

# THE OHIO UNION.

VOL. VIII.

ASHLAND, OHIO, WEDNESDAY MORNING, APRIL 26, 1854.

NO. 49.

## THE OHIO UNION.

The Union is published every Wednesday morning at the office of Ashland, Ohio, by J. S. BERRIDAN, Editor.

**TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.**  
The Union will be furnished to subscribers at the rate of one dollar per annum, in advance, or on the expiration of the year. Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, will invariably be charged, if payment be deferred till after the expiration of the year. A failure to pay in full, and give notice of discontinue to the Publisher, at the close of the time subscribed for, will be considered an engagement for the next year, and so on year after year.

**RATES OF ADVERTISING.**  
One square, 12 lines or less, 3 weeks or less..... \$1 00  
Every subsequent insertion..... 30  
One square, 3 months..... 3 00  
One square 6 months..... 5 00  
One square one year..... 9 00  
One third column one year..... 14 00  
One half column one year..... 17 00  
Two thirds column one year..... 20 00  
Three fourths column one year..... 23 00  
One column one year..... 26 00  
One column one year..... 29 00  
Advertisements, no insertion, should be handed in by Monday evening. The number of insertions should always be designated. Office and advertising matter will be continued until ordered out, and charged by the square.

**JOB PRINTING.**  
All kinds of Job Printing neatly executed, on the shortest notice and most reasonable terms.

## Business Directory.

**JUDICIAL OFFICERS.**  
JAMES STEWART, President Judge.  
A. L. CURTIS, Associate Judge.  
JOHN BERRIDAN, Clerk of C. C. Court.  
ALEX. FOSTER, Sheriff of Ashland County.

**COUNTY OFFICERS.**  
ISAAC GATES, Auditor.  
JAMES W. HOYT, Treasurer.  
JOHN B. JOHNSON, Assessor.  
ASA S. REED, Recorder.  
OWEN W. SMITH, Coroner.  
JOHN G. BRONK, Constable.  
GEORGE MCCONNELL, Constable.  
MORSE KELLEY, Constable.  
AMOS HILBORN, Constable.  
DAVID BUTTE, Constable.  
PATRICK KELLEY, Constable.  
WILSON BOTTEN, Constable.

**SCHOOL EXAMINERS.**  
GEORGE W. HILL, Ashland.  
ORLO W. SMITH, Ashland.  
J. McCORMICK, Ashland.  
J. H. HILLER, Ashland.

**BOURGOFFICERS.**  
JOHN H. MCCORMICK, Mayor.  
WILLIAM H. EASTON, Treasurer.  
J. W. KIRKMAN, Assessor.  
ALLEN HARRIS, Recorder.  
LACON HILBORN, Coroner.  
EDWARD GILBERTSON, Constable.  
MORSE KELLEY, Constable.  
JACOB KIRKMAN, Constable.

## HOTELS.

**MILLER HOUSE.**  
The subscriber begs leave to announce that he has opened a Hotel, to be called the "Miller House," directly opposite the Court House, in Ashland, Ohio, and respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. No effort will be spared to minister to the comfort of all who may favor him with call.  
Ashland, March 22nd, 1854.—H. MILLER.

**EMPIRE HOUSE,**  
ASHLAND, O.  
E. HAYDON, Proprietor.  
Aston, Jan. 15, 1854.—103 ft.

**AMERICAN HOUSE.**  
The undersigned having leased the above house for a term of years, respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. No effort will be spared to minister to the comfort of all who may favor him with call.  
J. H. HILLER, Proprietor.  
J. H. HILLER, Proprietor.  
J. H. HILLER, Proprietor.

**FRANKLIN HOUSE.**  
Having leased the above named house for a term of years, the undersigned respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. No effort will be spared to minister to the comfort of all who may favor him with call.  
Ashland, Nov. 23, 1853.

**FULLER HOUSE.**  
JOSEPH DEYANMAN, having again taken the above house, will be prepared to accommodate all his old friends who may favor him with a call.  
Loudonville, Nov. 23, 1853.

## LAWYERS.

COOPER & WATSON, GEORGE H. PARKER, Ashland, Ohio.  
WATSON & PARKER, Ashland, Ohio.  
City and Counsellors at Law and Solicitors in Chancery.  
Having formed a partnership, we will promptly attend to all business entrusted to our care in this and adjoining counties. Office on corner of Main and Church streets.  
Ashland, Nov. 23, 1853.

WOLVER W. BULLOCK, WILLIAM B. ALLISON, Ashland, Ohio.  
Attorneys at Law and Solicitors in Chancery.  
Will attend to all professional business entrusted to their care in this and adjoining counties. Office on corner of Main and Church streets.  
Ashland, Nov. 23, 1853.

JOHN H. FULTON, JOHN H. MCCORMICK, Ashland, Ohio.  
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law.  
Office on Main street, over the Grocery Store of J. & H. Proctor, Ashland, Ohio, Ohio, November 23, 1853.

THOMAS J. HULL, ASHLEY AT LAW and Justice of the Peace, Loudonville, Ashland County, Ohio, November 23, 1853.

## PHYSICIANS.

P. H. CLARK, M. D., Ashland, Ohio.  
Office at the residence nearly opposite the Court House, where he may be consulted at all times.  
Ashland, Feb. 14, 1854.

J. W. KINNAMAN, M. D., Practitioner of Medicine and Surgery.  
May be consulted at his residence on Main street, Ashland, Ashland County, Ohio, November 23, 1853.

DR. THOMAS HAYES, Practitioner of Medicine and Surgery.  
LAVANNA H. ASHLAND, Ohio, Custom House, Justice of the Peace and Notary Public.  
November 23, 1853.

J. B. GOODFELLOW, WATCH AND CLOCK MAKER, Jeweller, Clocks, Yankee Notions, &c. Watches and Clocks repaired and warranted. Highest price paid for old Gold and Silver. Opposite the Samsell House, Ashland, Ohio. Dec. 14, 1853.

WILLIAM EASTON, WATCH AND CLOCK MAKER, Jeweller, Gold and Silver, and a choice variety of Watches, Jewellery, kept constantly on hand. November 23, 1853.

C. A. HUBBS, Manufacturer of Boots and Shoes.  
These shoes below the Times Printing Office, Ashland, Ohio, Custom House, done to order on the shortest notice and most reasonable terms.  
December 14th, 1853.

## THE NEBRASKA AND KANSAS BILL.

SPEECH OF  
HON. M. H. NICHOLS,  
OF OHIO,  
Delivered in the House of Representatives,  
April 6, 1854.

Mr. NICHOLS then obtained the floor and said: I have obtained the floor, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of protesting against the passage of the Nebraska bill in its present shape. I will not vote for either of the territorial bills now before us, while either the one or the other contains a repeal of the Missouri Compromise or the Clayton amendment.

In assuming this position, sir, I am fully aware of all its responsibilities. Like most northern men, I have felt the rough consequences of this slavery agitation. Like most northern men, who have seen here, I have a constituency divided to some extent upon this question. But, in examining the question, I have not counted the chances of my own preservation, or estimated what expediency required of me. The reproach of "skulking behind my constituency" the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] shall never apply to me. What duty my own sense of right and justice demands of me I will discharge, regardless of consequences. My own philosophy has long since taught me, that to give my vote to a project condemned by my deliberate judgment would be a degradation much too bitter and unpalatable for me to relish; and I regret sir, not the fact that my own sense of justice constrains me to vote against this bill, but that in doing so I cannot feel assured of its complete overthrow.

I suppose, sir, the House will bear with me while I attempt a historical review of this question. It is necessary to me in defining my position.

In 1818 Missouri first petitioned Congress for admission as a State. The question was opened on the 18th of December of that year, and on the 19th of the succeeding February we find the House applying to her a clause prohibiting the further introduction of slavery into her borders by a vote of 87 yeas to 73 nays. March 15th another amendment was adopted in the words following: "All children born in said State, after the admission thereof, shall be free after the age of twenty-five years." I instance these two amendments, Mr. Chairman, for a purpose that I shall indicate hereafter. They were struck out by the Senate, and as the House refused to recede from them, the bill failed at that session. All effort to harmonize were ineffectual. At the next session of Congress, December, 1819, the subject was resumed. The struggles of that period have been so long matters of history, they were of themselves so pregnant with important consequences, that I may be excused from advertising to them in detail.—Out of the contest sprang the far famed Missouri act, the essential feature of which to the North was the following:

"And be it further enacted, That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and hereby is, prohibited forever."

This feature, sir, harmonized the action of Congress and in the progress of events, and the lapse of time, it harmonized the opinions of the country.

Well, sir, Missouri came into the Union, but not without some further difficulties. Her constitution excluded free negroes; and as it was contained in the body that she could not constitutionally do this thing, she was compelled to come in under Mr. Clay's resolution, giving a construction to that provision of her constitution, which, under judicial decisions, has rendered it nugatory. Missouri adopted that construction; and as this constitutional impediment was the only difficulty of any magnitude, subsequent to the passage of the act of Congress authorizing her to form her State constitution, she came into the Union bound by the faith, spirit, and intent of that act.

This act was one of a series, by which Congress has, from time to time, settled the character of particular Territories. In its scope it was limited to the Louisiana Territory, acquired from France in 1803. As these slavery adjustments, from the existing nature of the question involved, have always been regarded final as to their particular objects, and in the nature of irrevocable laws, so the Missouri act has always been regarded as final, so far as the Louisiana Territory is concerned. I quote now, sir, from Nile's Register, immediately after the passage of this Missouri act:

"It is true the compromise is supported only by the letter of the law, repugnant by the authority which enacted it; but the circumstances of the case give to this law a moral force equal to that of a positive provision of the Constitution; and we do not hazard anything by saying that the Constitution exists in its observance. We wish to see the compact kept in good faith, and we trust that a kind Providence will open the way to relieve us of an evil which every good citizen deprecates as the supreme curse of the country."

In 1820, the Constitution existed only in the observance of the Missouri act.—Now we are told the Constitution can only exist in its overthrow.

March 1, 1845, when the joint resolutions for the annexation of Texas were pending, I find in the reported proceedings, the following, from the Congressional Globe, (page 193,) detailing the action of the House of Representatives:

"The question being on the joint resolution to admit Texas into the Union.

Mr. MILTON BROWN, of Tennessee,

submitted the following as an amendment to it: Strike out amendment of Mr. Weller in the original resolution, and insert as follows:

"Joint resolution declaring the terms on which Congress will admit Texas into the Union as a State.

"Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

"Third, New States of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union, with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire.

"Mr. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, asked the gentleman from Tennessee to accept the following as a modification of his amendment, to come in after the last clause:

"And in such States as shall be formed out of said Territory, north of said Missouri compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude, except for crime, shall be prohibited.

"Mr. BROWN accepted the modification.

"The Speaker announced the question to be on agreeing to the amendment.

"Mr. VINTON called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

"The question was then taken by yeas and nays; and resulted thus—yeas 118, nays 101.

At page eighty-five of the same work the following will be found:

"House of Representatives, Jan. 23, '45.

"The House being in Committee of the Whole on the Texas question."

"Mr. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, moved to amend the amendment of Mr. WELLES, by substituting therefor the resolutions he had the honor to introduce a few days since."

The resolutions of Mr. DOUGLAS are in the following words:

"Joint Resolutions for the reannexation of Texas to the United States, in conformity with the treaty of '03, for the purchase of Louisiana.

"Whereas, &c.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect, or in any way interfere with the sixth section of the act, approved the sixth of March, 1820, admitting the State of Missouri into the Union, and commonly called the Missouri compromise, that act having been passed and approved prior to the ratification of the treaty commonly called the Texas treaty, by which Texas was ceded to Spain."

Certain gentlemen were then, Mr. Chairman, very careful in moving the slavery-exclusion clause. On the 10th of August, 1848, the bill to establish a territorial government in Oregon was pending in the Senate. That bill contained the famous exclusion clause of the ordinance of 1787. This Mr. DOUGLAS proposed to amend by placing before it: "That inasmuch as said Territory is north of the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri compromise line," therefore that slavery and involuntary servitude should be prohibited. Then Mr. DOUGLAS was so wedded to the Missouri act that he moved it as an amendment to the exclusion clause of the Oregon bill. But he says it is unconstitutional now. The Oregon bill passed without this amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS, and with its clause excluding slavery; and the principles of the Missouri act had been applied to the territory we sold Spain in 1819, and acquired again when Texas was annexed.

The argument, sir, which we heard from the gentleman from Kentucky, the other day, that this second application of the Missouri principle was intended as a final adjustment, to be extended *ad infinitum*, to my mind is baseless and visionary. It seems to me so, sir,—first, because contiguity of soil and similarity of climate, and aptitude for production, pointed out the Missouri line as the natural settlement for Texas; and because, secondly, it might well happen, in the course of time, that we might acquire territory to which that line could not be applied. But, sir, in 1850 Congress was again called upon to adjust the difficulties of this slavery question, growing out of the annexation of Mexican territory. The excitement of that period is yet fresh; ay, sir, so vividly impressed upon the minds of all, as to need no comment. But you know, sir, that side issues were created, and that abuses of long standing, bitter recriminations, and sectional jealousies, were either to be provided for or crushed out.

Well, sir, you know the Senate's omnibus of that year—you know how it toiled and creaked on its devious journey along the tortuous track of legislation, until it broke down, and let all its passengers out on the wayside. They were picked up, sir; and, out of the wreck, certain measures were perfected, which have since been dignified with the names of the "compromise acts of 1850."

They were:

1. An act proposing to the State of Texas as the establishment of her northern and western boundaries, the relinquishment by the said State of all territory claimed by her claim upon the United States, and of all her claim upon the Territory of New Mexico.—(September 9th, 1850.)

In the fifth clause of the first section of said act is the following proviso, introduced on the motion of Mr. MASSON, of Virginia:

"Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify anything contained in the third article of the second section of the joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, approved March 7, after formed out of the State of Texas or otherwise."

In the second section, establishing the Territory of New Mexico, is the following proviso:

"And provided, further, That when admitted as a State, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union, with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescribe.

2. An act to establish a territorial government for Utah.—(September 9, 1850.)

This act contains the same provision in regard to slavery as the preceding.

3. An act for the admission of the State of California. This has no reference whatever to slavery; the constitution of the State, however, prohibited it.

4. An act to amend the act entitled "An act respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their masters," approved February 12, 1793.—(September 10, 1850.)

5. An act to suppress the slave trade in the District of Columbia.—(September 20, 1850.)

These five acts constitute what are called the compromise measures of 1850.

These measures covered every foot of territory not previously affected by some adjustment of the slavery question. They had taken a part of the territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. claimed by Texas, from under the influence of the Missouri restriction, and had incorporated it with New Mexico, providing that it might be slave or free territory, as the people of New Mexico might determine when they formed their constitution. They had taken from the Louisiana territory the "Middle Park," as it is called, a basin in the Rocky Mountains, and had added it to Utah, and made it subject to the same provisions.—In all other things the Missouri compromise was expressly saved. Mr. MASSON's proviso had saved the right of Texas to her new States—States south of 36 deg. 30 min. north of that line, as, indeed, no act impairing that right would have been worth a straw, as it would have violated one of the fundamental conditions of her union with the States.

I beg, sir, to call your attention to the prominence given to the Missouri act in all this legislation—how it was fought for by the southern members here up to the last moment of the existing session of '50; how, perhaps it might have been weakened, provisions were moved to save rights supposed to have accrued under it. Yes, sir, and prior to that time, the father of this agitation had incorporated it into his Texas resolutions, and into the Oregon bill; and with what tenacity it has clung to life and vitality, while the doctrines of the ordinance of 1787 have gone to rest—ay, sir, while they "sleep the sleep that knows no waking!" Yes, sir, legislation relating to the Missouri act has been well defined—the act has been carefully created in all its parts. The soul, the embodiment of two adjustments, it was so important in the third, that while a different principle was applied to the new Territories, it was expressly saved as to the old.

And so, sir, the question stood in the fall of 1850. Three sessions of Congress have come and gone, and each one has treated the question as finally settled. Did not the last Congress declare a finality as to this slavery question? Now, I ask, would gentlemen have justified themselves by such a vote, had anything been needed to make them final? To suspect them of such folly is an insult I would not offer to any gentleman amongst them. No, sir, they never imagined that the Missouri compromise was to be repealed, or dreamed that it had been done by others.

And again, sir: in time both political parties of the country came together in convention. They nominated their candidates, they adopted their platforms. That party to which I belong adopted the following resolutions as a part of theirs:

"3. That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the Abolitionists or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery, or to take ineffectual steps in relation thereto, are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend of our political institutions.

4. Resolved, That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress; and therefore the Democratic party of the Union, standing on this national platform, will abide by and adhere to a faithful execution of the acts known as the compromise measures settled by the last Congress, the act for reclaiming fugitives from service or labor included; which act being designed to carry out an express provision of the Constitution, cannot, with fidelity thereto, be repealed or so changed as to destroy or impair its efficiency.

5. Resolved, That the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made."

I need not say, sir, the platform was sustained. Mr. Pierce came into office with the prestige of almost entire unanimity. He had pledged himself to the platform. His inaugural affirmed that pledge. His message re-affirmed it. A dispatch had gone from one of his Cabinet to Massachusetts that agitation must be crushed out; yes, sir, that free-soil, abolition agitation must be crushed out! Crushed out were the words, sir. They were pondered words; and I would to God the man who uttered them possessed the moral courage to apply them now to the fathers of this agitation.

shall leave the history of the past. Did you not pass a Nebraska bill last year?—You did, sir, the same bill now pending here, as a substitute for the bill of the Committee on Territories. I need not say, sir, that the two bills are different; you know that fact too well. Well, sir, when you were debating that bill, did any one discover that the Missouri act was disturbed, or superseded, by inconsistent legislation? No, sir; but my agitating colleague [Mr. GIBBONS] called your attention to the slavery exclusion of this very Territory; he said, to multiply words about it, would weaken the force of that prohibition; and in the face of this language the bill passed by a large majority—eighteen southern gentlemen voting for it.

Mr. Atchison said, in the Senate, while discussing the bill of last session:

"I had two objections to it. One was that the Indian title in that Territory had not been extinguished, or, at least, a very small portion of it had been. Another was the Missouri compromise, or, as it is commonly called, the slavery restriction. It was my opinion at that time—and I am not now very clear on that subject—that the law of Congress, when the State of Missouri was admitted into the Union, excluding slavery from the Territory of Louisiana, north of 36 deg. 30 min. would be enforced in that Territory, unless it was specially rescinded; and, whether that law was in accordance with the Constitution of the United States or not, it would do its work, and that work would be to preclude slaveholders from going into that Territory. But when I came to look into that question, I found that there was no prospect, so long as a repeal of the Missouri compromise excluding slavery from that Territory. Now, sir, I am free to admit, that at this moment, at this hour, and for all time to come, I should oppose the organization or the settlement of that Territory, unless my constituents, and the constituents of the whole South, of the slave States of the Union, could go into it with the same footing, with equal rights and equal privileges, carrying that species of property with them to other people of this Union. Yes, sir, I acknowledge that would have governed me, but I have no hope that the resolution will ever be repealed.

I have always been of opinion that the first great error committed in the political history of this country was the ordinance of 1787, rendering the Northwest Territory free territory. The next great error was the Missouri compromise. But they are both irremediable. There is no remedy for them. We must submit to them. I am prepared to do it. It is evident that the Missouri compromise cannot be repealed. So far as that question is concerned, we might as well agree to the admission of this Territory now as next year, or five or ten years hence."—Congressional Globe, Second Session 32 Con. vol. 26, page 1113.

Sir, I maintain that all this shows the wickedness, the bad faith of this bill. It proves the individuality, the exclusiveness of each, and every one of these slavery compromises—that they were never dependent the one upon the other, but they were each and every one of them, separate and independent adjustments of a great and dangerous question, having application to particular territories clearly defined in each. Originally partaking of the nature of compact, repeated legislation has legitimated them; solemnly and in honesty has the faith of the nation—of political parties—been pledged to their support, and they stand there now, partaking of the nature of great landmarks, sanctified by the approval of the people, and in their nature irrevocable.

What do you gain by a repeal? Is it the removal of any imaginary line which galls the pride of any particular locality. No, sir, else no such struggles to extend it would ever have been made. What then? Do you expect practical results from the repeal? If so, what are they? Make them manifest! I want to see them.

I oppose this bill, sir, for reasons of my own. I oppose it because it is unjust.—You cannot restore the *status quo*. You said that slavery might go south of the line of 36 deg. 30 min. and it went there, because you said it might go, and because northern emigration chooses to go where slavery cannot go. It has peopled the country south of that line, with negroes and their masters. I do not complain of this; it was in the bond. There was Louisiana, she had been already admitted. By your very act, you brought in Missouri. That was in the bond. Then came Arkansas, with her immense territory. Here they are, all of them. You have yet south of the line a strip of Indian country, enough for a State, perhaps. You have the influences around that sufficient to fix the character of the embryo State there, and when the savage is impelled, God knows where, by progress, there comes another slave State. All this is secure. The power is not speculative—it is practical—it is here. Yes, sir, the bond has been filled, the pond of fish has been taken. You have got all that was bargained to you, notwithstanding the bitter taunts of some gentlemen direct at the public faith of the North. *Public faith!* I do not stand here, sir, to defend northern faith. It needs no defense. In every hour of peril, in the darkest days of your legislation, the North has stood up to the Constitution and the Union, with unflinching devotion, with generous concession. What honorable sacrifices were demanded for peace and concord, she has made. What perils were to be encountered, she has met them with an eye single to the glory and prosperity of our common country. I say not the zeal which creates imaginary wrongs, for a basis of complaint and assault upon any portion of our common country. I admit not that tone in the

public sentiment of any locality which finds solace only in the bitter invectives which its representatives direct at fraternal associations. No, sir, as a whole, we are the glory of all lands, and yet our mission is but half accomplished. I say, in the language of others, "conquer your prejudices." Conquer that prejudice of imagination which sees a covert assault in every word spoken on this floor by a northern man, unless, indeed, he sings hosannas to the institution of slavery.

Sir, I have listened with amazement to the denunciations bandied about on this floor. I have heard the citizens of more than one half of your great nation branded as incendiaries, fanatics, and Abolitionists; and gentlemen speak of us as if there were contamination in the associations.

A gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. BARKDALE] the other day, in his remarks here, read from a Vermont statute to show that in one case resistance had been made to the execution of a law of Congress.—Were a drag net cast over the land, and the fulminations of every newspaper writer, every frothy, demagogical stump orator, and every insane preacher brought together, I am not aware, sir, that it would have any other effect than to strengthen the attachment of our people to their Government. They would show only that error, in a free Government, is harmless, so long as truth is left free to combat it.—That we have men of the North who are not friendly to our Government, who are ever-greivous, or who are weak, who does not well know!

But such men are not confined to any single locality, nor was the example quoted by the gentleman the only one furnished by our history where resistance to a law of Congress has been advised and counseled. Far from it, sir. It appears to me, sir, that we have heard in southern States, not many years since, of political battles waged in opposition to these same compromise gentlemen as so anxious to extend—of canvasses where the issue, so far as practical results were concerned, was union or disunion—where the overthrow of our Constitution was openly spoken of, and the consequences of that overthrow calmly contemplated.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, we are yet together. Nationalism, secessionism, and abolitionism, are all here—all represent ed. All shades have been willing to accept of us; and as well they might love the Union as well as they might love it, they have manifested but little hostility, at least, to the benefits it confers. All this, sir, proves that, while we have actual faults, a recurrence to this bickering, this eternal denunciation and complaint is unworthy of us—unworthy of our high position here, and productive of no good to any interest. Such things evince no statesmanship, no liberality, no general or extensive appreciation of the character of our country and its institutions.

But what is the other side of the picture? We were to have all north of 36 deg. 30 min. What have we realized? Iowa; nothing more. But now, when the performance on the one side is complete and ample, it is proposed to remove the restriction and allow slavery to go north of the line, as you had before permitted it to go south of that line. As this would be a concession without a consideration, I for one will have none of it. I will not join in making it.

What can you give the North for this concession? What do you give her?—Can she profit by the vast domain of Texas? Can you disturb the compact you made with her, the fundamental conditions of her annexation? I say you cannot. That compact must stand, though the Missouri compact falls. It is irrevocable.—Texas holds your bond; this bill does not reach her, and you cannot reach her without her consent. Her rights are saved.—Am I right or wrong in this? Let me quote from one now dead. I quote from a speech, sir, that the compromise men in 1850 said saved the Union. I never attributed to it that efficacy, but I always thought it embodied sound logic:

"Now, what is here stipulated, enacted, secured? It is, that all Texas south of 36 deg. 30 min., which is nearly the whole of it, shall be admitted into the Union as a slave State. It was a slave State, and therefore came in as a slave State; and the guarantee is, that new States shall be made out of it, and that such States as are formed out of that portion of Texas lying south of 36 deg. 30 min. may come in as slave States to the number of four, in addition to the State then in existence, and admitted at that time by these resolutions. I know no form of legislation that can strengthen that. I know no mode of recognition that can add a title of weight to it. I listened respectfully to the resolutions of my honorable friend from Tennessee, [Mr. BELL.] He proposed to recognize that stipulation with Texas. But any additional recognition would weaken the force of it, because it stands here on the ground of a contract, a thing done for a consideration. It is a law founded on a contract with Texas, and designed to carry that contract into effect.—A recognition founded not on any consideration or any contract would not be so strong as it now stands on the face of the resolution. Now, I know no way, I candidly confess, in which this Government, acting in good faith, as I trust it always will, can relieve itself, from that stipulation and pledge, by any honest course of legislation whatever. And, therefore, I say again that, so far as Texas is concerned, the whole of Texas south of 36 deg. 30 min., which I suppose embraces all the slave Territory—there is no land, not an acre, the character of which is not established by law, a law which cannot be repealed without the violation of a contract, and plain disregard of the public faith."

So said Mr. Webster in 1850, in his speech on the compromise measures; and he was good authority—that is to say, good compromise authority. I say then, sir, this trade is unequal; and all that we

get for conceding the right to establish slavery in an empire is, the chance of making free territory of a strip thirty miles wide, taken from the Indian Territory south of 36 deg. 30 min. and added by the bill to the proposed Territory of Kansas. I will have no non-interference as such terms.—On the one side, is full performance; on the other, a want of consideration and broken faith.

But, sir, I am told that slavery can never go into these Territories. Then why all this excitement? Are you having all this difficulty about a practical absurdity? Did you mean a hunch, with this bill—repeal in its mouth, and a stamp in its belly? If so, let me say it is presuming a little too much upon the patience of 'high-minded' representatives, to array them before the country as the principal characters in a broad farce. I think the bill has a meaning—that slavery may well go to Kansas; indeed, that it is likely to go there. But, although the Almighty had reared against it impenetrable obstacles, though he had stamped prohibition on every bluff, on every rock, and blade of grass throughout the whole country, I yet would not vote to remove this obstacle of the Missouri exclusion. It ought to stand, sir, for complete performance.—Once you said slavery should not go north of 36 deg. 30 min. It is too late now to say that it may go there.

I am opposed to this bill because it is a trade. I am pledged against agitation. When I gave in my adhesion to the Baltimore platform, I made no promise to this or to break to the last. I was sincere. I was elected on that platform, discussed it, and vindicated it against the assaults of Free Soilers, and of Whigs, too, who attacked our work, while spitting upon their own. I thought, sir, that I saw in that platform, practical good. I took the platform of the two parties, and I argued that upon this slavery question they were both right. That this great and absorbing question of slavery had received its quietus; that it was banished from the halls of Congress forever. Yes, sir, I said forever, and I held it forever.—Vain word, Mr. Chairman, now dwindled in significance to the brief span of a "bitterly's" existence! I said, sir, that every foot of territory to be affected by the question was already under compromise, that shut out further action; that henceforth we had an open sea, and pain still.

Well, sir, or say I do, except the Free Soilers, held this language. We were believed, trusted, and assumed. And why were we so assumed? Because, sir, the people were worried, sick, and disgusted with agitation. They wanted repose. Gentleman make a sad mistake if they suppose that the triumph of 1832 was the triumph of men only. It was more than that; it was the triumph of a principle of non-resistance. Established by the people, because they wanted repose, the faith, the honor, the character of the party depend upon the faith that execution of the law. I thought a share in memory to the world. I stood with many who have made their marks upon this question, the faith I pledged I will redeem. I said I would give no countenance to agitation, and I do not intend in the first instance to give ground to enact a deliberate falsehood. Well, sir, we came in here, and heard no word of this repeal. Every body deprecates agitation. The author of the Senate bill reported against agitation and repeal. The President was against agitation. The Union was against agitation and repeal.—And so we went on swimmingly. But presto! The change that came over the spirits of our dream, was far from pleasant; and this question, sprung upon us like a fire-bell in the night, disturbed and dispelled all our visions of peace.

Sir, though repeal now is expedient; when it was wrong thirty months ago—though party tests have been spoken of—I will be true to my pledge not to agitate. I recognize no man's right to make tests for me. I will not submit to this as a party test; I have a title of influence. I repudiate its use; and as I will neither submit to it as a test, nor suffer myself to be driven from the party upon it, I shall leave others to recommend their course with their party, and treat this question as one outside of party requirements, and of interest to the whole country. But I say, sir, that this Nebraska bill violates the faith we pledged, as Democrats, to the country.

Sir, I beg to ask honorable gentlemen, what is proposed to be gained by this repeal? What do you effect, if you do not simply grant to slavery the right to go north of 36 deg. 30 min.? We have all heard, sir, of ground taken and abandoned with regard to this bill; of superabundant set-up, and inconsistency, substantiated for it, of non-interference, sustained by a direct repeal of a local law. Yes, sir, we have seen all this, and yet some of us are not satisfied. We want a reason, a well-grounded, well-defined reason for this agitation. Have you any other than that which I have stated? You say, sir, you have—at least, honorable gentlemen here say they have. What is it, sir? I believe gentlemen say we must do this thing to harmonize our legislation—no, to render it consistent on this question. We are told that legislation of 1850 embodied certain great principles—established a great precedent, which, if we would restore a constitutional government, we must perpetuate. In our legislation that we have heretofore grouped in the dark, waded in the slough of ignorance and folly, and that we must now undo our work, and joint and dare not undo, until we make a harmonious whole of the matter. Now, sir, what is it worth? What practical good is there in it? Will it pay?

Harmonious? When will you have it on the slavery question? How, you ever harmonized on it since the ordinance of 1787 was born? Yes, or, sir? And you never will harmonize again—that the evils of a slave population.

(Concluded on fourth page.)