## IFUNCTURE Deautrat.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO POLITICS, NEWS, LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, SCIENCE, AND MORALITY.

Chase & Day, Proprietors.

Montrose, Susquehanna County, Penn'a, Chursday Morning, March 16, 1854.

Volume 11, Aumber 11.

## Nebraska Territory

SPEECH OF HON, S. A. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole

organize the Territory of Nebraska.

Mr. Docalas, Mr. President, when I proposed on Tuesday last that the Senate should proceed to the consideration of the bill to or-ganize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas, it was my purpose only to occupy ten or fifteen minutes in explanation of its provisions. I desired to refer to two points; first to those provisions relating to the Indians, and second to those which might be supposed to bear up-

on the question of slavery.

The Committee, in drafting the bill, had in view the great anxiety which had been expressed by some members of the Senate to pressed by some inclined of the protect the rights of the Indians, and to prevent infringement upon them. By the provisions of the bill, I think we have so clearly succeeded, in that respect, as to obviate all rossible objection upon that score. The bill itwith the United States expressly consent to come under the operations of the act, and be ries. This provision certainly is broad enough to protect all the rights of the Indians as to their persons and their property.

Upon the other point that pertaining to the question of slavery in the territories, it was the intention of the committee to be equally explicit. We took the principles established by the compromise acts of 1850 as our guide, and intended to make each and every provision of the bill accord with those principles. Those measures established and rest upon the great principle of self-government, that the people should be allowed to decide the questions of their domestic institutions for themselves, subject only to such limitations and restrictions as are imposed by the Constitution of the United States, instead of having them determined by an arbitrary or geographical

The original bill, reported by the commitconstruction. In some parts of the country the original substitute was deemed and construed to be an annulment or a repeal of what has been known as the Missouri Comstrued. As the object of the committee was to conform to the principles combissed all knowledge of the fact—who came to me by the compromise measures of 1850, and to with a smiling face, and the appearance of carry those principles into effect in the ferritories, we thought it was better to recite in the bill precisely what we understood to have been accomplished by those measures, viz: uperseded by the legislation of 1850, has beone and ought to be declared inoperative: hence we propose to leave the question the people of the States and the territories. subject only to the limitations and provisions

Sir this is all that I intended, to say, if the question had been taken up for consideration on Tuesday last; but since that time occurrences have transpired which compelme to go more fully into the discussion. It will be borne in mind that the senator from sideration of the bill, and asked for its postonement until this day, on the ground that there had not been time to understand and consider its provisions; and the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Sumner] suggested that the postponement should be for one week for that purpose. These suggestions seeming to is certainly out of order. e reasonable, in the opinions of senators consented to the postponement of the bill un-

il this day.
Sir, little did I suppose, at the time that I granted that act of courtesy to those two senators, that they had drafted and published o the world a document, over their own signatures, in which they arraigned me as havtrust, as having been guilty of an act of bad faith and been engaged in an atrocious plot against the cause of free government. Little did I suppose that those two senators hadbeen guilty of such conduct, when they callthem an opportunity of investigating the since discovered that on that very morning the National Era, the abolition organ in this city, contained an address, signed by perverted, in which our motives are arrainged and our characters caluminated. And, sir, what is more. I find that there was a postscript added to the address, published that morning in which the principal amendment reported by the committee was set out and then coarse epithets applied to me by name. Sir, had I known those facts at the sime I granted that act of indulgence, I should have responded to the request of those senators in such terms as their conduct deserved, so far as the rules of the Senate and a respect for my own character would have permitted me to do: In order to show the character of this document, of which I shall have much to say in the course of my argument, I will read certain passages:

"We arraign this bill as a gross violation of a sacred pledge; as a crimical betrayal of precious rights; as part and parcel of an atrocious plot to exclude from a vast unoccupied region ers from our own States, and convert it into a

tains a similar relation to slavery with that acquired from Mexico, covered by no prohibition except that of disputed constitutional or Mexican law, and that the compromises of 1850 require the incorporation of the pro-slavery clauses of the Utah and New Mexico bill in the Nebrasks act, are mere inventions, designed to cover up from public reprehension meditated bad faith." Mere inventions to cover up bad faith."

"Servile demagogues may tell you that the Union can be maintained only by submitting to

the demands of slavery."

Then there is a postscript added, equally offensive to myself, in which I am mentioned by name. The address goes on to make an appeal to the legislatures of the different States, to public meetings, and to ministers of the Gospel in their pulpits, to interpose and arrest the vile proceeding which is about to be consummated by the senators who are thus denounced. That address, sir, bears date Sunday, January 22, 1854. Thus it appears that, on the holy Sabbath, while other senators were engaged in divine worship, these abolition confederates were assembled in sesucceeded, in that respect, as to obviate all nossible objection upon that score. The bill it shall not operate upon any of the rights or lands of the Indians, hor tors. This was done on the Sabbath day that they be included within the limits of shall they be included within the limits of and by a set of politicians to advance their own hose territories, until they shall by treaty political and ambitious purposes, in the name and by a set of politicians, to advance their own of our holy religion.

But this is not all. It was understood from the newspapers that resolutions were pending before the legislature of Ohio pro-posing to express their opinions upon this subject. It was necessary for these confederates to get up some expesition of the question by which they might facilitate the passage of the resolutions through that legislature. Hence you find that, on the same morning that this document appears over the names of these confederates in the abolition organ of this city, the same document appears in the New York papers—certainly in the Tribune, Times, and Evening Post—in which it is stated, by authority, that it is "signed by the senators and a majority of the representatives from the state of Ohio"-a statement which I have every reason to believe was utterly false, and known to be so at the time that these confederates appended it to the address. It was necessary, in order to carry out this work of deception, and to lasten the action of the Ohio clear and specific, which seemed, in the the Democratic representation in the other at the time that the Missouri act passed, the men who proved faitless themselves Mr. CHASE. Mr. President-

Mr. Douglas. Mr. President, I do not yield the floor. A senator who has violated all the rules of courtesy and propriety, who showed a consciousness of the character of the act he was doing by concealing from me all knowledge of the fact—who came to me ate and appeale the document n wider circu-Mr. Chase Mr. President, the

misstates the facts Mr. CHASE. And I shall make my denial pertinent when the time comes

The PRESIDENT. Order. terpose, in violation of the rules of the Senthe statements in this address which are ing that dividing line as far west as our ter- mental principle of freedom, was established, over his own signature, as a wicked fabrica- ritory went, and running it onward on each was it not an abandonment of the old one-

of this country:
Mr. Chase. I call the Senator to order. The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois

Mr. Douglas. Then I will only say that around me, I yielded to their request, and I shall confine myself to this document, and prove its statements to be false by the legislation of the country. Certainly that is in

Mr. CHASE. You cannot do it. Mr. Douglas. The argument of this manifesto is predicated upon the assumption that passed. There was inserted in that joint rest tain that the compromise of 1850 did not suthe policy of the fathers of the republic was olution a provision, suggested in the first in-percede that of 1820, by quoting the proviso ing been guilty of a criminal betrayal of my to prohibit slavery in all the territory coded by the old States to the Union, and made United States territory, for the purpose of being organized into new States. I take issue upon that statement. Such was not the practice in the early history of the governed upon me to grant that courtesy, to give ment. It is true that in the territory northwest of the Ohio river slavery was prohibited substitute reported by the committee. I have by the ordinance of 1,787; but it is also true that in the territory south of the Ohio river. slavery was permitted and protected; and it this city, contained an address, signed by is also true that in the organization of the certain abolition confederates, to the people, in which the bill is grossly misrepresented, in of the ordinance of 1787 were applied to it, which the action of the committee is grossly with the exception of the sixth article, which prohibited slavery. Then sir, you find upon the statute-books under Washington and the early Presidents, provisions of law showing that in the southwestern territories the right to hold slaves was clearly implied or recognised, while in the northwest territories it was prohibited. The only conclusion that can be fairly and honestly drawn from that legislation is, that it was the policy of the fathers to admission under the provisions of the federal of the republic to prescribe a line of demarkation between free territories and slave-holding territories by a natural or a geographical line, being sure to make that line correspond, as near as might be, to the laws of clipeople inhabiting the respective territories. Sir, I wish you to bear in mind, too, that this geographical line, established by the founders of the republic between free territories and slave territories, extended as far westject being to avoid all agitation upon the constitutions. I presume no one pretends this declaration. ward as our territory then reached; the ob-

It will be seen that it contains a very re-

which prohibited slavery. That act implied | would not be binding on the new State one | the Missouri compromise line applied, was inthat the territory of New Orleans was to be day after it was admitted into the Union. a slaveholding territory by making that ex- The other provision was that such States as ception in the law. But, sir, when they came should lie south of 36 deg. 30 min should to form what was then called the territory of come into the Union with or without slavery Louisina, subsequently known as the territo- as each should decide in its constitution. Louisana, subsequently known as the territo-ry of Missouri, north of the thirty-third par-alell, they used different language. They did not extend to it any of the provisions of the ordinance of 1787. They first provided that it should be governed by laws made by the governor and the judges, and, when in 1819 Congress grave to that ferritory under the 1812 Congress gave to that territory, under the them by even paying Texas for it ten million name of the territory of Missouri, a territorial of dollars, in order that it might be included

name of the territory of Missouri, a territorial of dollars, in order that it might be included government, the people were allowed to do as they pleased upon the subject of slavery, Mexico.

Subject only to the limitations of the Constitution of the United States. Now what is the inference from that legislation? That and the Pacific ocean. Immediately after slavery was, by implication, recognised south that acquisition, the Senate, on my own moof the thirty-third parallel; and north of that tion, roted into a bill a provision to extend the people were left to exercise their own the Missouri compromise indefinitely westjudgment and do as they pleased upon the subject, without any implication for or against the existence of the institution.

This continued to be the condition of the country in the Missouri Territory up to 18-20, when the celebrated act which is now of Representatives, and was defeated there by

called the Missouri compromise was passed. Slavery did not exist in, nor was it excluded from the country now known as Nebras- moment. The first time that the principles ka. There was no code of laws upon the of the Missouri compromise tere ever abansubject of slavery either way; First, for the reason that slavery had never been introduced into Louisiana, and established by postive enactment. It had grown up there by a sort of common law, and been supported and protected. When a common law, grows up, when an institution becomes established under a usage, it carries it so far as that usage actually goes, and no further. If it had been established by direct enactment, it might have carried itso far as the political jurisdiction extended; but, be that as it may, by the act of 1812, creating the Territory of Missouri, that territory was allowed to legislate uponthe subject of slavery as it saw proper, subject only to the limitations which I have stated; and the country not inhabited or thrown open to settlement was set apart as compromise was a solemn compact and should Indian country, and rendered subject to In- never be violated or departed from. Every dian laws. Hence, the local legislation of the State of Missouri did not reach into that Indian country, but was excluded from it by advised, was opposed to the lissouri comprothe Indian code and Indian laws. The mu- mise in 1848. The very nen who now armicipal regulations of Missouri could not go raign me for a departure fom the Missouri the senator from Iowa, [Mr. Donge,] was believed to have accomplished this object.

The amendments which was subsequently reported by us was only designed to render that

whole whig representation, and a portion of the
ported by us was only designed to render that

whole whig representation, and a portion of

the other than title had been extinguished, and the country thrown open to setthement. Such being the case, the only lesuperior set of the other

the senator from Iowa, [Mr. Donge,] was belegislature, under a misapprehension of the
there until the Indian title had been extinguished, and the country thrown open to setthement. Such being the case, the only lesuperior of the other

there until the Indian title had been extinguished, and the country thrown open to setthement. Such being the case, the only lesuperior of the other

there until the Indian title had been extinguished, and the country thrown open to setthement. Such being the case, the only lesuperior of the other

there until the Indian title had been extinguished, and the country thrown open to setthement. Such being the case, the only lesuperior of the other

there until the Indian title had been extinguished, and the country thrown open to setthement. Such being the case, the other

there until the Indian title had been extinthe country thrown open to setsuperior of the other

there until the Indian title had been extinto the country thrown open to setsuperior of the other

there until the Indian title had been extinthere until the Indian title had been extinthere until the Indian title had been extinto the country thrown open to setthere until the Indian title had been extinthe other than the country thrown open to setthere until the Indian title had been extinthere until the Indian title had been extint

in that legal condition, positive opposition created the necessity for the establishment of was made to the hill to organize a State gov- a new one in 1850, let us see what that comcrimenton; and a senator from my State, Mr.

Jesse B. Thomas, introduced an amendment, 1850 was congressional non-intervention as to friendship, even after that door the Sen-been uttered—who couldourtesy in order to which it was provided that slavery should be the Territories and of all the States, were to which it was provided that slavery should be the Territories and of all the States, were to prohibited north of 36 deg. 30 min. north be allowed to do as they pleased upon the been accomplished by those measures, viz: get time document before its infamy could be exposed; latitude, in all that country which we had such a senator has no right to my courtesy acquired from France. What was the object ions of the Constitution of the United of the enactment of that eighth section? - States: nator Was it not to go back to the original policy

namely, the 6th of March, 1820, was a pro-

misstates the facts of prescribing boundaries to the limitation of Mr. Douglas. Mr. President, I decline to free institutions, and or manifestitutions, by a geographical line, in order to avois troversy in Congress upon the subject ?-Hence they extended that geographical line through all the territory puchased from France, which was as far as our possessions then reached. It was not simply to settle the question on that piece of country, but it proper: Now the question is, when that new shall be able to nail that demal, as I shall was to carry out a great principle, by extendtion, and prove it by the solemn legislation new acquisition of territory. True, the extended the greegraphical line? Was it not a superfiction of this country:

True, the extended the greegraphical line? Was it not a superfiction of the legislation of the legislation of the sedure of the old one within the very landary. promise, only covered the territory acquired now under consideration! I say it did susupport, required that it should be extended indefinitely westward, so far as our territory

Thus stood the question up to 1845, when the joint requition for the annexation of Texas stance and brought before the House of Representatives by myself, extending the Missou- Texan boundary, and create the Territory of ri compromise line indefinitely westward New Mexico. That proviso was added, by through the territory of Texas. Why did I way of amendment, on indion of Mr. Mason bring forward that proposition? Why did of Virginia. the Congress of the United States adopt it ! I rejeat, that in order to rebut the preing the principle, in order that it might be Mexico in 1850. extended still further westward, even to the "Provided, That

"New States, of convenient size; not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of of States that may hereafter be formed out of Texas, having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36 deg, 30 minutes north latitude, commonly be admitted into the Union, with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking for admate, of production, and all those other cau- mission may desire, And, in such State or States ses that would control the institution and as shall be formed out of said territory north of make it either desirable or undesirable to the said Missouri Compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be pro-

markable provision, which is, that when states lying north of 36 deg. 30 min. apply for ad-mission, slavery shall be prohibited in their tion could not go farther than is exhibited in ward Wade, representatives from Onio, Geressary to legislate for the protection of the inhabitants reading therein. It will be seen as that was a gross at the constitution party in Congress.

The spekeness, therefore, that the reviews, as the spekeness, therefore, the territory, the sixth section.

The spekeness, therefore, the territory, the territory the decision of the territory of the United States, and to which lies north of 36 deg. 30 In order to give greater plausibility to the falsification of the territory of the falsification of the territory of the said that slavery was abolt for the compromise of 1850, the competency of the compromise of 1850, the competency of the said that slavery was abolt for the compromise of 1850, the compromise of 1850, the competency of the territory of the lemma title of the compromise of 1850, the territory of the lemma title said that slavery was abolt the definition of the terms of the compromise of 1850, the compromis

itory, or any portion of the same, shall be re-

northern votes.

Now, sir, let us pause and consider for moment. The first time that the principles by Congress, was by the defeat of that provision in the House of Representatives in 1848. By whom was that defeat effected ! By northern votes with freesoil proclivities. It was the defeat of that Missori compromise that re-opened the slavery apitation with all its fury. It was the defeat f that Missouri compromise that created be tremenduous struggle of 1850. It was the defeat of that Missouri compromise that creted the necessity for making a new comprehise in 1850.-Had we been faithful to the trinciples of the Missouri compromise in 1841, this question would not have arisen. Who was it that was faithless? I undertake to say it was the very men who now insist that the Missouri

vision, in effect, that the people should be ever faithful, the responsibilities and conseallowed to do as they pleased upon the all- quences of their own treachery. Then, sir, as I before remarked, the defeat ject of slavery.

The territory of Messouri having been left of the Missouri compromise of 1848 having

1850 was congressional non-intervention - to subject of slavery, subject only to the provis-

compromise measures of 1850. Those measures, therefore abandoned the idea of a geofree States - States; abandoned it because compelled to do not be to maintain it; and in lieu of that, substant ted a great principle of self-government, which would allow the people to do as they thought compromise, resting upon that great funda-Missouri act, now called the Missouri com- guage of the substitute for the bill which is from France; but the principles of the act persede it, because it applied its provisions the object of its adoption, the reasons in its as well to the north as to the south of 36 deg. 30 min. It established a principle which was equally applicable to the country north as might go, whenever new purchases should be well as south of the parallell of 36 deg. 30 min.—a principle of universal application.— The authors of this abolition manifesto attempted to refute this presumption, and main-

to the first section of the act to establish the New Mexico. That proviso was added, by

Not because it was of the least practical im- sumption, as I before stated, that the Missouportance, so far as the question of slavery ri compromise was abandoned and superseded within the limits of Texas was concerned; for by the principles of the compromise of 1850, no man ever dreamed that it had any practi- these confederates cite the following amendcal effect there. Then why was it brought ment, offered to the bill, to establish the bounforward? It was for the purpose of preserv- dary of Texas and create the Torritory of N.

Jexico in 1850.
"Provided, That nothing herein contained Pacific ocean, whenever we should acquire shall be construed to impair or qualify anythe country that far. I will here read that thing contained in the third article of the clause. It is the third article, second section, and is in these words: March 1, 1845, either as regards the number the States of Texas or otherwise."

After quoting this proviso, they make the following statement, and attempt to gain credit for its truth by suppressing material facts which appear upon the face of the same statute, and which, if produced, would conclusively disprove the statement:

"It is solemnly declared in the very compromise acts, 'that nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify the prohibition of slavery north of thirty-six degress thirty minutes; and yet, in the face of this declaration, that sacred prohibition is said to be overthrown. Can presumption further go !"

I will now proceed to show that presump

They suppress the following material facts. dignation with which is seed in a street of the discussion of the great principles of self government, and the public, bat to malign my character by deliberate falsification of the great principles of self government, and the public statutes and

corporated into that territory of New Mexico. And then what was done! It was infall by their own merits." corporated into that territory with this clause:

ceived into the Union with or without slavery, Yes, sir, the very bill and section from which they quote cuts off all that part of Texas which was to be free by the Missouri compromise, together with some on the south side of the line; incorporates it into the territory of New Mexico; and then says that the territory, and every portion of the same, shall come into the Union with or without slavery

That, when admitted as a State, the said ter-

What else does it do ! The sixth section of the same act provides that the legislative power and authority of this said Territory of New Mexico shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation sonsistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of the act, not excepting slavery. Thus the New Mexican bill, from which they make that quotation, contains the provisions that ion with or without slavery, as it saw proper,

and in the mean time that the territorial legislature should have all the authority over the subject of slavery that they had over any other subject, restricted only by the limitation of the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of the act. Now I ask those Senators, do not those provisions repeal the Missouri compromise, so far as it applied to the country cut off from Texas? Do they not annull it? Do they not supersede it?— If they do then the address which has been out forth to the world by these confederates s an atrocious falsehood. If they do not then what do they mean when they charge me with having, in the substitute first reported from the committee, repealed it, with having annulled it, with having violated it, when I only copied those precise words? I copied he precise words into my bill, as reported then along on the 42d parallel to the Pacifi rom the committee, which were contained in the New Mexico bill. They say my bill annuls the Missouri compromise. If it does, it
had already been done before by the act of Colonel Freemont, to the east of the line, and 1850; for these words were copied from the hence a part of the Louisiana purchase. Yet,

Mr. Wape. Why did you do it over again?
Mr. DOUGLAS. I will come to that point presently. I am now dealing with the truth and veracity of a combination of men who lie my motives. I say, therefore, that their the territory of Utah. says that the same words in my bill do repeal and annul it. They must be adjudged other assection.

Now, sir, I propose to go a little further, and show what was the real meaning of the procuring an expression of opinion from the State of Rhode Island in opposition to this bill. I will state what its meaning is. constitutions prohibiting slavery! I have unnatural boundary. For that reason in ma-shown that it did not mean that, because the king the new territories, we formed natural

ountry cut off. What did it relate to !- either. south of 36 deg. 30 min. were to come in and in such State or States as were north of that line slavery should be prohibited. When we had cut off all north of 36 deg. 30 min. and thus circuinscribed the boundary and ditainly not four, it will be argued. Why ?-

Because the original resolution of annexation provided that one of the States, if not more, should be north of 36 deg. 30 min. It would leave it, then, doubtful whether Texas was entitled to two or three additional States under the circumscribed boundary.

In order to put that matter to rest, in order to make a final settlement, in order to meaning of Congress, the Senator from Vir- to the unorganized territory not covered by to establish and abolish such institutions as ginia offered the amendment that nothing those bills, it was superseded by the principle they thought their own good required ion either as to the number of States or oth- know that the object of the compromise erwise, that is, that Texas should be entitled measures of 1850 was to establish certain to the same number of States with her reduced boundaries as she would have been entitled to under her larger boundaries; and those States shall come in with or without

proposition. Any other construction of it out compass when new territory was acquired a vast wilderness, filled with hostile savages, would stultify the very chacter and purpose of its mover, the senator from Virginia. Such, made? then, was not only the intent of the mover, but such is the legal effect of the law; and I say that no man, after reading the other sec-tions of the bill, those to which I have referr-energies upon the altar of his country! Was

ification that an erroneous and injurious im- to sustain the compromise of 1850 ! Wasit | Thus you did not succeed in Illinois Terripression has been created upon the public the understanding of the whig party, when tory with your ordinance or your Wilmot pression has been created upon the public in an accordance of your without they adopted the compromise measures of Proviso, because the people there regarded it language of severity; but there is no other language that is adequate to express the indignation with which I see this attempt, not and had no reference to the future? If that government. They regarded it as violative

the provisions of that bill was confined to the territory acquired from Mexico, when the very section of the law from which they quoted that provise did purchase a part of that very territory from the State of Texas. And the next section of the law included that territory in the next section of the law included that territory in the new territory of Mexico. It took jections, and we will stand by you and with the next section of the law included that territory in the new territory of Mexico. It took jections, and we will stand by you and with the next section of the law included that territory in the new territory of Mexico. It took jections, and we will stand by you and with a small portion also of the old Louisiana pur- you in carrying out these principles in the chase, and added that to the territory of New future. Mexico, and made up the rest out of the Such I understand to be the meaning of the Mexican acquisitions. Then, sir, your statutes show, when applied to the map of the country, that the territory of New Mexico was composed of country acquired from Mexico meant merely to adopt resolutions which were ico, and also of territory acquired from Texas and of territory acquired from France; and yet in defiance of that statute, and in falsification of its terms, we are told, in order to yet in defiance of that statute, and in falsification of its terms, we are told, in order to
decieve the people, that the bills were confined by the Utah and New Mexico bills, there ed to the purchase made from Mexico alone; was an express annulment of the Missouri New Mexico, including that part of Texas and in order to give it a greater solemnity, which was cut off, should come into the Unthey repeat it twice, fearing that it would not ganized territories, it was superseded by the believed the first time. What is more, the principles of that legislation, and we are territory of Utah was not confined to the bound to apply those principles to the organcountry acquired from Mexico. That terri- ization of all new territories, to all which we

But I will tell you to what country I alsource, and then the line ran due north of the source of the Arkansas to the 42d parallel, ocean. That line, due north from the head inasmuch as that middle part is drained by

Why did we do it? Because we sought stituents wish to judge by. They wish to seded by the measures of 1850, and then it it was deemed better to take the mountains | The legal effect of this bill, if it be passed guilty of one falsehood in order to sustain the nex them to the country on the other side, tories nor out of them, but to leave people to amendment of the Senator from Virginia, out of which these gentlemen have manufactured so much capital in the newspaper press and have succeeded by that misrepresentation in procuring an expression of opinion from the quence of the action of free-soilers and abolitionists when it was superceded by the compromise measures of 1850. which rested Did it mean that the States north of 36 upon a great universal principle—there was deg. 30 min. should have a clause in their no necessity for keeping in view the old and

section containing that proviso cut off all the was acquired from Louisiana, from France, that part of Texas north of 36 deg. 30 min. or from Mexico; for what difference did it

Why, it meant simply this: By the joint In fixing those boundaries, I paid no at resolution of 1845, Texas was annexed, with tention to the fact whether they included old the right to form four additional States out territory or new territory-whether the counof her territory; and such States as were try was covered by the Missouri compromise or not. Why? Because the principles eswith or without slavery, as they saw proper; tablished in the bills superseded the Missouri compromise. For that reason we disregarded the old boundaries; disregarded the territory niarily may require. to which it applied, and disregarded the source from whence the title was derived. I say, Hampshire became free, while South Caroliminished the territory of Texas, the question therefore, that a close examination of those na continued to hold slaves; Connecticut arose, how many States will Texas be entitled acts clearly establishes the fact that it was abolished slavery, while Georgia held on to to under this circumscribed boundary. Certification,

very agitation in all time to come. Was it

and the legal enect of that law.

Then I submit to the Senate if I have not convicted this manifesto, issued by the abolition confederates, of being a gross falsification of the laws of the land, and by that falsification that the Baltimore platform pledged its lifeation that an arrangement and injurious im-

versy growing out of that acquisition, and of conduct? If it had been in relation to past that controversy only. They must stand or confluct only, the pledge would have been I submit to the Senate if there is an intelligent man in America who does not know that that declaration is falsified by the Statute from which they quoted. They say that the provisions of that bill was confined to the newer would have voted affirmatively on them.

country acquired from Mexico. That territory, as is well known to every man who understands the geography of the country, includes a large tract of rich and fertlle country, acquired from France in 1803, and to which the eighth section of the Missouri act applied in 1820. If these confederates do not know to what country I allude I only reply the section of the moment you ratify a part treaty acquired and the moment you ratify and the part treaty acquired and the moment you ratify and the part treaty acquired and the part tre know to what country I allude, I only reply new treaty acquiring an inch of country from that they should have known before they ut- Mexico. By any other construction, you retered the falsehood and imputed a crime to me. open the issue every time you make a new But I will tell you to what country I alterritorial government. But, sir, if you treat lude. By the treaty of 1819, by which we the compromise measures of 1850 in the acquired Florida and fixed a boundary be-tween the United States and Spain, the boun-dary was made of the Arkansas river to its where in all time to come, then you avoid the agitation for ever, if you observe good faith to the provisions of these enactments,

Mr. President, I repeat that, so far as the question of slavery is concerned, there is nothing in the bill under consideration which does not carry out the principles of the compromise measures of 1850, by leaving the people to do as they please subject only to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. If that principle is wrong, the bill is wrong. If that principle is right, the bill is the constitution of the United States. have assembled in secret caucus upon the part from Nebraska, or from the Louisiana right. It is unnecessary to quibble about Sabbath day to arraign my conduct and be purchase, and included it within the limits of phraseology or words it is not the mere words, the mere phraseology, that our con-

> as a boundary, than by an air line to cut the as reported by the Committee on Territories. valleys on one side of the mountains, and an- is neither to legislate slavery into these terri-And why did we take these natural bounda- do as they please, under the provisions and ries, setting at defiance the old boundaries? subject to the limitations of the Constitution. The simple reason was that so long as we of the United States. Why should not this ly address the argument to the section of country, and ask why should any northern man object to this principle! If you will review the history of the slavery question in the United States, you will see that all the which have been worked out, have been &c. complished by the operation of this principle,

and by it alone states were colonies of Great same act says that they oper. I say it could our title was derived. in writing these bills Britain, every one of them was a slaveholding not mean that for another reason: The same I paid no attention to the fact whether the ti- province. When the Constitution of the thirteen were slaveholding States. Since that and hence there was nothing for it to operate make? The principle which we had established time six of those States have become free. ipon. It did not, therefore, relate to the lished in the bill would apply equally well to How has this been effected? Was it by virtue of abolition agitation in Congress ? Was . it in obedience to the dictates of the federal government? Not at all: but they have become free States under the silent but sure and irresistible working of that great principle of self-government which teaches every people to do that which the interests of themselves and their posterity morally and pecu-

Under the operation of this principle. New compromise measures of 1850, to supersede, while Maryland preserved it; New York, the Missouri compromise, and all geographical New Jersey, and Pennsylvania abolished slacal and territorial lines.

Sir, in order to avoid any misconstruction, Kentucky retained it. Did they do it at will state more distinctly what my precise your bidding! Did they do it at the dictaidea is upon this point. So far as the Utah tion of the federal government! Did they do and New Mexico bills included the territory it in obediance to any of your Wilmot prowhich had been subject to the Missouri com- visos or ordinances of '87? Not at all; they promise provision, to that extent they abso did it by virtue of their rights as freemen have it explicitly understood what was the lutely annulled the Missouri compromise. As under the Constitution of the United States,

therein contained should impair that provis- ples of the compromise of 1850. We all Let me ask, where have you succeeded in excluding slavery by an act of Congress from great principles which would avoid the slat tell me that you did it in the Northwest territory by the ordinance of 1787. I will show our object simply to provide for a temporary you by the history of the country that you evil! Was it our object to heal over an old did not accomplish any such thing. You slavery, as they might prefer, being all south sore, and leave it to break out again? Was prohibited slavery there by law, but you did so 36 deg. 30 min, and nothing to impair that it our object to adopt a mere misreable expression of 36 deg. 30 min, and nothing to impair that it our object to adopt a mere misreable expression. With the exception the act. Such, sir, was the meaning of that alone, and leave ourselves entirely at sea, with of a few French and white settlements, it was or new territorial organizations were to be when the ordinance of 1787 was adopted. Yet, sir, when Illinois was organized into a Was that the object for which the eminent territorial government, it established and proand venerable Senator from Kentucky Mr. tected slavery, and maintained it in spite of ed, can doubt that such was both the intent and the legal effect of that law.