WASHINGTON, D. C.

MR. BENTON ON THE NEBRASKA BILL.

SPEECH OF MR. BENTON,

Delivered in Committee of the Whole of the House of Representatives, April 25, 1854.

Mr. BENTON. If any bill to impair the Missouri Compromise line of 1820 had been brought into this House by a member from a slave State, or under the Administration of a President elected from a slave State, I should have deemed it my duty to have met it at the threshold, and to have made the motion which the parliamentary law prescribes for the repulse of subjects which are not fit to be considered: I should have moved its rejection at the first reading. But the bill before us, for the two may be considered as one, does not come from that quarter. It comes from a free State, and under the Administration of a President elected from a free State; and under that aspect of its origin, I deemed it right to wait, and hear what the members of the free States had to say to it. It was a proposition from their own ranks, to give up their half of the slavery Compromise of 1820; and if they chose to do so, I did not see how Southern members could refuse to accept it. It was a free State question; and the members from the free States were the majority, and could do as they pleased. So I stood aloof, waiting to see their lead, but without the slightest intention of being governed by it. I had my own convictions of right and duty, and meant to act upon them. I had come into political life upon that Compromise. I had stood upon it above thirty years, and intended to stand upon it to the end—solitary and alone, if need be; but preferring company to solitude, and not doubting for an instant what the result was to be.

I have said that this bill comes into Congress under the Administration of a free State President; but I do not mean to say, or insinuate, by that remark, that the President favors the bill. I know nothing of his disposition towards it; and if I did, I should not disclose it here. It would be unparliamentary, and a breach of the privileges of this House to do so. The President's opinions can only be made known to us by himself, in a message in writing. In that way it is his right, and often his duty, to communicate with us. And in that way there is no room for mistake in citing his opinions; no room for an unauthorized use of his name; no room for the imputation of contradictory opinions to him; and in that way he becomes responsible to the American people for the opinions he may deliver. All other modes of communication are forbid to him, as tending to an undue and unconstitutional interference with the freedom of legislation. It is not bribery alone attempted upon a member which constitutes a breach of the previleges of this House. It is any attempt to operate upon a member's vote by any consideration of hope or fear, favor or affection, prospect of reward or dread of punishment. This is parliamentary law, as old as English Parliaments, constantly maintained by the British House of Commons, and lately declared in a most signal manner. It was during the reign of our old master, George the Third, and in the famous case of Mr. Fox's East India bill. A report was spread in Parliament by one of the lords of the bed chamber, that the King was opposed to the bill; that he wished it defeated; and had said that he would consider any member his enemy who should vote for it. The House of Commons took fire at this report, and immediately resolved:

"That to report any opinion, or pretended opinion, of his Majesty, upon any bill depending in either House of Parliament, is a high crime and misdemeanor, derogatory to the honor of the Crown, a breach of the fundamental privileges of Parliament, and subversive of the Constitution of the country."

This resolve was adopted in a full House, by a majority of seventy-three votes, and was only declaratory of existing Parliamentary law—such as it had existed from the time that English counties and boroughs first sent knights of the shire and burgesses to represent them in the Parliament House. It is old English Parliamentary law, and is so recorded by Hatsell, and all the writers on that law. It is also American law, as old as our Congress; and as such recorded in Jefferson's Manual. It is honest law; and, as such, existent in every honest heart. Sir, the President of the United States can send us no opinions, except in written messages, and no one can report his opinions to influence the conduct of members upon a bill, without becoming obnoxious to the censure which the British House of Commons pronounced upon the lord of the bed chamber, in the case of the King and the Fox East India bill.

Nor can the President's Secretaries—his head clerks, as Mr. Randolph used to call them—send us their opinions on any subject of legislation depending before us. They can only report, and that in writing, on the subjects referred to them by law or by a vote of the Houses. Non-intervention is their duty in relation to our legislation; and if they attempt to intervene in any of our business, I must be allowed, for one, to repulse the attempt, and to express for it no higher degree of respect than that Mr. Burke expressed for the opinions of a British Lord Chancellor, delivered to the House of Commons, in a case in which he had no concern. Sir, I suppose I can be allowed to repeat on this floor any degree of comparison or figure of speech which Mr. Burke could use on the floor of the British House of Commons. He was a classic speaker, and, besides that, author of a treatise on the Sublime and Beautiful; though I do not consider the particular figure which I have to repeat, although just and picturesque in itself, to be a perfect illustration of either branch of his admired treatise. It was in reference to Lord Thurlow, who had intervened in some legislative business, contrary to the orator's sense of right and decency. Mr. Burke repulsed the intrusive opinion, and declared that he did not care three jumps of a louse for it. Sir, I say the same of any opinion which may be reported here from our Secretaries, on any bill depending before us, and that in any form in which it may come from them—whether as a unit or as integers.

Still less do I admit the right of intervention in our legislative duties in another class of intermeddlers, and who might not be able to meddle at all with our business, were it not for the ministration of our bounty. I speak of the public printers, who get their daily bread (and that buttered on both sides) by our daily printing, and who require the Democratic members of this House, under the instant penalty of political damnation, to give in their adhesion to every bill which they call Administration; and that in every change it may undergo, although more changeable than the moon. For that class of intermeddlers, I have no Parliamentary law to administer, nor any quotation from Burke to apply—nothing but a little fable to read; the value of which, as in all good fables, lies in its moral. It is in French, and entitled, "*L'ane et son maitre;*" which, being done into English, signifies "*The ass and his master,*" and runs thus:

"An ass took it into his head to scare his master, and put on a lion's skin, and went and stood in the path. And when he saw his master coming, he commenced roaring, as he thought; but he only brayed, and the master knew it was his ass; so he went up to him with a cudgel, and beat him nearly to death."

That is the end of the fable, and the moral of it is, "a caution to all asses to take care how they undertake to scare their masters."

Mr. Chairman, this House will have fallen far below its constitutional mission, if it suffers itself to be governed by authority, or dragooned by its own hirelings. I am a man of no bargains, but act openly with any man that acts for the public good; and in this spirit, I offer the right hand of political friendship to every member of this body that will stand together to vindicate its privileges, protect its respectability, and maintain it in the high place for which it was intended—the master branch of the American Government.

The question before us is to get rid of the Missouri Compromise line; and to a lawyer that is an easy question. That Compromise is in the form of a statute; and one statute is repealable by another. That short view is enough for a lawyer. To a statesman it is something different; and refers the question of its repeal, not to law books, but to reasons of State policy—to the circumstances under which it was enacted, and the consequences which are to flow from its abrogation. This Compromise of 1820 is not a mere statute, to last for a day; it was intended for perpetuity, and so declared itself. It is an enactment to settle a controversy—and did settle it—and cannot be abrogated without reviving that controversy. It has given the country peace for above thirty years; how many years of disturbance will its abrogation bring? That is the statesman's question; and without assuming to be much of a statesman, I claim to be enough so to consider the consequences of breaking a settlement which pacified a continent. I remember the Missouri controversy, and how it destroyed all social feeling, and all capacity for beneficial legislation; and merged all political principle in an angry contest about slavery—dividing the Union into two parts, and drawing up the two halves into opposite and confronting lines, like enemies on the field of battle. I do not wish to see such times again; and therefore am against reviving them by breaking up the settlement which quieted them.

The Missouri Compromise of 1820 was the partitioning between the free and slaves States, of a great province, taking the character of a perpetual settlement; and classing with the two great Compromises which gave us the Ordinance of July 13, 1787, and the Federal Constitution, of September 17, of the same year. There are three slavery Compromises in our history, which connect themselves with the foundation and the preservation of this Union. First, the Territorial Partition Ordinance of 1787, with its clause for the recovery of fugitive slaves; secondly, the cotemporaneous constitutional recognition of slavery in the States which chose to have it, with the fugitive slave recovery clause in the same instrument; thirdly, the Missouri partition line of 1820, with the same clause annexed for the recovery of fugitive slaves. All three of these Compromises are part and parcel of the same policy; and neither of them could have been formed without the other, nor either of them without the fugitive slave recovery clause incorporated in it. The anti-slavery clause in the Ordinance of 1787 could not have been adopted (as was proved by its three years' rejection) without the fugitive slave recovery clause added to it; the Constitution could not have been formed without its recognition of slavery in the States which chose it, and the guarantee of the right to recover slaves fleeing into the free States; the Missouri controversy could not have been settled without a partition of Louisiana between free and slave soil; and that partition could not have been made without the addition of the same clause for the recovery of fugitive slaves. Thus, all three Compromises are settlements of existing questions, and intended to be perpetual. They are all three of equal moral validity. The Constitutional Compromise is guarded by a higher obligation, in consequence of its incorporation in that instrument; but it no way differs from the other two in the circumstances which induced it, the policy which guards it, or the consequences which would flow from its abrogation. A proposition to destroy the slavery Compromises in the Constitution, would be an open proposition to break up the Union; the attempt to abrogate the Compromises of 1787 and 1820, would be virtual attempts to destroy the harmony of the Union, and prepare it for dissolution, by destroying the confidence and affection in which it is founded.

The Missouri Compromise of 1820 is a continuation of the Ordinance of 1787—its extension to the since acquired territory west of the Mississippi, and no way differing from it, either in principle or detail. The Ordinance of 1787 divided the then territory of the United States about equally between the free and slave States; the Missouri Compromise line did the same by the additional territory of the United States, as it stood in 1820; and in both cases it was done by act of Congress, and was the settlement of a difficulty which was to last forever. I consider them both, with their fugitive slave recovery clauses, and the similar clause in the Constitution, as part and parcel of the same transaction—different articles in the same general settlement.

The anti-slavery clause in the Ordinance of 1787, could not have been put in (as was proved by its three years' rejection) without the fugitive slave recovery clause added to it. The Constitution could not have been formed without the recognition of slavery in the States which chose it, and the right of recovering slaves fleeing to the free States. The Missouri controversy could not have been settled except by the prohibition of slavery in the upper half of the Territory of Louisiana; and that prohibition could not have been obtained without the right to recover fugitive slaves from the part made free. Thus, the three measures are one, and the Ordinance of 1787 father to the other two. It led to the adoption of the fugitive slave clause in the Constitution, and, we may say, to the formation of the Constitution itself, which could not have been adopted without that clause, and the recognition of slave property in which it was founded. This vital fact results of itself from the history of the case. In March, of the year 1784, the Virginia delegation in the then Congress of the Confederation, headed by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Monroe, conveyed the Northwestern Territory to the thirteen United States. In the month of April ensuing, the organizing mind of Mr. Jefferson, always bent upon systems and administration, brought in an Ordinance for the government of the Territory so conveyed, with the anti-slavery clause as a part of it, to take effect in the year 1800; but without a clause for the recovery of fugitive slaves. For want of this provision, the anti-slavery clause was opposed by the slaveholding States, and rejected; and the Ordinance was passed without it. In July, of the year 1787, the Ordinance was remodeled, the anti-slavery clause, with the fugitive slave recovery clause, as they now stand, were inserted in it; and in that shape the Ordinance had the unanimous vote of every State present—eight in the whole—and an equal number of slave and free States present. Thus, it is clear that the anti-slavery clause in the Ordinance of 1787 could not have passed without the fugitive slave recovery clause annexed. They were inseparable in their birth, and must be so in their life; and those who love one must accept the other.

This was done in the month of July, in the city of New York, where the Congress of the Confederation then sat. The National Convention was sitting at the same time in the city of Philadelphia, at work upon the Federal Constitution. The two bodies were in constant communication with each other, and some leading members (as Mr. Madison and General Hamilton) were members of each, and attending by turns in each. The Constitution was finished in September, and received the fugitive slave recovery clause immediately after its insertion in the Ordinance. It was the work of the same hands, and at the same time, in both instruments; and it is well known that the Constitution could not have been formed without that clause. Thus the compromise clause in the Ordinance is father to the compromise clause in the Constitution; and all three stand before me as founded in the same circumstances, induced by the same considerations, and directed by the same policy—that of the peace, harmony, and perpetuity of this Union. In point of moral obligation I consider them equal, and resulting from conditions which render them indispensable. Two of them have all the qualities of a Compromise—those of the Ordinance and of the Constitution. They are founded in agreement—in consent—in compact—and are as sacred and inviolable as human agreements can be. The third one—that of the Missouri anti-slavery line—was not made upon agreement. It was imposed by votes—by the South upon the North—resisted by the North at the time—acquiesced in afterwards: and by that acquiescence became a binding covenant between both parties; and the more so on the South, because she imposed it.

This brings us to the question of repeal, or abrogation of these Compromises. The one in the Constitution cannot be got rid of, without an amendment to that instrument; and is, therefore, beyond the reach of Congress. The other two, being in the form of statutes, are subjects of legislation, and legally repealable by Congress. Efforts were made to impair one, that of 1787, some fifty years ago. An effort is now made to repeal the other; and the history and fate of the first attempt may be advantageous in the consideration of the second. It was in the year 1803. The then Territory of Indiana had been slave territory under the French Government, and continued so under the American until 1787. It extended to the Mississippi, and contained many slaves. Vincennes, Cahokia, Prairie de Rocher, Kaskaskia, were all slaveholding towns. The inhabitants were attached to that property, and wished to retain it, at least temporarily; and also to invite a slaveholding emigration, until an increase of population should afford an adequate supply of free labor; and they petitioned Congress accordingly. The petition came from a convention of the people, presided over by Governor Harrison, and only asked for the suspension of the anti-slavery part of the Ordinance for ten years, and limited in its application to their own territory. The petition was referred to a select committee of the House; Mr. Randolph was chairman; and received its answer in a report, in these words:

"That the rapid population of the State of Ohio sufficiently evinces, in the opinion of your committee, that the labor of slaves is not necessary to promote the growth and settlement of colonies in that region. That this labor, demonstrably the dearest of any, can only be employed to advantage in the cultivation of products more valuable than any known in that quarter of the United States; that the committee deem it highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the Northwestern country, and to give strength and security to that extensive frontier. In the salutary operation of this sagacious and benevolent restraint, it is believed that the inhabitants of Indiana will, at no very distant day, find ample remuneration for a temporary privation of labor and emigration."

This was the answer of the select committee; and it became the answer of the House—of this House just fifty years ago—when the South was about as ably represented here as it ever has been since, and when its relative strength was greater than it has ever been since. The answer is a peremptory refusal to yield to the petition of the people of Indiana, even for a ten years' local suspension of this anti-slavery clause. "Highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair that provision." Yes, to impair! that is the word; and it is a refusal to weaken or lessen, in the smallest degree, an act which the committee calls a "benevolent and sagacious act;" and which they recommend to maintain unimpaired, because it is "calculated to increase the happiness and prosperity of the Northwest, and to give strength and security to its frontier." That Congress, and that without division between North and South, would not impair an act of so much future good to posterity, not even upon the mistaken application of a few present inhabitants.

But this was not the end of the petitions. The people of Indiana were not satisfied with one repulse. They returned to the charge; and four times more, in the course of as many years, renewed their application for the ten years' suspension of the Ordinance. It was rejected each time, and once in the Senate, where the North Carolina Senator [Mr. Jesse Franklin] was chairman of the committee which made the report against it. Five times, in as many years, rejected by Congress; and the rejection the more emphatic in some instances because it was the reversal by the House of a favorable report from a committee. And now, what inhabitant of Indiana does not rejoice at the deliverance which the firmness of Congress then gave them, in spite of the request of its inhabitants fifty years ago?

Thus, five times in the beginning of this century—five different times, and without any distinction between Northern and Southern members—did Congress refuse to "impair" the slavery Compromise of 1787, notwithstanding five times asked for by the people of the Territory. Oh, squatter sovereignty! where were you then? It was a case for you to have shown your head—to have arisen in your might, and established your supremacy forever. It was a case of a convention of the sovereigns themselves; and neither this convention nor the Congress had a dream of their sovereignty. The convention petitioned Congress as a ward would its guardian, or children under age would petition their father; and Congress answered like a good guardian, or a good father, that it would not give them an evil, although they begged for it. Benighted times these, and infinitely behind the present age. The mare's nest had not then been found in which has been laid the marvellous egg out of which has been hatched the nondescript fowl, yclept "squatter sovereignty." The illustrious principle of non-intervention had not then been invented. The ignoramuses of that day had never heard of it, though now to be learned in every horn-book; and, I believe, nowhere else but in the horn-books.

Five times in the beginning of this century did Congress refuse to impair the slavery Compromise of 1787; and now, in the middle of the century, and after thirty years of peace under the Missouri Compromise—the offspring and continuation of that of 1787—we are called upon, not merely to impair for a season, but to destroy forever, a far greater Compromise—extending to far more territory—and growing out of necessities far more pressing. And how called upon? Not by the inhabitants—not by any one human being living, or expecting to live, on the territory to be affected—but upon a motion in Congress—a silent, secret, limping, halting, creeping, squinting, impish motion—conceived in the dark—midwifed in a committee-room, and sprung upon Congress and the country in the style in which Guy Fawkes intended to blow up the Parliament House, with his five hundred barrels of gunpowder, hid in the cellar under the wood.

My answer to such a motion is to be found in the whole volume of my political life. I have stood upon the Missouri Compromise for above thirty years; and mean to stand upon it to the end of my life; and in doing so shall act, not only according to my own cherished convictions of duty, but according to the often-declared convictions of the General Assembly of my State. The inviolability of that Compromise line has often been declared by that General Assembly; and as late as 1847, in these words:

"*Resolved,* That the peace, permanency, and welfare of our national Union depend upon a strict adherence to the letter and spirit of the eighth section of the act of Congress of the United States, entitled, '*An act to authorize the People of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories,*' approved March 6, 1820."

with an instruction to the Senators, and a request to the Representatives in Congress, to vote accordingly.

"The peace, permanency, and welfare of the Union depend upon a strict adherence to the Missouri Compromise of 1820." So resolved the General Assembly of Missouri as late as 1847. I believe the Assembly was right then: I believe it now: and, so believing, shall "adhere" to the Compromise now, as then.

I should oppose any movement to impair that Compromise, made in an open, direct, manly, manner: much more shall I oppose it if made in a covert, indirect, and unmanly way. The bill, or bills before us, undertake to accomplish their object without professing it—upon reasons which are contradictory and unfounded—in terms which are ambiguous and inconsistent—and by throwing on others the responsibility of its own act. It professes not to interfere with the sovereign right of the People to legislate for themselves; and the very first line of this solemn profession throws upon them a horse-load of law, which they have no right to refuse, or time to read, or money to purchase, or ability to understand. It throws upon them all the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable; and that comprehends all that are not specially made for other places: also, it gives them the Constitution of the United States, but without the privilege of voting at Presidential or Congressional elections, or of making their own judiciary. This is non-interference with a vengeance. A community to be buried under a mountain of strange law, and covered with a Constitution under which they are not to have one single political right. Why this circumlocution? this extension of a mountain of irrelevant law, with the exception of the only one relevant and applicable? Sir, it is the crooked, insidious, and pusillanimous way of effecting the repeal of the Missouri Compromise line. It includes all law for the sake of leaving out one law; and effects a repeal by an omission, and legislates by an exception. It is a new way of repealing a law, and a bungling attempt to smuggle Slavery into the Territory, and all the country out to the Canada line and up the Rocky Mountains.

The crooked line of this smuggling process is this: "abolish the Compromise line, and extend the Constitution over the country; the Constitution recognises slavery; therefore, slavery is established as soon as the line is abolished, and the Constitution extended: and being put there by the Constitution, it cannot be legislated out." This is the English of this smuggling process; and certainly nothing more unworthy of legislation—more derogatory to a legislative body—was ever attempted to be made into law. Sir, the Constitution was not made for Territories, but for States. Its provisions are all applicable to States, and cannot be put in operation in Territories. They cannot vote for President, or Vice President, or members of Congress, nor elect their own officers, or prescribe the qualifications of voters, or administer their own laws by their own judges, sheriffs, and attorneys; and the clause extending the Constitution to them is a cheat and an illusion, and a trick to smuggle slavery into the Territory. Nor is it intended that they shall have any legislative right under the Constitution, even in relation to slavery. They may admit it because it is to be there by the Constitution: they cannot exclude it, because the Constitution puts it there. That is the argument; and it is a juggle worthy of the trick of one egg under three hats at the same time—and under neither at any time. Besides, the Constitution is an organic, not an administrative act. It is a code of principles, not of laws. Not a clause in it can be executed except by virtue of a law made under it—not even the clause for recovering fugitive slaves.

But I am not done yet with the beauties of this mode of repealing a law by an exception. There is a further consequence to be detected in it. The Missouri Compromise consists of two distinct parts: first, an abolition of slavery in all the ancient Louisiana north and west of Missouri; secondly, a provision for the recovery of fugitive slaves in the territory made free. By the omitted extension of this section, both these parts are repealed. A tract of country larger than the old thirteen Atlantic States, and bordering a thousand miles on the British dominions, is made an asylum for fugitive slaves. There will be no law to recover a slave from all that vast region. The constitutional provision is limited to States; the provision in the act of 1787 is limited to the Northwest Territory; the second part of the Missouri Compromise extended this right to all the territory north and west of Missouri; and that being repealed, that right of recovery is lost. I object to this on the part of the State of Missouri—the State to be most injured by converting all the territory north and west of her, quite out to the British line, into an asylum for runaway slaves. The blunder cannot be corrected, (at least, in the opinion of those who deny the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on slavery in Territories) by an act of Congress.

Then comes the reason for excepting the Missouri Compromise from the extension which is given to a mass of laws which are not there, and denied to itself which is there. If the reason had been because it was already there, it would have been a logical and comprehensible reason; but that is not the cause assigned; and those which are assigned are actually numerous and curious, and worthy of examination. First, because it was superseded by certain acts of 1850; next, that it is inconsistent with those acts; then that it is inoperative; and, finally, that it never was there, being dead in its birth under the Constitution, and void from the beginning.

Let us look into these reasons, *seriatim*, as the lawyers say: and first of supersession. It is said that the measures of 1850 superseded this Compromise of 1820. If so, why treat it now as still existing, and therefore to be repealed by an exception in order to get rid of it? If it was repealed in 1850, why do it over again in 1854? Why kill the dead? But it was not superseded; but acknowledged and confirmed by every speaker in 1850 that referred to the subject, and by every act that mentioned it. This being matter of fact, and proven by all sorts of testimony—parole, written, and record—it had to be given up, (though a test of political orthodoxy as long as it stood,) and something else put in its place. Thereupon supersession was itself superseded by "inconsistent." Out of the frying-pan into the fire! Inconsistent signifies inability to stand together—two things which cannot stand together—from *con* and *sisto*. Now, what is the fact with respect to the Compromises of 1820 and 1850? Can they not stand together? And if not, why knock the one down that is already down? It is now four years since this inability to stand together took effect; and how do the two sets of measures make out together at the end of this time? Perfectly well. They are both on their feet—standing bolt upright—and will stand so forever, unless Congress knocks one or the other of them down. This is fact, known to everybody, and admitted by the bill itself; for if the first is inconsistent with the second, and unable to stand, why all this trouble to put it down? Why trip up the heels of the man already flat of his back on the ground? Then comes another reason—that this compromise of 1820 is inoperative and void. If so, those who are against its operation should be content. It is in the very condition they wish it—useless powerless, inactive, dead—and no bar to the progress of slavery to the North. Void is vacant, empty, nothing of it. Now, if the line of 36 deg. 30 min. is inoperative and void, it is in the condition of a fence pulled down, and the rails carried away, and the field left open for the stock to enter. But the fence is not pulled down yet. The line is not yet inoperative and void. It is an existing substantive line, alive and operating; and operating effectually to bar the progress of slavery to the North; and will so continue to operate until Congress shall stop its operation.

Then comes the final reason, that there never was any such line in the world—that it was unconstitutional and void—that it had no existence from the beginning; and that it must not be repealed by a direct act, for that would be to acknowledge its previous existence, and to nullify the constitutional argument; and, what is more terrible, involve the authors of the doctrine in an inconsistency of their own; and thereby make them, themselves, inoperative and void. And this is the analysis of the reasons for the Nebraska bill—that part of it which is to get rid of the Compromise of 1820: untrue, contradictory, suicidal, and preposterous. And why such a farrago of nullities, incongruities, and inconsistencies? Purely and simply to throw upon others—upon the Congress of 1850 and the innocent Constitution—the blame of what the bill itself is doing; the blame of destroying the Compromise of 1820; and with it, destroying all confidence between the North and the South, and arraying one-half the Union against the other in deadly hostility. It is to be able to throw blame upon the innocent, that this farrago is served up to us.

And what is all this hotch-potch for? It is to establish a principle, they say—the principle of non-intervention—of squatter sovereignty. Sir, there is no such principle. The Territories are the children of the States. They are minors under twenty-one years of age; and it is the business of the States, through their delegations in Congress, to take care of these minors until they are of age—until they are ripe for State Government—then give them that Government, and admit them to an equality with their fathers. That is the law, and the sense of the case; and has been so acknowledged since the first Ordinance in 1784, by all authorities, Federal and State, legislative, judicial, and executive. The States in Congress are the guardians of the Territories, and are bound to exercise the guardianship; and cannot abdicate it without a breach of trust and a dereliction of duty. Territorial sovereignty is a monstrosity, born of timidity and ambition, hatched into existence in the hot incubation of a Presidential canvass, and revolting to the beholders when first presented. Well do I remember that day when it was first shown in the Senate. Mark Antony did not better remember the day when Cæsar first put on that mantle through which he was afterwards pierced with three-and-twenty "envious stabs." It was in the Senate in 1848, and was received as nonsense—as the essence of nonsense—as the quintessence of nonsense—as the five-times distilled essence of political nonsensicality. Why, sir, the Territory itself is the property of the States, and they do what they please with it—permit it to be settled or not, as they please; cut it up by lines, as they please; sell it, or give it away, as they please; chase white people from it, as they please. After this farrago—this *olla-po-drida*—comes a little stump speech, injected in the belly of the bill, and which must have a prodigious effect when recited in the prairies, and out towards the frontiers, and up towards the heads of the creeks. I will read it, and I hope without fatiguing the House; for it is both brief and beautiful, and runs thus:

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act, not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

This is the speech, and a pretty little thing itself, and very proper to be spoken from a stump in the prairie. It has intent, and a true intent; which is neither to legislate slavery into or out of any State or Territory. Then why legislate at all? Why all this disturbance, if no effect is produced, and things to remain just as they were? Let well enough alone, was the old doctrine; to make well enough still better, is the doctrine of progress; and that in spite of the Italian epitaph, which says: "I was well, and would be better; took physic, and here I am." But the States must be greatly delighted at the politeness and forbearance of this bill. It puts States and Territories upon precisely equality with respect to the power of Congress over them. Congress does not mean to put slavery in or out of any State or Territory. To all that polite abnegation, I have to say that, in respect of the States, it is the supererogation of modesty and humility, as Congress happens to have no power to put slavery in them, or out of them; and in respect of the Territories, it is an abdication of a constitutional power and duty; it being the right of Congress to legislate upon slavery in the Territories, and its duty to do so when there is occasion for it—as in 1787 and 1820.

I object to this shilly-shally—willy-won'ty—don'ty-can'ty—style of legislation. It is not legislative. It is not parliamentary. It is not manly. It is not womanly. No woman would talk that way. No shilly-shally in a woman. Nothing of the female gender was ever born young enough, or lived long enough, to get befogged in such a quandary as this. It is one thing or the other with them; and what they say, they stick to. No breaking bargains with them. But the end of this stump speech is the best of the whole. Different from good milk, in which the cream rises to the top, it here settles to the bottom, and is in these words: "Leave it to the people thereof, that is to say, of the States and of the Territories, to regulate slavery for themselves as they please, only subject to the Constitution of the United States." Certainly this is a new subjection for the States. Heretofore they have been free to regulate slavery for themselves—admit it or reject it; and that not by virtue of any grant of power in the Constitution, but by virtue of an unsurrendered part of their old sovereignty. It is also new of the Territories. Heretofore they have been held to be wards of Congress, and entitled to nothing under the Constitution but that which Congress extended to them. But this clause is not accidentally here; it is to keep up the dogma of the Constitution in Territories; but only there in relation to slavery, and that for its admission—not rejection.

Three dogmas now afflict the land; *videlicet:* squatter sovereignty, non-intervention, and no power in Congress to legislate upon slavery in Territories. And this bill asserts the whole three, and beautifully illustrates the whole three, by knocking each one on the head with the other, and trampling each under foot in its turn. Sir, the bill does deny squatter sovereignty, and it does intervene, and it does legislate upon slavery in Territories; and for the proof of that, see the bill; and see it, as the lawyers say, *passim;* that is to say, here, and there, and everywhere. It is a bill of assumptions and contradictions—assuming what is unfounded, and contradicting what it assumes, and balancing every affirmation by a negation. It is a see-saw bill; but not the innocent see-saw which children play on a plank stuck through a fence; but the up-and-down game of politicians, played at the expense of the peace and harmony of the Union, and to the sacrifice of all business in Congress. It is an amphibological bill, stuffed with monstrosities, hobbled with contradictions, and Badgered with a proviso.

Amphibology is a cause for the rejection of bills, not only by Congress, but by the President, when carried to him for his approval. Gen. Jackson rejected one for that cause, and it was less amphibological than this: it was the last night of the last day of his last administration, and a quarter before midnight. Congress had sent him a bill to repeal the specie circular, and to inaugurate the paper money of a thousand local banks as the currency of the Federal Government. It was an object not to be avowed, nor to be done in any direct or palpable manner. Paraphrases, circumlocution, ambidexterity, and ambiguity, were necessary to cover the design; and it was piled on until it was unintelligible. The President read it, and could make nothing of it: he sent to his Attorney-General, who was equally puzzled. He then returned it, with a message to the Senate, refusing to sign the bill for amphibology. We should reject this bill for the same cause, if for nothing else. Hard is the fate of party fealty. It has to keep up with the ever-changing measure. Often have these bills changed; and under every phase they had to be received as a test of orthodoxy; and have more changes to undergo yet; and to continue to be a test under all mutations.

And, now, what is the object of this movement, which so disturbs Congress and the country? What does it propose to accomplish? To settle a principle, is the answer—the principle of non-intervention, and the right of the people of the Territory to decide the question of slavery for themselves. Sir, there is no such principle. The Territories are the children of the States. They are minors, under age, and it is the business of the States, through their delegations in Congress, to take care of them until they are of age—until they are ripe for State government; then to give them that government, and admit them to an equality with their fathers. That is law, and has been so admitted since the first Ordinance, in 1784. The States in Congress are the guardians of the Territories, and are bound to exercise that guardianship, and cannot abdicate it without a breach of trust and a dereliction of duty. Why, sir, the territory itself is the property of the States, and they do with it what they please—permit it to be settled, or not, as they please; cut it up by lines, as they please; sell or give it away, as they please; chase white people from it, as they please. This has been always the case. There is a proclamation now extant of the old Congress of the Confederation, describing the first settlers in the Northwest Territory as "disorderly persons," and ordering them to be driven off by the military. I remember many such military expulsions in the early settlement of the Western country, often executed with severity; burning houses, cutting up corn, destroying fences, and driving off the people at the point of the bayonet, and under the edge of the sabre. As late as 1835–'36, and after the extinction of the Indian title to the Platte country, in Missouri, similar orders were given to the then colonel of dragoons commanding on that frontier, the now Senator in Congress, HENRY DODGE, to expel the people from that purchase; orders which he executed in gentleness and mercy, going alone, explaining his business, and requiring them to go away; which they did, like good and orderly people; and when he was gone, came back like sensible and industrious people, and secured their pre-emptions. Not only settled but organized territory has been so treated by the Federal Government, and worse—the people driven off, and their homes given away. This happened in Arkansas, in 1828, when twelve thousand square miles of her organized territory was given to the Cherokees, and the people driven away. Why, sir, this very line of 36 deg. 30 min., with all the territory on one side of it, and two degrees on the other side, were given away to the King of Spain. This has been the seventy years' practice of the Government—to treat the Territories as property, and the people as uninvited guests, to be entertained, or turned out, as the owner of the house chooses. Fine sovereigns, these! chased off by the military, and their homes given to Indians or Spaniards.

The whole idea of this sovereignty is a novelty, scouted from Congress when it first appeared in the Senate, contradicted by the Constitution, and the whole action of the Government, in all times; and contradicted by the bill itself, which is to secure it. The provisions of the bill are a burlesque upon sovereignty. It gives to the people, instead of receiving from them, an organic act. And what an organic act! One in which they are denied every attribute of sovereignty. Denied freedom of elections; denied freedom of voting; denied choice of their own laws; denied the right of fixing the qualifications of voters; subjected to a foreign supervision; and controllable by the Federal Government, which they have no hand in electing; and only allowed to admit, and not to reject, slavery. Their sovereignty only extends to the subject of slavery, and only to one side of that—the admitting side; the other half of the power being held to be denied by the Constitution which is extended over them, and which (according to the reading of the supporters of this bill) forbids any law to be made which will prevent any citizen from going there with his slaves. This is squatter sovereignty, non-intervention, and no power to legislate in Territories upon slavery. And this is called a principle—the principle of non-intervention—letting the people alone to settle the question of slavery for themselves. How settle it? That can only be done in an organic act; and they have no such act, nor can have one till they make a Constitution for a State Government. All the rest is legislation, which settles nothing, and produces contention at every election. Sir, this principle of non-intervention is but the principle of contention—a bone given to the people to quarrel and fight over at every election, and at every meeting of their Legislature, until they become a State Government. Then, and then only, can they settle the question.

For seventy years—since the year 1784, when the organizing mind of Jefferson drew the first territorial Ordinance—we had a uniform method of providing for the government of Territories, all founded upon the clause in the Constitution which authorizes Congress to dispose of, and make rules and regulations respecting, the territory and other property of the United States. This mode of government has consisted of three grades, all founded in the right of Congress to govern them. First grade: a Governor and judges, appointed by the United States, to adopt laws from other States, to be in force until disapproved by Congress. Second grade: a Territorial Legislature, when the inhabitants shall amount to five thousand men above the age of twenty-one, composed of a Council partly appointed by the United States, and a House of Representatives elected by the People, at the rate of one Representative for every five hundred voters, its legislation subject to the approval of Congress. Third grade: entrance on the State Government, in full equality with the other States. This is the way these Territories have been governed for seventy years; and I am for adhering to it.

And now, what is the excuse for all this disturbance of the country; this breaking up of ancient compromises; arraying one-half of the Union against the other, and destroying the temper and business of Congress? What is the excuse for all this turmoil and mischief? We are told it is to keep the question of slavery out of Congress! To keep slavery out of Congress! Great God! It was out of Congress! completely, entirely, and forever out of Congress, unless Congress dragged it in by breaking down the sacred laws which settled it. The question was settled, and done with. There was not an inch square of territory in the Union on which it could be raised without a breach of compromise. The Ordinance of 1789 settled it in all the remaining part of the Northwest Territory beyond Wisconsin: the Compromise line of 36 deg. 30 min. settled it in all the country north and west of Missouri to the British line, and up to the Rocky Mountains; the organic act of Oregon, made by the people, and sanctioned by Congress, settled it in all that region: the acts for the government of Utah and New Mexico settled it in those two Territories: the compact with Texas, determining the number of slave States to be formed out of that State, settled it there: and California settled it for herself.

Now, where was there an inch square of territory within the United States on which the question could be raised? Nowhere! Not an inch! The question was settled everywhere, not merely by law, but by fact. The work was done, and there was no way to get at the question but by undoing the work! No way for Congress to get the question in, for the purpose of keeping it out, but to break down compromises which kept it out.

What advantage do the slave States expect from this bill? Certainly they expect the extension of slave power, and slave population. That may prove a fallacious expectation. The question of slavery in these Territories, if thrown open to territorial action, will be a question of numbers—a question of the majority for or against slavery; and what chance would the slaveholders have in such a contest? No chance at all. The slave emigrants will be outnumbered, and compelled to play at a most unequal game, not only in point of numbers, but also in point of stakes. The slaveholder stakes his property; and has to run it off, or lose it, if outvoted at the polls. I see nothing which slaveholders are to gain under this bill—nothing but an unequal and vexatious contest, in which they are to be losers.

I deprecate such a contest, and did my part to keep it out of the State of Missouri when her Constitution was formed. I was not a member of the convention, but was a chief promoter of the clause which forbid the Legislature to emancipate slaves without the consent of their owners. I promoted that clause for the sake of peace—for the sake of keeping the slavery question out of our elections and legislation—for the sake of preventing perpetual strife among the people. What I did for Missouri, I would do for the Territories; and if it was an open question, would vote one way or the other to settle it; but it is not an open question! and cannot be opened without a breach of faith, and the destruction of the peace of the country.

Sir, the question has been decided. The free States are against this bill, and it is an ill return for their past generous conduct to endeavor to force it upon them. They have been not only just, but magnanimous, to the slave States. What was the condition of the slave States thirty years ago, in relation to the use of the soil within their limits? Debarred of a great part of its use—an Indian population covering more or less of almost every slave State, and preventing the expansion of its population. What is it now? All relieved. The Indians all gone, their lands all brought under the dominion of the white man, and the area of slave population and of slave cultivation greatly increased—to the extent of a third or a fourth of its soil in some of the States. How was this done? Certainly by the help of free State votes, (for it could not have been done without them;) by the help of their votes in procuring the appropriations, and ratifying the treaties which the removal of the Indians required. Missouri got her fine southwest quarter relieved by these means. The same votes gave us the Platte country; seven fine counties added to the State! and that by altering the Compromise line to include it, and actually converting that fine region from free soil to slave soil. Northern votes enabled it to be done; Northern votes altered above an hundred miles of the Compromise line for our benefit, upon our request; and I will never be ungrateful to them for it, nor requite it by a breach of the line to their prejudice.

And how did we obtain the Northern votes which were necessary for all these measures—the appropriations and treaties for all these Indian removals, and for that alteration of the Compromise line which gave us the beautiful Platte country? Did we get these votes by belching Abolitionism against the North? No! no! we got them by appealing to the justice and the fraternal feelings of our Northern brethren, and to which we never appealed once in vain. And I, who was part of all these transactions, accustomed to solicit Northern votes, and express thanks for them, will not now return them evil for good, by attempting to deprive them of their share of a Compromise which we imposed upon them.

It is now four months since this movement for the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise commenced in this Congress. It began without a memorial, without a petition, without a request, from a human being. It has labored long and hard in these Halls, and to this hour there is not a petition for it from the class of States for whose benefit the movement professes to have been made!—not a word in its favor from the smallest public meeting or private assemblage of any slave State. This is the response of the South to this boon tendered to it by Northern members under a Northern President. It is the response of silence—more emphatic than words—and worthy of especial note in this debate. It argues well for the harmony of the Union, and goes to show (what in fact has been often seen) that the troubles of the country come from uneasy politicians—its safety from the tranquil masses.

IMPORTANT TO YOUNG MEN.

I OFFER for sale upwards of thirty different Receipts, many of which have been sold the past year for five dollars a-peice, and the whole comprising so many different ways to make money. In the sale of one of the articles alone, I have known young men the past year to make from five to twelve dollars per day; and in the manufacture and sale of any one of the articles, no young man of energy and ability can fail to make money. Address E. BOWMAN, Boston, Mass., enclosing one dollar, and the whole number of Receipts will be forwarded by mail. No letter taken from the office unless prepaid. March 1.

E. BOWMAN,
No. 117 Hanover street, Boston Mass.,
IMPORTER of French and German Toy Watches; Manufacturer's Agent for the sale of Jewelry; also, Wholesale Dealer in Vegetable Ivory Goods, Sewing Silk, &c. All orders promptly attended to.

ARNOLD'S, 84 STRAND, LONDON.

I HEREBY constitute Mr. Simon Willard, No. 9 Congress street, Boston, sole agent for the sale of my Watches in the United States of America.
April 15, 1853. CHARLES FRODSHAM.

The undersigned, having been appointed sole Agent in the United States for the sale of Charles Frodsham's Improved Timekeepers, would respectfully call public attention to his extensive and valuable stock of Compensated Chronometer Watches, made by Charles Frodsham, and styled his "New Series." In the Watches of the new series, Mr. Frodsham has succeeded—by a more perfect method of compensation, a more correct adjustment in isochronism, and an entirely new and peculiar construction of the train, by which more power is obtained without increase of size—in producing timekeepers of wonderful and unrivalled accuracy. The great importance of the improved Watches is a perfect regularity of time, under every variety of climate, motion, and position. So perfect are the adjustments, that the most violent exercise—such as horseback riding, jumping, &c.—produces on them no sensible effect. They are therefore peculiarly adapted to railroad purposes.

The scientific French critic, Mons. Borsendorf, in his review of the Great London Exhibition of 1851, styles the contribution of Mr. Charles Frodsham as "bearing the stamp of peculiar merit, and as being the flower of the English school."

The British Government have awarded Messrs. Arnold and Charles Frodsham the sum of £3,170, for the excellence of the *principle* of their timekeepers.

One of Mr. Frodsham's correspondents writes as follows:

LONDON, *April* 26, 1852.

SIR: I have much pleasure in giving an account of the Gold Compensation Lever Watch. No. 3,325, you have made for me, and in which I expressly stipulated that it should maintain a uniform rate of going under every variety of motion and climate. This it has done in a most remarkable manner; its rate of going for the first six months was five seconds per month, and in the next six months it changed its rate a little faster, viz: eight seconds per month, and at the end of 365 days it was found to be fast of Greenwich mean time one minute and fifteen seconds. Though I was not led by any previous promise to expect such performance, yet I believe it is only the usual character of your improved watches, which you term your "new series."

I remain, sir, yours, respectfully,
THOMAS BARTLETT
To Mr. Charles Frodsham.

The undersigned has received the following:

BOSTON, *October* 5, 1853.

SIR: I herewith give you an account of the remarkable performance of the watch I purchased of you, made by Charles Frodsham, No. 7,014. Its total variation for 17 months, by weekly observations, was but one minute and fifty-five seconds.
Yours, respectfully, BILLINGS BRIGGS.
To Mr. Simon Willard.

BOSTON, *September* 3, 1853.

The Compensated Lever Watch I purchased of you, made by Charles Frodsham, of London, No. 7,300, has varied but thirty seconds from mean time in six months, by actual daily comparison with your regulator. Yours, &c., ALVIN ADAMS.
Mr. Simon Willard.

The undersigned is permitted to refer to the following gentlemen, who, among many others, have proved the excellence of Frodsham's Watches as timekeepers:

Enoch Train, Esq. Wm. Whiting, Esq.
E. C. Bates, Esq. Geo. M. Thacher, Esq.
F. W. Thayer, Esq. David Dyer, Esq.
E. F. Osborne, Esq., } Sandusky,
Eben. Lane, Esq., } Ohio.

The subscriber would respectfully state that the above Watches are designed and executed by Mr. Frodsham and himself, especially to meet the demands of the American public in the great essential of perfect time, and that in this and in external beauty they stand unrivalled.

All orders addressed to the undersigned will receive immediate attention. SIMON WILLARD,
Jan. 5. No. 9 Congress street, Boston.

BOOK AGENTS WANTED.

TO circulate in every county in the Union some most *rapid selling,* popular, and beautifully illustrated subscription books. A small cash capital required. Apply to HENRY HOWE, 111 Main street, Cincinnati, Ohio. Feb. 16.

YOUNG & CARSON,
Wholesale Grocers and Commission Merchants,
No. 77 Exchange Place, Baltimore,
KEEP constantly on hand a large stock of Groceries, which they offer on the most favorable terms. Baltimore, Jan. 15.

S. P. CHASE. F. BALL

CHASE & BALL, Attorneys and Counsellors at Law, Cincinnati, Ohio, practice in the State Courts of Ohio, in the Circuit and District Courts of the United States in Ohio, and in the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington. Jan. 5

R. D. MUSSEY, M. D., W. H. MUSSEY, M. D.,
SURGEONS and Physicians, No. 70 West Seventh street, (near Vine street,) Cincinnati. Jan. 30.

WM. B. JARVIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Madison, Wisconsin.
COLLECTIONS promptly attended to. Particular attention paid to such claims as are marked "Gone West," &c., against persons residing in any of the Western States. Address as above, post paid.
Jan. 5

Liver Complaint, Jaundice, Dyspepsia, Chronic or Nervous Debility, Diseases of the Kidneys,

AND all diseases arising from a disordered liver or stomach, such as Constipation, Inward Piles, Fullness or Blood to the Head, Acidity of the Stomach, Nausea, Heartburn, Disgust for Food, Fullness or Weight in the Stomach, Sour Eructations, Sinking or Flatulency at the Pit of the Stomach, Swimming of the Head, Hurried and Difficult Breathing, Fluttering of the Heart, Choking or Suffocating Sensations when in a lying posture, Dimness of Vision, Dots or Webs before the sight, Fever and dull pain in the head, Deficiency of Perspiration, Yellowness of the skin and eyes, Pains in the side, back, chest, limbs, &c., Sudden flushes of heat, Burning in the flesh, Constant imaginings of evil, and Great Depression of spirits, can be effectually cured by

DOCTOR HOOFLAND'S CELEBRATED GERMAN BITTERS,
Prepared by
Dr. C. M. Jackson at the German Medicine Store, 120 Arch street, Philadelphia.

Their power over the above diseases is not excelled, if equalled, by any other preparation in the United States, as the cures attest, in many cases after skillful physicians had failed.

These Bitters are worthy the attention of invalids. Possessing great virtues in the rectification of diseases of the liver and lesser glands, exercising the most searching power in weakness and affections of the digestive organs, they are withal safe, certain, and pleasant.

More Home Testimony.

PHILADELPHIA, *March* 1, 1853.

DEAR SIR: For the past two years I have been severely afflicted with Liver Complaint, Dyspepsia, and Piles, suffering constantly the pains and inconveniences attendant upon such complaints, without energy, being scarcely able to attend to any business. I used a great deal of medicine, without any apparent change until I used your "Hoofland's German Bitters." They have entirely cured me. I am now entirely free from pain and ache of any kind, and feel like a new man in every respect, and unhesitatingly recommend your Bitters to all invalids.
Yours, respectfully, JOHN R. CORY,
Dr. C. M. Jackson. No. 12 Lagrange Place.

PHILADELPHIA, *January* 13, 1853.

DEAR SIR: I have used your "Hoofland's German Bitters" in my family for the last four years, for Liver Complaints and Dyspepsia, and am pleased to acknowledge that we have received the greatest benefit from its use. I have recommended it to a great many afflicted with similar diseases, with the same good result. I have no hesitation in saying that it is an invaluable medicine, and hope you will be able to introduce it into every family in the Union.
Yours, truly, WM. HUGHES,
Dr. C. M. Jackson. 171 Wood st.

These Bitters are *entirely vegetable,* thereby possessing great advantages over most of the preparations recommended for similar diseases. They possess great power in the removal of diseases of the liver and lesser glands, exercising the most potent influence in weakness of the nerves and digestive organs. They are, withal, safe, certain, and pleasant.

Sold at wholesale by the Druggists in the principal cities, and at retail by Apothecaries and dealers throughout the United States.

For sale in Washington, D. C., by Z. D. GILMAN, and in Georgetown by J. L. KIDWELL.
April 1—3taw

NEW YORK RECORDER.

Tenth Volume enlarged, in quarto form. The largest Baptist newspaper in the world. Price, in advance, by mail, $2; by carriers, $2.50. Luther F. Beecher & Co., Proprietors, 122 Nassau street, New York.

IN the determination to make their journal a complete repository of general and denominational religious intelligence, and of the news of the day, as well as the earnest advocate of sound Christian doctrine and social progress, the proprietors will summon for these ends every available facility, whether editorial, or in the way of contributors and correspondents. They have engaged able writers at home, and their correspondence from England and Continental Europe, from Asia and every part of America, they believe to be unsurpassed. By furnishing a paper of the highest grade, from this great commercial centre, they hope to increase the patronage with which they are already favored from every section of the United States and the neighboring British Provinces.

The tenth volume commenced March 29. Subscriptions are solicited, and the present is suggested as the best time for forwarding names, with payments accompanying. L. F. BEECHER.
April 14—4tdw S. S. CUTTING.

GRATIS!

A FEW words on the rational treatment, without medicine, of local weakness, nervous debility, loss of memory, love of solitude, self-distrust, dizziness, pimples on the face, and other infirmities of man. By this entirely new and highly successful treatment, every one is enabled to cure himself perfectly, and at the least possible cost. Sent to any address, post free, in sealed envelope, by remitting (post paid) two postage stamps, to DR. B. DE LANEY,
April 1—3m 51 Lispenard street, New York.

R. C. WALBORN & CO.,

WHOLESALE and retail premium ready made shirt and collar manufactory, and gentlemen's furnishing store, Nos. 7 and 9 North Sixth street, Philadelphia. On hand a large assortment of shirts, collars, dress stocks, gloves, hosiery, &c., which we will sell at the lowest cash prices.

Shirts and wrappers made to order by measurement, and warranted to give satisfaction.
WM. W. KNIGHT,
Jan. 30—3m R. C. WALBORN.

BARD & WILSON,

MANUFACTURERS OF GOLD PENS, of every description, respectfully call the attention of the public and Pen Dealers to their recently patented "ANGULAR NIB" Gold Pens. These pens are pronounced by competent judges to be superior to any other now extant. For sale at the manufactory, northeast corner of Market and Third streets, Philadelphia. Jan. 21

HO, HO! YOU ARE GETTING GRAY! ARE YOU?

WELL, THAT IS A MISFORTUNE, and not a crime; but to remain gray when it is unfashionable, and so fine an opportunity offers to restore your "rich ambrosial locks," in all their pristine vigor and beauty, in three minutes, without injury to the *hair* or *skin,* by applying John A. Jones' Improved National Hair Dye, is but little short of crime. Therefore, don't delay. Applied and for sale by the original inventor of Liquid Hair Dye in this country
JOHN A. JONES,
23 East Baltimore st., bet. Front and High.
☞ Also, for sale at all the respectable Druggists and Fancy Stores in every city and town throughout the Union. April 11

THE INDUSTRIOUS POOR

CAN now buy, for $1, in a nice volume, all the following Arts, Receipts, and Discoveries, viz: Dow's 76, Weston's 56, Bowman's 33, Cook's, Holt's, Bishop's, Shipman's, and 30 others, which I have gone to the expense of purchasing and printing for the benefit of those wishing employment. One of these receipts alone cost me $10, and others have been advertised as yielding $6 and $12 per day, and from 500 to 1,000 per cent. Address, post paid,
M. J. COOK.
March 18—4tw Crawfordsville, Indiana.

Mrs. Partington's Life and Sayings.
First Edition 20,000 Copies!

NOW READY, the Life and Sayings of Mrs. Partington, and others of the Family, by B. P. Shillaber, of the *Boston Post.*

"I did fynde her a woman of manye wordes, yet of a very pleasante fancie withal, and havynge much good counselle."—*Doct. Digg his Works: Lib. oxi. Art.—"Mistress Unis Hyte."*

One elegant 12mo volume, 384 pages, printed on superfine paper, with 43 fine Engravings on Wood, including the following full page Illustrations in tints, designed by Coffin & Brown, and engraved by Orr & Andrews:

1. Ruth Partington, a portrait.
2. Paul's Ghost.
3. Partingtonian Philosophy.
4. Punch in the Head.
5. Stock of the Revolution.
6. Ike in the Country.
7. Partington Mouse Hunting.
8. A Christmas Story.

The undersigned has the pleasure of announcing the day of the publication of the long looked for volume, "Mrs. Partington, her Life and Sayings," including those of "Paul," "Ike," and others of the Family. The large number ordered in advance—more than 12,000 copies—is the best evidence of the popularity of the book. With the hope and expectation that the Old Lady will be kindly received by an appreciating public, "the Biographer places his hand on his heart, and bows, as the curtain descends to slow music." J. C. DERBY, Publisher,
8 Park Place, New York.
And for sale by Booksellers throughout the United States and Canadas.
Price $1.25. Single copies sent by mail, post paid, on receipt of price. April 12

TO YOUNG MEN.
Pleasant and Profitable Employment!

YOUNG MEN in every neighborhood may obtain healthful, pleasant, and profitable employment, by engaging in the sale of useful and popular Books, and canvassing for our valuable Journals. For terms and particulars, address, post paid,
FOWLERS & WELLS,
No. 308 Broadway, New York.
P. S. All Agents who engage with us will be secured from the possibility of loss, while the profits derived will be very liberal. April 21

GEORGE W. JULIAN,
Attorney and Counsellor at Law, Centreville, Indiana,
WILL attend to the securing and collecting of claims, and all other business intrusted to his care, in the counties of Wayne, Randolph, Henry, Union, and Fayette, and in the Supreme and Federal Courts at Indianapolis. Dec. 22

CLEVELAND WATER CURE ESTABLISHMENT.

THE above Establishment continues in successful operation during the winter as well as summer. The number of patients treated at the Establishment has been on the increase from year to year, for the past six years, until the last season, when the demands of the public far exceeded our power to accommodate them. The increasing rapidity and proportion of cures, from year to year, induces the subscriber to believe that his enlarged experience and opportunities for treatment give facilities to the invalid rarely equalled.

Diseases peculiar to females are treated with a success and *rapidity* of cure believed to be surpassed by none. [Dec. 8.] T. T. SEELYE, M. D.

AYER'S CHERRY PECTORAL,
FOR THE RAPID CURE OF
COUGHS, COLDS, HOARSENESS, BRONCHITIS, WHOOPING COUGH, CROUP, ASTHMA, AND CONSUMPTION.

AMONG the numerous discoveries Science has made in this generation to facilitate the business of life, increase its enjoyment, and even prolong the term of human existence, none can be named of more real value to mankind, than this contribution of Chemistry to the Healing Art. A vast trial of its virtues throughout this broad country, has proven, beyond a doubt, that no medicine, or combination of medicines, yet known, can so surely control and cure the numerous varieties of pulmonary disease which have hitherto swept from our midst thousands and thousands every year. Indeed, there is now abundant reason to believe a Remedy has at length been found, which can be relied on, to cure the most dangerous affections of the lungs. Our space here will not permit us to publish any proportion of the cures affected by its use, but we would present the following, and refer further inquiry to my American Almanac, which the agent below named will always be pleased to furnish, free, wherein are full particulars, and indisputable proof of these statements.

OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION,
Laurens R. R., S. C. Aug. 4, 1853.

DEAR SIR: My little son, four years old, has just recovered from a severe attack of malignant Scarlet Fever; his throat was rotten, and every person that visited him pronounced him a dead child. Having used your *Cherry Pectoral* in California, in the winter of 1850, for a severe attack of Bronchitis, with entire success, I was induced to try it on my little boy. I gave him a teaspoon-full every three hours, commencing in the morning, and by ten o'clock at night I found a decided change for the better, and after three days' use, he was able to eat or drink without pain.

Its use in the above-named disease will save many a child from a premature grave, and relieve the anxiety of many a fond parent. For all affections of the Throat and Lungs, I believe it the best medicine extant. A feeling of the deepest gratitude prompts me in addressing you these lines; but for your important discovery, my little boy would now have been in another world. I am yours with great respect,
J. D. POWELL, Supt. Trans. L. R. R.
J. C. Ayer.

ROCK HILL, SOMERSET CO., N. J.,
July 21, 1852.

SIR: Since your medicine has become known here, it has a greater demand than any other cough remedy we have ever sold. It is spoken of in terms of unmeasured praise by those who have used it; and I know of some cases where the best they can say of it is not too much for the good it has done. I take pleasure in selling it, because I know that I am giving my customers the worth of their money, and I feel gratified in seeing the benefit it confers.

Please send me a further supply, and believe me
Yours, with respect, JOHN. C. WHITLOCK.
P. S. Almost any number of certificates can be sent you, if you wish it.
Dr. J. C. Ayer.

WINDSOR, C. W., *June* 26, 1852.

SIR: This may certify that I have used your *Cherry Pectoral* for upwards of one year, and it is my sincere belief that I should have been in my grave ere this time if I had not. It has cured me of a dangerous affection of the lungs, and I do not overstate my convictions when I tell you it is a priceless remedy.
Yours, very respectfully,
D. A. McCULLIN, Attorney at Law.
J. C. Ayer.

Prepared by J. C. AYER, Chemist, Lowell, Mass.
Sold in Washington by Z. D. GILMAN, and by all Druggists and Dealers in Medicine everywhere.

Eldridge's Hill Boarding School,
For Young Men and Boys.

THIS Institution is pleasantly situated, on a high elevation, in a healthy, well-improved, and highly flourishing neighborhood, Salem county, New Jersey. The Summer Session will commence on the 22d of the 5th month, (May,) 1854, and continue twenty-two weeks.

The usual branches of a liberal and thorough English education will be taught.
Terms.—$50 per session.
For circulars, &c., address
ALLEN FLITCRAFT, Principal,
March 8—3m Eldridge's Hill, Salem co., N. J.

PIANOS AT GREAT BARGAINS.

T. GILBERT & CO'S celebrated Piano Fortes, with or without the Æolion.—The subscriber, who is sole agent in this city for the sale of these instruments, (the reputation of which has become world-wide,) is prepared to offer them at prices which, to those wishing to purchase, cannot fail to be satisfactory. Possessing facilities for obtaining Pianos unsurpassed by those of any other house in the city, he does not hesitate to say that he can present inducements to buyers not to be found elsewhere. He has constantly on hand an extensive assortment of second-hand Pianos, at bargains, which he fearlessly asserts will defy competition. Also, elegant upright, grand, and Boudoir Pianos; superior Melodeons, made by D. & H. W. Smith; Martin's Guitars, and Brown's Harps.

Second-hand Pianos, nearly equal to new, at prices from $100 to $200. HORACE WATERS,
333 Broadway, New York.
Extensive publisher of Music, and dealer in Musical Instruments. The trade, teachers, and seminaries, supplied on the most favorable terms.
Music sent postage free. Feb. 2.