Vermont Watchman & State Journal.

ISSUED SIMULTANEOUSLY AT MONTPELIER, NORTHFIELD, WATERBURY, &C.

BY E. P. WALTON, JR. | FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1854. | VOL. XLVIII, NO. 23......WHOLE NO. 2481.

Watchman & State Journal.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING.

TERMS.—$1.50 cash in advance; $2,00 if payment is not made in advance; interest always charged from the end of the year.

Annexed is a list of agents to receive subscriptions advertisements and communications, and acknowledge, payment for the same:

Bakersfield, J. N. POMEROY,
Brookfield, S. H. SMITH,
Cabot, C. C. BROWN,
Danville, CHARLES S. DANA,
Elmore, S. G. SCOTT,
Hydepark, EDWARD B. SAWYER,
Johnson, C. W. SCOTT,
Marshfield, E. D. PUTNAM,
Morrisville, J. C. NOYES,
Middlesex, JESSE JOHNSON, Jr.
Northfield, E. SMITH,
Orange, CARLOS CARPENTER,
Plainfield, A. T. BANCROFT,
South Hardwick, C. SHIPMAN,
Stowe, JOSEPH C. RAYMOND,
Strafford, WILLIAM ROLLINS,
South Strafford, DANIEL W. JUDD,
Tunbridge, AARON N. KING,
Waitsfield and Fayston, ORANGE SMITH,
Warren, FRANKLIN A. WRIGHT,
Waterbury and Duxbury, E. C. SMITH,
Williamstown, DARIUS PRIDE,
Worcester, JONAS ABBOTT.

Railroads.

1854 Vt. Central Railroad. 1854

Northern & Western, British and United States Mail Route.

ON and after May 1, 1854, Passenger Trains will run as follows:

Going North and West.

LEAVE BOSTON at 7 1/2 A. M., reaching Burlington at 5 3/4 and Rouse's Point at 7 P. M., Montreal at 9, and Ogdensburgh at 11 1/2 P. M.

LEAVE BOSTON at 12 M., New York 8 A. M., lodge at Montpelier, Vt., and arrive at Burlington at 6.45 A. M., Montreal at 10, and Ogdensburgh at 1 P. M. next day.

ALSO, LEAVE MONTPELIER at 4.45 A. M., and 3.45 P. M.

Going East and South.

LEAVE ROUSE'S POINT at 8 A. M. and 7 P. M., in connection with trains from Montreal and Ogdensburgh, and arriving in Boston and New York THE SAME DAY, by the 8 A. M. train, and the next day, by the 7 P. M. train.

ALSO, LEAVE MONTPELIER at 4.15 and 10.45 A. M.

For further information, apply at the Ogdensburgh and Rouse's Point Passenger Stations, the Champlain and St. Lawrence Railroad Office, Montreal, to Otis Kimball, Agent, 108 State Street, at the Ticket Office, Scollay's Building, 30 Court street, Boston, and to J. W. Hobart, Station Agent, Montpelier.

Freight trains run daily.

JAMES MOORE,
Supt. V. C. R. R.

Northfield, Vt., April 25, 1854.

18 54.

Northern Railroad, N. H.

British & U. S. MAIL ROUTE,

—Via—

Boston, Lowell, Concord, Northern, Passumpsic, Vermont Central, Ogdensburgh and Montreal Railroads.

TO AND FROM

St. Johnsbury, Burlington, St. Albans, Montreal, Ogdensburgh and the West, and Manchester, Nashua, Boston, Lawrence, Salem, Dover, Portsmouth, Portland, Groton Junction, Worcester, Providence, Norwich and New York.

This is the direct route betwixt the above places, and passes through the capitals of New Hampshire and Vermont. The fare and freight as low as by other routes.

After Dec. 12, 1853, trains North leave Boston at 7.45 A. M. and 12 M. and Concord at 10.30 A. M. and 3 P. M. Trains South leave White River Junction at 7.15 A. M. and 1.30 P. M., on the arrival of Cars from upper roads.

Special cattle trains pass over this route every Tuesday, and freight trains daily between Burlington, Rouse's Point, Ogdensburgh, Montreal, and Nashua, Lowell, Boston, Salem, Portsmouth, Worcester, Providence and intermediate places, and it is the only route from the Ogdensburgh and Montreal Roads by which Freight can be carried without changing cars.

ONSLOW STEARNS, Agent.

Concord, N. H. Dec. 10, 1853.

ALBANY & RUTLAND

RAILROAD.

NOW OPEN AND RUNNING THROUGH to Albany without change of Cars

1853. Fall & Winter Arrangement. 1853.

Shortest and quickest through Mail Line from Ogdensburgh, Montreal, Rouses' Point, Plattsburgh and Burlington to Troy, Albany and New York,

via Rutland and Eagle Bridge,

in connection with Rutland and Burlington, and Hudson River Railroad.

Passengers over this route may rely upon making all the connections without difference. Roads, as advertised. This is the ONLY ROUTE by which passengers can with certainty go through from Montreal to New York the same day.

NO CHANGE OF CARS,

Conductors or Baggage Masters between Rutland and Troy or Albany.

FIRST TRAIN leaves Burlington 9.15 A. M.

SECOND TRAIN leaves Burlington 10.30 A. M. arrives at Troy 3.15 P. M. and Albany 3.25 P. M., leaves Troy 4.15 P. M. or Albany 4.25 P. M. for New York.—Arrives at New York 9.15 P. M.

THIRD TRAIN leaves Burlington 6.30 P. M., lodge at Rutland, and leaves Rutland at 6.30 A. M., arrives at Troy 10 A. M. and Albany 10.15 A. M., leave Troy 10.30 A. M., or Albany 10.45 A. M. for New York, arrive at New York 4.10 P. M.

Express Train for Buffalo leaves Albany 10.30 A. M.

Through Tickets to be procured at the Rutland and Burlington Railroad office, or of

JAMES W. MILLS, agent, Burlington,
S. TILLEY, Travelling Agent.

Also, Through Tickets to Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Cincinnati, Chicago, and all the Western cities, for sale at the Office of the Rutland and Burlington Railroad, and of the Agents of the Albany & Rutland Railroad.

Baggage Checked Through to Troy, Albany or New York.

In all cases to avoid delay Check Baggage through by EAGLE BRIDGE ROUTE.

THOS. H. CANFIELD, Sup.

Burlington, Nov. 9, 1853. 58tf

Poetry.

Now-a-days.

Alas! how everything has changed,
Since I was sweet sixteen,
When all the girls wore home-spun frocks,
And aprons nice and clean;
With bonnets made of braided straw,
And tied beneath the chin,
The shawls laid neatly on the neck,
And fastened with a pin.

I recollect the time when I
Rode father's horse to mill,
Across the meadows, rock and field,
And up and down the hill;
And when our folks were out at work,
As sure as I'm a sinner,
I jumped upon a horse bare back
And carried them their dinner.

Dear me! young ladies now-a-days,
Would almost faint away,
To think of riding all alone,
In wagon, chaise or sleigh;
And as for giving "Pa" his meals,
Or helping "Ma" to bake,
Oh! saints, 'twould spoil their lily hands,
Though sometimes they make cake.

When winter came, the maiden's heart
Began to beat and flutter;
Each beau would take his sweetheart out
Sleigh-riding in a cutter,
Or if the storm was bleak and cold,
The girls and beaux together,
Would meet and have most glorious fun,
And never mind the weather.

But now, indeed, it grieves me much
The circumstance to mention,
However kind the young man's heart,
And honest his intention;
He never asks the girls to ride,
But such a war is waged,
And if he sees her once a week,
Why, surely, "they're engaged!"

[From the Edinburgh Magazine.]

The Dead Soldier.

Lines on a Dead Soldier, found dead on the field of battle.

Wreck of a warrior passed away!
Thou form without a name!
Which thought and felt but yesterday,
And dreampt of future fame!
Stripp'd of thy garments, who shall guess
Thy rank, thy lineage and race?
If haughty chieftain, holding sway,
Or lowlier, destined to obey!

The light of that fix'd eye is set,
And all is moveless now,
But Passion's traces linger yet,
And low upon that brow;
Expression has not yet wax'd weak,
The lips seem e'en to speak,
And clenched the cold and lifeless hand,
As if it grasp'd the battle brand!

Though from that head, late towering high,
The waving plume is torn,
And low in dust that form doth lie,
Dishonored and forlorn!
Yet death's dark shadow cannot hide
The graven characters of pride,
That on the lip and brow reveal
The impress of the spirit's seal.

Lives there a mother to deplore
The son she ne'er shall see?
Or maiden, on some distant shore,
To break her heart for thee?
Perchance to roam a maniac there,
With wild flower wreaths to deck her hair,
And through the weary night to wait
Thy footstep at the lonely gate.

Long shall she linger there, in vain
The evening fire shall trim,
And gazing on the darkening main,
Shall often call on him
Who hears her not—who cannot hear—
O! deaf forever is the ear
That once in listening rapture hung
Upon the music of her tongue!

Long may she dream—to wake is woe!
Ne'er may remembrance tell
Its tale, to bid her sorrows flow,
And hope to sigh farewell;
The heart, bereaved of its stay,
Quenching the beam that cheers her way
Along the waste of life—till she
Shall lay her down and sleep, like thee!

Miscellaneous.

THE TURK AT HOME.

FROM DICKENS' "HOUSEHOLD WORDS."

The Turk, as he is presented to the popular mind, is a gentleman with a ferocious beard; wearing a curved sword; having more wives than he can count; smoking all day long; and disdaining the convenience of a chair. Blue Beard is supposed to have been a Turk; and, in fact, all the horrible monsters of our children's story-books are represented to be Turks. To call a man "a pretty Turk" in England, is not to pay him a compliment. Even in Turkey no man likes to be called a Turk; he is an Ottoman; a Turk in his eyes is a barbarian.

The Turk or Ottoman of the present day is a being who differs very widely from the savage gentleman of popular fiction. He is brought up to respect the laws as he respects his religion, and to consider them a part of it; he usually confines himself to one wife; and, when he returns home in an angry mood he does not tie his lady up in a sack and throw her into the Bosphorus. He is not in the habit of stabbing people in the dark; he is not always hard hearted and cruel; he can be honest, in his dealing, and is far from being outrageously impure in his morals—that is in the morals which are held up to him as proper. The law protects his wife against cruelty or neglect; and his chance of rising in the world depends very much upon his own exertions. He is not elbowed off the public scene by hereditary legislators; he may be born of a slave mother, and yet live to be the great chamberlain of the palace.—Every office is open, in Turkey, to every man.

Montesquieu's description of Turkey, is no longer applicable. When he wrote, it was true that property was not respected; that civil law was not known; that slavery had degraded the people; and polygamy had destroyed the purity of social life. But things have changed within the last fifty years, under the rule of the present Sultan and his predecessor. The Koran has been interpreted anew, to serve the great cause of human advancement. Its direction to believers to bring light even from China, has been used to sanctify the introduction of the arts of Western Europe; and to make the introduction of modern military science popular, Mahommedans were reminded that the arms even of the enemy might be used to crush him. Provinces that were ravaged by incessant civil wars; that were by turns a prey to the rapacity of the predominant pacha within, or to the lust and brutality of armed bandits from without, have been brought within the influence of Constantinople. Officials, who exacted presents and sold justice, have been subjectee to the utmost rigor of the law.—The slave-market has been suppressed, and slaves have been surrounded with the protecting spirit of the government, so that, at the present moment, no master may ill-use them.—A new and merciful code of laws has been drawn up, and commerce has been re-arranged on the French model. Thus it will be seen that the Turk (for we must still call him so) born in the present time, does not enter upon a scene quite so barbarous as that upon which his grandfather played a part. No mountain of light may be descried about him, but we may see a glimmer of promise.

The care with which the Osmanlis have always kept their wives and daughters apart, still prevails in Constantinople. To ask a Turkish gentleman after his wife or his daughter, is to give him mortal offence. If he alludes to them he calls them "the home," or "the house." He will tell you that the house is well. Also when he announces to his friends the birth of a daughter, he says, "a veiled one," or "a stranger has been given to me." He is taught by the Koran to honor his wife, and to believe that she will be, equally with himself, a participator in Heavenly felicity. This teaching effectually displaces the vulgar error that declares the Mohammedans to believe women have no souls. Polygamy is allowed to this day in Turkey, but it is so surrounded with social and religious difficulties that it is rarely practiced. The Koran allows a Musselman to marry four legitimate wives, but tells him expressly that it is meritorious to marry only one.—In Constantinople the ulemas, the great bodies of government officials, the navy and military officers, the tradesmen and the workmen have generally only one wife. In the provinces one wife is even more universally the rule. And now, all the great officers of state make a merit of marrying one wife only, to show a good example to their countrymen. Nor is the wife a slave entirely. In her own apartment she is supremely mistress. She may receive her female friends and her male relations; she may go out in the day time (veiled and attended;) and her husband consults her on all his affairs. She is not the painted doll we have read of. She is thoroughly domestic, and is effectually protected by the state from cruel treatment. The Musselman is bound by law to maintain her according to his rank; if he fails in this she may claim a divorce. When he marries her he gives a present to her relative, instead of expecting a dower, as with us. She has the care of his household, and if he be poor, she employs her leisure in spinning. She has the exclusive right, by law, to bring up her children—the girls until they are married, the boys until they enter one of the public schools. If the Ottomans have one tender chord in their breasts, it is that which is awakened within them at the sound of the maternal name. Women may even even perform the functions of the Imam recite prayers, and under ordinary circumstances, they may be invested with political powers. Yet, undoubtedly, the Turkish woman is not yet free. The law allows her to see her distant relatives only once in each year, if her husband objects to more frequent visiting; her near relatives are also subject to legal interference.

The Ottoman at home, therefore, is not a Bluebeard—his wife is not a slave. Yet in his house he has slaves, whom he buys as sheep are bought. These slaves are said to be well used, and can, with reasonable exertion, earn their liberty. Thus the son of a slave mother is incontestibly free. In fact these slaves represent very closely the condition of the Russian serf, but appear to be better treated. In Turkey a man is compelled by law to feed and clothe his slaves; he may not ill-treat them; he cannot force or prevent their marriages. They are simply servants without wages, and in most cases personally and of choice attached to their masters; yet the condition of the female slave is barbarous enough, and very shocking to any civilized man who may have an opportunity of watching their condition, and the terrible traffic of which they are the object. Then, the son of a slave, being free, has an equal chance in the world with the boys of the most favored parentage; for in Turkey there is no aristocracy.

The story runs that one day the Khalif Omer having received some fine linen from Yemen, distributed it amongst the Musselmans. Every man had an equal piece, Omer reserving no more for himself than he had given to the rest. Arrayed in the garment this share had been made into, he entered a pulpit and exhorted the Mussulmans to wage war with the infidels. But a man, present rose, and interrupting the Khalif said, "We will not obey you."

"Why not?" Omer asked.

"Because you have distinguished yourself from us all by a particular partiality."

"In what way?" said the Khalif.

"Listen. When you pretended to divide the linen equally you deceived us, for our pieces do not suffice to make a garment like yours.—You are a man of great height, and have retained enough to clothe yourself from head to foot."

Omer, turning to his son, said, "Abd-Allah, answer this man."

Whereupon Abd-Allah rose and explained. "When the prince of believers, Omer, wished to make a garment of his portion of linen, he found it insufficient. I found my portion too much, so I gave him my surplus."

"Very good," the questioner then answered; "in that case we will obey you."

This spirit predominates to this hour. All men are equal in Turkey; and if a man becomes a minister for foreign affairs, be sure that he has a good right to the post. Only the sovereign's position is hereditary, and only the royal family bears a recognized family name, and traces exactly its descent. Thus we find such designations as "Ibrahim the son of the slipper-maker," are common throughout the country. The only recognized rank is that of the government officials, who, as in Russia, have all a military grade. The rest of the nation is divided into two distinct classes;—employers and artisans. The artisans are banded together as in other continental states, into distinct corporations or Esnafs, and are governed by an inspector or Kiaya. These bodies are very numerous, and include corporations of bonnet-makers, pipe-tube manufacturers, water carriers, boatmen, and others; the corporation of boatmen being amongst the largest. These men are the cabmen of Constantinople, and ply upon the waters of the Bosphorus, in their little varnished kaiks. They are nearly all beggars, or bachelor adventurers, who leave their homes on the borders of Asia, for two or three years, to earn money enough at Constantinople to return in comfort to their distant villages.—Their object being to economise as far as possible, they generally club together in bands of five or six, to hire one large room (which they get for about twenty piastres, equal to three shillings and fourpence per month) and therein each member has his carpet and his bedclothes.—They give a sum about equal with the rent, to some old man, who is charged with the arrangement of the room, and with the preparation of the boatmen's supper. This old man is well cared for by his employers, and is their umpire in disputes. Thus these prudent fellows gather their modest harvest quickly, and return to their homes, unless in the meantime by the exhibition of some rare talent, they have been made capitan pacha.

The capitalists and landowners are reputed to be a grave, dignified, intensely prejudiced class of men.—They preside over their farms or business, take great care of their homes; extend to their neighbors a bountiful hospitality; pray; give away abundantly in charity; educate their children; and, with the well-loved tchibouk or pipe, enjoy the *kef*, that irresistible, idle dreaminess, that the Ottoman loves to nurse, sitting cross-legged upon his splendid carpet. He sees the progress going forward in his country with the look of a hopeless man. He says, "When the medicinal properties of the plants revealed themselves to Hokman, not one of them said to him, 'I can restore life to a corpse.' Sultan Abdul Medjid is another Hokman, but the empire is a corpse, all true Musselmans are under ground." If he be a rich man he will order his relatives to convey his body to the great cemetery of Scutari of Asia, that the infidels may not disturb his bones when they shall have taken possession of Stamboul. He represents a large class of men in the Turkish empire. These men look upon all the reforms which have been going on during the last fifty years as so many hopeless attempts to restore animation to a dead body. They are the Turkish Tories, longing for the good old times when the pachas were unquestioned tyrants; when the slave-market was brisk in the open squares of Constantinople; and when the Koran was interpreted in defence of oppression and of wrong. They are, in fact, the faint type of the Turk vulgarly known throughout Europe. They are represented as exhibiting those virtues which characterize the Arab:—hospitality, religious zeal, and a scrupulously moral life; but they are known to be crafty, and, when roused, cruel. They are declared fatalists, and any Turk will see his property fall from him without a murmur. The doctrine of predestination has fastened itself upon his soul; he expresses it in many different proverbs: "The blood destined to be shed cannot be retained in the artery;" "When Destiny arrives the eye of Wisdom becomes blind:" "When the darts of divine will have been sped from the bow of Destiny, they cannot be warded off by the shield of Precaution." These are among the old Turk's popular proverbs; and although the enlightened Ottomans of the present day ceased to preach the errors of fatalism, the belief in it continues to operate throughout the dominions of the Sultan, and to paralize the national energies. But while this fatalism retards the progress of the Ottomans, it imparts a singular dignity to them.—The old-fashioned Musselman is never astonished, never delighted, never stricken down with grief. If his house is consumed by fire, he says calmly, "It was written." When he is upon his death-bed, he quietly performs his ablutions, repeats his *namar;* trusting to his prophet and his God, he directs that his head shall be turned towards Mecca, and expires.

Law of Newspapers.

I. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary, are considered as wishing to continue their subscription.

II. If subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publisher may continue to send them till all that is due be paid.

III. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible till they have settled their bills and ordered their papers discontinued.

IV. If subscribers move to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.

V. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncalled for, is *prima facie* evidence of intentional fraud.

VI. A Postmaster neglecting to inform a publisher, when his paper is not taken from the office, makes himself liable for the subscription price.

St. Petersburgh, Moscow, and Odessa are the only cities in Russia the population of which exceeds 100,000. There are only four towns containing more than 50,000 each, and eighteen or twenty with a population of 25,000.

The taxable property of the State of Texas has increased 100 per cent. in the last three years. It is now $99,155,114.

Speech of Col. Benton

ON THE

NEBRASKA BILL,

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, 25th day of April, 1854.

The House being in Committee of the Whole, Mr. Chandler in the Chair:

The Chairman—The question before the committee is on the Senate amendments to the deficiency bill; and on that question the member from Mississippi [Mr. Harris] has still the floor.

Mr. Harris not availing himself of his right,

Col. Benton rose and addressed the committee.

THE BILL COMES FROM A FREE STATE.

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 the 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 choose to do so, I do 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 intend to stand upon it to the end, "solitary and alone, if need be;" (*applause and laughter*) 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 breech 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 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 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 forbidden to him, as tending to an undue and unconstitutional interference with the freedom of legislation. It is not bribery alone, attempt upon a member, which constituents a breach of the privileges 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 should 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 an 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 being obnoxious to the censure which the British House of Commons pronounced upon the lord of the bedchamber, in the case of the King and the Fox East India bill.

MINISTERIAL INTERFERENCE.

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 profess 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 integers. (Roars of laughter.)

PUBLIC PRINTERS' INTERFERENCE.

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 in 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 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." (*Prolonged applause, cries of Good, good.*)

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.

MISSOURI COMPROMISE NOT MERELY A STATUTE.

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 THREE SLAVERY COMPROMISES.

The Missouri Compromise of 1820 was the partitioning between the free and slave 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 preservation of this Union. First, the territorial partition ordinance of 1787, with its clause for the recovery of fugitive slaves; secondly, the contemporaneous constitutional recognition of slavery in the states which choose 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 the 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 guaranty 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 in no way differs from the other two in 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 same 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 Compromise 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 headed by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Monroe, conveyed the northwestern territory to the thirteen U. S. 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 the 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 remodelled, the anti-slave 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 the Missouri Compromise results from both; 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.

MISSOURI COMPROMISE IMPOSED BY SOUTHERN VOTES.

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. I repeat: It was an imposition, not a compact. The South divided and took choice; and now it will not do to claim the other half on the ground of the original dissatisfaction of the other party. Brothers cannot divide an estate in that way—one make the division, and take choice, and afterwards claim the other half. The South has her half. She gave it away once—gave it to Spain; the North helped her to get it back, even at the expense of war—without suspecting that she was strengthening the South to enable it to take the other half. But this attempt does not come from the South, and finds resistance there.

THE RESULT OF AN ATTEMPT TO REPEAL THE COMPROMISE OF 1787.

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 repeal. The others are 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 invite a slaveholding emigration, until an increase of population should form 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 it received its answer in a report, in these words:

"That the rapid population of Ohio sufficiently evinces, in the opinion of your committee, that the labor of slaves is not necessary to support 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 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, not-