line of argument pursued by my friend from Alabama [Mr. Houston]—they certainly are. But I do not hold them to any responsibility on such grounds. Gentlemen stand here by their principles. It is said that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Campbell) could have been elected, if all the anti-Nebraska men had voted for him. For three days Mr. Banks was within three of an election. If three of those who voted for others had voted for him he would now have been Speaker. You can transfer the responsibility on whom you please by taking the votes as they are on record, because combinations could have been made at any time by which an election would have been effected. That result could be figured out of the vote of anti-Nebraska men; and the same could be done in the vote of Democrats and Americans. It is not expected that those voting for Mr. Richardson will change their position, because by doing so they may gain a few votes. Nor should it be expected that those voting for Mr. Banks will change their ground, because by so doing they may gain a few votes. Those of us who were here at the time resisted the repeal of the Missouri compromise, and were opposed to reopening the slavery agitation. We were borne down then, but our views of the justice of that measure have not changed. What was wrong when enacted never ceases with me to be a wrong.

January 19, 1856.

Mr. Quitman.—I intended yesterday to take the floor for the purpose of making a few 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 gentleman would have done it. But, there were some expressions that fell from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 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 that bill which has produced this state of feeling between the different sections of the country? If it is, then the gentlemen who concur with him have taken the bold position that they will deny 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 underline the Constitution of the United States?—the right of 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 north.

But gentlemen are mistaken. They do not travel back to the sources of that angry feeling which exists between the different sections of the Union, when they stop at the passage Nebraska bill by the last Congress. That was not the cause of that hostility of feeling which now prevents the organization of this House. That was not the original cause why, at the present time, we find the two sections of the country arrayed against one another. I will tell gentlemen what the cause is. The cause has operated for more than a year. It made its appearance on this floor in 1819, and was only quieted for a time by the compromise in 1820. It came out afreshin 1835. It is to be found in that spirit of aggression upon the institutions of the South which comes from a portion of that section of the country which the gentleman [Mr. Grow] represents. The South has ever stood by the guarantees of the Constitution; she has adhered faithfully to the system of government under which we live. She has never undertaken to make any encroachment upon any State rights, or upon any individual rights of the citizens of the North. Not so with the North. Upon the application of Missouri for admission into the Union in 1819, she evinced her disposition to exercise her political powers to prevent the increase of slaveholding States, and to deprive the South of her just rights to a participation in all the benefits of the Union. The political strife which grew out of that controversy threatened the dissolution of the Union. It resulted in a compromise unjust to the South, but which she was compelled to accept. The result of that struggle, thus terminated, quelled agitation for a time. It soon rose again with fearful violence, and has been continued ever since.

But the gentleman traces back the cause of this hostility one year only. Let me tell him that, twenty years ago, when I had the honor to send in an an executive message to the Legislature of Mississippi, I deemed it proper to call the attention of the Legislature of that State to the aggressive movements in the northern States. Could I have procured that document, I would have read extracts from it to show the truth of my remarks.—The South has ever since complained of this intermeddling of the North with her institutions. Yet it has continued without intermission; it is the agitation which that gentleman, and those who co-operate with him, has raised that has produced this feeling between the different sections of this country, and not the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; that was the result, not the cause.—It is not because the Kansas-Nebraska bill has taken away a single right of the North, but it is because it has performed a constitutional duty to the South: because it has given to the South the same rights which we acknowledge are possessed by the people of the North. Let the gentleman, then, when he attempts to trace causes, go back to the sources of this state of feeling, and he will find that it is upon you, northern men, the responsibility of this state of things lies—upon you, who have stirred up this sectional agitation, you who seek to deprive sovereign States of their federal and constitutional rights. When you attempt, then, to trace it back, go to its true source. In the future of our country, if it should happen that the glorious system which our fathers have transmitted to us should fall and tumble into ruin, the verdict of posterity and history will be to condemn the agitators of the slavery question as traitors to the Constitution and to the equal constitutional rights of a portion of this Union. There, sir, I trace it, and will not impute it to the action of the last Congress in doing what was nothing but mere justice to the South.

Gentlemen tell us here, graciously, that they are not disposed to invade our rights to property within the States. I do not thank them for that. Let me tell them here on this floor—though myself born on the north of Mason and Dixon's line—that that is not all we desire. We desire the common benefit of this system of government. We are not content that that great interest, whose existence in our section of the country has constituted so important an element of your prosperity as well as ours—that system which God in his infinite wisdom has permitted to be built up in our country to promote, foster and carry forward its destiny—should meet a mere tolerance at your hands 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 for our property as well as for yours, within the legitimate sphere of its action. We will not be content, we ought not to be content with 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 superior—that you shall reap all the advantages of our common government.—We want its benefits also, and we insist upon them. You 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 from their bounty mere toleranee of our institutions in the States. We demand all our constitutional rights—I say, we demand them. [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. Grow. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr Quitman] complains of remarks made by me yesterday, and refers to a 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, gentlemen say. Very well. Sir, whether the Missouri compromise was constitutional or not—whether or not it was a violation of your constitutional rights—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 slavery should be forever after excluded from the territory north of the line 36 deg. 30min. Of the one hundred and three gentlemen who then represented the South in this House and in the Senate, but forty-six voted against this line. Among the number was your own immortal Clay. He delared in the Senate of the United States, in 1850, "that a majority of southern members sustained the wrong—himself among the number." Whether this passage was or was not a constitutional right, it was a 'fair bargain,' and good faith required that it should be observed. By it you consented voluntarily to relinquish all right to carry slavery north of the line 36 deg. 30 min.; and after availing yourselves of all the advantages secured by that arrangement to you, after converting every foot of territory south of that line into slave territory, you came here, and by force of numbers struck down that bargain which your fathers made, and which was religiously observed for over a third of a century.

M. Quitman. Do you assert that Mr. Clay voted for the Missouri compromise line?

M. 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 say so.

Mr. Grow. And that a majority of the southern members in the House and in the Senate voted for it.

Mr. Bowie. Mr Clay has stated that he did *not* vote for that line; he was not present, but he thought that if he had been he would very likely have done so.

Mr. Grow. I refer to a speech made by Mr. Clay in the Senate of the United States on the 6th of March, 1850, in which he says that "*among those who agreed to that line a majority of southern members*," and that, "*I have no earthly doubt that I voted in common with my other southern friends for the adoption of the line of* 36 deg. 30 min." That is the language of Mr. Clay in 1850, in the Senate of the United States. And, although he cannot speak to-day with living voice, he does 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 voted for the line of 36 deg. 30 min. I wish to furnish a contradiction.

Mr. Grow. You may do so when I get through.

Mr. Harris. You challenge a contradiction, 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 South, made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Quitman,] 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 differ 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 therefore under this Government.

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

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

Mr. Grow. Sir, I hold no "hostility" to the institutions of the Southern States, but shall resist the effort now making to change the construction given to the Constitution by our fathers and the action of every branch of the Government for over sixty years. If any one thing more than another secured my return to this House for the third time, by the unanimous vote of my district, it was no doubt because I had stood upon this floor and resisted 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 its infancy, when too feeble to stand alone; and you have made it strong in manhood by the injudicious and unjust legislation of this Hall. When the North petitioned this Government to take steps in reference to the institution of slavery, where it is conceded to be solely under the jurisdiction of Congress, you passed the twenty-first 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 *alone* but for the North. In resisting the re-opening of this agitation in the last Congress, by a repeal of the Missouri compromise, I took occasion to say that—

"Previous 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 when a great principle of constitutional rights 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 in this country, where we claim that intelligence should circulate as free as the air we be 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, through your Secretary of State, John C. Calhoun—a 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 religiously observed by them for more than a third of a century.

Mr. Quitman, (in his seat.) You robbed us of California.

Mr. Grow. The gentleman says that we have robbed you of California. How is that? California came to Congress and asked to be admitted as a State of this Union. Your government had neglected to give her a government, and she was forced to fall back upon the inherent rights of men to take care of themselves.

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

Mr. Grow. I am coming to that presently. The people of California—in the exercise of what is called popular sovereignty, and which was in this case really so, because the people were forced by the neglect of the Government 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 Union 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 Union after the act of admission had passed. And what is the reason these Senators gave for their opposition? Because her constitution excluded slavery. I will read the language of their protest.

Mr. Humphrey Marshall. Will 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 is, "that the bill gives the sanction of law, and thus imparts validity to the unauthorized action of a portion of the inhabitants of California, 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 Californian, under her constitution, was a violation of the right of fifteen slaveholding States.

Mr. Quitman. Let me tell the gentleman 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 slavery.

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 the 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 the fact.

Mr. Grow. I do not think that I dared any one to deny it, but appealed to the record for the truth of my assertion.

Mr. Harris. Well, whether the gentleman did or did not, his words are taken by the reporters, and their record will show how the fact is.

Mr. Grow. Very well; let that determine it.

Mr. Harris. But I want to say a few words in connection with this same question, and to dispose of the challenge which the gentleman has thrown out to the House.—

I state here in in my place, that the remark which the gentleman made, that Mr. Clay favored the territorial restriction, is not correct. What does the record show? In the first place I read from the 17th volume of Niles's Register, pages 174 and 175, as follows:

"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 a line on which those in favor of, and those opposed to, the slave restriction might compromise their views.]

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

"'*And provided further, and it is hereby enacted*, That forever hereafter 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 line of north latitude and west of the Mississip river, *and of the boundaries os the State of 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 fugitives may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed, according to the laws of the United States in such case made and provided, to the person claiming his or her labor as aforesaid.

"On this motion a debate ensued 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 that debate; but the question here naturaly 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 upon the State, when he, deciding 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 than that—and I take pleasure in bringing it to the notice 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 years in the service of his country, serving her faithfully, whose world has never been questioned, and never will be—who was present and heard Mr. Clay upon both of these occasions, when he debated the resolution of Mr. Storrs and the resolution upon State restrictions. He took notes of those speeches, as he tells me, and he authorizes me to say that Mr. Clay opposed all restrictions either upon Territory or State. ["Who is it?"] General Jessup, whose authority no man will question. He says he heard Mr. Clay upon this floor upon both of these occasions, and took notes of his remarks. He has them now, and he proposes to give them to the public at a proper time. He says that Mr. Clay opposed restriction upon both branches of this subject, and that he was opposed to all restriction.—he also details the line of argument pursued upon those occasions.

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 statement I have, in connection with the remarks of those gentlemen from Pennsylvania, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. Grow. I shall say but a few words in reply to the gentleman from Illinois. The effort which he has made to change the record of the country by citing officers of the Army, or any other living witness, will not, I trust, be admitted here, or in the country, against the declarations of the living man, made in the Senate 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. That is not the question in controversy. That question is, whether he was in favor of the adoption of the line of 36 dgs. 30 min., north of which slavery should be forever prohibited; and I will read an extract from his remarks, where he himself, on the 6th of February, 1850, gives the history of the whole transaction. In that history he clears up the misapprehension which existed in the country that he was the originator of the 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 of a restriction on the State, but that he was in favor of the line of 36 dgs. 30 min., and that a majority of southern men supported it. And what is the record? M. Clay says:

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

"My friend from Alabama in the Senate, [Mr. King.] Mr Pinkney, from Maryland, and a majority of the southern members in this body, voted in favor of the line of 36 dgs. 30 min.; 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* 36 dgs. 30 min."

Mr Clay's own declaration, made by himself! And the summoning of living witnesses to contradict him raises a question, not between me and the witnesses you summon, but a question between the declaration of your own Clay and that of your witnesses. There I leave you.

I leave the record, then, with the living witnesses whom you summon to impeach the declaration of your own immortal statesman. But, sir, from the archives of your country comes the declaration of one of the living actors of the times, that the South regarded the adoption of that line as a *triumph.*—Charles Pinkney wrote from this Capitol at midnight—for it seems that all these slavery laws must be passed in the darkness of 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. Pinkney, 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 Louisana to the southward 30 dgs., 30m., free of the restriction of slavery, *and give the South in a short time an addition of six and perhaps eight members to the Senate of the United States.* It is considered here by *the slaveholding State as a* great triumph."

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, Louisana, Tennessee, Georgia, Kentucky, Missouri, Alabama Mississippi, and Delaware, with Mr. Stokes, of North Carolina, and Mr Giliard, of South Carolina—leaving two against it.

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

"To the north of 36 dgs. 30m., there is to be, by the present law, restriction, which, you will see by the votes, I voted against.—*But it is at present of no moment.* It is a vast tract uninhabited only by savages and wild beasts, in which not a foot of the Indian to soil is extinguished, and in which according to the ideas prevalent, *no land office 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 restriction—strike down everything which the North thought she had rescued by that arrangement.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Humphrey Marshall] 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. Sir, what was the Missouri restrictions applied to? To the territory purchased of France—to that alone, and nothing else. It was not applied to any other territory, for there was no other to apply it to. Then, has it not been adhered to by the North in its application to the territory to which it was applied? Was it not put on the statue-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; Mis ouri is the question. The gentlemen rest upon Missouri. She had passed a law prohibiting the migration of free blacks; and the ground of resistance to her admission was, that she could not enact such a restriction, and not that she tolerated slavery. It was in the compromise that Mr. Clay figured as the originator. He brought in a proposition to harmonize the question and it passed. But there was no question raised, at that time, about the line of 36 dgs. 30m. nor at any other time, so far as the Louisana purchase was concerned, the only territory to which the 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 institutions; while leaving almost indefinite expansion to the institutions of slavery? Besides, sir, we have acquired free territory—territory in which slavery was abolished by laws of Mexico—and we were asked to make it, by act of Congress, slave territory. To such a proposition I answer the gentlemen, in language of Kentuck's own illustrious statesmen, 'I never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote, to spread slavery over a territory where it does not exist.' That 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 bequeathed 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 excluded by positive law.

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 prohibited 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 one 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 existance while under the jurisdiction of Congress, it is just the same in effect as if carried there by your votes, for you permit to be done what you have the power to prevent.

The Danger of Burying too Soon.—The danger of too rapid interment was exemplified in a very extraordinary manner recently, according to one of our exchanges. A young man who had been suffering from a malignant fever, to all appearances died. To avoid the danger of infection which might arise from a corpse remaining in the house all night, a coffin was immediately commenced, the certificate of death sent for, and urgent application was made to the incumbent of a church to allow the corpse to be interred the same evening. This, however, he declined, considering the proceeding too hasty, but consented to the interment taking place the following morning. The grave was dug, and the coffin ready, but the dead man in the course of the night gave signs of returning animation, and at the hour fixed for his burial, was in the comfortable enjoyment of a cup of coffee which he had requested, with every prospect of recovery.

Fast and Loose.—It will be remembered that at the last session of the Legislature, a law was passed changing the compensation of members from the per diem pay of three dollars as it then existed; to $500 per session. The Legislature adjourned leaving said bill in the hands of the Governor, who recently returned the same with his objections; although he had previously given his approval to the appropriation bill containing a similar provision. Without expressing any opinion ourself, as to the propriety of the measure, we cannot help thinking it an afterthought of Governor Pollock, vetoing the law itself, when he had sanctioned the measure already, as being intimated in the appropriation bill of last winter. Wonder if this veto would have made its appearance had the present body been of like complexion with the former one.

☞ It is remarked, in Sturm's Reflections, that the Word of God mentions no one in particular, but sets forth salvation in general and extensive terms. It is exactly suited to the most vile and accursed state of sinners, perfectly sufficient to relieve the mind, encourage hope, and forbid despair, under a sense of the most complicated sins and accumulated guilt of lost, wretched, and undone souls; for the ransom of Jesus is sufficient. Those who call the happy, cause thee to err; they distress the way of thy path.

Mr. Rust's statement

Washington, Wednesday, Jan. 30, 1856.

Mr. Rust says that when he first approached Mr. Greeley, it was not his intention to assault him, and that he told his friends that he should only remonstrate with him then; but when he inquired of Mr. Greeley, 'Would you resent an insult?' Mr. G. replied, 'I don't know, Sir,' in such a tone that it provoked him to strike him. He also says that Mr. Greely struck him in return. He says that Mr. Greeley, at the second meeting, added to the remark, that he believed it was Mr. Rust, 'and you have treated me very ungentlemanly.' When Mr. Rust again inquired, 'Are you a non-combatant?' Mr. Greeley said, 'I don't shelter myself under that plea;' but when he requested him to fight, Mr. Greeley said that he had nothing to fight with.

From Washington.

House, Feb. 2.—The long struggle for Speaker was closed to-day, the Plurality rule being sustained by nine-majority, and Mr. Banks elected by 103 to 100 for Mr. Aiken on the first vote under the rule. Mr. Banks was sworn in, and made a brief speech.—John W. Forney was thanked for his services as temporary Chairman, and the House adjourned.

Patriotic Ladies.—The Imperial Princesses of Russia have sold their diamonds, and paid the amount recieved for them into the Coffers of the State.

Montrose Democrat.

THE LARGEST CIRCULATION IN NORTHERN PENN'A.

E. B. CHASE, Editor.

Montrose, Thursday, Feb. 6 1856.

☞ Who wants the CASH for half a ton of good hay? At this office.

☞ Who wants the CASH for a good new milk's cow? Leave word at this office.

☞ In order to place before our readers the present state of the Kansas question, we publish this week the Message of the President on that subject,—the reply of Governor Reeder, and the debate between Mr. Grow and others in the House of Representatives.

☞ We have several interesting communications, but the crowded state of our columns oblige us to put them over till next week. They will not hurt by keeping. Our old Friend E. F. W. is very welcome.

Book Table.

The Knickerbocker, For February is at hand, overflowing, as usual, with wit, sentiment and art.

The Ladie's Pearl, one of the sweetest little Magazines ever printed, is on our table for February. It is a religious work, and deserves large success. Published at Nashville, Tenessee, by Langdon & Provine, at $1.00 per year.

Littell's Living Age. It is perhaps quite unnecessary for us to say one word in praise of this most valuable American publication. The high literary position attained for it places it beyond the reach of rivalry. Its pages are weekly laden with the solid literature of ancient and modern times. Long may this work live to bless mankind. Littell, Son, & Co., Boston. 12½ cents per copy.

Arthur's Home Magazine.—We acknowledge the receipt of this well conducted magazine for February. It is the first number we have seen in a long time, but it still stands as a star among magazines. Address F. S. Arthur & Co., Phil'a. Terms $2,00 per year.

An End of Counterfeiting.

We have received a copy of "Dye's Bank Note Plate Delineator, a large volume of nearly 300 pages. Mr. Dye has labored three years in the perfection of his work, attaining at last the most triumphant success. In this work we have the *genuine plate* of every Bank Bill in the United States and British North America, carefully delineated, so that a child cannot fail to detect counterfeit or altered notes. All you have to do is simply to compare the Bill with the genuine, and of course you will at once detect the difference of any exist. Nobody can be imposed upon with this guide before him, unless he be an idiot, and no one should think of doing business without this work, for with it they can bid defiance to rogues.

Single copies of the Delineator, only $2,00. The Bank Mirror, and Coin Chart Manual, issued semi monthly with accurate description of the latest counterfeits, will be sent to subscribers, with the Delineator for $3.00. Address John S. Dye, New York City.

For the Democrat.

Mr. Editor:

The Republican of last week seems deeply concerned about a resolution adopted by the last Democratic Convention, and in its accustomed manner of perversion attempts to get up a scism between Mr. Grow and his constituents, upon a false issue. The resolution referred to was proposed to the convention by myself, entirely upon my own responsibility. I deem it, therefore my privilege as well as duty to give the reasons for thus presuming upon his vote for speaker.

The Republican stigmatises the resolution as condemning Mr. Grow for supporting a free-soil candidate for speaker, and says, "this is only another way of asking him to support Richardson, or Orr, or whoever may be the nominee of the National Democracy." The editors of that paper deal more in fictions than with facts and cannot understand a resolution that explains itself, or, rather, they do not mean to understand. They would rather pervert it, in order that they can use the words "dough-faces, office-seekers, sham Democracy," &c. These words have a peculiar charm for that press, and are used without signification except to signify that they are a kind of "stop-thief" cry. Dishonest men are always ranting about the dishonesty of others. The resolution did not ask Mr. Grow to support Richardson, or Orr. It simply said, "the vote of Hon. G. A. Grow for Mr. Banks a well known Know Nothing and *Republican* for Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington meets our disapprobation, and we hereby request him to vote for an *anti-Know Nothing Democrat* for that position." The resolution explains itself.—Mr. Grow is not asked to vote against his principles, unless it be against his principles to vote against a Know Nothing and Republican. The charge against Mr. Banks, is that he is a well known Know Nothing and Republican. What say Messrs Read and Frazier to this charge? Not one word in their leading editorial about his Know Nothingism and Republicanism. They are whist about that just now, but say they, "he is a free-soil man." A free-soil man! and how long has he been a free-soil man? Scarcely twelve months have elapsed since he ignored the slavery question in one of his speeches.—His past history tells us he can change his politics to suit the dominant party, at any time when it is his interest to do so. When the Democratic principles prove se most successful, he was a professed Democrat. When Pro-Slavery doctrines are popular, he is Pro Slavery. When the Know Nothing and Republicans, the avowed enemies to Democracy, will receive him into their lodges and swear to his support, he subscribes to their doctrines and in a secret manner takes a secret oath to keep their secrets. If he is a free-soiler to day I would like to know what assurance we have that he will be so till the close of the Session? Certainly his own acts are no guarantee.

Now in asking Mr. Grow not to support Mr. Banks is it requiring from him any different principles than that which he was elected? Anything different from what he has always professed? By no means. His free-soil principles, as he has always professed them, have always been, and still are acceptable to the Democrats of this county. And he has not been called upon to change them in the least. "To vote for an anti-Know-Nothing Democrat," leaves him to select his own man. That he would select a man with Northern sentiment is expected, of course.—If it had been intended to mean otherwise it would have been so written. Richardson and Orr were both candidates, and this was known to the Convention and especially to myself. Their names not being mentioned in the resolution it was equivalent to a resolution against them.

That Convention had a right to request Mr Grow to support a Democrat. He has been thrice returned to Congress by the Democrats in spite of the most strenuous efforts of his opponents. The very press that is now courting him poured out its most violent vituperations against him when he was first made a candidate. The Democracy then made him their standard-bearer—and he with the rest of the Democrats has lived to see Democratic principles acknowledged almost universally—as superior to those of the opposition. The Know-Nothings and Republicans are a still more deadly foe to the principles of Democracy. Mr. Grow was still elected by the Democrats without any favors from the opposition. He was elected upon the same principles as formerly and upon the same ticket with the other candidates. His Democratic friends have, therefore, a full right to disapprove his vote for Mr. Banks. Mr. Grow will do well to defend his own position and not leave it to the Republican.

I must ask the Republican to correct one statement that it has in substance before published. "That Davis stumped the eastern part of the county making pro-slavery speeches for Bigler in the fall of '54. This is quite a mistake. If the editors have been so informed, their informant told it for a political fraud, or was misinformed himself.—I never made a pro-Slavery speech in my life. True I supported Gov. Bigler for re-election, but not on pro-slavery views, but because he was a man of superior qualifications and better principles than his opponent, Mr. Pollock. Like an honest man, he declared that the Governor of this Commonwealth, had nothing to do with the slavery question in Congress or the passage of the Nebraska bill, and if re-elected would have nothing to do with it.

But Mr. Pollock professed everything.—Well Pollock was elected, and what has he done? Emphatically nothing! He rode his hobby horse till he got into office, then he turned it loose again. Indeed his long silence during the struggle in the Legislature for U. S. Senator showed him a more Pro-Slavery man than Bigler, even when he was under pledges to do something for free-soilism. Why don't the Republican call him to an account? Oh! the reason is obvious, the Editors have doubtless taken a Know-Nothing oath which makes it a sort of heresy and invokes some severe penalties if they question the conduct of a superior Know Nothing. Yours &c.,

A. J. Davis.

Susqu'a Depot Feb. 4th, 1859

Special Dispatch to The N. Y. Herald.

Washington, Tuesday, Jan. 29, 1856.

The Hon. Horace Greeley was twice assaulted this afternoon by Mr. Rust, representative from Arkansas. The first attack was made as Mr. Greeley was walking down in front of the Capitol, immediately after the House adjourned. He had got about half way down from the Capitol, steps to the avenue, when Mr. Rust stepped up to him, and calling him aside, and inquiring if he was Mr. Greeley, asked, "are you a non-resistant?—Mr. Greeley replied, "That depends upon circumstances." Mr. Rust then struck him a blow on the right temple, and followed it up by others.

The affair was sudden, Mr. Greeley had his hands in his great coat pockets and could make no resistance. He said: "Who is this man? I don't know him." Mr. Rust answered: "Damn you, you'll know me after this." Mr. Rust walked on and Mr. Greeley came along towards his lodging at the National Hotel. When near the steps, Mr. Rust met him, and exclaimed: "Do you know me now?" Mr. Greeley said: "It is Mr. Rust of Arkansas, I believe." Mr. Rust then raised a cane and struck at Mr. Greeley's head. Mr. Greeley warded off the blow from his head, and received it on his left arm, which was pretty badly bruised. Several gentlemen rushed in, and the assault was stopped.

I saw Mr. Greeley, about 8 o'clock, in his room. He was writing at his table, with wet cloths bound round his head and arm. No bones were broken. The attack was provoked by the severe letter about Mr. Rust's proposition, published in Monday's *Tribune*. B.

MARRIED.

In Ararat January 23d, by the Rev. Wm. Shelp, Mr. Philip T. Dunn of Herrick, to Miss Lydia M. Hay of Ararat.

Also by the same Mr. Greenville H. Farnam, of Benton Lugerne Co., to Miss Harriet Sprague, of Lenox.

On Thursday the 31st ult. by the Rev J. B. McCreary, Mr. Nathaniel G. Newton, of Hopewell, Ontario Co. N. Y. to Miss Ann Merryman, of Franklin, Susquehanna Co. Pa.

On the 23d Jan. at Binghamton, by Rev. Amos B. Beach, Mr. Alonzo E. Bell, of Hopbottoms, to Miss Rebeca B. Merrill, also of Hopbottoms Pa.

Feb. 2d at Searles Hotel, By Rev. A. Oz. Warren, Mr Estabrook of Susquehanna to Miss Elizebalh B. Adams, of Hartford.

DIED.

In Harford on the 23d inst. Franklin F. infant son of Josiah and Maria Williams aged 19 months and one week.

How could I part with my darling child, in any other way, than at the call of our Saviour, who said Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not for such is the Kingdom of Heaven.

In Princetown, Scott Co. Iowa, Dec. 6th 1855, Mrs. Corinna, wife of Luther Stanley, Esq., late of Choconut township, aged 55 years.