BRADFORD REPORTER.

ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM, INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

VOL. XVI.—No. 35.

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

TOWANDA:

Saturday Morning, february 9, 1856.

Missonri Compromise, &c.

Remarks of Messrs. Grow, QUITMAN & T. L. HARRIS,

In the House, Jan. 18th and 19th. On the Missouri Compromise, and the Respons bility for the Organization of the House.

Mr. GROW said : Mr. Clerk, I have refrained from participation in the debates of this Hall until an organization of the House should be effected, and I do not now propose to say anything in reference to the legitimate legislation of the country until the attainment of that result. But as to the responsibility for the or-ganization of this House which has been raised here this morning, I propose to say a few words. The responsibility should rest on those who have produced the state of things we find in this Hall and the country. It is not a ques-tion of figures or votes, whether this or that man could have been elected by transferring

rotes from this or the other candidate. What has produced the present state of things? Why cannot this House organize? At the opening of the last Congress, peace reigned in every quarter of the country, and men came here from every section with fratergs. There were no disturbing ele-jar the universal harmony of senti-The dead past had buried its dead." The bitter controversies of previous years had ceased, and sectional quarrels were for the time forgotten. No note of discord was heard in the councils of the nation, and the future was unclouded and bright; yet, in violation of good faith, mutually pledged by the representatives of the two great political parties of the coun-try, "to resist the further agitation of the slavery question in Congress or out of it," a timered compromise between the two sections on was trampled under foot, thus opening, under the sanction of the Government, vast territory to the introduction of slavery, from which our fathers agreed that it should e ferever excluded. Upon the men, and the afteence that secured its abrogation, rests the responsibility for our want of organization at

It was declared here, as a reason for the reeal of that compromise, that it was necessary take the question out of Congress. The efto take it out has been a civil war in Kanss and a sectional strife unparalleled in the Missouri compromise was urged on the ground that it would quiet agitation, and take this

rly and constant friend of this Administration. s precious hopes to man, I desire the for its passage will tear open wounds as wonted tenacity and strength."

in the midst of this quasi revolution .be heads, then, of those who trampled

4 the vote of Democrats and Americans. | South. expected that those voting for Mr. ox will change their position, because so they may gain a few votes. Nor be expected that those voting for Mr.

What was wrong when enacted never ceases with me to be a wrong.

SATURDAY, January 19, 1856. remarks in reply to those which fell from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Grow,] who last spoke upon the subject of the responsibility of the several parties for the failure of this House to organize; but I refrained from doing so in the hope that some other gentle-man would have done it. But, there were some expressions that fell from the gentleman from Pennsylania, in the few eloquent remarks that he made to the House, which I think it my duty to animadvert upon. He traces the cause of the failure of this House to effect an organization, not to what has occurred during the present session, but he goes back to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill as the cause of the hostile feeling between the different sections of the Union which to-day produces the disorganization of this House.

The gentleman does not go far enough back Is it, sir, the passage of that bill which has given to all portions of this country their equal rights in this Confederacy—is it the passage of ing between the different sections of the coun-If it is, then the gentlemen who concur with him have taken the bold position that they will denv to a large portion of this country their common, equal, constitutional rights. If this is the position gentlemen occupy, we from the minority section of the Union would be glad to know it. But, sir, what is the Kansas-Nebraska bill? What is it but a recognition of the principles which underlie the Cou-stitution of the United States?—the right of souri compromise was constitutional or not all the States in their Federal capacity, and the rights of the citizens of the respective States to an equal participation in a country which was acquired by their common blood and treasure-not less by that of the people of the South than that of the people of the slavery should be forever after excluded from

of the Union, when they stop at the passage of line. Among the number who sustained it was the Nebraska bill by the last Congress. That your own immortal CLAY. He declared in the was not the cause of that hostility of feeling | Senate of the United States, in 1850, "that which now prevents the organization of this a majority of southern members sustained that House. That was not the original cause why, wrong-himself among the number." Whether at the present time, we find the two sections its passage was or was not a violation of a of the country arrayed against one another. I constitutional right, it was "a fair bargain," will tell gentlemen what the cause is. The and good faith required that it should be ob-cause has operated for more than a year. It served. By it you consented voluntarily to reas, and a sectional strife unparalleled in the istory of the country. Such is the result thus are of the attempt to take the question out of longress; and the restriction in Minnesota and Oregon still remains a bone of contention. and Oregon still remains a bone of contention the institutions of the South which comes from foot of territory south of that line into slave a portion of that section of the country which territory, you came here, and by force of numthe gentleman [Mr. Grow] represents. The bers struck down that bargain which your fa-South has ever stood by the gnarantees of the | there made, and which was religiously Constitution; she has adhered faithfully to ed for over a third of a century. the system of government under which we live. She has never undertaken to make any encroach- CLAY voted for the Missouri Compromise succerity either do not understand the real sentiment the North, or they fail to comprehend aright the springs unusual action. Sir, you are raking open and fanning a flaine coals which were already smothered, and, if shere, would have buried themselves forever in their a cinders. ment upon any State rights, or upon any indi- line? Missonri for admission into the Union in 1819, she evinced her disposition to exercise her poshe evinced her disposition to exercise her po-listic, beyond a doubt, an anti-Administration the next Congress. As an earnest and devoted to Democratic party to which I have cheerfully est energies from my earliest political action, I her just rights to a participation in all the bene- voted for it. fits of the Union. The political strife which grew out of that controversy threatened the he did not vote for that line; he was not pre-dissolution of the Union. It resulted in a com-sent, but he thought that if he had been he of fraternal concord among the citi-cy, and as a devotee at the shrine of promise unjust to the South, but which she was would very likely have done so. compelled to accept. The result of that struggle, thus terminated, quelled agitation for a Mr. CLAY in the Senate of the United States time. It soon rose again with fearful violence, tervene before it can be restored, if ev- and has been continued ever since.

Sir, history has made those remarks pro- this sectional hostility one year only. Let me have no earthly doubt that I voted in common beta, though it was but the natural result of tell him that, twenty years ago, when I had with my other southern friends for the adoption at legislation. The responsibility for want of the honor to send in an executive message to of the line of 36 deg. 30 min." organization of this House is upon those the Legislature of Mississppi, I deemed in pro- language of Mr. Clay, in 1850, in the Senate reopened this agitation. You trampled per to call the attention of the Legislature of of the United States. And, although he can a fair arrangement between the two see- that State to the aggressive movements in the not speak to-day with living voice, he does of this Union ; you trampled on your own northern States. Could I have procured that faith, given in the conventions assem- document, I would read extracts from it to at Baltimore in 1852. Yet scarcely a show the truth of my remarks. The South had elapsed before the question was re has ever since complained of this intermeddling and in Congress. Wounds were torn open of the North with her institutions. Yet it has bad just healed; and to-day we find our- continued without intermission; it is the agitation which that gentleman, and those who co operate with him, has raised that has produced these compacts of good faith be the re- this feeling between the different sections of ted for the line of 36 deg. 30 min. I wish to this country, and not the passage of the Kan-Sir, by the records of votes here you can sas-Nebraska bill ; that was the result, not the that almost anybody is responsible for cause. It is not because the Kansas-Nebras-Fant of organization. Did not the gen- ka bill has taken away a single right from the as from Alabama, [Mr. WALKER,] the first North, but it is because it has performed a onstitutional duty to the South; because it the two parties unite, and elect a (what has given to the South the same rights which ational man Speaker; are not the we acknowledge are possessed by the people of four men who vote for Mr. RICHARD- the North. Let the gentleman, then, when he epossible because they did take that pro- attempts to trace causes, go back to the sources By the same line of argument pur- of this state of feeling, and he will find that it my friend from Alabama, [Mr. Hous- is upon you, northern men, the responsibility My certainly are. But I do not hold of this state of things lies-upon you, who have any responsibility on such grounds .- stirred up this sectional agitation, you who stand here by their principles. It seek to deprive sovereign States of their federthat the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. al and constitutional rights. When you attempt, could have been elected, if all the then, to trace it back, go to its true source. risks men had voted for him. For In the future of our country, if it should hap 18 Mr. BANKS was within three of an pen that the glorious system which our fathers three of those who voted for oth- have transmitted to us should fall and tumble wied for him, he would now have been into ruin, the verdict of posterity and history You can transfer the responsi- will be to condemn the agitators of the slavewhom you please by taking the votes ry question as traitors to the Constitution and the record, because combina- to the equal constitutional rights of a portion d have been made at any time by of this Union. There, sir, I trace it, and election could have been effected .- there posterity will trace it, and will not impute could be figured out of the vote of it to the action of the last Cougress in doing isba men; and the same could be what was nothing but mere justice to the

Gentlemen tell us here, granciously, that they are not disposed to invade our rights of property within the States. I do not thank them for that. Let me tell them here on this their ground, because by so floor-though myself born north of Mason and States. hay secure a few more votes. Those Dixon's line that that is not all we desire. were here at the time resisted the re- No, sir ; we desire more. We desire the com-

were borne down then, but our views of the whose existence in our section of the country justice of that measure have not changed .- has constituted so important an element of your prosperity as well as of ours—that sys-tem which God in his infinite wisdom has per-mitted to be built up in our country to promote, foster, and carry forward its great desti-Mr. QUITMAN. I intended yesterday to ny-should meet a mere tolerance at your hands take the floor for the purpose of making a few in the States in which it exists. No, sir; we would be craven, we would be traitors to our constitutional rights, if we did not ask of you what we have a right to demand—the benefits of the great system of government which your fathers and our fathers established. We demand it. We demand its benefits as well for our property as for yours, within the legitimate sphere of its action. We will not be content, we ought not to be content, with anything less. We are willing to meet you here as independent and patriotic men, and stand as equals upon a level, face to face and eye to eye; but we do not intend that you shall be our superiors-that you shall reap all the advantages of our common Government. We want its deprive us of most of our constitutional rights when you refuse to us all and every of the blessings which those institutions were intended to secure to all the citizens of every State. Do not be mistaken; let not gentlemen deceive themselves with the idea that we are asking that bill which has produced this state of feel- from their bounty mere tolerance of our institutions in the States. We demand all ou: constitutional rights-I say, we demand them.-

sippi [Mr. QUITMAN] complains of remarks made by me yesterday, and refers the agitation which exists in the country at the present moment back to the year 1835, instead of to the repeal of the Missouri compromise. In 1819, gentlewhether or not it was a violation of your constitutional rights under this Government-your fathers agreed with our fathers, on the 6th of March, 1820, that they would give up that constitutional right—if they had it—and that the territory north of the line 36 deg. 30 min. But gentlemen are mistaken. They do not Of the one hundred and three gentlemen who travel back to the sources of that angry feel- then represented the South in this House and ng which exists between the different sections in the senate, but forty-six voted against this

Mr. QUITMAN. Do you assert that Mr.

Mr. GROW. I do assert that Mr. CLAY says he voted for the line of 36 deg. 30 min. Mr. HARRIS, of Illinois. He never did

Mr. GROW. And that a majority of southern members in the House and in the Senate

Mr. BOWIE. Mr. CLAY has stated that

Mr. GROW. I refer to a speech made by on the 6th of March, 1850, in which he says that " among those who agreed to that line wer But the gentleman traces back the cause of a majority of southern members," and that "I speak through the records of his country; and I trust that no man will stand here to contradict his own declaration.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him ?

Mr. GROW. No, I cannot now. Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman dares a contradiction of the statement that Mr. CLAY vo-

furnish a contradiction. Mr. GROW. You may do so when I get

through Mr. HARRIS. You challenge a contradic-

tion, and I wish to make it. Mr. GROW. No, sir, I only refer to the record. One word now in reply to the charge of northern aggressions upon the Sonth, made by the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. Qurr-MAN,] for whom I entertain the kindest feelings; and the remarks I may make I trust will not be considered as in any way reflecting personally upon any southern man. We expect men coming here-reared under the influences which surround them-impressed with the influences of the society in which they live-to hold views upon slavery differing from ours.— With that we find no fault; but we claim the right to hold the sentiments inculcated by the education of our childhood and influences which have surrounded our lives, and that we shall be allowed to express them here or elsewhere with the same freedom as a southern man expresses his, without being disfranchised thereunder this Government.

Sir, what are the northern aggressions that the gentleman speaks of? Let me say to the

Mr. QUITMAN, (interrupting.) I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania this question : whether be himself was not elected as a member of this House on the principle of hostility to the institutions of the southern

posed to re-opening the slavery agitation. We We are not content that that great interest, the construction given to the Constitution by man made, that Mr. CLAY favored the territoour fathers, and the action of every branch of rial restriction, is not correct. What does the the Government for over sixty years. If any record show? In the first place I read from one thing more than another secured my return to this House for the third time, by the and 175, as follows :unanimous vote of my district, it was no doubt because I had stood upon this floor, and resis-

ted the repeal of the Missouri compromise. But, let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that political Abolitionism in the North—paradoxical as it may seem—is the child of the South. You nurtured it in infancy, when too feeble to stand alone; and you have made it strong in manhood by the inju-dicious and unjust legislation of this Hall.— When the North petitioned this Government to take steps in reference to the institution of where it is conceded to be solely under the jurisdiction of Congress, you passed the twentyfirst rule, denying a great constitutional right to freemen under this Government. That inaugurated political Abolitionism in the North; and from that day to this the warfare has been one of constitutional rights, not for the South benefits also, and we insist upon them. You alone, but for the North. In resisting the reopening of this agitation in the last Congress, by a repeal of the Missouri compromise, I took occasion to say that-

"Previous to that time [i. e. the passage of the twenty-first rule] Abolitionism was but a sentiment, and a mere sentiment is not a sufficient basis for a formidable political organization; but great principles of constitutional right are violated in the legislation of the country, legislative acts combining with a strong and universal sentiment may form enduring organizations. And the sentiment of the North, in reference to slavery, being deep and general, when you force up legislative issues to combine with it, then becomes a formidable element."

You then placed a censorship over the mails of this country like that placed by Louis Napoleon to-day over the press of France; and n this country, where we claim that intelligence should circulate as free as the air we breathe, you empowered your postmasters to declare what is incendiary, and to withhold such matter from the white freemen of the South. You placed upon the records of your country, thro' your Secretary of State, John C. Calhouna man whose memory I revere for his purity of character and integrity of purpose—one of the brightest and purest intellects that the country ever produced-you put, I say, upon the records of the country, through him, a justification of the annexation of Texas, on the ground that it would uphold and support the institution of slavery; and you asked northern men to indorse that issue, made in our State papers. And in the last Congress, you struck down-as I stated in the opening of my remarks-a fair bargain, made by your fathers with our fathers, and which had been religious ly observed by them for more than a third of

Mr. QUITMAN, (in his seat.) You robbed

Mr. GROW. The gentleman says that we have robbed you of California. How is that?
California came to Congress and asked to be
JESUP, whose authority no man will question. admitted as a State of this Union. Your Go-He says he heard Mr. CLAY upon this floor vernment had neglected to give her a Governupon both of those occasions, and took notes ment, and she was forced to fall back upon

Mr. QUITMAN. Why not extend to California the compromise line?

Mr. GROW. I am coming to that present-The people of California—in the exercise those occasions. of what is called popular sovereignty, and which was in this case really so, because the people were forced by the neglect of the Goremment to rely entirely on their inherent rights-formed a Government, and excluded slavery. And what did you do? The application of California for admission into the ion was resisted from the first; and on the Journal of the Senate of the United States is, to-day, a protest of ten southern Senators against the admission of California into the I have nothing more to say. Union after the act of admission had passed. And woat is the reason these Senators gave for their opposition? Because her constitution their protest.

Mr. HUMPHREY MARSHALL the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to make a suggestion here?

Mr. GROW declined to yield the floor, and continued: The reason alleged in this protest "that the bill gives the sanction of law, and thus imparts validity to the unauthorized action of a portion of the inhabitants of Califor-nia, by which an odious discrimination is made against the property of the fifteen slaveholding States of the Union." That was the protest of ten southern Senators, that the admission of California, under her constitution, was a violation of the rights of fifteen slaveholding

Mr. QUITMAN. Let me tell the gentlenan from Pennsylvania that no southern man has ever taken the ground of opposition to the admission of California on the ground of her having adopted a constitution excluding

Mr. GROW. I refer the gentleman to the language of the protest which I have just quoted. [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HARRIS said : I should not, sir have attempted at this time to occupy the time of the House for a moment, had it not been for the declaration made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. Grow,] who dared any one to deny what he had asserted. In the full confidence that in the denial of that assertion would be the truth. I ventured a denial at the time. The statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was that Mr. Clay was the supporter of the Missouri line of 1820, and he dared any one to deny that such was

Mr. GROW. I do not think that I dared any one to deny it, but I appealed to the re- to contradict him raises a question, not between cord for the truth of my assertion.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, whether the gentlenan did or not, his words are taken by the reporters, and their record will show how the I leave you.

Mr. GROW. Very well ; let that deter-

the 17th volume of Nile's Register, pages 174

and 143, as lollows:—

"Wednesday, January 26, (1820.) After other business, the House went into Committee of the Whole (Mr. Baldwin in the chair) on the Missouri bill.

"The proposition under consideration was an amendment offered yesterday to the second section of the bill by Mr. Storrs, substantially to alter the limits of the proposed State, so as to make the Missouri river the northern boundary thereof.—[with the view of drawing, affine on which those in favor of, and those opposed to, the slave restriction, might compromise their views.]

"Mr. Storrs rose and withdrew the amendment he offered yesterday, and in lieu thereof submitted the following:

fered yesterday, and in lieu thereof submitted the following:

"And provided further, and it is hereby enreted, That forever hereaiter neither slavery nor involuntary servitude (except for the punishment of crimes for which the party shall have been duly convicted) shall exist in the territory of the United States, lying north of the thirty-eighth degree of north latitude, and west of the Missouri, as established by this act: Provided, That any person escaping into said Territory from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any of the States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed, according to the laws of the United States in such ease made and provided, to the person claiming his or her labor as aforesaid.

"On this motion a debate occurred of a desultory character. Messrs. Randolph, Lowndes, Mercer, Brush, Smith of Maryland, Storrs, and Clay, successively followed each other in debate."

Now, Mr. Clerk, here is the only meager account we find of the character of that debate; but the question here naturally arises upon which side of that proposition was Mr. Clay found. From the position which Mr. Clay subsequently took in February, in opposition to restrictions when the State of the State o sition to restrictions upon the State, when he, according to the declaration of the National Intelligencer of this city, rose and spoke for four hours in opposition, the House being in the Committee of the Whole, and when the greatest range of debate was allowed, is it probable that he would have omitted to state his views in reference to this question of territorial restriction? No one can suppose that for a moment; and the question is, what position did he take upon that question? The gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. HUMPHREY MARSHALL,] who has just taken his seat, has stated certain matters which may be adduced collaterally to show what position he took upon that occasion. But there is better proof years in the service of his country, serving her faithfully, whose word has never been questioned, and never will be-who was present and heard Mr. CLAY upon both of these occasions, when he debated the resolutions of Mr. Storks and the resolution upon State restriction. He took notes of those speeches, as he tells me, and he authorizes me to say that Mr. CLAY opposed all restrictions either upon terof his remarks. He has them now, and he proposes to give them to the public at a protion upon both branches of this subject, and that he was opposed to all restriction. He also details the line of argument pursued upon

But upon other facts of individual recollection, from other notes and memoranda taken at the time, there can be no doubt as to Mr. CLAY's position upon that question; and it was to correct that misrepresentation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and to place the correction before the country, that I rose, and for nothing more; and having made the statements I have, in connection with the remarks of those gentlemen from Pennsylvania,

Mr. GROW. I shall say but a few words in reply to the gentleman from Illinois. The excluded slavery. I will read the language of effort which he has made to change the record of the country by citing officers of the Army, or any living witness, will not, I trust, be admitted here, or in the country, against the declarations of the living man, made in the Sen-

ate of the United States in his own vindication. That Mr. CLAY was opposed to any restriction on the State of Missouri there is no question. He resisted it from first to last. is not the question in controversy. The question is, whether he was in favor of the adop-tion of the line 36 deg. 30 min., north of which slavery should be forever prohibited; and I will read an extract from his own remarks, where he himself, on the sixth of February, 1850, gives the history of the whole transac-In that history he clears up the misap-

prehension which existed in the country that he was the originator of that proposition .-That fact he denied. In that speech he reviewed the controversy, stating his connection with it. I did not claim that he was in favor excluded by positive law. of a restriction on the State, but that he was in favor of the line of 36 deg. 30 min., and that a majority of southern men supported it. And what is the record ? Mr. CLAY says :

And what is the record? Mr. CLAY Says:

"Mr. Thomas, acting in every instance, presented the proposition of 36° 30′, and it was finally agreed to. But I take the occasion to say, that among those who agreed to that line, were a majority of Southern members."

"My friend from Alabema, in the Senate, [Mr. King.] Mr. Pinckney, from Maryland, and a unjority of the southern members in this body, voted in favor of the line of 36° 30′; and a majority of the members in the other House, at the head of whom was Mr. Lowndes himself, voted also for that line. I have no doubt that I did also.

"But, as I was Speaker of the House, and as the Journal does not show which way the Speaker votes, except in the case of a tie, I am not able to tell with certainty how I actually did vote; but I have no earthly doubt that I voted, in common with my other Southern friends, for the adoption of the line of 36° 30′."

Mr. Chay's own deeless time works.

Mr. Clay's own declaration, made by himself! And the summoning of living witnesses me and the witnesses whom you summon, but a question between the declaration of your own CLAY and that of your witnesses. There

I leave the record, then, with the living witnesses whom you summon to impeach the declaration of your own immortal statesman. But, Mr. HARRIS. But I want to say a few sir, from the archives of your country comes words in connection with this question, and to the declaration of one of the living actors of Mr. GROW. Sir, I hold no "hostility" to dispose of the challenge which the gentleman the times, that the South regarded the adopthe institutions of the southern States, but has thrown out to the House. I state here in tion of that line of 36 deg. 30 min. as a triumph. Missouri compromise, and were op- mon benefits of this system of Government -- shall resist the effort now making to change my place, that the remark which the gentle- Charles Pinckner wrote from this Capitol at

midnight-for it seems that all of these slavery laws must be passed in the darkness of the night; twelve o'clock seems to be the fitting hour for passing all compromises in regard to slavery, and for repealing them—at least such is the history of the country—Mr. PINCKNEY, writing from this hall at the dead hour of the night, in 1820, says:

"DEAR SIR: I hasten to inform you that this moment we have carried the question to admit Missouri and all Louisiana to the southward of 86° 30', free of the restric-tion of slavery, and give the South an addition of six and perhaps eight members to the Senate of the United States it is considered here by the slaveholding States as a new you

It was considered by the South at the time as a great triumph. And yet men stand here and tell us that it was forced upon them by the North. In the Senate of the United States, on the engrossment and passage of the bill, twenty Southern Senators voted for it-two only against it.

But four northern Senators voted for that line—eighteen against it. But two southern Senators voted against it—twenty for it.— Among the latter were both Senators from Virginia, Louisiana, Tennessee, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi, and Delaware, with Mr. Stokes, of North Carolina, and Mr. GILLIARD, of South Carolina-leaving two against it.

Now there is another part of this letter of Mr. Pickney's, which is testimony contemporaneous with the passage of that compromise which has been so ruthlessly stricken down:

"To the north of 36° 30' there is to be, by the present law, restriction, which, you will see by the votes, I wagainst. But it is at present of no moment. It is a tract, uninhabited only by savages and wild beasts which not a foot of the Indian claim to soil is extingued, and in which, according to the ideas prevalent, no loffice will be opened for a great length of time."

But when a land office comes to be opened you come here and strike down this restrictio strike down everything which the North thought she had secured by that arrangement. The gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. Mar-

SHALL] said, in the way of interrogatory, that I would not agree to extend the Missouri compromise line to the Pacific. That is true. He undertook to say, however, that the North had not been faithful to the compromise of 1820. than that - and I take pleasure in bringing it Sir, what was the Missouri restriction applied to the notice of the House, and I wish it to go carefully upon the records of the House, as a declaration which I make by authority.—

There is now a gentleman living in this city, venerable in years, having been near fifty the service of his country, serving her the territory to which it was applied? Was applied? Was applied? Was applied? the territory to which it was applied? Was it not put on the statute book on the 6th of March, 1820; and did it not continue a valid enactment, without change or alteration, till the passage of the Nebraska bill by the last Congress? How then was it abandoned?-Gentlemen complain that when Missouri asked to be admitted into the Union, the North objected to her admission.

A MEMBER made a suggestion here as to the opposition to the admission of Arkansas.

Mr. GROW. No, sir; Missouri is the question. The gentlemen rest upon Missouri. She had passed a law, prohibiting the immigratio per time. He says Mr. CLAY opposed restrict of free blacks; and the ground of the resis tance to her admission was, that she could not enact such a restriction, and not that she tolerated slavery. It was in that compro that Mr. CLAY figured as the originator. He brought in a proposition to harmonize that question, and it passed. But there was no question raised, at that time, about the line of 36 deg. 30 min., nor at any other time, so far as the Louisiana purchase was concerned, the only territory to which that arrangement applied. But when the Government acquired new territory, to which we were asked to apply that line, we said "no." And why? Because, while you would hem us in, in our territorial expansion, by this line on the south and the British possessions on the north, you would be left almost indefinite expansion on the south. Would it then have been fair for the North to have hemmed herself in forever upon twelve and a half degrees of latitude over which to carry free labor and free institu tions; while leaving almost indefinite expan sion to the institutions of slavery? Besides, sir, we had acquired free territory—territory in which slavery was abolished by the laws of Mexico-and we were asked to make it, by act of Congress, slave territory. To such a proposition I answer the gentleman, in the lan guage of Kentucky's own illustrious states man, "I never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote, to spread slavery over territory where it does not exist." Tha was the declaration of your own CLAY, made on the 6th of March, 1850. It was almost his dying declaration, and it will live among the proudest legacies that he has bequeather to after times. Sir, I stand with him in declaring that by no act of mine shall slavery ever be carried into any territory from which it is

Mr. HUMPHREY MARSHALL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me to say, that there is not a southern Representative on this floor who will vote to spread slavery over territory where it does not now exist.

Mr. GROW. But the proposition to extend the Missouri compromise line through the acquisition of Mexican territory was in fact the same thing. It was saying, by legislative act of this Republic, that slavery might exist in that Territory, notwithstanding the laws of Mexico probibited it. We were asked to strike off all restrictions by a positive legislative act. If slavery had then gone into that Territory, it would have been the act of this Government, as in the case of Kansas now. If slavery plant itself there, who is responsible for it? The men who struck down that restriction; for, with the Missouri compromise in force, slavery could never have gone there. If then it goes there during its territorial existence, while under the jurisdiction of Congress, it is just the same in effect as if carried there by your votes, for you permit to

"Have you said your prayers, John?" "No ma'am. It ain't my work. Bill says the prayers, and I the amens! We agreed to do

be done what you have the power to prevent.