THE OHIO UNION.

VOL. VIII. ASHLAND, OHIO, WEDNESDAY MORNING, MAY 3, 1854. NO. 50.

THE OHIO UNION.

THE UNION is published every Wednesday morning in the town of Ashland, Ashland county, Ohio,

BY J. SHERIDAN.

Office on Main Street, over Robert McMahan's Store.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The Union will be furnished to subscribers at the rate of two dollars per annum, if payment be made before 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 discontinuance 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, 11 lines or less, 3 weeks or less	$1 00
Every subsequent insertion	37
One square, 3 months	3 00
One square 6 months	5 00
One square one year	9 00
One fourth column one year	12 00
One third column one year	17 00
One half column per year	20 00
Two thirds column one year	25 00
Three fourths column one year	30 00
One column per year	35 00

Advertisements, to insure insertion, should be handed in by Monday evening. The number of insertion should always be designated—otherwise advertisements 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. CURTISS.....PROBATE JUDGE.
JOHN SHERIDAN.....CLERK OF C. C. PLEAS.
ALEX. PORTER.....PROSECUTING ATTORNEY.

COUNTY OFFICERS.

ISAAC GATES.....AUDITOR.
JAMES W. BOYD.....TREASURER.
JOHN D. JONES.....SHERIFF.
ASA S. REED.....RECORDER.
ORLOW SMITH.....SURVEYOR.
JOHN G. BROWN.....CORONER.
GEORGE McCONNELL, LUKE SELBY, AMOS HILBORN, } COMMISSIONERS.
DAVID BRYTE, PATRICK KELLEY, WILSON HOTDORF, } INFIRMARY DIRECTORS.

SCHOOL EXAMINERS.

GEORGE W. HILL.....ASHLAND.
ORLOW SMITH....." "
J. McCORMICK.....LOUDONVILLE.

BOROUGH OFFICERS.

JOHN H. McCOMBS.....MAYOR.
WILLIAM RALSTON.....RECORDER.
J. W. KINNAMAN.....TREASURER.
ALLEN DRAKE.....MARSHALL.
JACOB HILDERBRAND, MATHEW CLUGSTON, M. H. MANSFIELD, JACOB KRIECHBAUM, } TRUSTEES.

HOTELS.

MILLER HOUSE:

THE subscriber begs leave to announce that he has opened a Hotel, to be called the "Miller House," directly opposite the Sampsell House, Main Street, Ashland, and respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. M. MILLER.
Ashland, March 22nd, 1854.—844.—tf.

EMPIRE HOUSE,
AKRON, O.
G. RAYNOLDS, Proprietor.
Akron, Jan. 18, 1854.—839 tf.

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 a call. DAVID RICE.
Jeromeville, Nov. 26, 1853. 26tf.

FRANKLIN HOUSE.

HAVING leased the above named House for a term of years, the undersigned respectfully solicits a share of the public patronage. No pains will be spared to make comfortable all those who may favor him with a call. WILLIAM ROBINSON.
Ashland, Nov. 23, 1853. 26tf

FULLER HOUSE.

JOSEPH DEYARMAN, having again taken the above House, will be prepared to accommodate all his old friends who may favor him with a call.
Loudonville, Nov 23d, 1853. 26tf

LAWYERS.

COOPER K. WATSON, Tiffin, Ohio. | GEORGE H. PARKER, Ashland, Ohio.

WATSON & PARKER,
Atty's and Counsellors at Law and Sol'rs in Chancery;

HAVING formed a copartnership, will give prompt attention to all business entrusted to their care in this and surrounding counties. Office in the room lately occupied by the County Treasurer.
Ashland, Nov. 23d, 1853. 26tf

SOLIVER W. KELLOGG. | WILLIAM S ALLISON.

KELLOGG & ALLISON,
Attorneys at Law and Solicitors in Chancery;

WILL attend to all professional business entrusted to their care, in this and adjoining counties.
Ashland, Nov. 23d 1853. 26tf

JAMES W. SMITH. | JAMES SLOAN.

SMITH & SLOAN,
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law;

OFFICE over Empire Store of J. R. Squire. Business in this and neighboring counties promptly attended to.
Ashland, Nov. 23d, 1853. 26tf

THOS. J. KENNY. | ALEX. PORTER.

KENNY & PORTER,
Atty's and Counsellors at Law.

WILL attend promptly to all business entrusted to their care in this and adjoining counties. Office on corner of Main and Church streets.
Ashland Nov. 23d, 1853. 26tf

JOHN S. FULTON. | JOHN H. M'COMBS.

FULTON & McCOMBS,
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law;

OFFICE on Main street, over the Grocery Store of J. & R. Freer, Ashland, Ashland County, Ohio.
November 23d, 1853. 26tf

THOMAS J. BULL,

ATTORNEY AT LAW and Justice of the Peace, Loudonville, Ashland County, Ohio.
November 23d, 1853. 26tf

PHYSICIANS.

P. H. CLARK, M. D.,

OFFICE at his 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 23d, 1853. 26tf

DR. THOMAS HAYES,
Practitioner of Medicine and Surgery;

SAVANNAH, Ashland County, Ohio. Also, Justice of the Peace and Notary Public.
November 23d, 1853. 26tf

JEWELERS, &c.

I. R. GOODFELLOW,

WATCH MAKER AND JEWELER, Dealer in Watches, Jewelry, Clocks, Yankee Notions, &c. Watches and Clocks repaired and warranted. Highest price paid for old Gold and Silver. Opposite the Sampsel House,
Ashland, Ohio. 30tf Dec 14, 1853.

WILLIAM RALSTON,

WATCH AND CLOCK MAKER, Post Office Building, Main street, Ashland, Ohio. Gold and Steel Pens, and a choice variety of Jewelry, kept constantly on hand.
November 23d, 1853. 26tf

C. A. HUMES,
Manufacturer of Boots and Shoes;

THREE doors below the Times Printing Office, Ashland, Ohio. Custom Work done to order on the shortest notice and most reasonable terms.
December 14th, 1853. 30

ASCENT OF MOUNT POPOCATAPEL.

The following is an extract of a letter published in an English paper, from Hon. Gerard Noel, M P., dated Mexico, Jan. 2, 1854 and describing his successful attempt to ascend, Popocatapel, in the depth of winter:

I returned yesterday from an expedition to Popocatapetal, the highest mountain in North America, 17,060 feet above the level of the sea. I believe there is no record of an ascent before at this season of the year, although it has been frequently done in May and June. The first night of our ascent we slept at a hut at the line where vegetation ceases, and perpetual snow commences; and at a quarter past five the next morning, we started for the summit, one of the guides leading. At eight o'clock I found myself 100 yards ahead of the rest of the party, (consisting of four,) at nine out of sight of the party altogether, and at eleven o'clock I reached the crater. The crater is a vast basin, three miles in circumference, and 900 feet deep; in some parts perpendicular, in others great masses of projecting rock form bold and stupendous outlines, with enormous icicles hanging from every point. The volcano itself has long since ceased to show any signs of eruption. I began to feel very much be numbed with cold, and my eyes suffered a good deal from the glare of the snow. I should have been very glad of something to eat, having had nothing but a cup of coffee and biscuit before leaving the hut; but the guide who carried the breakfast had remained with the others who had not come up. Having examined the crater for about a quarter of an hour, I told the guide who had persevered with me, to lead the away up to the top. The fellow declared it was impossible: but not intending, as you may imagine, to give it up (having come for) without any push, I started for the top alone. I was now only able to take three steps at a time without stopping, as my legs began to give way, and I had oppression of the head and chest. A little after 1 P. M., I reached the top, and enjoyed one of the finest views conceivable of the great valley of Mexico, and looking down on the twin volcano (I forget the Mexican name but in English it means the White Lady, from its top resembling a woman lying at full length,) seemingly miles below me, but actually only about 2,000 feet. The cold was too intense for to remain more than ten minutes to the top, and I commenced the descent to the crater. By this time the mountain was enveloped in clouds and I could see nothing distinctly, so I commenced a further descent, and in a few minutes came in sight of the pole of Mr. S—e (one of my *compagnons de voyage*,) and soon after of himself lying down black in the face, and wishing to be let alone to die. A little lower down I saw Mr. C——d, rolling about like a drunken man but still, with undoubted pluck, struggling to reach the summit, at the rate of about a yard in three minutes. However, after a little rest and encouragement, they both rallied, and returned with them as far as the crater, but no human effort could get them any higher. I attribute my being able to reach the top to my wind: I never felt want of breath at any time, while the others blew like porpoises. In our descent from the crater we encountered the only real danger. At first the snow was good walking, but as we come lower, where the sun makes a sheet of ice of the surface of the snow, it became so slippery that we frequently lost our footing, as if, after a slip, you get to much impetus that you can't stop yourself, the certainty is that you arrive at the bottom in much the same condition as the man who jumped from the monument. At one time I almost gave myself up. However, no accident did happen though it makes me creep to think of the slips I took. At five P. M., with my hands cut to pieces, nails worn to the quick with holding on, I reached the hut, and there got my breakfast glad to think it was over, hungry as forty hours' abstinence and battling with 17,000 feet of mountain snow and ice could make me.—One of my eyes is completely "bunged up," the other just enables me to write this. My face is a mass of raw flesh and blisters; but I have the satisfaction of having perched upon a higher mountain than exists in Europe, and climbed 2500 feet nearer to heaven than Albert Smith.

Crime in Ohio in 1853.

We have gathered from the report of Attorney General Pugh, for the year ending on the 1st of December, the following interesting statistics.

In convictions for crimes, seven have been for murder in the second degrees' twenty for manslaughter, nine for rape, one for bigamy, five for arson, thirty-four for burglary, ten for assault, with intent to murder, two with intent to ravish, two with intent to rob, forty-three for grand larceny, of which the "State of Hamilton" furnished seventeen, seven for robbery, three for forgery, seventeen counterfeiters, two for malicious shooting, and four for malicious stabbing, seventeen horse thieves, and several for other crimes. Altogether, the prisoners were sentenced last year to 185 years imprisonment—and seven of the prisoners for life. These prosecutions cost the State $14,999,83. The number of acquittals for crimes was 93; the nolle prosequis 112; of the former were three cases of indictments for murder in the first degree.

The convictions for misdemeanors by which we mean petit larceny, assaults, &c., were 1548, acquittals and nolles 645.—There are some 100 indictments for crimes and misdemeanors now pending, among them five cases for murder in the first degree, not including one or two cases now in error, or determined since Mr. Pugh's report was made out.

This report differs very little from that of the year 1852, when the prisoners in all were sentenced to 229 years, and six imprisoned for life, and three capital convictions.

[From the Plough, Loom, and Anvil.]

GRUBS IN PEACH TREES.—SHORTENING IN.

It has become a fact pretty well established, that soils and climate adapted to the growth of the peach are to be found, in greater or less extent, in nearly every portion of the country. This is seen in the exhibition of beautiful peaches so often witnessed in our cold New England, hitherto celebrated mostly for its production of ice, rocks, and men. Scarcely an agricultural or horticultural fair was held last autumn in which this fruit did not claim a conspicous position, and attract the admiration and wonder of the spectators. Many, from what they saw at these conventions, will undoubtedly be induced to try their fortunes in the business, and we sincerely hope it will be with satisfactory results, for we would gladly see so delicious and healthful a fruit placed abundantly within the reach of every body.

We have alluded to the success attending the peach culture, (which we admit, is now carried in a very small, yet promising way,) in New England, supposing that if it succeeded in these States its success must be nearly certain in every State of the Union.

Yet, as sure indications as the peach may have given of its adaptedness to a wide range of territory, there are obstacles to be contended with in order to insure for it satisfactory results. Among these the grub, so perpetual in its annoyance, and so fatal in its operations, furnishes one of the least formidable. So far as our observation has extended, it slyly secrets itself in the earth untill age and strength have armed it to the teeth for mischief, when it insinuates its way into the tree, under the darkness and cover of earth, where it noiselessly works on in its mission of destruction, untill its errand is complete.

Different methods have been pursued to cut off the march of this desolater of beautiful verdure and heart-gladdening fruits, each productive of different results. Among the many which have been brought to our notice, none has higher claims for simplicity and facility of application than one casually mentioned a day or two since. It was, simply to take a rag, of sufficient size, and wind it around the collar of the tree, not too tight, of course when setting out. The rag should be of sufficent size to extend quite up to the surface, and the lower it extends to the roots the better. If, in course of years, it wastes away, as it naturally must, a new one is easly replaced by removing the earth. We have been credibly informed that, when at any time the earth is displaced and the rag removed, the bark exhibits a soundness and freshness nowhere to be found but in vigorous and healthful trees.

Since we are upon the subject of peach trees, we may as well suggest a hint upon our favorite and successful process of shortening in. It is well known that the tree as a native of warm climates. Consequently it pushes its growth to the full extent of our short seasons, leving the latter growth wholly immature and unable to withstand the mildest severity of winter. Of course, the extremity of the branches is almost uniformly winter-killed. We only attest to the experience of others when we say that we have found a fully remunerating benefit in shortening in the branches, a process that may be safely performed at any time previous to the flow of sap in the spring. We thin and shorten in every twig, untill we are sure it is reduced so much that none but healthy wood remains. In this way the sap goes to work in healthful and vigorous vessels, and no impediment remains to its free circulation and rapid appropriation to the nourishment or new branches and the fruit.

Yours, truly, WILLIAM BACON.

ECLIPSES FOR THE YEAR.

In the year 1854 there will be two eclipses of the Sun, and two of the moon.

1. The Moon will be partially eclipsep on the 12th of May, beginning at 10h. 52m. A. M., consequently invisible to us.

2. There will be an annular eclipse of the Sun on the 26th of May, visible as follows.

Beginning at 4h. 10m.; greatest obscuration 4h. 26m.; and 6h. 34m. P. M.

Eclipse begins 147 degrees 52 minutes from vertex to the right.

Digits, eclipsed 10¼ on the Northern Limb.

The line of Central and Annular Eclipse passes through a portion of the northern part of the United States and southern part British America.

This will be the largest eclipse visible in the United States untill the year 1900, when the Sun will be totally eclipsed, the center passing near Washington.

3. A partial eclipse of the Moon will occur on the 4th of November, at 4h. 11m. P. M., invisible. The Moon will rise with a slight shade on its Northern Limb.

4. The Sun will be thtally eclipsed on the 20th of November, the middle occurring at 5h. 14m. A. M., invisible. This eclipse will be central and total in the southern part of Africa, South America, and the Southern Ocean.

☞ A poetical young gentleman, while alone in our village Church the other day, under the influence of highly devotional feeling, delivered himself of the following sublime verses, which betrays more genius and wit, than sympathy for our fallen race:

"I stand again,
Oh! sacred fane,
Beneath thy turret high,
Conscious that all,
By Adam's fall,
Are fond of apple pie."

The deacon "remained" after the services on the following Sabbath, and summoning the 'Nine' to his assistance, wrote directly underneath:

Men to this temple should resort,
In prayer their time to pass;
But some appear to come for sport,
With too much *apple sauce*.

THE NEBRASKA AND KANSAS BILL.

SPEECH OF HON. GEORGE BLISS, OF OHIO,

Delivered in the House of Representatives April 18, 1854.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. BLISS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is my desire to say enough upon the Senate bill for the organization of the Territories of Nebraka and Kansas to exhibit the reasons for the vote which I intend to give upon that measure. And as I know that upon that subject the opinion of a highly intelligent and soundly Democratic constituency, I feel no embarrassment in declaring my opposition to what the whole country regards as the most importants features of the bill.

The objectionable clause regulating suffrage in the proposed Territories, contained in what is known as the Clayton amendment, finds so little favor in this body, that it seems unnecessary for me to consume time in its discussion; but I shall notice it incidentally in the course of my remarks.

My purpose is principally to consider the proposal to repeal the slavery restriction contained in the act of 1820, known as the Missouri compromise. If I did not oppose this policy, I should be under the humiliating necessity of regarding myself as an unfaithful Democrat; false not only to a higher beneficial measure, which by the general voice of the nation, has been held sacred, beyond the touch of legislation, for more than a third of a century but false also to the last great pledge of my party to the country in 1852 that the laws then in force, without addition or change, should be and remain a final adjustment of the slavery question. The pledge then deliberately made against further agitation of the subject in Congress or out of it, applies, with the only real force it was intended to have, to those who are *in* Congress, forbidding all action to disturb any existing compromise or settlement; and constituting an honorable bar to the legislation now proposed. Other gentlemen think differently. I do not arraign their motives. I speak of my own obligations and duties as they appear to my own judgment.

Sir, there is too much weight of character in the dominant political party to admit of its shuffling thus suddenly from one position to an opposite one, while circumstances remain unchanged; and whatever individuals may feel constrained to do, the Democratic of the nation will maintain the ground upon which they so signally triumphed over sectionalism and fanaticism in the great canvass which placed the present Administration in power. Vacillation in policy is not the vice of that party; and thought the many thousands of Democrats who verily believed that the four years of this Administration would glide smoothly away, without a renewal of the slavery controversy, are butterly disappointed at the throwing of this firebrand among them, yet their virtuous consistency will be their safeguard. They will exorcise the storm fiened and allay the tempest.

But I have something more to say about the Baltimore resolutions of 1852. Both the great parties of the country assembled, nearly at the same time, to put in nomination their respective candidates for the presidency. Both had experienced enough of the profitless quarrel upon the subject of slavery, to force upon them a uniform sentiment with respect to it however much they might differ in other matters. It is true that many of the leading politicians of the Whig party at the North denounced their platform while they labored for the election of their candidate. But the Democracy came up at once to the support of *their* platform, with its finality clause.—Those among them who thought there were faults in the compromise measures of 1850, especially in the fugitive slave law, which ought to be corrected, smothered their objections for the sake of harmony. All prejudices were sacrificed on the altar of the general good. The happy effect of such patriotic action was very soon perceived. Democracy triumphed everywhere. The Whigs were sorely rebuked for their infidelity. Abolitionism became powerless. The greatest agitation king in the land might well have exclaimed with the afflicted Moor, "Othello's occupation's gone." Until the advent of this injudicious bill, *finality* was the word. It was heard on all the hills of New England, and through all the prairies of the West. It stands now the recorded language of the Administration. The democracy of Ohio, assembled in convention on the 8th of January 1854, affirmed it with great unanimity—echoing back the voice which just before that time reached them from Washington.

Sir, a great change has occured in the aspect of affairs—a change sudden and unlooked for. We are astounded at finding ourselves in the midst of a seething agitation. The dogs of war are baying around us, and the wild spirit of discord is poisoning the very air. The value of the policy established in 1852 is more apparent, now that the consequences of an attempt to depart from it are seen, than it ever was before. Yet we are urged to kick our platform from under us, and drop down into the mud and slime of a hateful contest, which, however it may eventuate, offers us nothing better to be gained than an impaired character for political consistency.

Sir, it appears to me peculiarly appropriate that the South should make her voice heard upon the right side of this question. The Missouri compromise was with her a favorite measure; and I know of no party more interested than she in the keeping of such compacts. Her entire interest in negro slavery, and the facilities for protecting that interest, have been secured to her by compromises—beginning with the compromises of the Constitution, about which so much has been said, and ending with the compromise of 1850. Those compromises which guarantee rights to the South, the men with whom I act at the North, have ever held most sacred. We have preached about their sacredness till we were hoarse. Not to meet the North with corresponding faith, would be to invite an assault from those who held these compromise in lower estimation. Let the South, then, and the North, perform the honorable act of standing by their engagements, and protecting sectional faith. I am happy to know that there are gentlemen on this floor, from southern States, who are determined to do it. It is well. The Missouri compromise is an arbiter of peace, fraternity, concord. It calmed the trouble waters of strife in times past, and affords thest assurance of unity and prosperity in time to come.

There is a class of men who profess to support this bill upon the ground that the abolition of the Missouri line, as a boundary between free and slave territory, will operate prejudicially to the slave interest, by setting aside all amicable adjustments, and leaving parties to contend for every inch of ground hereafter, when States formed out of Texas shall propose to come into the Union with slavery; and, in fact whenever and wherever the opportunity for such controversy shall be presented. And this upon the ground that, if the Missouri compromise shall fall, all others will be held to have fallen with it. I say there is a class of men in the country who profess to desire the passage of the bill for such reasons. They are not avowed Abolitionists, and therefore I doubt their sincerity. But if they are cincere, I cannot sympathize with their designs. If I were one of that factious class of politicians, and proposed to subsist only upon the pabulum of sectional strife, I might entertain such an argument; for the consequences they forsee are more that likely to follow. But as a Democrat, I repudiate it altogether. I recognize fully the constitutional rights of the South, and whenever *outside* of the Constitution, conflicting in interests, or claims of interest, have been settled upon terms to which the nation has assented, I desire settlements to be observed in good faith, and never violently disturbed. What the South has lawfully got let her keep or surrender, as her own conscience or interest may determine; and the equivalents which she has deliberately given, let her not seek to retract.

We ought to provide against unnecessary war, rather than to sit down and calculate its results. If we would do this, we have but to recognize the sovereignty of the people, and bow down before their clearly manifested will. It must be a morbid taste which can find anything agreeable in the anticipation of a controversy like that which this bill invokes; to which no end is promised, except in that possible disruption of the Confederacy which some gentlemen apprehend much more than I do, but which I will admit to be quite probable, when they can prove that its preservation in 1854 requires the destruction of the very appliance which saved it in 1820.

Sir, you will recollet when this measure was introduced, it was claimed by its author not to be an act of affirmative legislation, for it was argued that the Missouri compromise had already been, in effect, abrogated by the compromise measures of 1850; and, probably, because nobody in the world had been wise enough to discover it, he undertook to declare that fact. Legislative construction may make law, but it ought to be truthful and reasonable. However, the weakness of this assumption was so obvious that it has been abandoned; we are now asked to repeal it out right, because its longer continuance is not consistent with the *spirit* and *principle* of the law of 1850. This shift does not help the case. For wherein the inconsistency can truly be affirmed, no man has been, or ever will be, able to show. Did the Congress of 1850 suppose that it was establishing a principle which must lead to a change in all the legislation then in force creating territorial governments? The Territory of Oregon had been organized with the slavery restriction; Minnesota with the same. And even after the compromise measures of 1850 were passed, the Territory of Washington was formed out of of the limits of Oregon, and the restriction within it left in full force. According to this argument, that was all wrong. It was contrary to a great principle which had been established without anybody knowing it. Aqueer principle that. It's birth will be registered in the family record of humbugs, as of 1854, and not of 1850.

But to the point. By the time the proper laws shall have been passed to let the light of this principle shine upon all these Territories, there many have been agitation enough to make politicians desire to rest from their labors. If not, when the anticipated brood of new States shall be hatched from Texas, there will, as all the lovers of turmoil foresee, be an opportunity to continue it by a fierce contest over their admission into the Union with slavery. Then it will be convenient for agitators, whose numbers and strength will be somewhat increased, to know that no faith attaches to these legislative compacts with regard to slavery. The South will insist that the compact (she will call it by that name) with Texas shall be kept. The North asks only the same thing with reference to Nebraska. The South should render the faith she intends to exact.

Sir, if there were an abyss of dark and and unknown depths before us, it would be prudent to turn aside and shun it; but in truth, it lies far aside from our path, and we are deviating from our course to drop into it. The laws of 1850 will not drive us there. The Baltimore platform will not. It does not require us to *unsettle* all things to prove that all things are *settled* and to remain so; nor to plunge the country into an endless *agitation* to prove that *non-agitation* is our policy. I cannot understand the logic by which such an idea is practically taught. Nor, to venture upon another use of an illustration which has been quoted here can I see the same thing, at short intervals, in the likeness of a camel, then of a weasel, and then of a whale, because it may please the Lord Hamlet to assert such contradictions.

But, sir, what is that principle which was established in 1850, and now requires the repeal of the Missouri compromise, and legislation to do away the slavery prohibitions in existing Territories? It is defined in this bill to be "non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories." Nobody ever thought of interfering with slavery in the States and the idea that Congress in 1850 intended to adopt, or did adopt, a new rule as to legislation upon the subject of slavery in Territories incompatible with laws then and now existing, is proved to be untrue by reference to the acts to organize New Mexico and Utah, in which acts alone such rule is claimed to have been established. People not familiar with the subject will be surprised to learn that there is no power in the Legislature, either of New Mexico or Utah, to pass any law, without the assent of Congress, upon supervision. Let us see how congressional non-intervention, in general, is established in these Territories. The third section of the act "to establish a territorial government for New Mexico," provides for the appointment of a Governor by the President, who is to hold his office for four years, who "shall approve all laws passed by the Legislative Assembly before they shall take effect." Section seventh provides that "the legislative power of the Territory shall extend to all rightful subjects consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act," and concludes with these words: "All the laws passed by the Legislative Assembly and Governor shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States, and, if disapproved, shall be null and of no effect." The law organizing Utah, in these respects, is the same. There is no provision relating to slavery in either. But it is provided that they may hereafter come into the Union as States, with or without it, as the people, in framing their State constitutions, shall elect. These Territories are vested with no new powers of legislation as to slavery, or any other subject. The same powers were delegated to Oregon and Minesota before compromise of 1850, and to Washington afterwards. And, if I am not mistaken, the same have been gives to all Territories that have ever been created—except that the restriction upon the exercise of the powers professedly granted are less in some other Territories than in New Mexico and Utah. Slavery is prohibited in Oregon and Washington by the terms of the Oregon act which is let in force in Washington; in Minnesota, also, by this same Missouri compromise. When is the repeal of those prohibitions to be urged?

Sir, I desire it to be kept in mind, that the leading reason set up for abolishing the Missouri compromise is, that it conflicts with the principle of the territorial acts of 1850. It is claimed, and by many supposed, that the restrictive section of the Missouri law was totally annulled in that part of Texas over which it had been extended by the joint resolutions and which was incorporated into the Territory of New Mexico. But how was it annulled? Certainly not if express words; nor, as it appears to me, by any fair implication.—When a state shall be formed, it may be disregarded; but until then it must remain in full force, unless hereafter repealed.—This celebrated principle, therefore is merely imaginary; and it would be better, instead of setting up an unfounded claim to precedent for this bill, to openly eschew the Baltimore platform, and demand a new and different policy. But I sum up this argument upon principle in behalf of the bill, and find it stands thus: the establishment of a *new* principle consists in the continuance of an *old* one; and congressional non-intervention in a particular branch of legislation in a Territory consists in the exercise, of complete supervision and control of *all* the legislation of such Territory.

It is gravely contended that the Missouri compromise ought to be repealed, because Congress refused, in 1850, after the acquisition of territory from Mexico, to extend the separating line to the Pacific ocean. There does not appear to be any force in the suggestion. Parties certainly are not bound, either in law or honor, to make a bargain because they made one long ago; nor is the one actually made avoidable in law or honor, because one of the parties refuses to make another. So, a law of Congress, or compact made in 1820, loses none of its force because Congress or the parties refused, in 1850, to make one of like terms, relating to a different subject. But the principle—the *principle!* responds this vain casuistry, should be either abandoned or carried to the utmost extent. To this I reply what has been well said, and should be obvious to every one, that there is no principle involved in the Missouri compromise, nor in the laws of 1850, if they be a compromise, nor in any other specific compromise whatever. And I say this as a further, and, in itself conclusive answer to the argument in favor of this bill, founded upon the pretense of a principle, which constitutes nine tenths of the whole of it.

Sir, a compromise is an adjustment of claims or differences made by the mutual concessions of the parties in interest. They yield something to each other, in order to reach a medium ground of conciliation. Neither of them believes the result to be entirely consistent with his rights, but he accepts it to avoid further controversy. The contract by which the particular matter in dispute was adjusted, although its violation involves extraordinary turpitude, furnishes no rule to govern other transactions between the same parties.

Let us see how the Missouri compromise originated. The slave States claimed a right to insist that she should be admitted only with freedom to all her inhabitants. Both parties stood, for a time, upon their respective claims of right, and Missouri remained out of the Union. After a long controversy, they *compromised*; they settled the question by an agreement which was, that Missouri should be admitted as a slave State, and, as an equivalent to the free States for this concession, it was further agreed that the residue of the Louisiana Territory, out of which Missouri had been formed, north of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude, should be forever free; that slavery should there be forever prohibited. This was a specific arrangement, settling the question in dispute, and nothing else; applying to the country which is now proposed to be erected into the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas, and to no other country in the world.

Another compromise, entirely independent of the former, was made when Texas was admitted into the Union, by which four additional States were to be formed out of her limits—those south of 36 deg. 30 min. to come into the Union with or without slavery, at their election; and in that part of Texas north of 36 deg. 30 min. slavery to be forever prohibited. The Missouri line was adopted in this instance, not because there was any peculiar virtue in it, or because any principle appertained to it, but because conformity to a line then existing of the same kind, was a matter of convenience. Texas was a slaveholding country, and, therefore, the application of the prohibition to a portion of her territory, slavery lost ground; but was very soon much more than indemnified, as we shall directly see.

Last of all came the compromise measures of 1850, by which that prohibition in the larger part of that portion of Texas north of 36 deg. 30 min., which is made a part of New Mexico, may be superseded by forming slave States, and by which, also, the right to erect all Utah and New Mexico into slave States is guaranteed, while in the smaller portion of northern Texas the prohibition remains entirely unimpaired. Now, any one can see that these transactions were independent of each other, and not upon any principle whatever; and that one is of no higher authority than another.

The consideration to the North for all this was, that California should be admitted, according to the wishes of her own people, with the free constitution which they had formed. The North had to buy for her the right—not the *right*, but the privilege—of coming into the Union. This was the grand feature of the compromise. Thus we have one free State from the Mexican territory. All the rest may be made into slave States, or not, as circumstances shall determine. From Louisiana, as originally acquired, four slave States have been formed—Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas. Four more, to be created by a division of Texas, make eight. Only one free State from that territory—Iowa—has been formed. Now, sir, it appears to me, the South has got enough, without violating any compromise.

Sir, I have noticed that the meager support which is given to this measure in most parts of the country, is upon the assumption that congressional non-intervention in the governmental affairs of the Territories, is its characteristic virtue; that it commits the power of legislation and government directly to the people. Certain phraseology in the bill, which has been used with liberal additions in speeches and newspapers, is calculated to induce such an impression, and enforce an appeal to the favorite idea of popular sovereignty which prevails particularly in the North.

Let us see if this is not all a delusion—if there is any such thing in the bill. Are the people to elect their Governor? No. Their judges? No. Nor their secretary, nor their attorney, nor their marshal. All these officers are to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, which is one branch of Congress. The Governor, secretary, and marshal are liable to be removed at the President's will. Are the people to have an unshackled power of legislation? No. The Governor to be appointed, and removable as aforesaid, is to be armed with the veto power; and if he shall see fit to exercise it upon a bill that may have passed, the concurrence of two-thirds of both branches of the Legislature will be necessary to make it a law. The Governor may exercise this high power without peril to his official station through the displeasure of the people; for his responsibility is not to them, and they have no power over him. I do not say that the President and Senate will not make good appointments, nor that the Governor will improperly exercise his power; but I do say, that in all this system, there is not much of that vaunted power of "self government" with which this bill is glorified by its advocates.

Again, no power of legislation is proposed to be given to Nebraska and Kansas, which has not been given to existing Territories and former ones, except the power to legislate upon the subject of slavery. That is new. It was not given by the compromise of 1850. It is not in accordance with any precedent, but a peculiarity of this bill. Now, to be candid and fair in this discussion, I must admit, that if freedom from congressional intervention, self-government, popular sovereignty, (I believe it has no more names,) consists in the power to make slaves, then I am wrong, and the bill is what it is claimed by its advocates to be. But I desire to know how it is, that the cause of self government in the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas is to be promoted by a restriction of the right of suffrage. If the foregoing definition is to be taken as true, it is simple enough; but otherwise, it is a very knotty question. Heretofore persons having made their declaration of intention to become citizens of the United States, and taken the prescribed oath, have been permitted to vote in Territories. But in Nebraska and Kansas, where such institutions powers are given to the people, a less liberal rule is to

[Concluded on fourth page.]