apply not only to the other territory then owned by the United States, but also to all which might thereafter be acquired. If it were otherwise, the settlement of 1820 amounted to nothing, for the whole question would be opened every time a territorial government was to be formed or territory acquired. He appealed to those who represented the North to stand by this principle of self-government. He begged them to remember that all the original States were at one time, slaveholding colonies. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution twelve out of the thirteen States were slaveholding. Since that time six of them had become free, not because of abolition agitation in Congress, or by any action of the General Government, but by the free and unfettered exercise of the great principle of self government, which would always lead men and States to do all things best calculated to promote their own interests. Thus New Hampshire had prohibited Slavery, and Georgia had not; Connecticut abolished it, and South Carolina retained it. Not one of those States had abolished Slavery because of the Wilmot Proviso or Ordinance of 1787, or Congressional agitation, but they had abolished it because free to act upon the principle of self government. They abolished such institutions when and as their interests required it. Slavery was never abolished or prevented by Congressional enactment. It was never prohibited in the North-west Territory; it was never prohibited by law, but not in fact. When Illinois was admitted into a territorial government she established Slavery at once, maintained it, and held it in defiance of the ordinance of '87. So long as Congress said by law that Slavery should not exist, then she did not do it, and the very day that Congress withdrew the prohibition, she took measures to establish a system of slavery. They did not abolish it for the purpose of getting into the Union, for their very Constitution contained a provision for the gradual emancipation of the slaves. The territorial act for Iowa did not prohibit Slavery; the people of Iowa were allowed to do as they pleased. It might be said that it was prohibited because the laws of Wisconsin, which prohibited Slavery, were extended over Iowa, but power was expressly given to the Territorial Legislature of Iowa to alter, amend or repeal those Wisconsin laws. Some slaves were carried there and held, and he believed the census of 1850 showed there were a few in the State yet. He said that Oregon might be referred to as one spot wherein Congressional legislation had prohibited Slavery; but he called attention to the fact, that years before the enactment of Congress the temporary Government established by the people, had prohibited Slavery. The act of Congress was therefore nothing more than prohibiting the people from doing that which they had long prevented by declared they did not want to do. The adoption of the prohibition in the Oregon bill was therefore nothing more than a measure to manufacture something to promote the political ends of a certain party. When California was admitted, every abolitionist in the country declared that unless Congress prohibited Slavery there, it would be carried to that State. The result shows differently. The people left free, themselves prohibited it. So in Utah and New-Mexico, those who favored the principle of letting the people do as they pleased were denounced by the Abolitionists as Slavery propagandists, but not yet had anything been heard of those people establishing Slavery. He knew of no Territory now owned by the United States where Slavery existed except in this very Territory of Nebraska, where these confederates declare it is prohibited by the Missouri Compromise, and where the Ordinance of '87 is in force. There was a preacher in this city from Nebraska, who a few days since was before the Committee on Territories. A member of the Committee asked if there were any negroes there? He answered that there were a few held by the Indians. He was then asked if there were none held by white people. His reply was, that there were some held by white people, but under very peculiar circumstances. He said that some years ago an Abolition missionary from Boston came into that country with his wife, to reside: that the country being new, help was very scarce and could not be procured, and under these circumstances the missionary went down to Texas, paid a thousand dollars for a negro, and brought him for his own use. [Laughter.] By this it would appear that under peculiar circumstances, such is the difficulty of obtaining help, those Abolition gentry and missionaries will buy and hold slaves for their own use, taking particular pains too that no one else shall use them. The preacher himself, it also turned out, owned slaves there too, while these might be the case. Now, he did not believe that when the country was settled more closely, when labor could be procured, Slavery would exist in that climate a day. He said he stood by the Missouri Compromise as long as it was maintained. When that was set aside in the manner he had stated, he stood up for the principles of the Compromise of 1850, and would continue to stand by them. He denied the right of the Abolitionists to arraign him for being false to sacred pledges. They had succeeded in 1848 in rejecting and defeating it. They had hunted down with ferocity, and as if for seeking the blood of every man who in 1820 had voted for the Missouri Compromise. They had arraigned all who had supported or sustained the Compromise of 1850. They had sent out now to the people of the United States the false statements that the address was signed by a majority of the Ohio delegates, when in fact it had been signed by two Senators and a few Representatives in the House. No Whigs, no Democrats had signed it. Those few names attached to it were the pure, unadulterated representatives of Abolitionism, Free Soilism, Niggerism in the Congress of the United States. Gentlemen were willing to allow the people to legislate on all other subject but negroes. They were willing to allow to legislate upon property, taxation and all social relations, but would not trust them to legislate for negroes. Did it require any higher degree of intelligence to legislate for negroes than for white men? He did not believe so. He regretted that in the course pursued by the Abolition confederates in sending forth to the country their address, filled with misrepresentations and false statements, not only of the bill but of those who were instrumental in forming it, had compelled him to use language in the Senate of a tone so severe as he had alone; but having now presented his views, he would leave the bill to the Senate, and would perhaps hereafter take another occasion of replying to any objections which might be made to it. As he sat down, as well as at various parts of his speech, there were evident manifestations of applause in the galleries and in the lobbies, but they were promptly checked by the officers.

Mr. CHASE said that the Senator had spoken. He had fired his gun. They had heard the report; they were now in the smoke; but so far as he could see no one had been hurt. They all survived, and he trusted would long survive such assaults as that of the Senator. The Senator had charged him and his friends with having prepared their address somewhere on the Sabbath. The Senator had seized upon an accidental error of dating, and upon it had made the charge that he and his friends had violated the Sabbath, for which day the Senator seemed to have such peculiar respect, and yet the Senator himself must have known that it was an error of date, for he had mentioned the fact that on Monday the address appeared in *The New York Times*. The Senator said that it was intended to produce an effect upon some tender-footed Members of the Ohio Legislature, and therefore it had been represented by its author that it was signed by a majority of the Ohio Delegation. Here, too, the Senator was at fault. The corresponding editor of *The Times* had transmitted the address to his paper, and in his letter upon his own responsibility has stated that it had been signed by the Ohio delegation, that editor had not been informed by him, [Mr. Chase] nor could he have been by one who had signed the paper. He [Mr. Chase] was not responsible for what letter-writers or any one stated. There was the Address; it bore the signatures of those who had signed it. He had not sent it to Ohio. He knew not how it got there, but he had telegraphed to the Ohio papers, telling them not to publish it with any signatures but those actually signed to it. How it had been published he knew not. His colleague could say if it (the paper) had been presented to him.

Mr. WADE said he had never seen or read the document. As it had been made known by the Senator from Illinois, he approved of it cordially, and thought that if it had been presented to him he would have signed.

Mr. CHASE said that he did not envy the feeling which prompted the Senator to make the charge, or now having made it, to find it unfounded. The Senator had charged that he had been arraigned by the address. He truly assured the Senator that on writing that address the Senator had for one moment occupied his mind. The Senator was alluded to in the postscript, but only as the author of the bill. The Senator exaggerated his own importance; had considered himself the whole Committee and took upon himself all that was said of the measure. He knew the gigantic stature of the Senator's importance. He knew the immense power and influence the Senator exerted over the country; he knew the Senator was surrounded here by a large and powerful party, and he knew the disadvantage under which he labored in a controversy provoked by the Senator. He knew the odds against him. He and the Senator from Massachusetts stood alone; they were in a small minority; they were but two in a body of sixty two to challenge the Senator to point to any single instance wherein he or the Senator from Massachusetts had ever acted on the one side or the other in voting upon any measure to promote the interests of the country. He asked the Senator to point to any instance where his vote had been influenced for or against any measure, because a Northern or a Southern State was to be benefitted by it. All they had done was to obey the nationality of Slavery. This was their position, firm and unalterable, and on it they were in a minority in the Senate. He now, here in the Senate, and before the country, reaffirmed every word contained in that address, denying that it had any imputation upon motive, or calling in question the course of any individual. He would, at a proper time, proceed to answer the argument of the Senator, and then he expected to demonstrate the truth of the positions assumed in that address. In doing so, he would not follow it, because it was an example not fit to be followed. He thanked the Senator for having brought this address so prominently before forward. It would now reach and be read by thousands who would not have seen it. The people will read it and they will decide upon it. He denounced this bill because it took from the people of the Territory the great security which has so long been secured to them by a solemn compact. He defined the language and the terms used by him in the address as appropriate to the proposition which would make Slavery into a Territory which had been dedicated to Freedom forever free. He denied that the compromise bill was intended to repeal the compromise of 1820. He showed, upon examination, the authority of Messrs. Webster and Clay, which he, the Senator had asserted as strongly in his favor, would be found wholly different. Having so briefly explained the groundlessness of the charge made against him by the Senator, he would defer till to-morrow his argument on the merits of the bill.

SUMNER—Before the Senate adjourn, I crave a moment. As one of the signers of the address referred to by the Senator from Illinois, I accept now the challenge of the Senator and country, my full responsibility for it, and deprecate no criticism upon it from any quarter. That document was put forth, in the discharge of a high public duty, on the precipitate introduction into this body, of a measure which, as it seems to me, is not only subversive of ancient landmarks, but hostile to the peace, the harmony, and the best interests of the country, but sir, in doing this I judge the act and not its author. I saw only the enormous proposition and nothing of the Senator. The language used, is strong, but it is not stronger than the exigency required. Here is a measure, which reverses the time honored policy of our fathers in the restriction of Slavery, which sets aside the Missouri Compromise, a solemn compact by which all the territory ceded by France under the name of Louisiana was forever consecrated to freedom, and which violates also the alleged Compromise of 1850, and this is to open an immense territory to the ingress of Slavery. Such a measure cannot be regarded without emotions too strong for speech. It cannot be justly described in common language. It is a soulless, eyeless monster, horrid, unshaped and vast, fitly pictured in the verse of the poet, *monstrum horrendum informe ingens cui lumen ademptum*, and this monster is now let loose upon the country. Allow me one other word of explanation. It is true that I desired that the consideration of this measure should not be pressed at once with indecent haste, as was proposed even before the Senate could read the bill in which it was embodied. I had not forgotten that the Missouri bill as appears from the journal of Congress when first introduced in December, 1819, was allowed to rest on the table nearly two months before the discussion commenced. The proposition to undo the only part of that work which is now in any degree within the reach of Congress, should be approached with even a greater caution and reserve. The people have a right to be heard on this monstrous scheme, and there is no apology for this driving, galloping speed, which shall anticipate their voice, and in its consequences must despoil them of their right. Adjourned.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House documents from the Treasury Department giving information relative to the manufacture and importation of salt.

The House took up the resolution heretofore offered by Mr. Ewing, requesting the Senate to send to the House the joint resolution adopted on the 18th inst., proposing the appointment of a Select Committee on the amendment offered by him to the Constitution, to change the mode of electing President and Vice President of the United States.

Mr. EWING said his object was to withdraw the resolution, as he had learned the Senator who made a motion in the Senate to lay it on the table would withdraw the motion, and the probability is the Senate will appoint a committee on its part. He found the proposition to amend the Constitution offered by him has been misunderstood, and, therefore, he wished to give an explanation. He desired the Constitution to be amended so as to allow the people to vote directly for President and Vice-President, without the intervention of electoral agents, on whom at present the duty rests, there being no political, legal, or moral obligation to the will of their constituents. In lieu of this, he proposed to divide the States into as many districts as there are Senators and Representatives; the majority of each district casting the vote for the whole people. It might be sufficient to say that this is no new project; it has been advocated during a period of thirty years, by such men as Messrs. Benton, Van Buren, Mahlon Dickerson, George McDuffie, Robert Y. Hayne, Nathaniel Macon, Richard M. Johnson, and others, and was opposed by Rufus King, the great Federalist of New-York. They who apprehended danger from the opening up of the amendment, do not seem to see the hidden rock on which we may be wrecked. If the time should ever come when the three-fourths of the States shall deny to the remaining fourth the rights now secured and guaranteed to them by the Constitution, any proposition to avert such calamity would then be utterly idle.

Mr. HIBBARD wished to know whether the proposed amendment would entirely abrogate the whole system of choosing electors, thus annihilating State lines.

Mr. EWING said he could not undertake to argue that question just now; the effect however would not be such as the gentleman described; he wished to appeal to gentlemen to suspend their views, if they have not yet examined the importance of the question, in order that they may decide fairly without prejudice. He asked leave to withdraw his motion calling on the Senate to return a joint resolution, as he now thought it will be favorably acted on by that body.

Mr. HIBBARD wished to reply, but objection was made.

Mr. EWING withdrew his motion.

Mr. CHANDLER offered a resolution, instructing the Committee on Post Offices to inquire and report upon the expediency of causing to be purchased or erected in the City of Philadelphia, a building to serve as a Post-Office, and if deemed expedient to accommodate the United States Courts and their Officers, for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER moved an amendment which Mr. Chandler accepted, to extend a similar inquiry to New-York. Resolution adopted.

Mr. McMULLEN introduced a bill to change the mode of compensating Senators, Representatives and Delegates in Congress. Referred to Committee on Mileage.

Mr. BOYCE offered a resolution, calling on the President, if not inconsistent with the public interests, to communicate any correspondence which may have taken place between this Government and that of Holland in relation to the refusal by the Dutch authorities in the East Indies to receive or recognize American Consuls.

Mr. BOYCE said no part of the globe was more inviting to our commerce, and yet the Dutch authorities had practically adopted the Chinese policy, thus excluding us.

Mr. BAYLY, who was not opposed to the resolution, moved that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Agreed.

Mr. TAYLOR (Ohio) offered a resolution instructing the Committee on Military Affairs to inquire into the expediency of removing the Military Asylum near this City, to Mount Vernon.

Objection made. Lies over.

Mr. CORWIN offered a resolution instructing the Committees on Foreign Affairs to inquire into the propriety of acknowledging the independence of Liberia, and that the Committee report by bill or otherwise. Objected to.

On motion of Mr. WADE it was resolved that the Committee on Post-Office inquire as to what legislation is required for the safe, expeditious and uninterrupted conveyance of mails on railroads, and report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. CHURCHWELL introduced a bill to empower the Postmaster General to contract for the transportation of mails from New Orleans to San Francisco, according to time. It proposes to give a greater amount of pay for a shorter passage, and vice versa—as an instance, at an average time of twenty-five days from port to port, $100,000; for fifteen days, $1,000,000; and for ten days, $2,500,000, per annum. Referred to Post Office Committee.

Mr. CHURCHWELL introduced a bill granting public lands to the several States for a permanent and efficient system of Common Schools. Referred to to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHURCHWELL offered the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the people of this Union have ever received with the utmost concern the renewed intervention of powers in the affairs of countries not embraced within their borders, particularly when such intervention had avowedly for its object the repression of generous political sentiments, and they will never permit such an interference on this Continent without physical resistance to it.

*Resolved*, That while the United States of America are disposed to observe, in a spirit of good faith International obligations, they desire a similar observance of such obligations by all the nations of the earth; and that they can never behold with indifference the obliteration of independent States by a third power, because of the political freedom of such State.

*Resolved*, That the President be and he is hereby requested to cause a copy of these resolutions to be communicated to each of the diplomatic agents of foreign nations residing near this Government, and also copies thereof to be transmitted to our diplomatic agents in foreign countries, in order that the sentiments and purposes of this Republic may be neither misconceived nor misunderstood in any quarter of the globe.

Mr. DAVIS (R. I.) presented resolutions of the Legislature of that State against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. WHEELER offered a resolution that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report whether the census returns have been printed in conformity with the law; and if not, in what respect the act of Congress has been violated.

Mr. ORR moved that the resolution be sent to the Committee on Printing. Adopted.

Mr. DEAN introduced a bill to remove the Mint from Philadelphia to New-York. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WALBRIDGE offered a resolution instructing the Committee on amending the Constitution to inquire into the expediency of electing Deputy Postmasters and Collectors of Customs by the people. Rejected.

Mr. PECKHAM submitted the following, which was referred to the Committee on foreign affairs.

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested, if not inconsistent with the public interest, to transmit to this House copies of the correspondence not now communicated, of the United States Legation at Constantinople and the United States Consul at Smyrna, with Capt. Ingraham, and with the Government of Austria, and with this Government, together with the instructions from this Government to their agents abroad touching the seizure and rescue of Martin Koszta, and the terms and conditions on which he was liberated and sent to this country.

Mr. CUTTING, from the Judiciary Committee, reported a bill providing for holding of Courts in the Southern District of New-York, and for other purposes. He said the object was to enable the Secretary of the Interior to hire rooms for the United States Courts in New-York, their building having recently been destroyed by fire. The wheels of justice would stop unless this bill should be immediately acted on. It was passed.

Mr. PRINGLE offered a resolution instructing the Committee on Territories to report, at an early day, a bill which passed the House last session, providing for the organization of the Territory of Nebraska. An objection being, the resolution went over.

On motion of Mr. WALKER, it was

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby requested to report to this House, whether the Assay-Office now in course of construction in the City of New-York is of sufficient capacity for the coinage of gold and silver; if so, whether, in his opinion, it would be convenient and proper for Congress to authorize such coinage at said office.

Many other resolutions and bills were introduced on a variety of subjects, the most important of which are above given. Adjourned.

## RAILROAD EXTENSION.

EASTON, Penn., Jan. 30, 1854.

The first locomotive and train arrived here at noon today. The railroad is now finished and ready for the excursion train from Philadelphia on Friday next.

## THE SHOOTING AFFAIR IN PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

Captain Beaver, of the Sea Foam, was found secreted in the hold of the vessel yesterday afternoon, and was lodged in jail, together with the mate and crew, to answer the charge of shooting William Crompton, mate of the David Smith.

## FROM TEXAS—VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE.

BALTIMORE, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

New-Orleans papers of Monday and Tuesday last are received. They contain Galveston dates to the 20th inst. The District Attorney had entered a *nolle prosequi* in the Filibuster case.

A bill proposing to set aside two and a half millions for a school fund, to be loaned to Railroad Companies, had been discussed in the Senate, and an amendment submitting the bill to the decision of the people was adopted.

The Virginia Senate has rejected the bill appropriating one million dollars for the extension of the Orange and Alexandria Railroad to Lynchburg.

## THE NORTH PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD—PHILADELPHIA MARKETS.

PHILADELPHIA, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

The Northern Liberties have subscribed half a million dollars to the North Pennsylvania Railroad.

The City Councils purchased to night six lots for New-Market Houses, at a cost of $550,000, preparatory to tearing down the sheds in Market-st.

## MEETING AT CLEVELAND AGAINST THE NEBRASKA BILL.

CLEVELAND, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

On Saturday night the National Hall was crowded by our citizens to protest against Douglas's Nebraska Bill. Speeches were made by Messrs. H. Griswold, J. C. Vaughan, Senator Foote, J. Briggs, &c. A remonstrance is to be sent to Washington.

## FIRE AT MONTREAL.

MONTREAL, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

A fire on Saturday night destroyed Campbell's dry goods store, and Robson's millinery store over it, on Notre Dame-st. Loss $4,000; insured in the Globe Company.

## STEAMSHIP PHILADELPHIA AT NEW-ORLEANS.

NEW-ORLEANS, Thursday, Jan. 26, 1854.

The steamship Philadelphia from New-York, has arrived. She encountered a heavy gale on the 14th, in which she lost her mizzen mast. She sails for New-York on Friday.

## SUICIDE.

NEW HAVEN, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

Austin H. Parker, a respectable farmer of Guilford, while under a depression of mind cut his throat in his barn with a pocket-knife yesterday morning. He was 45 years of age, and leaves a family.

## MARINE DISASTERS.

NORFOLK, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

The British brig Otter, Hawkins, of Halifax, N. S., from Port Spain, Trinidad, bound for Baltimore, in ballast, was totally wrecked on the 20th inst., near Cape Charles. Captain and crew saved.

## PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE.

HARRISBURG, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

The City Consolidation Bill has passed the House, with a few amendments, requiring it to go back to the Senate for concurrence.

## CITY OF GLASGOW AT PHILADELPHIA.

PHILADELPHIA, Monday, Jan. 30, 1854.

The screw steamship City of Glasgow, from Liverpool on the 6th inst., with 130 passengers, has arrived at this port.

# THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE MEETING.

## SPEECH OF JUDGE EMMET.

### Remarks of James W. Gerard.

## THE RESOLUTIONS.

The meeting called to affirm the sanctity of the Missouri Compromise of 1820, and to denounce the attempt of Senator Douglas in his Nebraska bill to override that Compromise, and permit the establishment of Slavery in territory north of 36° 30′, was held last night at the Broadway Tabernacle.

We looked in at half-past seven o'clock. There were between 2,000 and 3,000 persons present, the majority being men of mature age, and of the class seldom seen at political gatherings. A few fossil party leaders, of by-gone days, were to be seen, scattered here and there like blasted oaks in an undergrowth of timber yet in the sap. Order was paramount. There was no uneasiness—no shuffling of feet no "hi! hi! ing!" or cat calls. The attendants glided in as silently as though church service was about to commence, and settled into the pews with that serious and careworn air which is so painfully characteristic of the business and professional men of this over-worked City. Any attempt at jocularity would have savored of sacrilege; indeed the only persons present not apparently under deep concern of mind, were the omnipresent Reporters, who, to the number of thirty, attended perforce on professional duty.

At about 8 o'clock the silence was broken by a call to order and the nomination for President of

SHEPHERD KNAPP,

President of the Mechanics Bank, and Chamberlain of the City. The announcement of the nomination was the signal for very general applause. When the cheering ceased, the following names of Vice-Presidents and Secretaries were read, and, without special expression of satisfaction or otherwise, were adopted:

*Vice-Presidents:*

WM. F. HAVEMEYER, GEORGE NEWBOLD, MINT. VAN SCHAICK, WALTER R. JONES, DAVID COWDEN, JOHN FAIRE, MOSES TAYLOR, C. C. HALSTEAD, JOHN L. LAWRENCE, T. R. SATTERTHWAITE, WILSON G. HUNT, F. W. EDMONDS, ZEBEDEE COOK, EDMUND M. YOUNG, ADAM NORRIE, MARK SPENCER, HENRY CASE, E. H. LUDLOW, THOMAS R. HUTSON, LUTHER BRADISH, NOAH PHILLIPS, CHAS. H. MARSHALL, JOHN HADDEN, JOSEPH ROSE, CHAS F. KIRKLAND, THOS. DE WITT, D.D., E. H. CHAPIN, D.D., ROBERT B. MINTURN, WM. WHITEWRIGHT, WM. CULLEN BRYANT, WILLIAM A. HALL, JOHN A. KING, JOHN PHELPS, WILLIAM TUCKER, JAMES SUTDAM, FREEMAN CAMPBELL, FANNING C. TUCKER.

*Secretaries:*

WALTER R. JONES JR., LUCIUS ROBINSON, WM. CURTIS NOYES, GEO. N. TITUS, JAMES L. EVERITT, W. E. DODGE, JOHN MCKESSON, EDWARD FRIRE.

The meeting being thus fully organized,

Mr. KNAPP, the President, rose and said: I feel honored by being called on to preside over this highly respectable meeting of merchants, mechanics and citizens, without distinction of class or calling. As to the threatened violation of the Missouri Compromise of 1820, the question is not now whether or not it was originally wise and good; but simply whether the South, after the matter received the full consideration which it demanded, shall be allowed to violate *its* part of the compact. We shall all agree on this that a bargain is a bargain. In New-York we do not understand, and will not tolerate the doctrine of repudiation. [Applause.] I see gentlemen here who can elucidate the subject much better than I can; I, therefore, will not detain you with any remarks of my own, but declare the meeting duly organized for business.

Mr. EDGAR S. VAN WINKLE, lawyer, of this City, then announced that letters had been received from several distinguished gentlemen, among whom he named Senator SALMON P. CHASE, (Free Soil,) of Ohio; [cheers mingled with hisses, cries of "Read! read!" "No! no!"] Senator WILLIAM H. SEWARD, (Whig,) of New-York; [vigorous cheers and violent hisses;] Senator HAMILTON FISH, (Whig,) of New-York: [very hearty cheers:] Senator CHARLES SUMNER, (Free Soil,) of Massachusetts; [loud cheers and many hisses:] DANIEL T. JONES, (Soft Democrat,) Representative in Congress from the Onondaga District; GEORGE W. CHASE, (Whig,) from the Otsego District; ORASMUS B. MATTESON, (Whig,) from the Oneida District; BENJAMIN PRINGLE, (Whig,) from the Genesee District; EDWIS B. MORGAN, (Whig,) from the Cayuga District; GEORGE A. SIMMONS, (Whig,) from the Essex District; RUSSELL SAGE, (Whig,) from the Rensselaer District, all of this State; and from W. H. ROBERTSON, (Whig,) of the State Senate, from Westchester County. Some little feeling was manifested as the lesser lights were named, but nothing worthy of remark.

The following copies of the letters, which for want of time were not read to the meeting, will be found interesting:

### *From Senator Chase of Ohio.*

WASHINGTON, Thursday, Jan. 26, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: I have to acknowledge the honor of your invitation to attend a public meeting in New-York, to protest against the repeal of the Slavery prohibition embodied in the Missouri act of 1820.

Out of all the territories acquired by treaty, or annexed by act of Congress, since the organization of our Federal Government, but two Free States—Iowa and California—have been created; while out of the same territory no less than five Slave States—Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas—have been organized. The Missouri act, conceding to the slave interest the admission of Missouri with Slavery, provided, by common consent, for the exclusion of Slavery from all the residue of territory north of 36° 30′. It is said, sometimes, that this prohibition was not binding by Northern men, and that the slave interest is not bound by it. This pretext is without foundation. The prohibition, as it now stands in the statute, was moved by Mr. Thomas, of Illinois, on the 3d February, 1820, as an amendment to the Missouri bill, which had then been tacked by the Senate to the bill for the admission of Maine. It was agreed to on the 17th, ayes 34, nays 10, by the following vote:

AYES—Merrill and Parrot of New-Hampshire; Mellen and Otis of Massachusetts; Dana and Lacman of Connecticut; Burrill and Hunter of Rhode Island; Palmer and Tichenor of Vermont; King and Sanford of New-York; Dickerson and Wilson of New-Jersey; Lewis and Roberts of Pennsylvania; Burgess and Thomas of Ohio; Horsey and Van Dyke of Delaware; Lloyd and Pinkney of Maryland; Stokes of North Carolina; Johnson and Lanier of Kentucky; Eaton and Williams of Tennessee; Brown and Johnson of Louisiana; Lake of Mississippi; King and Walker of Alabama; Edwards and Thomas of Illinois.

NOES—Noble and Taylor of Indiana; Barbour and Pleasants of Virginia; Macon of North Carolina; Gaillard and Smith of South Carolina; Elliott and Walker of Georgia; Williams of Mississippi.

It will be here seen that *four* free Senators from slave States voted for Mr. Thomas's amendment, and *twenty* Senators from free States; of whom eight from the former voted against it, with two from the latter.

When a separate bill for the admission of Missouri came up from the House, it was amended in the Senate, by striking out the clause requiring a provision in her constitution prohibiting Slavery, and by inserting Mr. Thomas's amendment, which thus—the sense of Senators having been fully ascertained by former votes.

It is therefore, perfectly clear, that so far as the Senate is concerned, where the slave States are and always, have been strongest, that the South joined with the North in the prohibition.

In the House, the final vote on concurring in the amendment for striking out the restriction on Slavery in the State, was ayes 90, noes 87. After this vote had been taken, it was certain that Missouri could not be admitted as a slave State; and the only remaining question was, shall Slavery be prohibited in the residue of the territory north of 36° 30′? The vote on concurring in the prohibition was—yeas 134, nays 42. Of the yeas, *sixty-eight* were from slave, and *sixty-six* from free States. Of the nays, *forty-one* were from slave States, and *five* from free.

It is clear, from the above statement, that in the Senate a large majority of Southern men voted for the prohibition; among them Mr King of Alabama, recently Vice-President of the United States. With these voted the few Northern senators to the admission of Missouri with slavery as well as those who insisted on its exclusion by a restriction forbidding Slavery, as shown in the votes recorded.

In the House a number of Southern men, for the obvious reason properly urged by one, sustained the prohibition. Among them was Lowndes of South Carolina, whose name is cherished by the worth and honor of the man, or revered as many expressions.

It is absolutely certain that without the prohibition clause Missouri with Slavery could never have been admitted. The admission was the consideration of the clause, and the clause the consideration of the admission. Taken together they constituted a compact not absolutely inviolable, indeed, for any compact may be violated—but not to be broken without dishonor. "It is over," said Mr Niles, in his *Register* at the time, "the compromise is supported only by the letter of a law respectable by the authority which enacted it, but *the circumstances of the case give to it also a moral character of a compact*, "to that of a mutual compromise of the CONSTITUTION itself, and we do "not scruple saying that the CONSTITUTION EXISTS LESS STRONGLY."

But I am making this reply too long. I desired only to show that the Missouri prohibition has every attribute of a solemn compact, and to ask the question to reveal it now, after one side has had all the advantages ever expected from it, is as unreasonable to our powers and sovereignty as oppressive in it to our honor, as it would be dishonorable to the men of the free States. I think I have so many times stated my views, that I leave the other matters and very important considerations of political considerations which belong to the subject to other and abler hands.

For myself, I have long been satisfied that the safety of the country and the honor of the States demand not merely prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, but its constitutional abolition, by which it is made out of the jurisdiction of the General Government, from all connection with it, and all responsibility for it, and its absolute restriction to the States by the laws of which it may be tolerated.

Regretting that I cannot be with you to preside and earnestly invoking for your patriotic movement the blessing and guidance of that Divine Being who led our fathers through the hazards and trials of the Revolution, I remain, with great respect,

Your fellow-citizen,

S. P. CHASE.

Messrs. Shepherd Knapp, Edgar S. Van Winkle, Samuel J. Bebee, Robert S. Emmet, J. F. Butterworth.

### *From Wm. H. Seward of New-York.*

WASHINGTON, Saturday, Jan. 28, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: The invitation to a meeting to be held in the City of New-York to protest against any repeal or violation of the Missouri Compromise, with which you have honored me, has been received only yesterday morning. I am more it required by the interest which the City of New-York and the State of New-York have in the great projects of a Railroad to San Francisco, and the extension of our commerce to the islands and continents divided from us by the Pacific Ocean, which are now being matured in Committees to which I belong. Moreover the day designated for the meeting is one upon which the Senate may be brought to vote upon the bill and amendments, the vote of which has so justly excited the patriotic apprehensions of the citizens of the Metropolis, could not be safely absent from the Capital under these circumstances, even if my attendance in New-York would otherwise be proper.

You have kindly asked me, in view of this inability, to give you such an expression of my sentiments as may help to arouse the "Democracy of the North" to the duty which the "hour and the occasion" demand of them. I cannot refuse to say, in response to the appeal, that when the Slavery area of 1850 were under discussion in the Senate, I regarded the ground then demanded to be conceded by the North as a vantage ground, which when once yielded would be retrieved with insuperable difficulty afterwards. If, indeed, it should not be alleged that the North had, in the end, yielded to a mere pretext, as a representative here said and did all that it was in my power to do and say, and all that I could now do and say, to "help to rouse the North to the defense of its rights, and the South to the unmistakable "nature of its danger." When, afterward, contrary to memories of Congress, who had been engaged in passing those laws, carried an appeal made at those who had opposed them before the people, in their primary assemblies, I declined to follow them, or to follow or even since embroiled from my temperate dispassionate consideration of life, and of matters pertaining to Slavery, even here, as well as elsewhere, because I was unwilling to injure so just a cause by discussions which might seem to betray undue solicitude, if not a spirit of faction. We have only now arrived at a new stage in the trial of that appeal. For it is quite clear that the Slavery laws now, over the territories before acquired from Louisiana, and that if we had maintained our ground on the laws of Freedom, which then protected New-Mexico and Utah we should not now have been attacked on our stronghold in Nebraska. It is equally evident, also, that Nebraska is not all that is to be saved or lost. If we are driven from this field, there will yet remain Oregon and Minnesota, and we shall then be left only so lately as 1843 of securing some portion at least of the shore of the Gulf of Mexico and all of the Pacific Coast to the institutions of freedom, will be, before 1860, brought to a doubtful struggle to prevent the extension of Slavery to the shores of the great lakes, and thence westward to Puget's Sound. I hope, gentlemen, that, for one, I may be allowed to continue to the end that course from popular agitation to which I have heretofore practised, free from considerations of self-respect, than from my confidence in the sagacity and virtue of the people I represent. Nevertheless, I beg you to be assured that, while declining to solicit popular assemblies, as an agitator, I shall endeavor to do my duty here with as many true men as shall be found in a delegation, which if all were firm and united in the maintenance of public right and justice, would be able to avert the calamities of the present, and secure to us the fruits of success and effort which shall crown our exertions must depend now, as heretofore, on the fidelity with which the people whom we represent shall adhere to the policy and principle which are the foundation of their own unrivaled prosperity and greatness.

I am, Gentlemen, with great respect, and esteem, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

To Messrs Shepherd Knapp, Samuel J. Bebee, Edgar S. Van Winkle, Richard S. Emmet, J. F. Butterworth.

### *From the Hon. Hamilton Fish of New-York.*

WASHINGTON, Friday, Jan. 27, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your invitation to attend a public meeting of citizens of New-York, without distinction of party, called to protest against the repeal or violation of the Missouri Compromise which prohibits Slavery in that portion of the territory acquired from France, north of 36° 30′, and is now included within the State of Missouri. The day named for your meeting has been assigned for the consideration in the Senate of the United States of the bill which proposes to abrogate the solemn compact which, more than the third of a century since, restored quiet and mutual confidence to discussed and estranged portions of the Confederacy. Will I sympathise entirely with your desire to maintain inviolate the Compromises which have been made in relation to the vexed question of Slavery, I cannot be with you. Duty requires that I remain here to vote against any and every measure which proposes or looks to a repeal or violation of the binding obligation of the Missouri Compromise. The Compromise of 1820 is not incompliance with that of 1850. On the contrary, the recognition of the exclusion of Slavery from territory north of 36° 30′ north latitude, is in express terms preserved and maintained in one of the laws of the Compromise of 1850. The proposition to repeal or violate portions of the Missouri Compromise would therefore be a violation of both entire plighted.

I am, gentlemen, with great respect, your obedient servant,

HAMILTON FISH.

To Shepherd Knapp, Edgar S. Van Winkle, Sam. J. Bebee, Robt. Emmet, J. F. Butterworth, Esqs.

### *From Charles Sumner of Massachusetts.*

WASHINGTON, Saturday, Jan. 28, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: It is not in my power to be at your meeting on Monday evening next, but I am glad of the opportunity you give me to enroll myself in the host now gathering from every side to repel the audacious attempt to overthrow the time-honored prohibition of Slavery in the National Territories north of 36° 30′. An act of Congress passed without any precedent solicitude, or even moderated discussion, and established by leading Southern statesmen, consecrated this broad domain to freedom *forever*; and, in consideration thereof, Missouri was admitted into the Union as a Slave State. This is the Missouri Compromise. And here let me quote the language of eminent Southern authority at the time: "It is true," says Mr. Niles, in his *Register* of March 11, 1820, "the Compromise is supported solely by the letter of a law respectable by the authority which enacted it; but *the circumstances of the case give to it also a moral character equal* "to that of a mutual compromise of the CONSTITUTION itself, and we do "not scruple saying that the CONSTITUTION EXISTS LESS STRONGLY" in its observance. Both parties have sacrificed much to conciliation. We wish to see this *compact* kept in good faith. And yet it is proposed to violate this important compact, and to break this faith! The prohibition of Slavery north of 36° 30′ was once more solemnly confirmed in the resolutions by which Texas was annexed to the Union in 1845, and still again in the altered compromises of 1850. It has also been practically enforced in the organization of the Territories of Oregon, Minnesota and Washington. It rests now with the American people to determine, if this prohibition is shall be swept down, and the immense region, embracing not only Nebraska, but the whole extent of National Territories, in their various subdivisions, shall be laid open to Slavery. Whatever may be the fate of the pending measure, let no man doubt that the malediction, once invoked upon him who disturbed the ancient landmarks, will at length be visited by an indignant country upon all who join to remove this land mark of freedom.

I remain, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

CHARLES SUMNER.

To Shepherd Knapp, Esq., Samuel J. Bebee, Esq., John F. Butterworth, Esq., Edgar S. Van Winkle, Esq., Committee, &c.

### *From the Hon. Daniel T. Jones of New-York.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., Friday, Jan. 27, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: I was elected a member of the 32d and 33d Congresses by a constituency who well understood that I was pledged to resist the introduction of Slavery into territory now free. These pledges will be redeemed—I have confidence we may be implaced. I shall at all times, both in Congress and out of it, resist the extension of Slavery into territory now free. The Nebraska bill is claimed by its friends here as being *another* and *a new* Compromise *intended* to permit the introduction of Slavery into free territory. The question is fully and fairly put. Slaves are now understood to be owned and employed within the limits of the territories to be created by the bill. We are asked to realize this unfounded assumption of their owners, and to legalize the violation of the solemn compact of the seventy years of freedom which have been passed for the last fifty years. Will the North stand quietly by and see this thing done? I trust not. But I hope that your meeting will be the commencement of a series which shall proclaim the voice of the North as be united in feeling and action as one man