

# THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOLUME IX.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

NUMBER 3.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O'MEARA GOODRICH.

## TOWANDA:

Wednesday Morning, August 2, 1858.

### Letter from Gen. Cass on the Proviso.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 30th, 1847.  
DEAR SIR.—I have received your letter, and shall answer it as frankly as it was written.  
You ask me whether I am in favor of the acquisition of Mexican territory, and what are my sentiments with regard to the Wilmot Proviso.  
I have so often and so explicitly stated my views of the first question, in the Senate, that it seems almost unnecessary to repeat them here. As you request it, however, I shall briefly give them.  
I think, then, that no peace should be granted to Mexico, till a reasonable indemnity is obtained for the injuries which she has done us. The territorial extent of this indemnity is, in the first instance, a subject of executive consideration. There the constitution has placed it, and there I am willing to leave it; not only because I have full confidence in his judicious exercise; but because, in the ever-varying circumstances of a war, it would be indelicate, by a public declaration, to commit the country to any line of indemnity, which might otherwise be enlarged, as the obstinate injustice of the enemy prolongs the contest, with its loss of blood and treasure.  
It appears to me that the kind of metaphysical magnanimity, which would reject all indemnity, at the close of a bloody and expensive war, brought on by a direct attack upon our troops by the unjust act of a series of years, is as unworthy of the age in which we live, as it is unbecoming to the common sense and practice of the world. It would produce but little in our future history, and would be a present reputation to a country, which has no other all expectation of cooperation with the Mexican government, and a fighting, not a peace, would result, but for some vague, person's philanthropic object, which escapes my penetration, and must be defined by those who assume this new principle of national intercommunication. All wars are to be deprecated, as well by the statesman as the philanthropist. They are great evils; but there are greater evils than these, and submission to injustice is among them. The nation which should refuse to defend its rights and its honor, when assailed, would soon have neither to defend; and, when driven to war, it is not by professions of disinterestedness, and declarations of magnanimity, that its rational objects can be best obtained, or other nations taught a lesson of forbearance—the strongest security for permanent peace. We are at war with Mexico, and its vigorous prosecution is the surest means of its speedy termination, as ample indemnity the surest guaranty against the recurrence of such injustices as provoked it.  
The Wilmot Proviso has been before the country some time. It has been repeatedly discussed in Congress, and by the public press. I am strongly impressed with the opinion that a great change has been going on in the public mind upon this subject—in my own as well as others; and that doubts are resolving themselves into conviction, that the principle it involves should be kept out of the national legislature, and left to the people of the confederacy in their respective local governments.  
The whole subject is a comprehensive one, and fruitful of important consequences. It would be ill-timed to discuss it here. I shall not assume the important task, but shall confine myself to such general views, as are necessary to the fair exhibition of my opinion.  
We may as well regret the existence of slavery in the Southern States, and wish they had been saved from its introduction. But there it is, and not by the act of the present generation; and we must deal with it as a present practical question, involving the most momentous consequences. We have neither the right nor the power to touch it where it exists; and if we had both, their exercise, by any means heretofore suggested, might lead to results which no-wise man would willingly encounter, and which no good man could contemplate without anxiety.  
The theory of our government presupposes that its various members have reserved to themselves the regulation of all subjects relating to what may be termed their internal policy. They are sovereign within their boundaries, except in order to give effect to the object of the Union, whether these concern foreign nations, or the several States themselves. Local institutions, if they so speak, whether they have reference to slavery or to any other relations, domestic or public, are left to local authority, either original or derivative. Congress has no right to say that there shall be no slavery in Georgia; nor is there any other human power but the people of those States respectively, which can change the relations existing there; and they can say, if they will, we will have slavery in the former, and we will abolish it in the latter.  
In various respects the territories differ from the States. Some of their rights are abridged, and they do not possess the peculiar attributes of sovereignty. Their relation to the general government is very imperfectly defined by the constitution; and it will be found upon examination, that in that instrument the only grant of power concerning them is conveyed in the phrase "Congress shall have the power to dispose of and regulate all the territory and other property belonging to the United States." Obviously this phraseology is very loose. If it were deemed to include in the grant the whole power of legislation over persons, as well as things. The expression, "the territory and other property," fairly connected, relates to the public lands, as such, to arsenals, dockyards, forts, ships, and all the various kinds of property, which the United States may and must possess.

But surely the simple authority to dispose of and regulate these, does not extend to the unlimited power of legislation; to the passage of all laws, in the most general acceptance of the word; which by the way, is very carefully excluded from the Amendment. And, indeed, if this were so, it would render unnecessary another provision of the constitution, which grants to Congress the power to legislate, with the consent of the States, respectively, over all places purchased for the "erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, &c." These being the "property" of the United States, if the power to make "needful rules and regulations concerning" them includes the general power of legislation, then the grant of authority to regulate the "territory and property of the United States" is unlimited, and every subject is found for its operation, and in its exercise needs no auxiliary provision. If, on the other hand, it does not include such power of legislation over the "other property" of the United States, then it does not include it over the "territory;" for the same terms which grant the one, grant the other. "Territory" is here classed with property, and treated as such; and the object was evidently to enable the general government, as a property holder—which, from necessity, it must be—to manage, preserve, and "dispose of" such property as it might possess, and which authority is essential almost to its being. But the lives and persons of our citizens, with the vast variety of objects connected with them cannot be controlled by any authority, which is merely called into existence for the purpose of making rules and regulations for the disposition and management of property.  
Such, as it appears to me, would be the construction put upon this provision of the constitution, were this question now first presented for consideration, and not controlled by imperious circumstances. The original ordinance of the Congress of the confederacy, passed in 1787, and which was the only act of this subject in force at the adoption of the constitution, provided a complete frame of government of the country north of Ohio, while in a territorial condition, and for its eventual admission in separate States into the Union. And the persuasion, that this ordinance contained within itself all the necessary means of execution, probably prevented any direct reference to the subject in the constitution, further than vesting in Congress the right to admit the States formed under it into the Union. However, circumstances arose, which required legislation, as well over the territory north of the Ohio, as over other territory, both within and without the original Union, ceded to the general government; and, at various times, in more enlarged power has been exercised over the Territories—meaning thereby the different territorial governments—than is conveyed by the limited grant referred to. How far an existing necessity may have operated in producing this legislation, and thus extending, by rather violent implication, powers not directly given, I know not. But certain it is, that the principle of interference should not be carried beyond the necessary implication which produces it.  
It should be limited to the creation of proper governments for new countries, acquired or settled, and then necessary provision for their eventual admission into the Union; leaving, in the meantime, to the people inhabiting them, to regulate their internal concerns in their own way. They are just as capable of doing so, as any race, as soon as their political independence is organized by admission into the Union. During this temporary condition, it is hardly expedient to call into exercise a doubtful and invidious authority, which questions the intelligence of a respectable portion of our citizens, and whose limitation, whatever it may be, will be rapidly approaching its termination—an authority which would give to Congress despotic power, uncontrollable by the constitution, over most important sections of our common country. For, if the relation of master and servant may be regulated or annihilated by its legislation, so may the relation of husband and wife, of parent and child, and of any other condition which our institutions and the habits of our society recognize. What would be the effect if Congress should undertake to prescribe the terms of marriage in New York, or to regulate the authority of parents over their children in Pennsylvania? And yet it would be as vain to seek one justifying the interference of the national legislature in the cases referred to in the original states of the Union. I speak here of the inherent power of Congress, and do not touch the question of such contracts as may be formed with new states when admitted into the confederacy.

Of all the questions that can agitate us, those which are merely sectional in their character are the most dangerous, and the most to be deprecated. The warning voice of him who, from his right to warn us, proclaimed to his countrymen in his Farewell Address—that monument of wisdom for him, as I hope it will of safety to them—how much we had to apprehend from measures peculiarly affecting the geographical portions of our country. The grave circumstances in which we are now placed make these words words of safety; for I am satisfied from all I have seen and heard here, that a successful attempt to engraft the principles of the Wilmot Proviso upon the legislation of this government, and apply them to new territory, should new territory be acquired, would seriously affect our tranquility. I do not suffer myself to foresee or foretell the consequences that would ensue; for I trust and believe there is good sense and good feeling enough in the country to avoid them.  
I am, I am opposed to the exercise of any discretionary power over this matter, and I am in favor of leaving to the people of any territory, which may be hereafter acquired, the right to regulate it for themselves under the general principles of the constitution. Because,  
1. I do not see in the Constitution any grant of the requisite power of Congress; and I am not disposed to extend a doubtful precedent beyond its necessary establishment of territorial governments when needed—leaving to the inhabitants the right compatible with the relation they bear to the confederacy.  
2. Because I believe this measure, if adopted, would weaken, if not impair, the union of the States,

and would sow the seeds of future discord, and harvest of calamity.  
3. Because I believe that a general conviction that such a proposition would succeed, would lead to an immediate termination of the war. I think no dispassionate observer at the seat of government can doubt this.  
4. If, however, in this I am under a misapprehension, I am under none in the practical operation of this restriction if adopted by Congress, upon a treaty of peace making any acquisition of Mexican territory. Such a treaty would be rejected just as certainly as presented to the Senate. More than one third of that body would vote against it, viewing such a principle as the exclusion of the citizens of the slaveholding states from a participation in the benefits acquired by the treasure and exertion of all, and which should be common to all. I am, repeating—neither advancing nor defending these views. That branch of the subject does not lie in my way, and I shall not turn aside to seek it.  
In this respect of the matter, the people of the United States must choose between this restriction, and the territorial limits. They cannot have both and which they will surrender must depend upon their representatives first, and then if these fail them, upon themselves.  
But after all, it seems to be generally conceived, that this restriction, if carried into effect, could not operate upon States to be formed of newly acquired territory. The well known attributes of sovereignty, recognized by us as belonging to the State governments, would sweep before them any such barrier, and would leave the people to express and exert their will at pleasure. Is the object then, of temporary exclusion for so short a period as the duration of territorial governments, worth the price at which it would be purchased—or the discord it would engender, the trial to which it would expose our Union, and the evils that would be the certain consequences, let that trial result as it might? As to the course which has been intimated rather than proposed, of engrafting such a restriction upon any treaty of acquisition, I persuade myself it would find but little favor in any portion of that country. Such an arrangement would render Mexico a party, having a right to interfere with our internal institutions in questions left by the constitution to State governments, and would inflict a severe blow upon our fundamental principles. Few, indeed, I trust, there are among us, who would thus grant to a foreign power the right to inquire into the constitution and conduct of the Sovereign States of the Union; and if there are any, I am not among them, and never shall be. To the people of the country, under God, now and hereafter, are its destinies committed; and we want no foreign power to interrogate us—Why have you done this, or why have you left this undone? Our own dignity and the principles of national independence repel such a proposition.

But there is another important consideration, which ought not to be lost sight of, in the investigation of this subject. The question that presents itself is not a question of increase but of the diffusion of slavery.—Whether its sphere be stationary or progressive its amount will be the same. The rejection of this restriction will not add one to the class of servitude, nor will its adoption give freedom to a single being who is now placed therein. The same numbers will be spread over greater territory; and so far as comprehension, with less abundance of the necessities of life, is an evil, so far will that evil be mitigated by transporting slaves to a new country, and giving them a large space to occupy. I say this in the event of the extension of slavery into any new acquisition. But can it go there? This may well be doubted. All the descriptions which reach us of the condition of California and New Mexico, to the acquisition of which our efforts seem at present directed, unite in representing these countries as agricultural regions, similar in their products to our middle states, and generally unfit for the production of the great staples, which can alone render slave labor valuable. If we are not grossly deceived—and it is difficult to conceive how we can be—the inhabitants of those regions, whether they depend upon their plows or their herds, cannot be slaveholders. Involuntary labor, requiring the investment of large capital, can only be profitable when employed in the production of a few favored articles, confined by nature to special districts and paying larger returns than the usual agricultural products spread over more considerable portions of the earth.

In the able letter of Mr. Buchanan on this subject, not long since given to the public, he presents similar considerations with great force. "Neither," says the distinguished writer, "the soil, the climate, nor the production of California, south of 36 deg. 30 min., nor indeed of any portion of it, north or south, is adapted to slave labor; and besides, every facility would be there afforded for the slave to escape from his master. Such property would be entirely insecure in any portion of California. It is morally impossible, therefore, that a majority of the emigrants to that portion of the territory south of 36 deg. 30 min., which will be chiefly composed of our citizens, will ever re-establish slavery within its limits."  
"In regard to New Mexico, east of the Rio Grande, the question has already been settled by the admission of Texas into the Union.  
"Should we acquire territory beyond the Rio Grande and east of the Rocky Mountains, it is still more impossible that a majority of the people would consent to re-establish slavery. They are themselves a colored population, and among them the negroes do not belong socially to a degraded race."  
With this last remark, Mr. Walker fully coincides in his letter written in 1844, upon the acquisition of Texas, and which every where produced so favorable an impression upon the public mind, as to have convinced very materially to the accomplishment of that great measure. "Beyond the Del Norte," says Mr. Walker, "slavery will not pass; not only because it is forbidden by law, but because the colored race there preponderates in the ratio of

ten to one over the whites; and holding, as they do, the government and most of the offices in their possession, they will not permit the enslavement of any portion of the colored race, which makes and executes the laws of the country."  
The question, it will be therefore seen on examination, does not regard the exclusion of slavery where it now exists, but a prohibition against its introduction where it does not exist, and where, from the feelings of the inhabitants, and the laws of nature, it is morally impossible, as Mr. Buchanan says, that it can ever re-establish itself.  
It argues well for the permanence of our confederation, that during more than half a century, which has elapsed since the establishment of this government, many serious questions, and some of the highest importance, have agitated the public mind, and more than once threatened the gravest consequences; but that they have all in succession passed away, leaving our institutions unscathed, and our country advancing in numbers, power, and wealth, and in all the other elements of national prosperity, with a rapidity unknown in ancient or modern days. In times of political excitement, when difficult and delicate questions present themselves for solution, there is one ark of safety for us; and that is, an honest appeal to the fundamental principles of our Union, and a stern determination to abide its dictates. This course of proceeding will carry us through many more, should many more be destined to assail. The Wilmot Proviso seeks to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another, created by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject-matter involved in this issue. By going back to our true principles, we go back to the road of peace and safety. Leave to the people, who will be effected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility, and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our government, and furnish another guaranty for its permanence and prosperity. I am, dear sir, respectively your obt. servant,  
LEWIS CASS.

A. O. P. NICHOLSON, Esq.,  
"MASON AND DIXON'S LINE"—What was the origin and purpose of it? We hear it frequently spoken of as connected with slavery, and as originally relating to that subject. Nothing can be further from the truth. At the time that line was established, slavery existed on both sides of it. A brief account of its origin may be of some interest just at this time.  
As early as the year 1682 a dispute arose between William Penn and Lord Baltimore, respecting the construction of their respective grants, of what now form the States of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland. Lord Baltimore claimed to, and including the 40th degree north latitude; and William Penn, mildly, yet firmly, resisting the claim. The debatable land was one degree or 69 English miles on the south of Pennsylvania, and extending west as far as the State itself. The matter was finally brought into the Court of Chancery in England, and after tedious delays (it has always been so) on the 15th day of May, 1763, Lord Chancellor Hardwick made a decree, awarding costs against Lord Baltimore, and directing that commissioners should be appointed to mark the boundaries between the parties. The commissioners so appointed, met at New-Castle, on the 15th day of November, 1763, and not being able to agree separated. After a further litigation and delay, the whole matter was settled by the mutual agreement between the surviving heirs of the original litigants.  
In the year 1761, Mr. Charles Mason, of the Royal Observatory, was sent to Pennsylvania, with all the needful astronomical instruments to measure a degree of latitude. That duty he performed, and a report of his proceedings is to be found in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, for the year 1768.  
This Mr. Mason and Jeremiah Dixon were appointed to run the line in dispute, which appears to have been done in conformity with the Lord Chancellor's decree. That is the famous "Mason and Dixon's Line," and the boundary between Pennsylvania on the south and Maryland on the north.  
Little did the actors in this matter think that in after times, the line established with so much trouble and expense, would ever be connected with a subject calculated to shake a great nation to its centre.  
"NINETEENTH YEAR."—The old Germans of our State and perhaps of other States, have a notion that every nineteenth year has peculiar characteristics, from which we understand, such as are farmers who entertain it, are more or less governed in their agricultural pursuits and operations. The peculiarities attributed by them to what they denominate the "Nineteenth Year," are an open winter during which farmers can plough through nearly the whole season; a protracted spring and a scarcity of snow and ice. This year, or this season, they say is the nineteenth year, the last being the year and season of 1829. By reference to that year, it is remembered by old inhabitants that it was an open winter, and that ice was so scarce that Mr. Moiere, unable to lay in a stock from this neighborhood, was compelled to secure a quantity of the article from a distance, which circumstance, the importation of ice to our city, was then considered "something new under the sun." Indications of the present season thus far seem to favor this notion of our worthy Germans, and perhaps a seasonable hint to those interested in either a cold winter and short spring, or an open and mild winter and protracted spring, may not be amiss.  
LIP SALVE.—This is made by shimmering together equal quantities of deerskin and soft soap, with a portion of essence of tin. Pour in of quantity of lumbago, a few drops to flavor it, and strain it through a cast sieve. It is excellent to cure cracks of the speech

Letters to the Meeting in New York.  
Letter from Hon. John A. Dix.  
WASHINGTON, 17th July, 1848.  
GENTLEMEN.—I received several days ago your favor of the 7th inst., inviting me to attend and address a meeting of the Democracy of the City of New York, in the Park, on the 18th instant, "for the purpose of ratifying the nomination of Martin Van Buren for the Presidency, and of contributing to the extension of free soil, and of the perpetuation of free labor."  
I have deferred answering your letter to the latest practicable moment from a desire to accept the invitation, if in my power, without neglecting my public duties—but I find it impossible. Important subjects of legislation press on both Houses of Congress; and I may, at any moment, be required to vote on some of them.  
In respect to the great questions on which so deep an interest is felt by yourselves and those you represent, I have so recently expressed my opinion, in the most public manner, that any further announcement of it would be superfluous. It accords entirely with your own; and, much as I desire to see this distracting question settled, I cannot advocate or acquiesce in any adjustment of it, by which slavery will be planted where it does not now exist.  
So long as there was a possibility of maintaining the integrity of the democratic party of New York without submitting to a sacrifice of principle, my efforts were directed in every proper way, to the restoration of harmony. Events too clearly indicate the hopelessness of its re-union. Under such circumstances, I cannot hesitate, for a moment, as to the course of propriety and duty. From the radical democracy of New York I cannot separate; their principles and measures are those for the maintenance of which I have contended, side by side, with them in the political field, from the moment I entered it. To introduce and preserve agricultural economy in the public expenditure; to curtail the patronage of the federal government, or, in other words, to dilute political favor and not to centralize it; to liberate industry, under all its forms, from useless and oppressive restraints; to narrow the sphere of monopoly and exclusive privilege; to uphold the rights of free labor; to maintain with fidelity and good faith, all the compromises of the constitution, by abstaining from all interference with the domestic concerns and relations of the people of the States, and, at the same time, to resist the extension of slavery to those portions of the territory of the United States in which it does not exist and especially where it is prohibited; these are the great issues presented by the position you have taken. I shall continue my best efforts to maintain it, satisfied as I am that the public honor and prosperity are alike involved in your success.  
I have never considered the democracy of New York bound by the nominations at Baltimore. No portion of the democracy of the Union, can be committed to the support of proceedings in which it has had no part, or to a participation in which it has been admitted in such a manner as to deprive it of all influence upon the result. I have, therefore, deemed it a matter of entire discretion with the radical democracy of New York how far they should acquiesce in the proceedings referred to. They have deemed it due to their honor and their just rights, as well as to the great principles, to make a separate nomination, and thus to sustain their legitimacy in the firm, manly, and dignified course by which they disconnected themselves from the Baltimore Convention. That nomination I shall support as the one best in accordance with the principles and issues I have alluded to, and the only one, by which they can be fully vindicated.  
Of the talents, firmness, moderation, private worth and public conduct of Mr. Van Buren, and his great experience in the affairs of government, no one can entertain a higher opinion than myself; and I shall give him my support, cheerfully and cordially, as the standard-bearer of the New York democracy in a great contest for principle, and as a statesman who has graced every official position he has occupied in the service of his country, and none more than the highest.  
I am, very respectfully,  
Your fellow citizen,  
JOHN A. DIX.  
To Messrs. Cochran and others, Committee.

Letter from Hon. Marcus Morton.  
TAUNTON, July 12, 1848.  
GENTLEMEN.—Deeming my personal attention to the duties of the office which I hold under the General Government of paramount obligation, I must decline your invitation to be present at your meeting on Tuesday next.  
I will not, however, on the occasion, omit to declare my approbation for the principles for which you are contending. I am not unaware of the obloquy to which in the present state of political parties, their advocates will be exposed. But the principles themselves are too important to be abandoned from motives of personal convenience, or political expediency.  
The provisions of our admirable constitution, and character of the illustrious men who formed it, conspire to show that while it protected the existing rights of the slaveholders, contemplated no farther extension of slavery. In all the territory belonging to the C. States, at the adoption of the Constitution the subject of slavery was under legal regulation. And while each state retained in its sovereign and independent character, the right to abolish or create by the action of all the states, in confederation had been peremptorily interdicted in all the territories. So that while new free states might grow up and be added to the Union, in those territories, no new slave states could be formed, except by the division of an old one. Under this wise arrangement, in about half a century, five large and flourishing states have been added to our number, and are now enjoying the priceless blessings of free soil and free labor.  
Whether the far seeing statesmen who constructed our government and the ordinance of 1787, foresaw the acquisition of foreign territory, I have no means

of judging. And had the contingency existed which would have justified their interposition, it cannot be known what course they would have adopted. It is not, however, an unreasonable presumption that the wise foresight which suggested the beneficent provision for the northwestern territory, would have provided a similar or equally wise regulation for our future acquisitions.  
The powers conferred, have been found sufficient to warrant the acquisition and government of extensive territories without our original limits. Upon these territories seven slaveholding and one free state, have been formed. How very different now stands the proportion between the slaveholding states from what it would have done, had our territorial limits remained the same as at the adoption of the constitution and the compact of 1787.  
In those acquired territories, slavery existed at the time of the acquisition, and was allowed to continue afterwards. The inhabitants being slave holders when they asked for admission into the Union, formed constitutions authorizing the holding of slaves, and were thus admitted. And although large portions of these territories were unsettled and of course unoccupied by slave or civilized man; yet, slavery was allowed to extend over a very large portion of them. I hope our Southern brethren will find no want of comity or liberality in the course which we have adopted towards them. They have the possession, nearly an exclusive one, of much the larger portion of our extensive rich and beautiful domain.  
We have recently added new territory of great extent, in which slavery does not exist, and cannot be introduced but by the action of our own government. Shall a free republic—a genuine democracy, founded upon the principles of our Declaration of Independence and recognizing as its basis the self-evident truths, that "all men are created equal," and are endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?" authorize men to hold in servitude their fellow men? I can never give my consent to it. To introduce such a principle in the democratic creed would be to interpolate an article not only novel but at war with every other article in the creed. To make the support of slavery in any form and to any extent, the test of democracy is to introduce a new test altogether to all the sentiments heretofore inculcated by the democratic party. I protest against the adoption of it, and deny the power of any man or body of men to establish such a test.  
Few men have served in the democratic ranks longer than I have. No man has more uniformly observed the usages of the party. I never voted against its regular candidates; not even when the candidate nominated according to the existing usages of the party. But while I recognized the influence which the recommendations of caucuses or conventions, when fairly and properly conducted, should have; I deny that they have any power to absolve the individual voters from their personal responsibility. They are only the machinery of party, and too often fall into the hands of intriguing and unprincipled politicians, who use them to subvert their selfish and sinister purposes.  
"PATRIOTISM, FOR ME" is a time honored axiom of our party. It should always govern our conduct. I would not violate any moral or religious principle, or any of the fundamental doctrines of democracy, for the sake of any man or upon the recommendation of any convention of men. I would not vote for a monarchist; I would not vote for a man who would infringe the constitutional right of the Southern States to the possession of their peculiar institutions; I would not vote for a man who should advocate the introduction of slaves into the free states; nor would I vote for a man who, either positively or negatively, would aid or encourage the establishment of slavery in free territories.  
Parties, to be successful, should be founded on broad and general principles. Such is the democratic party. The principles which constitute its foundation are every where true and applicable to all men, and ought to prevail in all countries and situations where human beings are found. The doctrines of liberty, of the equal rights of all men, and the fraternity of the whole human family form the broadest as well as the soundest basis upon which any party can rest.  
The recent attempt to extend slavery over free territory seems to be narrow and selfish as well as unjust. It is claiming peculiar rights and privileges for a portion of the people, residing in a section of our country. It is requiring THREE MILLIONS of citizens to give up their wishes, opinions and interests to the peculiar notions of THREE OR FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND. It is fraught with danger to our political institutions and our Union. It is forming a sectional and geographical party—such as the immortal Washington called upon us to frown indignantly upon.  
I am, gentlemen with high respect,  
your obedient servant,  
MARCUS MORTON.

"Dear me, how fluidly he does talk!" said Mrs. Partridge recently, at a temperance lecturer. "I am always rejoiced when he mounts the rostrum for his eloquence warms me in every nerve and cartridge of my body—verging myself could no be more smooth than his blessed tongue is;" and she wiped her spectacles with her cotton handkerchief and never took her eyes from the speaker, during the whole hour he was on the stand.  
BACHELORS.—Dr. Johnson gives the philosophy of marriage in a few words: "A married man," says he, "has many cares; but a bachelor has no pleasure." Cutting himself off from life's "purest and most exquisite enjoyments" for fear of some trifling annoyance, he ennobles the sagacity of the wiseacre who amputated his leg to secure himself from corns.  
CORN CROP.—The corn crop of the United States, according to the estimate of the Commissioners of Patents, for 1847, was 500 million bushels—being about four times in value the whole production of cotton.

of judging. And had the contingency existed which would have justified their interposition, it cannot be known what course they would have adopted. It is not, however, an unreasonable presumption that the wise foresight which suggested the beneficent provision for the northwestern territory, would have provided a similar or equally wise regulation for our future acquisitions.  
The powers conferred, have been found sufficient to warrant the acquisition and government of extensive territories without our original limits. Upon these territories seven slaveholding and one free state, have been formed. How very different now stands the proportion between the slaveholding states from what it would have done, had our territorial limits remained the same as at the adoption of the constitution and the compact of 1787.  
In those acquired territories, slavery existed at the time of the acquisition, and was allowed to continue afterwards. The inhabitants being slave holders when they asked for admission into the Union, formed constitutions authorizing the holding of slaves, and were thus admitted. And although large portions of these territories were unsettled and of course unoccupied by slave or civilized man; yet, slavery was allowed to extend over a very large portion of them. I hope our Southern brethren will find no want of comity or liberality in the course which we have adopted towards them. They have the possession, nearly an exclusive one, of much the larger portion of our extensive rich and beautiful domain.  
We have recently added new territory of great extent, in which slavery does not exist, and cannot be introduced but by the action of our own government. Shall a free republic—a genuine democracy, founded upon the principles of our Declaration of Independence and recognizing as its basis the self-evident truths, that "all men are created equal," and are endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?" authorize men to hold in servitude their fellow men? I can never give my consent to it. To introduce such a principle in the democratic creed would be to interpolate an article not only novel but at war with every other article in the creed. To make the support of slavery in any form and to any extent, the test of democracy is to introduce a new test altogether to all the sentiments heretofore inculcated by the democratic party. I protest against the adoption of it, and deny the power of any man or body of men to establish such a test.  
Few men have served in the democratic ranks longer than I have. No man has more uniformly observed the usages of the party. I never voted against its regular candidates; not even when the candidate nominated according to the existing usages of the party. But while I recognized the influence which the recommendations of caucuses or conventions, when fairly and properly conducted, should have; I deny that they have any power to absolve the individual voters from their personal responsibility. They are only the machinery of party, and too often fall into the hands of intriguing and unprincipled politicians, who use them to subvert their selfish and sinister purposes.  
"PATRIOTISM, FOR ME" is a time honored axiom of our party. It should always govern our conduct. I would not violate any moral or religious principle, or any of the fundamental doctrines of democracy, for the sake of any man or upon the recommendation of any convention of men. I would not vote for a monarchist; I would not vote for a man who would infringe the constitutional right of the Southern States to the possession of their peculiar institutions; I would not vote for a man who should advocate the introduction of slaves into the free states; nor would I vote for a man who, either positively or negatively, would aid or encourage the establishment of slavery in free territories.  
Parties, to be successful, should be founded on broad and general principles. Such is the democratic party. The principles which constitute its foundation are every where true and applicable to all men, and ought to prevail in all countries and situations where human beings are found. The doctrines of liberty, of the equal rights of all men, and the fraternity of the whole human family form the broadest as well as the soundest basis upon which any party can rest.  
The recent attempt to extend slavery over free territory seems to be narrow and selfish as well as unjust. It is claiming peculiar rights and privileges for a portion of the people, residing in a section of our country. It is requiring THREE MILLIONS of citizens to give up their wishes, opinions and interests to the peculiar notions of THREE OR FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND. It is fraught with danger to our political institutions and our Union. It is forming a sectional and geographical party—such as the immortal Washington called upon us to frown indignantly upon.  
I am, gentlemen with high respect,  
your obedient servant,  
MARCUS MORTON.

"Dear me, how fluidly he does talk!" said Mrs. Partridge recently, at a temperance lecturer. "I am always rejoiced when he mounts the rostrum for his eloquence warms me in every nerve and cartridge of my body—verging myself could no be more smooth than his blessed tongue is;" and she wiped her spectacles with her cotton handkerchief and never took her eyes from the speaker, during the whole hour he was on the stand.  
BACHELORS.—Dr. Johnson gives the philosophy of marriage in a few words: "A married man," says he, "has many cares; but a bachelor has no pleasure." Cutting himself off from life's "purest and most exquisite enjoyments" for fear of some trifling annoyance, he ennobles the sagacity of the wiseacre who amputated his leg to secure himself from corns.  
CORN CROP.—The corn crop of the United States, according to the estimate of the Commissioners of Patents, for 1847, was 500 million bushels—being about four times in value the whole production of cotton.

of judging. And had the contingency existed which would have justified their interposition, it cannot be known what course they would have adopted. It is not, however, an unreasonable presumption that the wise foresight which suggested the beneficent provision for the northwestern territory, would have provided a similar or equally wise regulation for our future acquisitions.  
The powers conferred, have been found sufficient to warrant the acquisition and government of extensive territories without our original limits. Upon these territories seven slaveholding and one free state, have been formed. How very different now stands the proportion between the slaveholding states from what it would have done, had our territorial limits remained the same as at the adoption of the constitution and the compact of 1787.  
In those acquired territories, slavery existed at the time of the acquisition, and was allowed to continue afterwards. The inhabitants being slave holders when they asked for admission into the Union, formed constitutions authorizing the holding of slaves, and were thus admitted. And although large portions of these territories were unsettled and of course unoccupied by slave or civilized man; yet, slavery was allowed to extend over a very large portion of them. I hope our Southern brethren will find no want of comity or liberality in the course which we have adopted towards them. They have the possession, nearly an exclusive one, of much the larger portion of our extensive rich and beautiful domain.  
We have recently added new territory of great extent, in which slavery does not exist, and cannot be introduced but by the action of our own government. Shall a free republic—a genuine democracy, founded upon the principles of our Declaration of Independence and recognizing as its basis the self-evident truths, that "all men are created equal," and are endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?" authorize men to hold in servitude their fellow men? I can never give my consent to it. To introduce such a principle in the democratic creed would be to interpolate an article not only novel but at war with every other article in the creed. To make the support of slavery in any form and to any extent, the test of democracy is to introduce a new test altogether to all the sentiments heretofore inculcated by the democratic party. I protest against the adoption of it, and deny the power of any man or body of men to establish such a test.  
Few men have served in the democratic ranks longer than I have. No man has more uniformly observed the usages of the party. I never voted against its regular candidates; not even when the candidate nominated according to the existing usages of the party. But while I recognized the influence which the recommendations of caucuses or conventions, when fairly and properly conducted, should have; I deny that they have any power to absolve the individual voters from their personal responsibility. They are only the machinery of party, and too often fall into the hands of intriguing and unprincipled politicians, who use them to subvert their selfish and sinister purposes.  
"PATRIOTISM, FOR ME" is a time honored axiom of our party. It should always govern our conduct. I would not violate any moral or religious principle, or any of the fundamental doctrines of democracy, for the sake of any man or upon the recommendation of any convention of men. I would not vote for a monarchist; I would not vote for a man who would infringe the constitutional right of the Southern States to the possession of their peculiar institutions; I would not vote for a man who should advocate the introduction of slaves into the free states; nor would I vote for a man who, either positively or negatively, would aid or encourage the establishment of slavery in free territories.  
Parties, to be successful, should be founded on broad and general principles. Such is the democratic party. The principles which constitute its foundation are every where true and applicable to all men, and ought to prevail in all countries and situations where human beings are found. The doctrines of liberty, of the equal rights of all men, and the fraternity of the whole human family form the broadest as well as the soundest basis upon which any party can rest.  
The recent attempt to extend slavery over free territory seems to be narrow and selfish as well as unjust. It is claiming peculiar rights and privileges for a portion of the people, residing in a section of our country. It is requiring THREE MILLIONS of citizens to give up their wishes, opinions and interests to the peculiar notions of THREE OR FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND. It is fraught with danger to our political institutions and our Union. It is forming a sectional and geographical party—such as the immortal Washington called upon us to frown indignantly upon.  
I am, gentlemen with high respect,  
your obedient servant,  
MARCUS MORTON.

"Dear me, how fluidly he does talk!" said Mrs. Partridge recently, at a temperance lecturer. "I am always rejoiced when he mounts the rostrum for his eloquence warms me in every nerve and cartridge of my body—verging myself could no be more smooth than his blessed tongue is;" and she wiped her spectacles with her cotton handkerchief and never took her eyes from the speaker, during the whole hour he was on the stand.  
BACHELORS.—Dr. Johnson gives the philosophy of marriage in a few words: "A married man," says he, "has many cares; but a bachelor has no pleasure." Cutting himself off from life's "purest and most exquisite enjoyments" for fear of some trifling annoyance, he ennobles the sagacity of the wiseacre who amputated his leg to secure himself from corns.  
CORN CROP.—The corn crop of the United States, according to the estimate of the Commissioners of Patents, for 1847, was 500 million bushels—being about four times in value the whole production of cotton.

of judging. And had the contingency existed which would have justified their interposition, it cannot be known what course they would have adopted. It is not, however, an unreasonable presumption that the wise foresight which suggested the beneficent provision for the northwestern territory, would have provided a similar or equally wise regulation for our future acquisitions.  
The powers conferred, have been found sufficient to warrant the acquisition and government of extensive territories without our original limits. Upon these territories seven slaveholding and one free state, have been formed. How very different now stands the proportion between the slaveholding states from what it would have done, had our territorial limits remained the same as at the adoption of the constitution and the compact of 1787.  
In those acquired territories, slavery existed at the time of the acquisition, and was allowed to continue afterwards. The inhabitants being slave holders when they asked for admission into the Union, formed constitutions authorizing the holding of slaves, and were thus admitted. And although large portions of these territories were unsettled and of course unoccupied by slave or civilized man; yet, slavery was allowed to extend over a very large portion of them. I hope our Southern brethren will find no want of comity or liberality in the course which we have adopted towards them. They have the possession, nearly an exclusive one, of much the larger portion of our extensive rich and beautiful domain.  
We have recently added new territory of great extent, in which slavery does not exist, and cannot be introduced but by the action of our own government. Shall a free republic—a genuine democracy, founded upon the principles of our Declaration of Independence and recognizing as its basis the self-evident truths, that "all men are created equal," and are endowed by their creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?" authorize men to hold in servitude their fellow men? I can never give my consent to it. To introduce such a principle in the democratic creed would be to interpolate an article not only novel but at war with every other article in the creed. To make the support of slavery in any form and to any extent, the test of democracy is to introduce a new test altogether to all the sentiments heretofore inculcated by the democratic party. I protest against the adoption of it, and deny the power of any man or body of men to establish such a test.  
Few men have served in the democratic ranks longer than I have. No man has more uniformly observed the usages of the party. I never voted against its regular candidates; not even when the candidate nominated according to the existing usages of the party. But while I recognized the influence which the recommendations of caucuses or conventions, when fairly and properly conducted, should have; I deny that they have any power to absolve the individual voters from their personal responsibility. They are only the machinery of party, and too often fall into the hands of intriguing and unprincipled politicians, who use them to subvert their selfish and sinister purposes.  
"PATRIOTISM, FOR ME" is a time honored axiom of our party. It should always govern our conduct. I would not violate any moral or religious principle, or any of the fundamental doctrines of democracy, for the sake of any man or upon the recommendation of any convention of men. I would not vote for a monarchist; I would not vote for a man who would infringe the constitutional right of the Southern States to the possession of their peculiar institutions; I would not vote for a man who should advocate the introduction of slaves into the free states; nor would I vote for a man who, either positively or negatively, would aid or encourage the establishment of slavery in free territories.  
Parties, to be successful, should be founded on broad and general principles. Such is the democratic party. The principles which constitute its foundation are every where true and applicable to all men, and ought to prevail in all countries and situations where human beings are found. The doctrines of liberty, of the equal rights of all men, and the fraternity of the whole human family form the broadest as well as the soundest basis upon which any party can rest.  
The recent attempt to extend slavery over free territory seems to be narrow and selfish as well as unjust. It is claiming peculiar rights and privileges for a portion of the people, residing in a section of our country. It is requiring THREE MILLIONS of citizens to give up their wishes, opinions and interests to the peculiar notions of THREE OR FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND. It is fraught with danger to our political institutions and our Union. It is forming a sectional and geographical party—such as the immortal Washington called upon us to frown indignantly upon.  
I am, gentlemen with high respect,  
your obedient servant,  
MARCUS MORTON.

"Dear me, how fluidly he does talk!" said Mrs. Partridge recently, at a temperance lecturer. "I am always rejoiced when he mounts the rostrum for his eloquence warms me in every nerve and cartridge of my body—verging myself could no be more smooth than his blessed tongue is;" and she wiped her spectacles with her cotton handkerchief and never took her eyes from the speaker, during the whole hour he was on the stand.  
BACHELORS.—Dr. Johnson gives the philosophy of marriage in a few words: "A married man," says he, "has many cares; but a bachelor has no pleasure." Cutting himself off from life's "purest and most exquisite enjoyments" for fear of some trifling annoyance, he ennobles the sagacity of the wiseacre who amputated his leg to secure himself from corns.  
CORN CROP.—The corn crop of the United States, according to the estimate of the Commissioners of Patents, for 1847, was 500 million bushels—being about four times in value the whole production of cotton.

of judging. And had the contingency existed which would have justified their interposition, it cannot be known what course they would have adopted. It is not, however, an unreasonable presumption that the wise foresight which suggested the beneficent provision for the northwestern territory, would have provided a similar or equally wise regulation for our future acquisitions.  
The powers conferred, have been found sufficient to warrant the acquisition and government of extensive territories without our original limits. Upon these territories seven slaveholding and one free state, have been formed. How very different now stands the proportion between the slaveholding states from what it would have done, had our territorial limits remained the same as at the adoption of the constitution and the compact of 1787.  
In those acquired territories, slavery existed at the time of the acquisition, and was allowed to continue afterwards. The inhabitants being slave holders when they asked for admission into the Union, formed constitutions authorizing the holding of slaves, and were thus admitted. And although large portions of these territories were unsettled and