon the honest fulfilment by Great Britain of the treaty of 1842, and her delivery, under that treaty, of the seven slaves who, after committing murder and robbery in Florida, fled to Nassau, and were protected there, and were refused to be given up to the Florida marshal, be palliated? Sir, your politicians dare not do their duty. The coasts of Florida are infested by dozens of British smacks from the Bahamas, manned and often commanded by the mulatto and negro emancipees of those islands, who, lurking about our harbors, inveigle off slaves and excite them to disaffection. Does this federal government seek to afford its aid for our protection against their incendiarism? No, sir. When the act of 1803 is invoked, an act passed at the instance of citizens of North Carolina, to keep out the brigands of St. Domingo, we are told it does not apply to the crews of vessels, and that they are protected by the treaty with Great Britain. Treaty or no treaty, law or no law, the visits of these vessels and their crews to our waters will be prevented.

And, sir, to all these wrongs the people of my State have had superadded other causes for the weakening of their affection for the federal government, and for the eastern sections of the Union.

In 1836 the war with the Seminole Indians broke out in Florida. It was not caused by its citizens—it was deprecated by us—but it was caused by the attempt to carry out a system of policy adopted by this government of removing the Indians west. We had nothing to do with its origin. When it broke out we were entirely defenceless and unprotected. Our Territory and its wants had been shamefully neglected by Congress and the federal Executive for years. Florida was devastated by the savages. A frontier of four hundred miles was a line of smoking ruins. Well, sir, our State and its citizens have been defamed and reviled, and denounced as having caused the war, as having made it a source for peculation and profit—the just claims of honest citizens for supplies sold your troops—for services—for property destroyed by your officers, and for spoliations by the enemy, caused by your not affording the protection it was your duty to have afforded, are refused to be paid on the most trifling pretences and subterfuges, and injustice and injury thereby added to defamation and insult. Nor is this all; the negro slaves of white citizens, fugitives among the Indians, if captured by your army, were sent west by the government without payment to the owner from whom they had fled; and if retained and employed in the service of the government, and if they were killed, the owner has to petition ten years in vain for compensation; and at this very session, only after a month spent in the House in its consideration, is a claim of this kind passed by a meager majority of one or two votes.

Mr. President, I have made these remarks for one reason; because that I have within a few days past seen in some northern papers erroneous causes assigned for the absence of my name with those of other southern democratic members of Congress from the Southern address to which I have adverted; and predicated upon the statements I allude to, some censures have appeared in southern prints of those who withheld their names from that paper. While I concurred in the policy of an address, I did not sign the paper presented, because it did not suit my fancy in several particulars. It did not meet my views of what such a paper should contain, and it contains some things I did not like. It did not refer to the often repeated accumulated aggressions of the East and North upon the South, in other respects than with reference to slavery. It did not, as I have stated, present the infamous Missouri act in its proper character, and as the leading wrong and the progenitor of all the subsequent outrages, and it passed over the abolition efforts from 1821 to 1835, and their effect in producing the insurrections in Charleston and Southampton, totally unnoticed.

Sir, if a revolt of slaves in the South should take place within a year, the incendiaries of the East will be responsible for the consequences. The blood that is shed will be on their heads. The address omitted what I wished to be inserted to prevent improper imputation, and to ward off defamation in advance. This was the unequivocal declaration of the attachment of the South to the constitution and the Union, and not merely a disclaimer of intention, but the denunciation as an unfounded calumny of the accusation that it was seeking to disrupt the confederacy. Sir, I hold we are the true champions of the constitution, the true defenders of the Union, and I desired it should be declared in terms.

Again: I should have preferred instead of the assertion of the anticipation of stubborn persistance by the East and North in their erroneous courses towards the South, and instead of the dissolution of the Union being put forth as the sole means of redress for wrongs the perpetration of which could not be averted, I preferred an expression, if not of confidence, at least of hope, that there would be no necessity for a resort to the terrible remedy. That hope I still entertain. I trust that all patriotism and liberality is not fled from our fellow-citizens of the Northern and Eastern and Middle States. If I could have procured the modification of the address, as I have suggested, I should have been proud to have placed my name with those of the distinguished sons of the South who did sign it; and if it is supposed that, from any cause, I shall be recreant to my State, or that I shall waver in my allegiance to her, I am done injustice. If my hope as to the course of the East is a mistaken one, I shall obey the mandate of Florida. It is expressed in the fourth resolution, in these words:

"That, knowing no *party* names, or political divisions, on questions involving in their settlement and consequences the character, property, and lives of those whom we represent, we are ready, heart and soul, with a united front, to join Virginia, the Carolinas, and the other southern States, in taking such measures for the defence of our rights and the preservation of ourselves and those whom we hold dear as the highest wisdom of all may, whether through a southern convention or otherwise, suggest and devise."

I can do so cheerfully, for I approve of it.

Mr. President, I have seized on this occasion to express my views in order to avail myself of the advantage afforded me by the publication of what I say here in the two papers of this city that report our debates. My constituents will be enabled to know what my course has been and will be, and the motives for it, and the whole country can see, and all may condemn or approve, as they think right. I am entirely satisfied as to that course, and careless of the opinion of very few with respect to it. I thank the Senate for its attention, and trust the resolutions will be read and printed, and laid on the table, as moved by my colleague.

EXPLORING EXPEDITION.

The joint resolution from the House, directing that the government of Russia be supplied with certain volumes of the narrative of the exploring expedition, was read a first and second time by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved a postponement of the prior orders, with a view to taking up the bill for the admission of California as a State into the Union; upon which motion he demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. ATHERTON would ask what was the special order of the day, and expressed the hope that the Senate would not be dandling with that bill for a few days, when they would be obliged to return to the appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS only wished to say that that bill had been up for consideration before the Senate for nearly a week, postponing all other business. The whole time had been taken up in the discussion of amendments on that bill, without coming to its final passage. He firmly believed that in this way other important measures might be defeated. The appropriation bill could not be lost, and there was no immediate necessity for passing it then. He did hope that the California bill would be taken up, and that they would fix the time when action could be had upon it.

Mr. WEBSTER said he had but a single word to say. His vote would be with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, until the measure in charge of that committee was finished. In his judgment that was the best way to act in the business of the Senate—to do one thing at a time—and he would answer for one, that if no one should consume more time than he did on that bill, very rapid progress would be made on the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill.

The yeas and nays being then ordered, were taken, and resulted—yeas 16, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Bell, Breese, Bright, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Fitzgerald, Fitzpatrick, Foote, Hale, Houston, Johnson of Louisiana, Jones, King, Sebastian, and Walker—16.

NAYS—Messrs. Atherton, Badger, Baldwin, Benton, Berrien, Borland, Bradbury, Butler, Calhoun, Cameron, Clarke, Corwin, Davis of Massachusetts, Davis of Mississippi, Dayton, Dickinson, Dix, Felch, Greene, Hamlin, Hunter, Johnson of Georgia, Mason, Miller, Niles, Pearce, Phelps, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Upham, Webster, Westcott, and Yulee—35.

So the motion was not agreed to.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate then resumed the consideration of the bill making appropriation for the civil and diplomatic expenses of the government for the year ending June 30th, 1850: the question pending being upon the following amendment submitted by Mr. BENTON on Saturday last:

For survey of the coast of the United States the sum of $30,000; and from and after the 30th day of June, 1849, the said survey shall be carried on exclusively by the Navy Department, under the direction of the President of the United States.

Mr. ATHERTON rose to address the Senate, but yielded to

Mr. FOOTE, who gave notice of his intention, at the proper time, to submit an amendment; the object of which was to engraft the main features of the bill for the admission of California into the Union, upon the bill under consideration.

The amendment, which was ordered to be printed, is as follows:

Add the following section:

SEC. . *And be it further enacted*, That the constitution of the United States, all and singular the several acts of Congress respecting the registering, recording, enrolling, or licensing ships or vessels, and the entry and clearance thereof, and the foreign and coasting trade, and fisheries, and all the acts respecting the imposing and collecting duties on imports, and the acts respecting trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, and all acts respecting the public lands, or the survey or sale thereof, and all and singular the other acts of Congress of a public and general character, and the provisions whereof are suitable and proper to be applied to the territories acquired from Mexico by the treaty of the second day of February, eighteen hundred and forty-eight, be, and the same are hereby, extended over and given full force and effect in said territories: and that the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to prescribe and establish, and from time to time modify or change, all such rules and regulations, (in conformity with the constitution of the United States,) and which may be necessary to the enforcement of said laws in said territories, and for the preservation of order and tranquillity, and for the establishment of justice therein; and to prescribe and establish, temporarily, in said territories such divisions, districts, ports, and offices, and appoint and commission such executive, judicial, civil, and ministerial officers as may be necessary to the purposes of this act for such term or terms as he may prescribe, whose authority shall continue until otherwise provided by Congress; said officers to receive such compensation as the President may prescribe, not exceeding double the compensation heretofore paid to similar officers of the United States, or its territories, for like service; and to defray the expenses accruing under this act the sum of two hundred thousand dollars is hereby appropriated.

Mr. ATHERTON then resumed the floor, and addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. President: After the remarks of the senator from Maryland, [Mr. PEARCE,] I shall certainly not undertake to go at large into the subject of the amendment offered by the senator on my right from Missouri, [Mr. BENTON.] But, sir, while I feel very much under obligation to the senator from Missouri for the compliment which he was pleased to pay me, in approving the attempts which I have made to resist all amendments offered to appropriation bills, which go to alter the laws of the United States—the object of which is to change the system of government as now established by law, and which do not belong to appropriation bills—I think I cannot better deserve that compliment than by resisting his amendment, the very object of which is to alter, in an appropriation bill, a system established by law, founded on law, and held together by law, as thoroughly as any part of the government—as any part of the transactions of government—as any bureau of the government, or any department of the government. Sir, the object of the senator's amendment is to change the law, to repeal the law, which now establishes the coast survey—to revive another law which has been repealed, and to alter the whole system as now established by law. If there are any abuses in the coast survey as now conducted—if it requires examination—if it requires modification and alteration, this ought to be done in the most calm and deliberate manner. It ought to receive the investigation of a committee, with power to enter into a full examination of the subject in all its bearings. And it seems to me, sir, that it is an entire departure from the principle which received the sanction, and high sanction, of the senator from Missouri, to undertake, by an amendment to the appropriation bill, to do what his amendment proposes to do. It is conceded on all hands that this is a most important object—that of the coast survey. There is no doubt about that. That object is now carried on in pursuance of law, and in a manner regulated by law; and, sir, we may just as well, in an appropriation bill, attack our system of pensions, and repeal the laws upon that subject, and establish another system of pensions—we might just as well abolish one of our departments, and substitute another—we might just as well abolish a bureau and substitute another—we might provide for the abolition, even, of part of our navy, or army—for the disbanding of the officers of the navy, or army, with just as much propriety, it seems to me, as to attack this system in this incidental manner, which is now, as I have stated, established by law, and prosecuted under regulations made in pursuance of law. Therefore, aside from any objections to the amendment, which arise from the manner in which the work is carried on—aside from any objections to the amendment, drawn from the fact of the importance of the object—from the fact that it is carried on, as I believe, in a more efficient manner than it ever has been before—I conceive that there are insuperable objections to attacking the system in this manner, and that this amendment does not belong to an appropriation bill. But, if the system is to be modified at all, it ought to be done by a separate bill, which shall receive the deliberate attention of the Senate.

Now, sir, it is said that the coast survey belongs to the bureau of ordnance and hydrography. Sir, that bureau of ordnance and hydrography was established after the coast survey was organized under this present system. It has for its object purposes altogether aside from this of the coast survey. The nautical survey of the coast was only a part of the object which was originally contemplated in the establishment of this coast survey. It will not be contended that the very respectable head of the bureau of ordnance and hydrography, with his clerks, would be sufficient to carry on the great work of the coast survey. It is conceded on all hands that it requires the highest application of science, and the application of all the modern discoveries of science, and a man of the highest character for science, to superintend all these works. Well, sir, why should this be under the superintendence of the navy any further than of the army? If there are men of science in the navy, are there not also men of science in the army? The original plan of survey contemplated the employment of officers of the army and navy also. If officers of the navy have a right to feel chagrined that this is not a work of their sole direction, why have not the army a right to go forward and say, You are passing us by. Place it under our superintendence, especially as you educate us at the West Point school, and train us up to science. There is science also to be found in the army, and they have a right to be chagrined and mortified that they have not the sole direction of the work. And, sir, it seems to me that these respectable gentlemen—and I respect those officers of the navy who have distinguished themselves for science as much as any gentleman can—it seems to me that these respectable gentlemen, whose names have been mentioned, have reputation enough for science to be satisfied without it, without any mixture of envy towards other scientific gentlemen. They have no need of being actuated by any such motives. It cannot conduce to their reputation if they suffer themselves to be actuated by such feelings, and I trust they are not, sir. It seems to me that the coast survey was originally organized upon the most efficient plan, which was, to bring the science of the country in connexion with the army and navy, or such officers and men as could be properly spared for the pursuance of that work; and it is only so, as I believe, that you can have an efficient prosecution of the work. Indeed, experience shows us that this is true.

Sir, I do not know that there is anything particularly incompatible with the highest attainments in science in the pursuits of the officers of the navy, or in the occupations of the officers of the army. It is very much to the credit of any gentlemen belonging to either of those branches, if they have attained high reputations for the highest attainments in science; but I may say, if they have become eminent in the highest degree for these attainments, it is not *because* they belong to the army or navy, but it is in *spite* of those employments: because their employments, as members of either branch, would tend rather to impede than to facilitate their progress towards the ultimate attainment of the highest degree of knowledge and skill—as much as the pursuit of any profession—the profession of the law, or application to any other occupation. Sir, it redounds to their credit, that notwithstanding these obstructions to their attainment to the highest degree of science, they have attained to so much reputation in scientific pursuits.

Why, sir, when the coast survey was first organized, did we send to Europe for a commodore to take charge of it? No, sir; but we sent for Mr. Hassler, a man eminent throughout Europe for his attainments. He was placed in charge of it. It seems to me that the officers of our army and navy might well be satisfied with being as great as Nelson or the Duke of Wellington; but who would select either of those gentlemen as superintendent of a coast survey? Who supposes that even they, whose reputations were so great—the one a great naval and the other a great military leader—that they possessed that sort of science which is necessary in superintending the business of the coast survey? No one, sir. And it is no disparagement to the officers of the navy that they are not solely and alone employed in this. The senator seems to suppose that this belongs to hydrography alone. Sir, the original design of the survey proves that this is not the case; the original instructions by Mr. Gallatin show that this is not the case. To be sure, the officers of the army and navy could be very justly called in to assist in the survey; the officers of the navy to make the