

THOMAS RITCHIE.  
DAILY, per year, \$10 00  
SEMI-WEEKLY, published bi-weekly during the session of Congress, 5 00  
WEEKLY, 3 00  
Five copies of the DAILY, for 40 00  
Ten copies of the SEMI-WEEKLY, 30 00  
Ten copies of the WEEKLY, 30 00  
Five copies of the WEEKLY, 15 00

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 20, 1850.  
"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."  
NUMBER 98.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.  
The price of no paper will be entered upon our books unless the payment of the subscription be made in advance.  
The country paper is published bi-weekly during the session of Congress, and weekly during the recess.  
Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be received on terms proportioned to the above rates, and all bills must be paid in advance.

CONGRESSIONAL.

On the President's Message transmitting the constitution of California, delivered in the House of Representatives, (in Committee of the Whole.) Saturday, June 8, 1850.

MR. MC MULLEN said: Mr. Chairman: It appears, sir, that after struggling for a long time, I have at last been awarded to me the right to speak in this case. I have taken my seat, I very much fear that at least I shall myself regret that I have even now obtained the floor. I am, sir, wholly and entirely unprepared to address this committee. I have made no notes from which to speak; much less have I any custom, or habit, or many good topics, which I believe, written out by my speech ready for the press before its delivery. Unlike, sir, almost every gentleman on both sides of this House, I do not intend to speak in a desultory manner. I will state to the Senate in a few days, what I think, and why I think, and why I think it should be done. I have already ordered that the documents accompanying the President's message should be brought down to the Senate. I have a part now ready for binding. I hold it in my hand. It embraces more than three hundred pages. It is accompanied by numerous maps, and when bound in so large a volume, will be cumbersome as to be very inconvenient for use. I find, accompanying the report from the General Land Office, a large number of maps, which will also render the whole very bad to be bound in one volume. If separated, we will then have the Land Office report, and the maps, and the report from the Department of the Interior in the one—another containing 370 pages, and the other nearly 1,000. The reason why I have offered this resolution now is, that the workmen engaged in the binding are entirely out of employment. Had the honorable senator from Connecticut, Mr. SEXTON, been in his seat before I introduced the resolution, I would have consulted with him, and no doubt agreed with him, and thus have been enabled to offer it as a report. But supposing that there would be no objection, I offered the resolution, and have stated these reasons for its passage.

The resolution was then agreed to. Mr. SEBASTIAN submitted the following resolution, and asked its immediate consideration: Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing for military recruits to accompany the companies of overland emigrants from Fort Smith, Arkansas, or other points on the western frontier, to California, by any of the routes usually pursued.

The resolution being under consideration, Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi, said: I hope that the honorable senator from Arkansas, who has the honor of proposing this bill, is not necessary to authorize escorts to be sent out with emigrants, as escorts are sent out in accordance with the duty of those who are upon our frontiers, not only to protect the frontier, but to visit the frontier, and to see that the emigrants are not molested. I have large escorts with the caravans of traders that trade with Santa Fe. There is no law necessary to give this authority. If the senator from Arkansas desires the committee to inquire into the propriety of a law to create such a duty, I hardly think his resolution will be directed to this committee.

Mr. SEBASTIAN. The offering of this resolution arose from the fact that the senator from Illinois, [Mr. DOUGLASS], not only in his seat, every morning introduced a resolution, similar resolution, proposing for escorts for western emigrants to Oregon. I should have offered this as an amendment to that resolution, and thus avoided the necessity of a separate resolution; but I did not quite catch the substance of the resolution on yesterday, and after it had passed. And, to obviate the difficulty, I have introduced this with precisely the same purpose, but with more application, as it embraces all of the different routes in the United States by which the overland emigrants endeavor to reach the Pacific. The senator from Mississippi is right in stating that possibly there is no law necessary. It is merely an executive function of the War Department. I was not well informed at the time when the senator from Mississippi made his remarks upon that point, and I am sorry that I have not been able to do better. In point of fact, I know that heretofore, as a matter of course, from the War Department. But I know it is very frequently the case that large companies go out without that kind of protection. If there is no further legislation necessary, why, the committee will report so, if necessary.

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi. My intention was not to object to the reference of the resolution of inquiry, if it was in the form to attain the object, and if the senator from Arkansas desired. My remarks were rather, in kindness, to point out to him that it did not appear to that committee to examine the subject that the senator desires. If he thinks it right, I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution, and let it lie upon the table. It may be necessary to amend it before it is called up for action.

The resolution accordingly lies over. Mr. BRIGHT, in pursuance of notice, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill granting the right of way and making a grant of land to the State of Indiana, to be used for the purpose of connecting the city of Indianapolis with the city of Chicago, by a line of railroad, near the intersection with Lake Michigan, to the city of Indianapolis, and a branch to intersect the southern Michigan railroad, at or near a point where the same intersects with its line. The bill was read a first and second time by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. B. gave notice that he would to-morrow, or some subsequent day, introduce a bill to amend the act in relation to the office of the Assistant Postmaster General.

THEODORE OFFUTT. Mr. UNDERWOOD asked the Senate to indulge him in taking up Senate bill No. 8, which he had been trying to get passed for the last two or three years. He said that it was a matter of some interest, and that the time for the special order could not be better devoted than to the passage of the bill.

The motion having been agreed to, the bill for the relief of Theodore Offutt was read a second time, and committed to a committee of the whole.

Mr. U. I do not pretend to say that there is no doubt about this claim, but the only doubt is in the amount of the claim. The department say they have paid eighty dollars already to an officer. The officer, however, says that he has not received a cent, and that he is willing to pay the \$10, but not the \$80. Offutt swears that he never gave any authority to receive the money. The Committee of Claims think that he should have the whole \$90. Mr. U. said that he would ask if this claimant has not the right to recover the money paid by the treasurer to an officer under such circumstances?

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 20, 1850.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."  
NUMBER 98.

MR. PHILIPS. The gentleman who introduced the bill, Mr. Mc MULLEN, conceived that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 20, 1850.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."  
NUMBER 98.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 20, 1850.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."  
NUMBER 98.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 20, 1850.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."  
NUMBER 98.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 20, 1850.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."  
NUMBER 98.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.

MR. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country. Mr. PHELPS. I conceive that the gentleman in opposition to the bill, Mr. PHELPS, would not insist on that which is unconstitutional, or if not unconstitutional, which will do great injury to the country.