

# The Independent Republican.

"FREEDOM AND RIGHT AGAINST SLAVERY AND WRONG."

C. F. READ & H. H. FRAZIER, EDITORS.

MONTROSE, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1857.

H. H. FRAZIER, PUBLISHER—VOL. 3, NO. 49

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Yellow Citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives.

In obedience to the command of the Constitution, it has now become my duty to give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as I judge to be "necessary and expedient."

But first, above all, our thanks are due to Almighty God for the numerous benefits which he has bestowed upon this people; and our united prayers ought to ascend to Him that He would continue to bless our dear Republic in time to come. As He has blessed it in time past. Since the adjournment of the last Congress our constituents have enjoyed an unusual degree of health. The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly, and has bountifully rewarded the husbandman. Our great staples have attained high prices, and up till within a brief period, our manufacturing, mineral and mechanical operations have largely partaken of the general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interest, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, while the appropriations made by Congress at its last Session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.

Under these circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present Session; but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove to be only a slight misfortune when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing among the people. With this the Government cannot fail to deeply sympathize, though it may be without the power to extend relief.

It is our duty to inquire what has produced such unfortunate results, and whether their recurrence can be prevented. In all persons, the blame might have been fairly attributed to a variety of co-operating causes; but upon the present occasion, it is apparent that our existing misfortunes have proceeded solely from our extravagant and vicious system of paper currency and bank credits, existing the people to wild speculations and gambling in stocks. These revolutions must continue to recur at successive intervals so long as the system of paper currency and bank loans and discounts of the country shall be left to the discretion of fourteen hundred irresponsible banking institutions, which, from the very law of their nature, will consult the interest of their stockholders rather than the public welfare.

The framers of the Constitution, when they gave to Congress the power "to coin money and to regulate the value thereof," and prohibited the States from coining money, emitting bills of credit, or making anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts, supposed the protection and interest of the people against the evils of an excessive and irredeemable paper currency. They are not responsible for the existing anomaly that a government endowed with the sovereign attribute of coining money and regulating the value thereof should have no power to prevent others from driving this coin out of the country and filling up the channels of circulation with paper which does not represent gold and silver.

It is one of the highest and most responsible duties of government to insure to the people a sound circulating medium, the amount of which ought to be adapted with the utmost possible wisdom and skill to the wants of internal trade and foreign exchanges. If this be either greatly above or greatly below the proper standard, the marketable value of every man's property is increased or diminished in the same ratio, and injury is done to individuals as well as to the community as a whole.

Unfortunately, under the construction of the Federal Constitution, which has now prevailed too long to be changed, this important and delicate duty has been dissevered from the coining power and virtually transferred to more than fourteen hundred State banks, acting independently of each other, and regulating their paper issues almost exclusively by a regard to the present interest of their stockholders. Exercising the sovereign power of providing a paper currency instead of coin for the country, the first duty which these banks owe to the public is to keep a sufficient amount of gold and silver to insure the convertibility of their notes into coin at all times and under all circumstances. No bank ought ever to be chartered without such restriction on its business as to secure the result that its notes shall be no more than a paper money country, though the only efficient regulator of paper currency—the only one which can guard the public against over-issues and bank suspensions. As a collateral and essential security it is doubtless wise, and in all cases ought to be required, that banks shall hold an amount of United States or State securities equal to their notes in circulation, and pledged for their redemption. This, however, furnishes no adequate security against over-issues.

On the contrary, it may be perverted to inflate the currency. Indeed, it is possible by this means to convert all the debts of the United States and State Governments into bank notes without reference to the specie required to redeem them. However valuable these securities may be in themselves, they cannot be converted into gold and silver at the moment of pressure, as our experience teaches, in sufficient time to prevent bank suspensions and the depreciation of bank notes. In England, which is to a considerable extent a paper-money country, though vastly behind our own in this respect, it was deemed advisable, anterior to the act of Parliament of 1844 which wisely separated the issue of notes from the banking department, for the Bank of England always to keep on hand gold and silver equal to one-third of its circulation and deposits. If its proportion was no more than sufficient to secure the convertibility of its notes, with the whole of Great Britain, and as a field for its circulation, rendering it almost impossible that a sudden and immediate run to a danger-

ous amount should be made upon it, the same proportion would certainly be insufficient under our banking system.

Each of our fourteen hundred banks has but a limited circulation for its circulation, and in the course of a very few days the depositors and note-holders might demand from such a bank a sufficient amount in specie to compel it to suspend, even although it had coin in its vaults equal to one-third of its immediate liabilities. And yet I am not aware, with the exception of the banks of Louisiana, that any State bank throughout the Union has been required by its charter to keep on hand any other proportion of gold and silver compared with the amount of its combined circulation and deposits. What has been the consequence? In a recent report made by the Treasury Department on the condition of the banks throughout the different States, according to returns dated nearest January, 1857, the aggregate amount of actual circulation in the United States, of their deposits, and their notes, was \$214,778,822, and their deposits \$230,351,352. Thus it appears that these banks in the aggregate have considerably less than one dollar in seven of gold and silver compared with their circulation and deposits. It was palpable, therefore, that the very first pressure would drive them to suspension, and deprive the people of a convertible currency with all its disastrous consequences.

It is truly wonderful that they should have so long continued to preserve their credit, and that their immediate liabilities would have driven them into insolvency. And this is the condition of the banks, notwithstanding that four hundred millions of gold from California have flowed in upon us within the last eight years, and the tide still continues to flow. Indeed such has been the extravagance of bank credits that the banks now hold a considerably less amount of specie, either in proportion to their capital or their circulation and deposits combined, than they did before the discovery of gold in California. While in the year 1848 their specie in proportion to their capital was more than equal to one dollar for every four and a half, in 1857 it does not amount to one dollar for every six dollars and thirty-three cents of their capital. In the year 1848 the specie was equal within a very small fraction to one dollar in five of their circulation and deposits; in 1857 it is not equal to one dollar in seven and a half of their circulation and deposits.

From this statement it is easy to account for our financial history for the last forty years. It has been a history of extravagant expansions in the business of the country, followed by ruinous contractions. At successive intervals the best and most enterprising men have been tempted to their ruin by exciting bank loans of mere paper credit, leading them to extravagant importations of foreign goods, wild speculations, and ruinous and generalizing stock gambling. When the crisis arrives, as arrive it must, the banks can extend no relief to the people. In a vain struggle to redeem their liabilities in specie they are compelled to contract their loans and their issues; and at last, in the hour of distress, when their assistance is most needed, they and their debtors together sink into insolvency.

It is this present system of extravagant expansion, raising the nominal price of every article far beyond its real value, when compared with the cost of similar articles in countries whose circulation is wisely regulated, which has prevented us from competing in our own markets with foreign manufacturers, has produced extravagant importations, and has contracted the effect of the large incidental protection afforded to our domestic manufactures by the protective tariff. But for this branches of our manufactures composed of raw materials, the production of our own country—such as cotton, iron and woolen fabrics—would not only have acquired almost exclusive possession of the home market, but would have created for themselves a foreign market throughout the world.

Deplorable, however, as may be our present financial condition, we may yet indulge in bright hopes for the future. No other nation has ever existed which could have endured such violent expansions and contractions of paper credits without lasting injury; yet the buoyancy of youth, the energies of our population, and the spirit which never quails before difficulties, will enable us soon to recover from our present financial embarrassments, and may even occasion us speedily to forget the lesson which they have taught.

In the meantime it is the duty of the Government, by all proper means within its power, to aid in alleviating the sufferings of the people occasioned by the suspension of the necessary to provide a temporary recourse of the same family. Unfortunately, in either aspect of the case, it can do but little. Thanks to the Independent Treasury, the Government has not suspended payment, as it was compelled to by the failure of the banks in 1837. It will continue to discharge its liabilities to the people in gold and silver. Its disbursements in coin will pass into circulation, and materially assist in restoring a sound currency. The present revenue credit, should we be compelled to make a temporary loan, it can be effected on advantageous terms. This, however, shall, if possible, be avoided; but, if not, then the amount shall be limited to the lowest practical sum.

I have, therefore, determined that while no useful Government work already in progress shall be suspended, new works not already commenced, will be postponed, if this can be done without injury to the country. Those works which have been suspended, and which though there had been no crisis in our monetary affairs.

But the Federal Government cannot do much to provide against a recurrence of existing evils. Even if insurmountable constitutional objections did not exist against the creation of a National Bank, this would furnish no adequate preventive security. The history of the last Bank of the United States abundantly proves the truth of this assertion. Such a bank could not, if it would, regulate the issues and credits of fourteen hundred State banks in such a manner as to prevent the ruinous expansions and contractions in our currency which afflicted the country throughout the existence of the late bank, or secure us against future suspensions. In 1838 an effort was made by the Bank of England to curtail the issues of the country banks under the most favorable circumstances. The paper currency had been expanded to a ruinous extent, and the Bank put forth all its power to contract it in order to reduce prices and restore the equilibrium of the foreign

exchanges. It accordingly commenced a system of curtailment of its loans and issues, in the vain hope that the joint stock and private banks of the kingdom would be compelled to follow its example. It found, however, that as it contracted they expanded, and at the end of the process, to employ the language of a very high official authority, "whatever reduction of the paper circulation was effected by the Bank of England (in 1825) was more than made up by the issues of the country banks."

But a Bank of the United States would not, if it could, restrain the issues and loans of the State banks, because its duty as a regulator of the currency must often be in direct conflict with the immediate interest of its stockholders. If we expect one agent to restrain or control another, their interests must, at least in some degree, be antagonistic. But the Directors of a Bank of the United States would feel the same interest and the same inclination with the Directors of the State banks to expand the currency, to accommodate their favorites and friends with loans, and to declare large dividends. Such has been our experience in regard to the last bank.

After all, we must mainly rely upon the patriotism and wisdom of the States for the prevention and redress of the evil. If they will afford us a real specie basis for our paper circulation by increasing the denomination of bank notes, first to twenty and afterward to fifty dollars; if they will require that the banks shall at all times keep on hand at least one dollar in gold and silver for every three dollars of their circulation and deposits; and if they will provide by a self-executing enactment, which nothing can arrest, that the moment they suspend they shall go into liquidation, I believe that such provisions, with a weekly publication by each bank of a statement of its condition, would go far to secure us against future suspensions of specie payments.

Congress, in my opinion, possess the power to pass a uniform bankruptcy law applicable to all banking institutions throughout the United States, and I strongly recommend its exercise. This would make it irretrievably organic law of each bank's existence, that a suspension of specie payments shall produce its civil death. The instinct of self-preservation would then compel it to perform its duties in such a manner as to escape its penalty and preserve its life.

The existence of banks and the circulation of bank paper are so identified with the habits of our people that they cannot, at this day, be suddenly abolished without much immediate injury to the country. If we could confine them to their appropriate sphere, and prevent them from appropriating to the use of wild and reckless speculation by extravagant loans and issues, they might be continued with advantage to the public.

But this I say, after long and much reflection. I experience shall prove it to be impossible to enjoy the facilities which well-regulated banks might afford, without at the same time suffering the calamities which the excesses of the banks have hitherto inflicted upon the country. It is, therefore, the lesser evil to deprive them altogether of the power to issue a paper currency, and confine them to the functions of banks of deposit and discount.

Our relations with foreign governments are, upon the whole, in a satisfactory condition. The diplomatic difficulties which existed between the Government of the United States and that of Great Britain, at the adjournment of the last Congress have been happily terminated by the appointment of a British Minister to this country, who has been cordially received.

While it is greatly to the interest, as I am convinced it is the sincere desire, of the Governments and people of the two countries to be on terms of intimate friendship with each other, it has been our misfortune almost always to have had some irritating, if not dangerous, outstanding question with Great Britain.

Since the origin of the Government we have been employed in negotiating treaties with that power, and afterward in discussing their true intent and meaning. In this respect, the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, has been the most unfortunate of all; because the two Governments place directly opposite and contradictory constructions upon its first and most important article.

While, in the United States, we believe that this treaty would place their powers upon an exact equality by the stipulation that neither will ever "occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion," in Great Britain, either as owner or protector, to the whole extensive coast of Central America, excepting round from the Rio Honda to the port and harbor of San Juan de Nicaragua, together with the adjacent Bay Islands, except the comparatively small portion of Central America which was in their occupancy at the date of the treaty; in fact, that the treaty is a virtual recognition on the part of the United States of the right of Great Britain, either as owner or protector, to the whole extensive coast of Central America, excepting round from the Rio Honda to the port and harbor of San Juan de Nicaragua, together with the adjacent Bay Islands, except the comparatively small portion of Central America which was in their occupancy at the date of the treaty.

This proposition was, of course, rejected. After the Senate had refused to recognize the treaty, Great Britain, in a virtual recognition of the fact, that the treaty was a virtual recognition on the part of the United States of the right of Great Britain, either as owner or protector, to the whole extensive coast of Central America, excepting round from the Rio Honda to the port and harbor of San Juan de Nicaragua, together with the adjacent Bay Islands, except the comparatively small portion of Central America which was in their occupancy at the date of the treaty, has been employed in negotiating treaties with that power, and afterward in discussing their true intent and meaning. In this respect, the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, has been the most unfortunate of all; because the two Governments place directly opposite and contradictory constructions upon its first and most important article.

It is not too much to assert that if in the United States the treaty had been considered susceptible of such a construction, it never would have been negotiated under the authority of the President, nor would it have received the approbation of the Senate. The universal conviction in the United States was that when our Government consented to violate its traditional and time-honored policy, and to stipulate with a foreign government never to occupy or acquire territory in the Central American portion of our own continent, the consideration for this sacrifice was that Great Britain should, in this respect at least, be placed in the same position with ourselves. While we have no right to doubt the sincerity of the British Government in their construction of the treaty, it is at the same time my deliberate conviction that this construction is in opposition both to its letter and spirit.

This laudable object in view was signed at London on the 17th October, 1856, and was submitted by the President to the Senate on the following 10th of December. Whether this treaty, either in its original or amended form, would have accomplished the object intended, without giving birth to new and embarrassing complications between the two Governments, may perhaps be well questioned. Certain it is, however, it was rendered much less objectionable by the different amendments made to it by the Senate. The treaty, as amended, was ratified by me on the 12th March, 1857, and was transmitted to London for the ratification of the British Government. That Government expressed its willingness to concur in all the amendments made by the Senate, with the single exception of the clause relating to Russian and other islands in the Bay of Honduras. The article in the original treaty, as submitted to the Senate, after reciting that these islands were the property of Great Britain, and that the Republic of Honduras, constituted and declared a free territory under the sovereignty of the said Republic of Honduras, stipulated that "the two contracting parties do hereby mutually engage to recognize and respect in all future time the independence and rights of the said free territory as a part of the Republic of Honduras."

Upon an examination of this convention between Great Britain and Honduras of the 27th of August, 1856, it was found that, while declaring the Bay Islands to be "a free territory under the sovereignty of the Republic of Honduras," it deprived that Republic of rights without which its sovereignty over them could scarcely be said to exist. It divided them from the remainder of Honduras, and gave to their inhabitants a separate government of their own, with legislative, executive, and judicial officers elected by themselves. It deprived the government of Honduras of the taxing power in every form, and exempted the people of the islands from the performance of military duty except for their own exclusive defense. It also prohibited the Republic from erecting fortifications upon them for the protection of themselves, and finally, it provided "that Slavery shall not at any time hereafter be permitted to exist therein."

Had Honduras ratified this convention, she would have ratified the establishment of a State substantially independent within her own limits, and a State at all times subject to British influence and control. Moreover, the United States, by ratifying the convention, had Great Britain in its original form, we should have been bound "to recognize and respect in all future time" these stipulations to the prejudice of Honduras. Being in direct opposition to the spirit and meaning of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty as understood in the United States, the Senate rejected the entire clause, and substituted in its stead a simple recognition of the sovereignty of Honduras over these islands in the following language: "The two contracting parties do hereby mutually engage to recognize and respect the islands of Ruatan, Bouaco, Uila Barabetta, Helena and Morat, situated in the Bay of Honduras, and off the coast of the Republic of Honduras, as under the sovereignty and as a part of the said Republic of Honduras."

Great Britain, in its message of December, 1855, and in its message of December, 1856, and in its message of December, 1857, in the opinion that this indemnity is justly due under the treaty with Spain of the 27th of October, 1765, I earnestly recommend such an appropriation to the favorable consideration of Congress.

A treaty of friendship and commerce was concluded at Constantinople on the 13th of December, 1856, between the United States and the Empire of the Ottoman, which was exchanged at Constantinople on the 13th of October, 1857, and the treaty was proclaimed by the President on the 18th of August, 1857. This treaty, it is believed, will prove beneficial to American commerce. The Shah has manifested an earnest disposition to cultivate friendly relations with our country, and has expressed a strong wish that we should be represented at Teheran by a minister plenipotentiary. It is recommended that an appropriation be made for this purpose.

Recent occurrences in China have been unfavorable to a revision of the treaty with that Empire of the 3d July, 1844, with a view to the security and extension of our commerce. The 24th article of this treaty stipulated for a revision of it, in case experience should prove this to be requisite; "in which case the two Governments will, at the expiration of twelve years from the date of said convention, transmit to each other, by suitable persons appointed to conduct such negotiations." These twelve years expired on the 3d July, 1856; but long before that period it was ascertained that important changes in the treaty were necessary, and several fruitless attempts were made by the Commissioner of the United States to effect these changes. Another effort was about to be made for the same purpose by our Commissioner, in conjunction with the Ministers of England and France, but this was suspended by the occurrence of hostilities in the Canton River between Great Britain and the Chinese Empire. These hostilities have necessarily interrupted the trade of all nations with Canton, which is now in a state of blockade, and have occasioned a serious loss of life and property. Meanwhile the insurrection within the Empire against the existing Imperial dynasty still continues, and it is difficult to anticipate what will be the result.

Under these circumstances, I have deemed it advisable to appoint a distinguished citizen of Pennsylvania Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to proceed to China, and to avail himself of any opportunities which may offer to effect changes in the existing treaty favorable to American commerce. He will be directed to give his attention to the question of the destination of the war-steamers Minnesota. Special Ministers to China have also been appointed by the Governments of Great Britain and France.

While our minister has been instructed to occupy a neutral position in reference to the existing hostilities at Canton, he will cordially co-operate with the British and French Ministers in all peaceful measures to secure by treaty stipulations those just concessions to commerce which the nations of the world have a right to expect, and which China cannot long be permitted to withhold. From assurances received, I entertain no doubt that the three Ministers will act in harmonious concert to obtain similar commercial

With France our ancient relations of friendship still continue to exist. The French Government have in several recent instances, which need not be enumerated, evinced a spirit of peace and kindness toward our country, which I heartily reciprocate. It is, notwithstanding, much to be regretted that two nations whose productions are of such a character as to invite the most extensive exchange and freest commercial intercourse should continue to enforce ancient and obsolete restrictions of trade against each other. Our commercial treaty with France is, in this respect, an exception from our treaties with all other countries. It justly levies discriminating duties both on exports and articles, the growth, produce, or manufacture of the one country, when arriving in vessels belonging to the other.

More than forty years ago, on the 3d of March, 1815, Congress passed an act offering to all nations to admit their vessels laden with their national productions into the ports of the United States upon the same terms with our vessels, provided they would reciprocate to us similar advantages. This act confined the reciprocity to the productions of the respective foreign nations who might enter into the proposed arrangement with the United States. The act of May 24th, 1828, removed this restriction, and offered a similar reciprocity to all such vessels without reference to the origin of their cargoes. Upon these principles, our commercial treaties and arrangements have been founded, except in France; and let us hope that this exception may not long exist.

Our relations with Russia remain, as they have ever been, on the most friendly footing. The present Emperor, as well as his predecessors, have never failed, when the occasion offered, to manifest their good will to our country; and their friendship has always been highly appreciated by the Government and people of the United States.

With all other European Governments, except that of Spain, our relations are as peaceful as we could desire. I regret to say that no progress whatever has been made, since the adjournment of Congress, toward the settlement of any of the numerous claims of our citizens against the Spanish Government. Besides, the claims committed on our flag by the Spanish war-ship Ferrola on the high seas, off the coast of Cuba, in March, 1855, by firing into the American mail steamer El Dorado, and detaining and searching her, remains unacknowledged and unredressed. The general tone and temper of the Spanish Government toward that of the United States are much to be regretted. The most eminent Spanish lawyer, and our Minister Plenipotentiary to Madrid has asked to be recalled; and it is my purpose to send out a new Minister to Spain, with special instructions on all questions pending between the two Governments, and with a determination to have them speedily and amicably adjusted if this is possible. In the mean time, whenever our Minister urges the just claims of our citizens on the notice of the Spanish Government, he is met with the objection that Congress have never made the appropriation recommended by President Polk in his annual message of December, 1847, "to be paid to the Spanish Government for the purpose of distribution among the claimants in the Amistad case." A similar recommendation was made by my immediate predecessor in his message of December, 1855; and entirely concurring with him in the opinion that this indemnity is justly due under the treaty with Spain of the 27th of October, 1765, I earnestly recommend such an appropriation to the favorable consideration of Congress.

A treaty of friendship and commerce was concluded at Constantinople on the 13th of December, 1856, between the United States and the Empire of the Ottoman, which was exchanged at Constantinople on the 13th of October, 1857, and the treaty was proclaimed by the President on the 18th of August, 1857. This treaty, it is believed, will prove beneficial to American commerce. The Shah has manifested an earnest disposition to cultivate friendly relations with our country, and has expressed a strong wish that we should be represented at Teheran by a minister plenipotentiary. It is recommended that an appropriation be made for this purpose.

Recent occurrences in China have been unfavorable to a revision of the treaty with that Empire of the 3d July, 1844, with a view to the security and extension of our commerce. The 24th article of this treaty stipulated for a revision of it, in case experience should prove this to be requisite; "in which case the two Governments will, at the expiration of twelve years from the date of said convention, transmit to each other, by suitable persons appointed to conduct such negotiations." These twelve years expired on the 3d July, 1856; but long before that period it was ascertained that important changes in the treaty were necessary, and several fruitless attempts were made by the Commissioner of the United States to effect these changes. Another effort was about to be made for the same purpose by our Commissioner, in conjunction with the Ministers of England and France, but this was suspended by the occurrence of hostilities in the Canton River between Great Britain and the Chinese Empire. These hostilities have necessarily interrupted the trade of all nations with Canton, which is now in a state of blockade, and have occasioned a serious loss of life and property. Meanwhile the insurrection within the Empire against the existing Imperial dynasty still continues, and it is difficult to anticipate what will be the result.

Under these circumstances, I have deemed it advisable to appoint a distinguished citizen of Pennsylvania Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to proceed to China, and to avail himself of any opportunities which may offer to effect changes in the existing treaty favorable to American commerce. He will be directed to give his attention to the question of the destination of the war-steamers Minnesota. Special Ministers to China have also been appointed by the Governments of Great Britain and France.

While our minister has been instructed to occupy a neutral position in reference to the existing hostilities at Canton, he will cordially co-operate with the British and French Ministers in all peaceful measures to secure by treaty stipulations those just concessions to commerce which the nations of the world have a right to expect, and which China cannot long be permitted to withhold. From assurances received, I entertain no doubt that the three Ministers will act in harmonious concert to obtain similar commercial

treaties for each of the powers they represent. We cannot fail to feel a deep interest in all that concerns the welfare of the independent Republics on our own continent, as well as of the Empire of Brazil.

Our difficulties with New-Granada, which a short time since bore so threatening an aspect, are, it is to be hoped, in a fair train of settlement, in a manner just and honorable to both parties.

The Isthmus of Central America, including that of Panama, is the great highway between the Atlantic and Pacific, over which a large portion of the commerce of the world is destined to pass. The United States are more deeply interested than any other nation in preserving the freedom and security of all the communications across this isthmus. It is our duty, therefore, to take care that they shall not be interrupted either by invasions from our country or by wars between the independent States of Central America.

Under our treaty with New-Granada, of the 12th of December, 1846, we are bound to guarantee the Isthmus of Panama, through which the Panama Railroad passes, "as well as the rights of sovereignty and property which New-Granada has and possesses over the said territory." This obligation is founded upon equivalents granted by the treaty to the Government and people of the United States.

Under these circumstances, I recommend to Congress the passage of an act authorizing the President, in case of necessity, to employ the land and naval forces of the United States to carry into effect this guarantee of neutrality and protection. I also recommend similar legislation for the security of any other route across the Isthmus in which we may acquire an interest by treaty.

With the independent Republics on this continent it is both our duty and our interest to cultivate the most friendly relations. We can never feel indifferent to their fate, and must always rejoice in their prosperity. Unfortunately, both for them and for us, our example and advice have lost much of their influence in consequence of the lawless expeditions which have been fitted out against some of them within the limits of our country. Nothing but a more vigorous and steady material progress, or impair our character as a nation, than the toleration of such enterprises in violation of the law of nations.

It is one of the first and highest duties of any independent State, in its relations with the members of the great family of nations, to restrain its people from acts of hostile aggression against their citizens or subjects. The most eminent writers on public law do not hesitate to denounce such hostile acts as robbery and murder.

Weak and feeble States, like those of Central America, may not feel themselves able to assert and vindicate their rights. The case would be far different if expedition were set on foot within our own territories to make private war against a powerful nation. If such expeditions were fitted out from a broad military expedition to some country, to burn down its cities, murder and plunder our people, and usurp our Government, we should call any power on earth to the strictest account for not preventing such enormities.

Ever since the Administration of General Washington, acts of Congress have been in force to punish severely the crime of setting on foot a military expedition to some country, to burn down its cities, murder and plunder our people, and usurp our Government, we should call any power on earth to the strictest account for not preventing such enormities.

Washington, acts of Congress have been in force to punish severely the crime of setting on foot a military expedition to some country, to burn down its cities, murder and plunder our people, and usurp our Government, we should call any power on earth to the strictest account for not preventing such enormities.

Washington, acts of Congress have been in force to punish severely the crime of setting on foot a military expedition to some country, to burn down its cities, murder and plunder our people, and usurp our Government, we should call any power on earth to the strictest account for not preventing such enormities.

Washington, acts of Congress have been in force to punish severely the crime of setting on foot a military expedition to some country, to burn down its cities, murder and plunder our people, and usurp our Government, we should call any power on earth to the strictest account for not preventing such enormities.

right of its Government to expect that such a decree would be obeyed cannot be acknowledged. But the Water Witch was not properly speaking, a vessel-of-war. She was a small steamer engaged in a scientific enterprise intended for the advantage of commercial States generally. Under these circumstances, I am constrained to consider the attack upon her as unjustifiable, and as calling for satisfaction from the Paraguayan Government.

Citizens of the United States, also, who were established in business in Paraguay, have had their property seized and taken from them, and have otherwise been treated by the authorities in an insulting and arbitrary manner, which requires redress.

A demand for these purposes will be made in a firm but conciliatory spirit. This will be more probably be granted if the Executive shall have authority to use other means in the event of a refusal. This is accordingly recommended.

It is unnecessary to state in detail the alarming condition of the Territory of Kansas at the time of my inauguration. The opposing parties then stood in hostile array against each other, and any accident might have rekindled the flames of civil war. Besides, at this critical moment Kansas was left without a Governor by the resignation of Gov. Geary.

On the 19th of February previous, the Territorial Legislature had passed a law providing for the election of a Delegate to the third Monday of June to a Convention to meet on the first Monday of September for the purpose of framing a Constitution preparatory to admission into the Union. This law was in the main fair and just; and it is to be regretted that all the qualified electors had not registered themselves and voted under its provisions.

At the time of the election for delegates, an extensive organization existed in the Territory, whose avowed object it was, if need be, to put down the lawful Government by force, and establish a Government of their own under the so-called Topeka Constitution. The persons attached to this revolutionary organization abstained from taking any part in the election.

The act of the Territorial Legislature had omitted to provide for submitting to the people the Constitution which might be framed by the Convention; and in the excited state of public feeling throughout Kansas an apprehension extensively prevailed that a design existed to force upon them a Constitution in relation to Slavery against their will. In this emergency it became my duty, as it was my unquestionable right, having the approval of all good citizens, to support the Territorial laws, to express an opinion on the true construction of the provisions concerning Slavery contained in the organic act of Congress of the 30th May, 1854.

Congress declared it to be "the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way." Under it, Kansas, "when admitted as a State," was to be received into the Union, with or without Slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission.

Did Congress mean by this language that the delegates elected to frame a Constitution should have authority finally to decide the question of Slavery, or did they intend by leaving it to the people that the people of Kansas themselves should decide this question by a direct vote? On this subject I confess I had never entertained a serious doubt, and, therefore, in my instructions to Gov. Walker of the 28th of March last, I merely said that when a Constitution shall be submitted to the people of the Territory they must be protected in the exercise of their right of voting for or against that instrument, and the fair expression of the popular will must not be interrupted by fraud or violence.

In expressing this opinion it was far from my intention to interfere with the decision of the people of Kansas, either for or against Slavery. From this I have always carefully abstained. Intrusted with the duty of taking care that the laws be faithfully executed, my only desire was that the people of Kansas should furnish to Congress the evidence required by the organic act, whether for or against Slavery; and in this manner smooth their passage into the Union. In emerging from the condition of territorial dependence into that of a sovereign State, it was their duty, in my opinion, to make known their will by the votes of the majority; on the question whether this important domestic institution should or should not continue to exist. Indeed, this was the only possible mode in which their will could be authentically ascertained.

The election of delegates to a convention must necessarily take place in separate districts. From this cause it may readily happen, as has often been the case; that a majority of the people of a State or Territory are on one side of the question, while a majority of the representatives from the several districts into which it is divided may be upon the other side. This arises from the fact that in some districts delegates may be elected by small majorities, while in others those of different sentiments may receive majorities sufficiently great not only to overcome the votes given for the former, but to leave a large majority of the whole people in direct opposition to a majority of the delegates. Besides, our history proves that influences may be brought to bear on the representatives sufficiently powerful to induce them to disregard the will of his constituents. The truth is, that no other authentic and authoritative mode exists of ascertaining the will of a majority of the people of any State or Territory on an important and exciting question like that of Slavery in Kansas, except by leaving it to a direct vote. How was, then, was it a question, while a majority of the representatives from the several districts into which it is divided may be upon the other side. This arises from the fact that in some districts delegates may be elected by small majorities, while in others those of different sentiments may receive majorities sufficiently great not only to overcome the votes given for the former, but to leave a large majority of the whole people in direct opposition to a majority of the delegates.

Besides, our history proves that influences may be brought to bear on the representatives sufficiently powerful to induce them to disregard the will of his constituents. The truth is, that no other authentic and authoritative mode exists of ascertaining the will of a majority of the people of any State or Territory on an important and exciting question like that of Slavery in Kansas, except by leaving it to a direct vote. How was, then, was it a question, while a majority of the representatives from the several districts into which it is divided may be upon the other side. This arises from the fact that in some districts delegates may be elected by small majorities, while in others those of different sentiments may receive majorities sufficiently great not only to overcome the votes given for the former, but to leave a large majority of the whole people in direct opposition to a majority of the delegates.

Besides, our history proves that influences may be brought to bear on the representatives sufficiently powerful to induce them to disregard the will of his constituents. The truth is, that no other authentic and authoritative mode exists of ascertaining the will of a majority of the people of any State or Territory on an important and exciting question like that of Slavery in Kansas, except by leaving it to a direct vote. How was, then, was it a question, while a majority of the representatives from the several districts into which it is divided may be upon the other side. This arises from the fact that in some districts delegates may be elected by small majorities, while in others those of different sentiments may receive majorities sufficiently great not only to overcome the votes given for the former, but to leave a large majority of the whole people in direct opposition to a majority of the delegates.