American party and the free soil party were synonymous. Now I beg leave to dissent from any such conclusion.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him. I merely wish to say that I distinctly announced that I would not use the name of the American party. I said that we in Pennsylvania considered Know Nothingism and free soilism upon that question to be synonymous.

Mr. CAMPBELL—Well, sir, I shall not quarrel about names; I am aiming at substance. Gentlemen may call members upon the floor of this House Americans, or they may select the name of Know Nothings, or use any other name they please, and I can tell the gentleman that he will find the Americans in Pennsylvania are not afraid of the name abolition; but what I want now to disclaim, what I aim at is, to show the members of this House that the American party in Pennsylvania is entirely a distinctive party from the free soil party; and it is easily done. I will inform my colleague from Pennsylvania that there are democratic members upon the floor of this House who were elected to their seats as democratic free soilers. I refer not only to the representative from Wilmot's district (Mr. Grow), not only to the county of Chester, and the adjoining counties; but, sir, out of the five members from our State, calling themselves democrats, two, if not three, were elected upon their avowal of opposition to the Nebraska bill. I say the democratic party in Pennsylvania were as much, if not more, reputed to be upon the ground of free soilism, than the American party. At the recent election the American party nominated a candidate for Canal Commissioner; the democrats had their candidate; the republicans had nominated Passmore Williamson, and they continued to vote for him, and gave him seven thousand votes in the canvass. Nicholson received the support of the American party; and why did he receive that support? Because it was deemed essentially necessary, in order to carry the State election, to fuse these discordant elements. And the American committee of the State addressed interrogatories to Mr. Nicholson, and they were each and every one answered in the affirmative. He was placed upon the record as an American. He was asked, "Are you not a member of the American party? Do you recognize the principles of that party as primary and paramount? Are you opposed to the introduction of every item into that organization which might place you, as our standard bearer, in a doubtful position?" To each and all of these Mr. Nicholson answered in the affirmative. He was supported by the American party as an American, when the democratic party of Pennsylvania, in various districts and various parts of the State, threw themselves into the arms of free soilism; and as such they are known and represented upon this floor. I deny, then, that the great American party of Pennsylvania is a free soil party. I do admit that gentlemen acting with the American party are opposed to the Kansas-Nebraska act. In my own district I received an open whig nomination, and I was supported, and I am proud to say so, by the American party.

Mr. FLORENCE—If my colleague will permit me I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL—I do not wish to be interrupted at this portion of my remarks. I will yield to my colleague when I have finished my argument, and will then be glad to answer any question that he may desire to put to me. Now, Mr. Clerk, I wish to say that the people of my district are opposed to the Kansas-Nebraska act, and, representing their sentiments, I am opposed to it; and I trust that I shall ever be opposed to any measure of equal iniquity. But, sir, the American party of Pennsylvania came to the present Congress and presented the name of a conservative gentleman as their candidate for the Speakership. True, that gentleman and his constituency were opposed to the provisions of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; but a more conservative gentleman could not have been offered for the support of members; and the Pennsylvania delegation, or a majority of them, have continued to vote for H. M. Fuller for the Speakership, so long as there was any prospect of effecting an organization of the House with his name. We supported him in good faith, because he was an American, and because he advocated the principle which we advocated, so far as the Kansas-Nebraska act is concerned. We did not abandon him on account of his principle, but we lost all hope of organizing the body with his name as a candidate. We are not factious; we are not disorganizers. We look the question broadly in the face, and admit that the opposition members cannot organize the House unless there is a fusion of some of these discordant elements. Striking, then, at an organization, and being sincerely desirous to effect that object, gentlemen with whom I act voted for Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts. And tell me why? Because we recognized in that gentleman an anti-Nebraska man. And, Mr. Clerk, no man in this House or out of it, has ever more distinctly placed his American sentiments on record than has Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts. He was one of the pioneers, so to speak, in the advocacy of American principles, which my colleague represents. If he was not the representative of their principles, he would not have received the single vote of a single member from Pennsylvania who is now acting with him upon the floor of this House. We vote for him now to effect an organization. He represents our principles; and let me tell my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. Jones) that he cannot submerge Americanism here. He may effect that when the memory of Washington is submerged. We are Americans, and we will remain such as long as we have places upon this floor. I now thank members for their attention.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—Mr. Clerk, I wish to put a few questions to my colleague, and not to address the House. He knows that I would be the very last man in the world who would put him in a false position before this House or the country. When I rose to ask the honorable gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Walker) a question, it was with the intention that his mind might be disabused, or that his friends might be disabused, from the idea that in passing that resolution we meant to cast an imputation upon any individual, or any collection of individuals. Such was not the intention.

Mr. CAMPBELL—Certainly not.

Mr. JONES—I also stated to the House that, as a national democrat from Pennsylvania, I understood that Know Nothingism in that State was synonymous with free soilism. I expected a response from one of my colleagues. The honorable gentlemen, (Mr. Allison,) known as a high minded man, and boldly professing free soil principles, rose in his place and stated that he agreed with what I had stated—that it was right. I would not wish to place my colleague from the Schuylkill district (Mr. Campbell) in a false position. He has stated that that is not the fact. He takes issue with me and my colleague from the Beaver district (Mr. Allison). I wish now, merely for my own satisfaction, to inquire from my colleague, who says that the Know Nothing party in Pennsylvania is not a free soil party, why it is that the delegation from that State, with the exception of three members, vote for Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts, who is publicly held up here as the very bone and sinew of free soilism? Explain that, and I shall be satisfied. I do not know whether my colleague is a Know Nothing or not; I never asked him; and I meant no imputation when I used the phrase. I again state that the Know Nothing party, known by us as such, has principles synonymous with those professed by the free soil party; that it is free soilism in disguise; and that that free soilism alone, under the name of Know Nothing, is what prevents my State this day from casting seventeen votes for Mr. Richardson instead of six.

Mr. GIDDINGS—What do you mean by free soilism? Define your terms.

Mr. JONES—I will, with a great deal of pleasure. I can only define it as I understand it. Men and things have charged of late with wonderful rapidity. If I am wrong I can be corrected. Free soilism, about three weeks ago, was the restoration of the Missouri line. Mr. Greeley now states in his paper that that is not the object of contest now; it means Kansas and Nebraska. The free soil party means that party which is against the Kansas-Nebraska act, and now struggling for its repeal. Am I correct?

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania—If my colleague (Mr. Jones) had inquired of me whether the democratic party of Pennsylvania had gone over to free soilism, I should have referred him to his colleagues, Mr. Grow, Mr. Barclay, and others. (Laughter.)

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—Will my colleague allow me to explain what I mean?

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania—Not now. But I say that my colleagues and myself have not gone over to free soilism. We consider that on this Nebraska question, gentlemen from the South may represent their views as gentlemen of the North may represent theirs. We are supporting Mr. Banks as an American. He may take any views he thinks proper on the subject of the Kansas and Nebraska bill.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois—I desire that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will give his attention for a moment, while I ask him a simple question.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—I desire, first, to have a correct understanding with my colleague. I say to my colleague that the democratic party of Pennsylvania, to which I belong, is a national party. One of my colleagues (Mr. Grow) said yesterday that he could not understand why the fact that the whole South, and those who are left of us at the North, voting for a national man living at the North, made the democratic party a national party. We do not make any distinction between the North or the South. But my colleague found fault with the paucity of our numbers, and gave it as a reason why we were not national that we numbered only fifteen from the North. Well, I believe it only required ten men to save Sodom. (Laughter.)

Mr. COBB, of Alabama—It only took five at last. (Renewed laughter).

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—So much the better. But we stand fifteen; and I understand that the point made by my colleague was that the paucity of our numbers was evidence of our want of nationality. Now, as we have been voting for a Northern man, and a national man, I thought the intention was rather to call the South to question; and I marvelled how they could be charged with being a sectional party, when they had been voting for a Northern man. I think that is the best test that could be given of nationality on this floor, coming, too, from Southern men, stung as they are to the very quick by an attempt to rob them of rights guaranteed by the constitution of this country—a body of men who come up into this hall asking for nothing that I have ever heard of but the simple guarantees of that constitution. I have never upon this floor been asked by a Southern man to cast a vote because it was for the South. I have never cast a Southern vote in my life. The only thing that has ever been asked of me (and I have always given it to the best of my humble ability) was to cast my vote for the South as far as she had rights guaranteed by the constitution; and I have made up my mind long ago that I will stand by those rights, if I stand alone, instead of with fourteen others. (Loud applause.)

Mr. EDDY—Will my colleague yield to me a moment?

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—Not now; I will give my colleague a chance by-and-and-by, for he and I agree upon one point at least. The magnanimity displayed here by Southern men is an exhibition I am glad to see, because the hue and cry throughout the country has been that the South want to dissolve the Union, and I want the North to see that there are Southern men in this House who are willing to vote week after week for a Northern man, thus declaring to the country that all they want is national principles, and that they care not whether the representative of those principles comes from the North or the South. If this exhibition were continued forty days longer, I think the time would be well spent. And now, sir, I want to ask a question of my colleague, (Mr. Campbell.) He said that there were democrats elected to this House from the State of Pennsylvania who were not sound on this question of slavery. I do not suppose he meant to say what might be inferred from his remark. I do not believe he meant to impeach the motives of gentlemen voting upon this floor, and it is contrary to the rules of this House to impute motives. I know, sir, that there are six members from Pennsylvania, who, from the day the democratic caucus met (and they were all there) to this day, have voted as I have voted. I cannot inquire into their motives. If my colleague knows anything about them——

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania, (interrupting.)—I did not impeach the motives of any gentleman. I never do such a thing. I referred to the fact that certain democratic members of this House from the State of Pennsylvania were elected openly as anti-Nebraska men.

Mr. JONES—Will my colleague name them?

Mr. CAMPBELL—I suppose those gentlemen will carry out fairly the principles on which they were elected.

Mr. KEITT—Who are they?

Several members.—Name them.

Mr. CAMPBELL.—Well, there is Mr. Grow [laughter] and Mr. Barclay.

Mr. JONES—Mr. Grow is able to speak for himself.

Mr. GROW—I am anxious for the floor for that purpose.

Mr. JONES—All I can say is, that I understand Mr. Grow to take his position openly, publicly and honorably. I will impeach the motives of no man. If he professes his principles openly, I will take him by that profession. Mr. Grow did not meet with us in caucus, and has not voted with us once. I understand that he does not pretend or profess to belong to what we call the national democracy; I was only sorry that I understood him to say yesterday that the only objection he had to it at the North was that there were only seventeen of us. I have no doubt he has another reason; but that was the only one he gave. I have no doubt, however, that he will explain himself fully. Other gentlemen from Pennsylvania met with us in caucus and have voted with us. We understand them to be opposed to the repeal of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and anything beyond that is between them and their constituents. I did suppose that the Pennsylvania vote cast for Mr. Banks, meant that all who voted for him from Pennsylvania were against the Kansas-Nebraska bill. If I am wrong in this, I shall be happy to be corrected.

Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois—I repeat that I desire to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JONES—I will yield to you for a moment.

Mr. GROW—I desire the floor to say a few words only.

Mr. LETCHER—There is plenty of time; take it leisurely.

Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois—I understood that the gentleman from the Berks district of Pennsylvania (Mr. Jones) made the platform which was adopted by the democratic caucus which nominated for Speaker my friend and colleague, Mr. Richardson. I understand, from the explanation he has made to-day in regard to that platform, that there is a difference between the Know Nothings and the Americans; that he considers the Know Nothings to be abolitionists; and that the expression "Know Nothings" used in that platform was not intended to apply to the Southern Know Nothings or Americans. I understood that to be his explanation here this morning. I desire to know if he wishes that explanation so to go out to the country?

Mr. JONES (of Pa.)—I can only say I am sorry my friend from Illinois should have misunderstood me upon the subject; for I certainly meant to say no such thing.

Mr. WASHBURNE—I certainly understood the gentleman as I have represented him.

Mr. JONES—I will relate the matter. An objection was raised here this morning by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Walker), that the resolution of the democratic caucus—not a platform made by me, but by the democratic party in caucus, of which I was merely a humble instrument, and, as such, offered the resolution—had treated the American party with contempt. I stated that the words "American party" were not in the resolution, and that not a single word used therein was intended to be disrespectful to any man or class of men. One word further. I stated that in my country—and there I speak for myself and do not mean to be sectional by any Mason and Dixon line, but mean by the word *country* the whole country—our belief and understanding is that Know Nothingism is free soilism in disguise; and, whatever it publicly professes, it goes to the polls and defeats the national democratic party, by voting for the free soil party, and that accounts for the paucity of our numbers. When I speak of Know Nothingism as we understand it at the North, I mean this: Know Nothingism, wherever it may be found, in its movements and consequences, is in direct conflict with the democratic party, and indirectly accomplishes the same end—the defeat of that party.

Mr. WASHBURNE—Then the gentleman says this: That he understands Know Nothingism to be abolitionism in disguise, as contradistinguished from Americanism.

Mr. JONES—No, sir; I did not say that.

Mr. WASHBURNE—Then I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he does not consider Know Nothingism and Americanism the same thing?

Mr. JONES—No, sir; I am an American myself; but I am not, and I never will be, a Know Nothing. (Laughter.)

Mr. WASHBURNE—I assume that we are all Americans, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania must well understand the meaning of the word in the manner in which I used it, and I desire him to explain the difference he has attempted to draw between Know Nothingism and Americanism.

Mr. JONES—I presume I could do that more satisfactorily after having gone through the process of initiation in the order, which has not happened to me as yet. But I will proceed to explain as best I can. There is a party in this country which calls itself American, which calls itself Know Nothing, which calls itself anti-foreign, which calls itself the party of the country, which calls itself the national party, and at other times a sectional party; and if the gentleman from Illinois means the sectional party, as they style themselves, then I mean that every one of those names are synonymous, and mean a party which bodes no good to our country.

Mr. WASHBURNE—I understood, from the language of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the explanation he made of the platform of the democratic caucus, that he intended that language as an invitation to the Southern Know Nothings to come in and vote for his candidate; and that the platform, as laid down by the democratic caucus and explained by himself this morning, offered no barrier to their coming in to such support. I merely state how I understood the matter.

Mr. JONES—I only say I am astonished that he should receive such a construction of my language. Shall I now say, that after I have offered a resolution in the democratic caucus which publicly proclaims the principles of its organization, and which says to the world and the country that we never will take down one plank of that platform—can that gentleman now, by any possibility, understand me now to mean that I am open to compromise, except so far as this—that our party is open to every man of you, as soon as you repudiate your errors, and come into our party, and upon our platform?

Mr. WASHBURNE—I believe I understood the gentleman as others did, and I certainly have no desire to misrepresent him. But some things have taken place here this morning which ought to be brought to the notice of the country, particularly the speech of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Walker,) taken in connection with what fell from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Jones.) What is he aspect which presents itself to us? The gentleman from Alabama says the platform of the democratic party, or caucus, interposes between those standing with him and the democratic party a wall of fire, which they cannot pass. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Jones) makes his explanation, after which the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Walker) again comes forward; and what does he tell the House, the country and the democratic party, upon this floor? Why, he tells the democratic party if they will ignore the platform they have laid down—if they will ignore the candidate they have nominated for Speaker—then the Know Nothing party of the South will join with the democracy, and assist in electing a Speaker. Now, I want to know what foundation there is for the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama. I want to know if the democratic party—the most conservative party in this House—are in favor of abandoning their organization and platform, and of coalescing with the Know Nothings of the South? If there are any such, let us know who they are. Let the country know it.

Mr. WALKER—The gentleman from Illinois misunderstood me, if he supposed I insinuated that there was any such intention.

Mr. WASHBURNE (of Illinois)—That is certainly what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. WALKER—Then the gentleman misapprehended me.

Mr. WASHBURNE—I stand corrected, and, of course, have no more to say upon that point.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—I believe I am entitled to the floor, having simply yielded it to the gentleman from Illinois for the purpose of asking a question. He seems, however, to be making quite a speech.

Mr. WASHBURNE—I will occupy but a moment more. The gentleman from Alabama disclaims having made any such remark as I have imputed to him, and declares there is no intention of pursuing the course I have spoken of; but if there are any democrats who intend to take that course, I would like to know who they are, and I should like to have the country know.

Mr. JONES—I am about to surrender the floor, but I wish to have this matter set right before I do so. I understand the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Walker) to say this, which amounts simply to the choosing of the least of two evils: that it might so happen to his party, without asking anything at our hands at all, that if they are called upon to decide between the candidate for Speaker who has received the largest number of votes and the candidate of the democratic party, as they now stand, as a choice of two evils they might prefer Mr. Richardson to Mr. Banks.

Mr. WALKER—The gentleman from Pennsylvania also misunderstood me.

Mr. JONES—Then I stand corrected.

Mr. WALKER—I think I said this—and in repeating it I would thank the House to hear and weigh well the words I employ to convey the idea—so far as I was concerned, desiring as I did a proper and conservative organization of the House, and believing as I did that I was expressing the wishes of most of those with whom I had acted upon this floor, I was willing, in the event that this House should not be organized to-day, to meet in this hall this evening upon this basis. I asked that all the members of the House who are willing to abide by the existing laws on the subject of slavery; who are opposed to a renewal of agitation on this question, here or elsewhere; and who, in obedience to their constitutional obligations, are prepared to vote for the admission of a State whether its constitution did or did not recognize slavery as a part of its social system, should meet in conference. These, I think, were my words.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania, resumed the floor.

Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois—May I ask my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. Jones) one question; and then I will yield him the floor?

Mr. JONES—Allow me one moment first. I cannot now.

Mr. WASHBURNE—Will the gentleman just allow me to ask him this one question?

Mr. JONES—Excuse me. I only want to say a word in reply to the explanation of my friend from Alabama, (Mr. Walker.) I can now easily understand how I was mistaken as to the meaning of what he said. He said—using his very words—that his sympathies were with the conservative party, with the national party, with the party which is opposed to the repeal of the Missouri compromise line, and which desires half a dozen other things; and the portraiture which he drew of this party fitted my party so well that I thought the gentleman was alluding all the time to the national democratic party. (Laughter.) Now, if I have committed a mistake in this, I hope the gentleman from Alabama will not find fault with me on that account, because, as I say, he described just the party to which I have the honor to belong. (Continued laughter.) It was, therefore, only a simple misconstruction of an application, and I hope he will pardon me for making the application which I did of his remarks. I certainly did apply all he said to the democratic party. My colleague from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Allison,) has asked me once or twice for the floor, and I now yield it to him.

Mr. WASHBURNE, of Ill.—I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Jones,) one single question.

Mr. COBB, of Ala.—Do give him the floor and let him get through.

Mr. WASHBURNE—The question I wish to ask is this:—Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Jones,) and his friends go to the caucus for which they have got so polite an invitation from the gentleman from Alabama? (Mr. Walker.) [Laughter, and shouts of "Oh, to be sure we will; why not?"]

Mr. JONES—The democratic party will meet in no caucus, except in a caucus called by that party itself, and on its well settled principles. That is the only political caucus that we will attend. (Cries of "Good, good!" and laughter.)

Mr. ALLISON—I will not occupy the time of the House long.

Mr. WALKER, (interrupting)—I would like to say a few words in reference to the invitation.

Mr. ALLISON—I cannot yield the floor now. It appears, Mr. Clerk, from the statement made by my colleague over the way, (Mr. Jones,) with which I agree, and from that made by my colleague on the left, (Mr. Campbell,) from which I differ, that this is a kind of three-cornered game between us. (Laughter.) And yet I think that when we come to understand each other, it will be found that there is no great difference between the three of us. When my colleague from the Berks district (Mr. Jones) put his question, I understood him to say that the opinions of the Know Nothing party, as it is termed, and of the party called by our Southern friends and by others the free soil party of the North, were, on the question of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, identical. I agree with him that in Pennsylvania they were the same; that is, that both these parties disapproved of that act; that they went into the election of 1855 on that principle; and that owing to the fact that the people of Pennsylvania were thus opposed to this measure, agreeing with the Know Nothings, they had sent here the members of Congress who now represent that State. Now it appears that my colleague to the left (Mr. Campbell) differs with me on the question. But I think it is a mere matter of difference as to phraseology, not as to facts.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania—I wish to say one word in explanation.

Mr. Allison yielded the floor for the purpose.

Mr. CAMPBELL—I distinctly stated that the American party of Pennsylvania made no issue whatever on the question of slavery, or of the Kansas Nebraska bill. The American party of Pennsylvania made no issue on that subject. It was an open question, as far as that party was concerned.

Mr. ALLISON—I agree with my colleague (Mr. Campbell) in that statement; but at the same time I would say, that a large body of the persons attached to the American party condemned that act, and that the members of Congress whom they sent here were elected on that question. That was the issue, the open issue, before the people of Pennsylvania. In almost every Congressional district in the State opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska bill was the issue, the great issue, on which we went before the people.

Mr. FLORENCE—That's true.

Mr. ALLISON—I know of no district out of the city of Philadelphia where that was not the all-absorbing question. I have yet to learn of a single district in Pennsylvania where the question was not fairly made, discussed and decided by the people against that bill. I want to know from our Know Nothing friends, if they come here and say that that was not the question in Pennsylvania, what decided their election? Was it Americanism? Was it Know Nothingism? Not at all. That was a quiet question. It was under the rose. The question that was before the minds of the people of Pennsylvania was the Kansas question. And I have said here, and I say so now, that, as far as my knowledge extends, the opinion of the Know Nothings and of the free soilers on the subject of the Kansas-Nebraska bill were identical in condemnation of the act. If ever there was a question settled fairly, after full and free discussion in Pennsylvania, it was this measure which is so much agitated—this question which we have here so much discussed. I know that my friend, (Mr. Campbell,) if he understands me, will agree with me in the opinion that a large majority of those who belong to the Order were anti-Nebraskaites. I know that in my section of the country many united in that Order, because they believed it to be anti-slavery, and in opposition to the extension of slavery.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania—Will the gentleman allow me one moment to reply to him, as he has referred to me? I want to be distinctly understood that so far as Americanism was concerned in that canvass, no issue was made on the slavery question. The views which I represent here in opposition to the Kansas Nebraska bill are the views of a large body of whigs and of Americans, but no such issue was made by the American party.

Mr. ALLISON—True; but was not the issue before the people? I ask my colleague, was the slavery question not an open issue before the people?

Mr. CAMPBELL—It was in some districts; but it was not inscribed on the American banner, nor was it made an issue.

Mr. ALLISON—Not at all; I do not claim any such thing. I claim that the American party, in their acts and through their ballot boxes, condemned that act and therein agreed with the free soil party. I do not say that the American party came out openly against it, but they acted in harmony with those who are known as free soilers.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania—Will my colleague (Mr. Allison) let me, in justice, ask him one question, and I am willing to abide by his answer?

Mr. LETCHER—Mr. Clerk——

Mr. JONES repeated his request.

Mr. LETCHER—Well, go on.

Mr. ALLISON yielded the floor to his colleague.

Mr. JONES—I want to inquire of my colleague on the other side (Mr. Allison) whether there was not, a short time prior to the election in Pennsylvania, in last October, a fusion committee assembled at Harrisburg, and whether one chairman of that committee did not represent the whig party, another chairman the American party, and a third chairman the free soil or republican party? I want my colleague to answer me whether that fusion committee did not meet within ten days, or at least within two weeks of the election. I want him to state whether there was not a proclamation put forth in the State of Pennsylvania, in which every man who was opposed to the Nebraska iniquity should come and cast his vote for Nicholson—that he was the embodiment of anti-Nebraskaism, whigism, Know Nothingism free soilism, abolitionism, and all other isms, knocked into one? And I want my colleague to state whether that statement was not published to the people of the whole State, and made the basis upon which the election was held?

Mr. ALLISON—My colleague asks me quite a number of questions, all of which I will answer, but one at a time. In the first place I will answer that there was an assemblage in Harrisburg of those opposed to the present administration and opposed to the Kansas and Nebraska act. I say they met in Harrisburg, and tried to concentrate the anti-Nebraska forces of Pennsylvania. They tried to unite them upon a single candidate, and I am only sorry they were not successful. They put forth the name of a gentleman who resides in my district; a gentleman whom I know well, and know to be just as sound upon the national questions as I am myself. (Laughter.) I know him, but admire him because he is a national man, believing that slavery ought not to be extended. Now let me ask my colleague (Mr Jones) one question. Did he not attend a convention held by the democratic party in Pennsylvania, which convention was afraid to show its hand upon this Nebraska bill? (Laughter.)

Mr. JONES—I will answer my colleague with great pleasure, for I like to respond to questions. I did not attend any convention that was afraid to speak out upon the Nebraska bill. At least they were not afraid, judging by their acts. I did attend a convention, over which I had the honor to preside, of the democratic party of the State of Pennsylvania. The committee appointed for that purpose reported a resolution. An amendment was offered, upon which the yeas and nays were called. It was this:—The original resolution read, "That the general government had no right to interfere with slavery." The amendment added, "in the States or Territories." The amendment was adopted with but three dissenting voices, and all of those are represented upon this floor by my colleague, (Mr. Grow.) That was the resolution, and it will speak for itself. The convention clearly expressed its opinion upon the principle of the Kansas and Nebraska bill, when it expressly asserted that the general government had no right to interfere with slavery in the Territories of the Union; and it was adopted, as I have said, with but three or four dissenting voices, and all from the district now represented on this floor by my colleague, (Mr. Grow.)

Mr. ALLISON—The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. JONES—I have answered it. The yeas and nays themselves, upon the resolution answer it.

Mr. GROW—Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield me the floor?

Mr. ALLISON—I occupy the floor myself only by permission.

Mr. GROW—I ask the Clerk who is entitled to the floor?

The CLERK—The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Jones) is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GROW—Then I appeal to him to yield the floor for a moment. My colleague has referred to certain gentlemen in the Democratic Convention of Pennsylvania who, he says, are represented here by me.

Mr. ALLISON—I have but a word or two more to say, and I shall be very happy to yield the floor to my colleague. I am now trespassing upon the time of the House, and upon the indulgence of my colleague by whose permission I occupy the floor, and I feel constrained to bring my remarks to a close. I am sorry that there should be the least difference of opinion among the anti-Nebraska members as to the strength of that sentiment among the people of Pennsylvania. Mr. Clerk, I have been in this House before. I have often witnessed discussions between Northern members, upon questions growing out of slavery, that have caused me a good deal of pain. I remember that the first time I was a member of this House, in 1851, the very first question that was agitated here was a question growing out of slavery. It was then that the two great parties of the Union vied with each other in their attempts to nationalize themselves. I remember the democratic party held their caucus and nominated their candidate for speaker, but refused to adopt as their platform the compromise measures of 1850. As soon as the whig party, with which I then acted, found out that the democrats had omitted this great duty, they met and indorsed the compromise measures of 1850 as their platform, which was to be the final settlement of all questions growing out of slavery. That was the first introduction we had here in 1851. We published that compromise as the final settlement. For the next two years, my constituents saw fit to leave me at home. And now, when I return, I recognize many of my friends upon the other side of the house with whom it was my pleasure to serve. But now they are asking us to make another final settlement of questions growing out of slavery. And what is the cause of all this excitement? It is because the people of the country will not say that this shall be a final settlement of slavery questions. They say that you did not abide by the compromises of 1850, which you proclaimed final. The very first time you found yourselves here in a majority you discarded that final settlement. You took from freedom that which belonged to freedom; you appropriated to slavery that which did not belong to slavery—that to which slavery had no right. And now you say to us, "Come, come, let us have another final settlement." Some of them say, "We have, perhaps, done you wrong in this matter. We have taken from you that which properly belonged to you, and appropriated it to ourselves. But pass that by, and let us, like brethren, now have a final settlement of the subject, to last, at any rate, for a year or two, and perhaps longer." Finally: the people of the North—and that is all I wish to say now—have said that that shall not be a final settlement. You have taken the advantage of them. You have made professions to the country, and the country believed you. The country believed that there was such a state of affairs existing that promised peace on this question for all time to come. They had heard the President declare that no act of his should go to disturb the harmony that pervaded the Union. The people thus believed and voted, and permitted themselves to be deceived. They sent here those who thought proper to disturb the harmony of the country by taking land from freedom, called Nebraska and Kansas.

Mr. OBR—I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania from whence the government of the United States acquired the country embraced within the existing Territories of Kansas and Nebraska?

Mr. ALLISON—By purchase, I suppose.

Mr. OBR—From whom?

Mr. ALLISON—France.

Mr. OBR—Was it not slave territory when it was purchased?

Mr. ALLISON—There were slaves there.

Mr. OBR—Slavery existed there at the time of the purchase from France?

Mr. ALLISON—Certainly.

Mr. OBR—Then by the compromise of 1820 gentlemen took from slavery—as he chooses to put it in these terms—that which belonged to slavery; and now, when it is taken back, he says that we have deprived freedom of that to which she was entitled.

Mr. ALLISON—It was a compromise forced upon the country by Southern votes; but gentlemen did not stand to their own bargain. And I have heard gentlemen here taunt us thus: Why, say they, you refused to stand by that compromise for many years, and because you refused to stand by it we will take from you the little that you were allowed to have. That is the kind of justice that is to be meted out to us. You drove us into a compromise contrary to the principles of right and justice. You gave us a portion, a small portion, and when you had the power again snatched even that small portion from us. Are we to be put off thus? Are we of the North to be taunted because our constituents are not willing to abide by such action? No, sir; the time has come when the people of the North are determined that Northern sentiment shall have justice done it. To be sure it was a Territory in which slavery did exist. That is true; but by the compromise of 1820 a large portion of it was dedicated to freedom, and that, too, by a solemn compact. At that time it was supposed many years would elapse before the Territory would be inhabited; but just as freedom was about to have some portion of it, when it was to realize some of the benefits of the compromise, a power steps in and takes that which under the compact justly he orged to her. And yet gentlemen ask us to acquiesce in the wrong that has been done us. There are honorable gentlemen here from the South who acknowledged this wrong, and who deprecated the act at the time of its commission. They believed it to be an injustice, and that it would open the flood gates of agitation and bitter feeling. They believed that it was an apple of discord thrown among the people; yet our constituents are condemned for sending those who think as they did into this body.

Mr. JONES, of Penn.—Name the Southern men to whom you allude. Are they whigs or democrats?

Mr. ALLISON—I will attend to my colleague's question at some future time. If he will call at my room, I will furnish him with all the information of the kind which he may desire.

Mr. FLORENCE—With my colleague's permission, I would ask the Clerk how long my colleague can retain the floor and farm it out to gentlemen to make speeches? I understand that my colleague (Mr. Jones) yielded it to him for the purpose of asking him some questions.

The CLERK—The Clerk will reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there are now no rules in force, and that a gentleman can retain the floor as long as it is the pleasure of the House to allow him to do so.

Mr. FLORENCE—I want to ask my colleague from the Schuylkill district (Mr. Campbell) some questions which are pertinent to the subject matter of his remarks. I am desirous of explaining in reference to what he said which was personal to myself. I ask my colleague to permit me to do so some time during the day. (Laughter.) I should like to have made clear what is so mysterious in this farming out of the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania—I hope my colleague may have the opportunity for explanation which he asks. (Cries of "Call the roll!" "Let us adjourn," &c.)

Mr. MCMULLIN.—The gentleman from Pennsylvania has finished. Who has the floor, Mr. Clerk?

The CLERK.—The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Clerk understands, still retains the floor.

Mr. JONES, of Pennsylvania.—When the House shows an unwillingness to further entertain a discussion of a question before it, in my opinion it is then high time that an end should be put to it. I have done.

Mr. CLERK.—The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized by the Clerk.

Mr. FLORENCE.—I hope he will yield to me, for the purpose which I have suggested.

Mr. ETHERIDGE.—Mr. Clerk, I did not get the floor to yield it, but for the purpose of using it. And permit me to say, sir, that the spectacle of this political "love feast" demands that somebody should use it effectually. We need some repose after the hard intellectual exertions of the morning. (Laughter.) We have listened to most able and elaborate efforts from that most prolific political family of Maine. (Renewed laughter.) And every politician from the Key Stone State has been playing the part of witness, or lawyer taking and giving depositions. It is obvious to us all that we are not making any progress, and I suppose this thing of taking political depositions is to go on *ad infinitum*; and the result is, that the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Banks,) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Fuller,) and the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. Richardson,) who are seeking the high honors of the Speakership, are completely thrown into the back ground. They may all say—"Save me from my friends." (Laughter.) Now, sir, we have been in session about two hours. No vote has yet been taken for Speaker, and I know what has been said this morning will be as much as the people can digest in the next three or four days; therefore, I suggest that universal panacea for the diseases of all legislative bodies, and that is an adjournment. (Laughter, and cries of "Let us adjourn," "Call the roll.")

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia—I would ask the gentleman to withdraw his motion for a moment?

Mr. ETHERIDGE—If I withdraw the motion to adjourn, will the gentleman renew it when he has finished his remarks?

Mr. SMITH—I will.

Mr. ETHERIDGE—Then I withdraw it.

Mr. SMITH—Mr. Clerk, I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Campbell) a question or two. I presume that it will be conceded by every gentleman in the hall to be important that we should ascertain the exact opinions and sentiments of the members who are voting for the various candidates for the Speakership. The gentleman from the Schuylkill district (Mr. Campbell) said, if I understood him aright, that he was voting for Mr. Banks as an American. Did I understand the gentleman aright?

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania, assented.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia—The gentleman says I did understand him aright. I then ask him if Mr. Banks did not quit the American party last fall?

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Pennsylvania—Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SMITH, of Virginia—Not to your knowledge!

Mr. CAMPBELL—No, sir.

Mr. SMITH—I ask the gentleman if he does not know, or if it be not the fact—and I am seeking information now—that Mr. Banks voted for and supported Mr. Rockwell, and against Mr. Gardiner this fall? Is the gentleman informed upon that subject?

Mr. CAMPBELL—I have heard about that matter, but I can only answer that I do not know.

Mr. SMITH—The gentleman does not know because he was not present when the vote was cast. He is no doubt perfectly satisfied that Mr. Banks left the American party last fall. I presume he is perfectly satisfied that Mr. Banks supported Mr. Rockwell against Mr. Gardiner, and yet I understand him to tell this House that he is supporting Mr. Banks because he is an American.

Mr. CAMPBELL—Will the gentleman let me ask him a question now?

Mr. SMITH—Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL—Was not the gentleman elected as an American? Will he answer that question?

Mr. SMITH—Yes, sir.

Mr. CAMPBELL—You were?

Mr. SMITH—No, sir, I was not.

Mr. CAMPBELL—Not elected as an American?

Mr. SMITH—I will enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL—I would like to be enlightened upon that point. I have been wanting to know why the gentleman has been voting for Mr. Richardson when he was elected as an American.

Mr. SMITH—Yes, sir. The gentleman is not well informed of my history. I have always supported the democratic party. I always, during my canvass from every stand from which I addressed my fellow citizens, proclaimed that I was an old ironsides democrat, that I was not a Know Nothing, and that I had never even sought admission into the order. I proclaimed that, I say, in every speech I made. I went further, Mr. Clerk, and gentlemen of this House, and said that I was against the secrecy that prevailed in the organization. I went further still, and said that while there was nothing in their platform that was not the echo of Mr. Jefferson's celebrated act establishing religious freedom, yet there was a purpose to practice proscription, and I was opposed to that. But I said this—and I proclaim it in this hall—I said, in every speech I made, that the ninth and eleventh basis principles, as proclaimed by the Virginia Know Nothings, were sound democratic doctrine, and that doctrine was to pledge the whole of the American party to support a strict construction of the constitution.

Mr. GIDDINGS—Will the gentleman say whether he voted for Mr. Wise? (Cries of "That's it," and laughter.)

Mr. SMITH—One thing at a time, sir. (Laughter.) The gentleman knows that well enough. I said, farther, that in reference to foreignism, the sentiments that were promulged in the basis principles of the American party of Virginia were principles that I could approve. I said, my countrymen, and I wish it to be heard everywhere, that in Virginia the representative of a minority section of this Union, the Know Nothings, upon the principles there promulged, were to be looked upon as allies, and not as enemies. I said that I would not abuse them; that I would not denounce them; that if they were in error, I would reason with them as brothers, but I would not quarrel with them. That is what I said, and it has been the labor of all my feeble exertion