THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL. MEMPHIS, THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1860. VOLUME XI.—NUMBER 152.

Daily Appeal.

VETO OF THE HOMESTEAD BILL.

We print on the first page of this morning, an original message from the President, communicating to Congress the reasons for withholding his approval from the bill (already passed by the two houses, commonly known as the homestead bill) entitled "An act to secure homesteads to actual settlers on the public domain, and for other purposes," expanded to use on the 30th inst.

This bill gives to every citizen of the United States, "who is the head of a family," and to every person of foreign birth residing in the country, who has declared his intention to become a citizen, though he may not be the head of a family, the privilege of appropriating to himself one hundred and sixty acres of Government land, to be held free of cost upon it for five years; and should his residence continue until the end of this period, he shall then receive a patent for the payment of twenty-five cents per acre, or one-fifth of the present Government price. During this time the land is protected from all the debts of the settler.

The bill also contains a cession to the States of all the public lands within their respective limits "which have been subject to sale at private entry, and which remain unsold for the space of thirty years." This provision embraces a present donation to the States of many millions, two hundred and thirty-one thousand seven hundred and thirty-one acres, which, from time to time, transfer to them a body of such land which, from peculiar circumstances, may not be absorbed by private purchase and settlement.

To the actual settler, this bill does not make a absolute donation; but the price is so small that it gives to every "head of a family" or adult person, twenty-five cents per acre; half another; this is not to be paid until the end of five years, it is, in fact, reduced to about eighteen cents per acre, or one sixth of the present minimum price of Government lands. To the States, it is an absolute and unqualified gift.

This state of the facts raises the question whether Congress, under the Constitution, has a right to give away the public lands either to States or individuals. On this question, I present a decided opinion in my message to the House of Representatives, of the 24th February, returning the agricultural colleges bill. My opinion remains unchanged. The President says, "clearly proper in the exercise of the power to dispose of the public lands by way of donation, as this bill does, as the bill does and as all bills of a character intended for the benefit of the public have been." Such, I do not, with all the respect I bear for the President, I do not think, the Constitution, the argument, taken in connection with the message vetoing the agricultural college bill, in which the President says, clearly proves that he does not consider the Constitution a warrant for the gift of the public lands by way of donation, as this bill does, and as all bills of a character intended for the benefit of the public have been. Such, I do not, with all the respect I bear for the President, I do not think, the argument, taken in connection with the message vetoing the agricultural college bill, in which the President says, clearly proves that he does not consider the Constitution a warrant for the gift of the public lands by way of donation, as this bill does, and as all bills of a character intended for the benefit of the public have been.

The President, then, finds it inexpedient to give land to an agricultural college, and yet he finds no difficulty in giving it to a class of persons who, as he says, are the benefit of the public, as the public lands are, and will be, disposed of. The President says, "the argument, taken in connection with the message vetoing the agricultural college bill, in which the President says, clearly proves that he does not consider the Constitution a warrant for the gift of the public lands by way of donation, as this bill does, and as all bills of a character intended for the benefit of the public have been." Such, I do not, with all the respect I bear for the President, I do not think, the Constitution, the argument, taken in connection with the message vetoing the agricultural college bill, in which the President says, clearly proves that he does not consider the Constitution a warrant for the gift of the public lands by way of donation, as this bill does, and as all bills of a character intended for the benefit of the public have been.