

The Montrose Democrat.

WE JOIN OURSELVES TO THE PARTY THAT DOES NOT CARRY THE FLAG AND KEEP STEP TO THE MARCH OF THE UNION.

A. J. GERRITSON, PUBLISHER.

MONTROSE, PA., APRIL 7, 1859.

VOLUME XVI, NUMBER 14.

GROVER & BAKER'S

CELEBRATED



FAMILY SEWING MACHINES.

New Styles—Prices from \$20 to \$125.

EXTRA CHARGE OF \$5 FOR REMITTANCE.

495 Broadway - New York.

F. B. CHANDLER, AGENT, MONTROSE.

These machines sew from two spools, as purchased from the store, requiring no stitching of thread; they sew, pull, gather, and finish in a superior style, finishing each seam by their own operation, without recourse to the handneedle, and is required by other machines, as they will do better and cheaper sewing than a seamstress can, even if she works for one cent an hour, and are unquestionably the best machines in the market for family sewing, on account of their simplicity, durability, ease of management, and adaptation to all varieties of family sewing—executing either heavy or fine work with equal facility, and without special adjustment.

As evidence of the unquestioned superiority of their machines, the GROVER & BAKER SEWING MACHINE COMPANY beg leave to respectfully refer to the following:

TESTIMONIALS:

"Having had one of Grover & Baker's Machines in my family for nearly a year and a half, I take pleasure in commending it as every way reliable for the purpose for which it is designed—Family Sewing."—Mrs. John H. Leavitt, Editor of Rev. Dr. Leavitt's Editor of N. Y. Independent.

"I confess myself delighted with your Sewing Machine, which has been in my family for many months. It has always been ready for any work, requiring no adjustment, and is easily adapted to every variety of family sewing, by simply changing the spools of thread."—Mrs. Elizabeth Strickland, wife of Rev. Dr. Strickland, Editor of N. Y. Christian Advocate.

"After trying several good machines, I prefer yours, on account of its simplicity, and the perfect ease with which it is managed, as well as the strength and durability of the work. After long experience, I feel competent to speak in this manner, and to confidently recommend it for every variety of family sewing."—Mrs. E. B. Spomer, wife of the Editor of Brooklyn Star.

"I have used Grover & Baker's Sewing Machine for many years, and have found it adapted to all kinds of family sewing, from the simplest to the most elaborate. It is easily kept in order, and easily used."—Mrs. A. B. Whipple, wife of Rev. Dr. Whipple, New York.

"Your Sewing Machine has been in my family the past two years, and the ladies request me to give you their testimony to its perfect adaptation, as well as to the quality of the work, and the strength and durability of the machine."—Robert Bowman, New York.

"For several months we have used Grover & Baker's Sewing Machine, and have come to the conclusion that every lady who desires her sewing beautifully and quickly done, would be most fortunate in possessing one of these reliable and indestructible machines. It is easily kept in order, and easily used."—Mrs. J. W. Morris, daughter of Gen. Geo. P. Morris, Editor of the New York Herald.

"I had a tent made in Melbourne, in 1853, in which there were over three thousand yards of sewing done with one of Grover & Baker's Machines, and a single seam at that has outlasted all the other seams sewed by sailors with a needle and wire."

"If Homer could be called up from his murky haunts, he would long the advent of Grover & Baker as a more beneficent miracle of art than was ever Vulcan's smithy. He would denounce midnight shirt-making, and the dreadful strain of work unnumbered."—Prof. North.

"I take pleasure in saying, that the Grover & Baker Sewing Machine have more than sustained my expectation. After trying and returning others, I have three of them in operation in my different places, and, after four years' trial, have no fault to find."—H. Hammar, Senator of North Carolina.

"My wife has had one of Grover & Baker's Family Sewing Machines for some time, and I am satisfied it is one of the best labor-saving machines that has been invented. I take much pleasure in recommending it to the public."—J. C. Harris, Governor of Tennessee.

"It is a beautiful thing, and puts every body into an excitement of good humor. Were I a Catholic, I should insist upon Santa Grover and Baker having an eternal holiday in commemoration of their good deeds for humanity."—Cassius M. Clay.

"I think it by far the best patent in use. This Machine can be adapted from the finest camber to the heaviest camber. It sews stronger, faster, and more beautifully than any one can imagine. If mine could not be replaced, money could not buy it."—Mrs. J. H. Brown, Nashville, Tenn.

"We find this Machine to work to our satisfaction, and with pleasure recommend it to the public, as we believe the Grover & Baker to be the best Sewing Machine in use."—Deary Brothers, Atlanta, Tenn.

"If used exclusively for family purposes, with ordinary care, I will wager they will last one, two, three, four, five, and never get out of fix."—John Kinkade, Nashville, Tenn.

"I have had your Machine for several weeks, and am perfectly satisfied that the work it does is the best and most beautiful ever made."—Magnus Ainslie, Nashville, Tenn.

"I use your Machine upon coats, dressings, and fine linen stitching, and the work is admirable—far better than the best hand-sewing, or any other machine I have ever seen."—Lucy B. Thompson, Nashville, Tenn.

"I find the work the strongest and most beautiful I have ever seen, made either by hand or machine, and regard the Grover & Baker Machine as one of the greatest blessings to our race."—Mrs. Taylor, Nashville, Tenn.

SEND FOR A CIRCULAR.

1859-1860-1861

Agricultural.

Cultivate the Farmer, as well as the Farm.

Operations for April.

April is no leisure month for the farmer. The plow and harrow are at work, spades are wanted in the field, fences are not yet cattle proof. Early crops require putting in, and the farm stock need much care at this their season of increase.

If not promptly and closely pursued, now, the work of the whole season will be delayed, and there will be the unpleasant necessity of being driven by work, rather than the pleasure of driving it.

It is important too that work be well done. A piece of land is half plowed, no after labor can fully atone for it, although even in hoed crops, while nothing can be done for the grain. Undertake to cultivate no more than can be put in and thoroughly tilled. If the farm contains more land than can be properly managed, turn out a portion to pasture, and till the rest.

Cattle—Do not turn off too early. In this latitude they will require feeding nearly through this month if not longer. Keep from tramping up mowing grounds. Cows about calving need special care and close watching. Ores are now performing heavy work; feed them accordingly.

Cattle—If not previously attended to, cleanse from filth, and accumulation of small roots, garbage, etc., and whitewash the walls and overhead ventilating freely.

Clover—If foot town with winter grain last month, attend to it.

Corn—Measure and plow grounds for planting next month. Provide and test seed previous to use.

Door Yards—Clean up the winter accumulations of chips and dirt, adding the latter to the manure heap.

Fences—Make new and repair the old. Clear stumps from meadows and put them into permanent use or road fences. Plant hedges, as frost and dryness will admit. Do not forget to replace the unhandy huts with convenient gates—they can be made under cover during wet weather.

Horses—Attend to mares with foal, giving them ample space at night. Have working teams and mules in good condition for heavy labor.

Manures—Get out and drop in heaps or spread on land as fast as it can be turned under. Heaps previously carried to the fields may be broken over or turned, breaking up finally. An addition of muck well worked in will improve the quality and add to the quantity. Cover with muck, soil, or plaster to retain the ammonia. Look well to every Wech water, chamber slope, etc., are so valuable to throw away. A vat or muck heap may be provided to receive them.

Meadows—Keep well fenced and do not permit stock to trample over or feed off. With a "muck" water any cattle droppings, pick up and cart off loose stones, and new grass seed upon any vacant spot.

Plowing is one of the chief operations of April, and is too slightly attended to.

Potatoes—Plant early ones, selecting good market varieties not subject to rot. Try, say ten bushels of combs salt spread over an acre of land in planting time, and note the results.

Sleepers are now dropping early lambs and need water shelter at night. Keep separate from other stock and well fed. Give salt once a week.

Swine are also increasing in numbers if proper care has been exercised. Keep them penned and accessible to them and give a little animal food which will frequently be the offspring from being eaten. The mother should have plenty of warm liquid food, and be kept from other animals. Do not neglect their manure making apartment.

Tools, wagons, gear, harnesses, etc., etc., should be provided at once and put in good working order. Some of the newer tools are real improvements upon the old, and well worthy of adoption. Those who say the old is better, may be able to do so with their hands, but be not too hasty to purchase every claimed improvement without trial.

Trees—Set out for shade and fruit along the roads and lanes and about the yards. The shade trees near the house may very properly be a well trained cherry tree, which is ornamental at two seasons of the year at least. We have seen places improved very much by a few such trees set out by the dwelling. Standard pears are also desirable.

This is the emphatically a tree planting month, both in orchard and nursery. Spring is usually the best season in which to plant all kind of trees, and April is the best month of spring, except for Apples, which do better planted in May. Early planting is desirable that the earth may become well settled about the roots, and the tree commence its growth before a dry season comes on.

Attending to sales, taking up and resetting your stock, grafting, plowing among and otherwise caring for the smaller trees will fully occupy the nurseryman's time. To facilitate his labor as much as possible, a good assortment of the various trees should be taken up and their roots beveled in or covered, near of access, from which an order can soon be filled. Mark the varieties by labels and division stakes.

In procuring trees for an orchard, go yourself, if possible and select, and see to the taking up which will frequently secure you to better trees than when it is left to nurserymen, who are anxious to dispose of all kinds.

Old trees that were cleared from rough bark and moss, and washed with soap suds last month, now need something for the roots to feed upon, especially if the ground has been in for many years. Better plow it up after manuring heavily, and plant potatoes upon the ground that it may receive the benefit of being. Many of the old trees will be greatly improved by grafting, and the first days of this month are the appropriate season for this operation.

Manure burying grounds heavily before plowing, so that a crop of trees may be grown without further addition. Spread a good quantity for some distance around the trunks of orchard trees—say as far as the branches extend.—*Am. Agr.*

ADMISSION OF OREGON.

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER R. STEPHENS

OF GEORGIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

FEBRUARY 12, 1859.

The House having under consideration the bill providing for the admission of Oregon, Mr. Stephens of Georgia said:

Mr. SPEAKER—I do not know that I can say anything that will add force to the argument already made in behalf of the admission of Oregon. It is my purpose, however, to contribute what I can to that end. And if I fail in my wish, it will be because my ability is not equal to my zeal. Apart from consideration of public duty and justice to the people claiming this admission, there is another consideration which enters into the question, and that is, the opportunity it affords me, as a Southern man, and one acting with the Democratic party, to show the groundlessness of the charge made last year, that we were in favor of putting one rule to a State applying with a slave State Constitution, and another and more rigorous rule to a free State application; that we required a larger population for the admission of a State not tolerating African slavery, than one permitting and allowing it. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stanton], who has just taken his seat, has re-asserted that charge, in substance. Sir, I repudiate it when it was first made, and I repudiate it now. The position of Kansas and that of Oregon are totally dissimilar; and whatever consideration of duty, looking to the peace and quiet of that country, as well as the general welfare, may have induced me and others, to put the population restriction upon any future application from Kansas, like considerations are under existing obligations which we cannot ignore, forbid that the same representative ratio should be extended to Oregon. As I stated in my opening remarks, under existing compact, under existing laws, admitting and extending what all regarded as a most solemn compact, the ordinance of 1787, it is, in my judgment, a high obligation to admit Oregon as soon as she has sixty thousand inhabitants.

Now, sir, before going into that, I wish to reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stanton], who has just taken his seat. If I understand him, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Goodrich] who asked the question of the Delegates from Oregon and Senator elect; how he would vote in the Senate on the repeal of the population clause in the Kansas bill of last session; both of them would be willing to vote for the admission of Oregon, provided that representative ratio required for Kansas should be repealed. They occupy this strange position because the Democratic party did not vote at the last session, as they say, a wrong, they will do Oregon as they wrong at this session, I may be retorted.

Mr. STEPHENS—The gentleman misunderstands me. I have heard the gentleman's argument; so has the House; and the gentleman and the House will hear mine. Let them stand together. I understand the minority of the Committee on Territories, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Grow] at their head, signify alike willingness.

Mr. GROW—No, sir; I stated distinctly that I would never go for the clause of the Constitution I have indicated.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—Do not interrupt me. I state the gentleman's position as it appears in his minority report. The only thing he complains of is its discrimination, as he calls it, in the Kansas conference bill. The only amendment he proposes to this bill is a repeal of that. Not a word in his report against the obvious clause in the Oregon Constitution against negro equality. That he proposes, and evidently seems to rest his argument, is to change the spirit of his "reason." I do not know. I am glad, however, to see that there is a number of the other side actuated by a more magnanimous sentiment. They cannot see the logic or the moral of the gentleman from Pennsylvania; that because, in his assumption, this side of the House did wrong last session, therefore he will do wrong this. To the majority on that question, acting with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would put the question, how can two wrongs make a right? If it were granted that injustice was done to Kansas, how can it be righted by repeating it towards Oregon? That side of the House will permit me to tell them, by their votes to-day they will spike every gun they have fired against the Democratic party for their alleged injustice done to Kansas. Let the gentleman from Pennsylvania do nothing to Kansas, but I shall show that the cases are totally dissimilar. The "Republican" party seems disposed to-day to follow suit, and do the same wrong they complain of to Oregon. If they are sincere in their belief, and not governed solely by opposition and antagonism, would it not be the wiser, the better, the nobler, and more statesmanlike course for them to come forward and set an example of doing right, to the two gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. Thayer and Mr. Comins] urged them yesterday?

But, Sir, the cases are totally dissimilar; the clause in the Kansas compromise bill, refusing to hear any further application for admission from her in case of her declining to come into the Union under her then application, with the modification of her land proposition, which was submitted, until she had a population equal to the representative ratio, may or may not have been right, according to the opinions of gentlemen. The policy of adopting such a general principle in all cases where it can be done, may, or may not be right, as gentlemen may vary in their opinions, but that question cannot arise in the case of Oregon. We are foreclosed on that point, in the territorial organic act; and I appeal, not only to this side of the House, but to every side, and ask how they can get round that obligation in the territorial bill of Oregon of 1848, which declares, solemnly that all the guarantees, rights and rights secured to the people of the Northwest Territory should be extended to the people of Oregon? The words of the act are:

Sec. 14. And be it further enacted, That the inhabitants of said Territory shall be entitled to enjoy all and singular rights, privileges and advantages granted and secured to the people of the Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio by the articles of compact contained in the ordinance for the government of said Territory on the 12th day of July, 1787, and shall be subject to all the conditions, restrictions and prohibitions in said articles of compact imposed upon the people of said Territory.

Statutes at Large, vol. 9, page 329.

And what were those rights and privileges guaranteed to the people in the Northwest Territory hereby secured and guaranteed to the people of Oregon. Here they are:

"And whenever any of the said States shall have sixty thousand free inhabitants therein, such State shall be admitted by its delegates into the Congress of the United States on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever; and shall be at liberty to form a permanent Constitution and State Government: Provided, That the Constitution and Government so to be formed shall be republican, and in conformity to the principles contained in these articles; and so far as it can be consistent with the general interests of the Confederacy, such an admission shall be allowed at an earlier period, and when there be a less number of free inhabitants in the State than sixty thousand. [Fifth Article Ordinance, 1787, Statutes at Large, vol. 1, page 53.]

No such guarantee as this was ever given to the people of the Territory of Kansas; if there had been that representative ratio restriction could have been put in the Constitution, and there would have been no violation of the compact, and there would have been no inconsistency on this side of the House in adopting the Representative ratio principle wherever it can be done, and still maintaining good faith where previous obligations prevent? Oregon is the only Territory to which this previous obligation to admit with sixty thousand inhabitants applies. Here must be an exceptional case in any general rule that it may be deemed advisable to adopt for all the other Territories for the future. Kansas stands in a position to take her place with all the others, except Oregon, without any just cause of complaint. Whether such general rule be wise and proper, is not now the question; nor whether its application to Kansas at the last session was right or wrong; the question before us at this time, is simply whether we will discharge an existing obligation.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Zollicoffer], who made one of the minority reports, argues that the compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—The gentleman is wrong. The compact of 1787, extended to Oregon by act of 1848, was not in the nature of an engagement with the people of a Territory, but with a State. The language, he says, is, "whenever any of said States," &c.

that there were sixty thousand people there; and that, under the compact, they were bound from all the facts before them, to admit the State.

How can gentlemen escape that? Mr. Macon, a gentleman who occupied a high position in the Republican party of that day—not the party of modern "Republicans," but of good old Republicans of the Jeffersonian school—one of the shining lights of the House, whose name will go down to history and live as long as the names of the founders of the Republic, said:

"The question before the committee was admitting the Territory to be a State in the Union. There appeared to him only two things as necessary to be inquired into. First, was the new government republican? It appeared to him to be so. Second, were there sixty thousand inhabitants in the Territory? It appeared to him there were; and if so, their admission as a State should not be considered as a gift, but as a right."

Again, Mr. Gallatin said he—

"Was of opinion that the people of the Southwestern Territory became *ipso facto* State the moment they amounted to sixty thousand free inhabitants; and that it became the duty of Congress, as part of the original compact, to recognize them as such, and to admit them into the Union, wherever they had satisfactory proof of the fact."

I cannot dwell on this branch of the subject. It is no question of what is the ratio of other Territories. It is no question of Kansas discrimination. It is the simple naked question of fulfilling obligation. That is the whole of it. I have no doubt that she has sixty thousand; and every man upon this floor so believing, according to this authority, is bound to vote for her admission. Will you do it?

But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stanton] complains of the Constitution of Oregon. He complains of that article which denies political equality to the African race; to that part which excludes negroes from voting; which prevents them from exercising the rights of citizenship; especially that which denies them the right to maintain an action in their courts. The Topeka Constitution of Kansas, which that gentleman favored in 1855, excluded free negroes entirely from the Territory of Kansas.

Mr. GROW—I will correct the gentleman. The Topeka Constitution did not exclude free negroes from Kansas, but the question was submitted to the people, as instruction to the Legislature, to pass an act of that character.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ga.—And a large majority of the gentleman's friends who adopted the Constitution voted to give the instructions.

Mr. GROW of Pa.—I make no point upon that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ga.—And those who profess to be the exclusive friends of negroes, as they now do, so far as that Constitution was concerned, voted to banish them forever from the State, just as Oregon has done. Whether this banishment be right or wrong, it is no worse in Oregon than it was in Kansas. But, on the score of humanity, we of the South do not believe that those who, in Kansas and Oregon, banish this race from their limits, are better friends of the negro than we are, who assign them that place among us to which by nature they are fitted, and in which they find so much more to their own happiness and comfort, besides to the common well-being of all. We give them a reception. We give them shelter. We clothe them. We feed them. We provide for their every want, in health and in sickness, in infancy and old age. We teach them to work. We educate them in the arts of civilization and the virtues of Christianity, much more effectively and successfully than you can ever do on the coast of Africa. And, without any reference to the world, the first lesson in civilization and Christianity to be taught to the barbarous tribes, wherever to be found, is the first great cause against the human family—that in the sweat of their face they shall earn their bread. Under our system, our tuition, our guardianship and fostering care, these people, existing so much as they do, of the degree of civilization than their race has attained anywhere else upon the face of the earth. The Topeka people excluded them; they like the neighbors we read of, went round them, and, like the good Samaritans, shut out their destitution or degradation—we alleviate both. But let that go.

Oregon has in this matter, done no worse than the gentleman from Ohio did in Kansas. I think he acted unwisely in it—that is her case, not mine. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stanton] questions me, how could a negro in Oregon ever get his freedom under the Constitution they have adopted? I tell him, under their Constitution a slave cannot exist there. The fundamental law is against it. But, he asks, how could his freedom ever be established, as no person of color can sue in her Courts? Neither can a colored man, in any Court, sue a white man to this class of people, nor appear by *prochein ami* or guardian.

Now, there is a great hardship in this; for a married woman cannot sue in her own name anywhere where the common law prevails. Minors also have to sue by guardian or next friend. We have suits continually in our tribunals by persons claiming to be free persons of color. They cannot sue in their own names, but by next friend. They are not citizens; we do not recognize them as such; but still the Courts are open; and just so will they be in Oregon if the question is ever raised.

Mr. REAGAN—By the laws of Texas free negroes are prohibited from residing in that State, and hence have no right to sue in her Courts; and yet the Courts there have entertained jurisdiction of suits for the liberation of free negroes, and I have assisted in the prosecution of such suits, in which they were declared free under writs of *habeas corpus*.

Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia—I understand the gentleman to say that the Constitution of Texas is similar to this, and yet her Courts are open just as I stated in reference to Georgia; and that he himself had assisted free negroes in the Courts of Texas to obtain their rights. There can be no difficulty upon that score. Let me say to gentlemen on the other side of the House, not to lay the flattering unction to their souls that they can escape by such a pretext as that.

But it was intimated by the gentleman from Ohio, that last year we voted to admit

Kansas as a slave State with a view of getting two Democratic Senators, and that our object in the same way in regard to Oregon. Sir, in this he is mistaken. We stood then, as now, upon principle. Had Kansas been admitted under the Lecompton Constitution, all of us knew that the probability was, that two "Republican" Senators would have been elected. Not was the large Democratic vote in the Senate, soon after, upon this bill for the admission of Oregon, based upon any such idea as he intimated. It could not have been. When this bill passed the Senate it was not known what sort of Senators would be elected there, any more than it was as to Kansas. The election in Oregon had not been heard from. It was a hot contest. And at the election, which returned camp off, the member who was returned to this House was elected by only sixteen hundred majority.

Under these circumstances, how can the gentleman attribute such motives to the action of Democratic Senators? Where is the slightest evidence for such an imputation? May be the gentleman attributes to others the motives by which he himself is governed—that is, a wish to bring the State under political auspices favorable to his own view of public policy. May be he thinks, by rejecting this Constitution, the State may come in under a "Republican" instead of a Democratic banner; for he said her admission was only a question of time. I will not say that this is his object in opposing this bill; but I do say, for myself, that I am governed by no such motives as he has intimated. I will vote, whenever a State comes here with a Constitution Republican in form, and with an obligation resting upon me to vote for her admission, as this does, for her admission, irrespective of what may be the political cast of her Senators and members elect. I will never do wrong that right may afterward come from it. Wrong does not produce such fruits.

What you plant and sow, that you reap. I will never commit an unpardonable error, hoping that good will come of it. Good ends never justify wrong means according to my code of morals. Honesty is the best policy in all things. Perhaps most of those on the other side of the House go against this bill, do so largely to be in opposition.

To such I would say what I once said to a gentleman in my District. When I was going to attend the people at a particular place, meeting him on the way, I asked him if he was going up to the Court house. He said, no; that I was going to speak, and that he only wanted to know what side I was on to be against it. I said, "that is the reason you are always in the minority; you give me choice of sides upon all questions, and of course I take the best." [Laughter.] Would it not be well for gentlemen on that side to consider the point, bare as a matter of political or party tactics? That gentleman was well pleased with the remark that he went and heard me on the occasion alluded to, and from that day this has never failed to vote for me. If the opposite side will allow me, I will say to them it is bad policy in any party to oppose everything largely for opposition sake. Let me entreat them not to oppose this bill—as some of them do. I fear, barely because Democratic vote for it. By this course you give us choice of sides in the great issue of right.

One word further, upon another subject, and I call the especial attention of the House to it. It is the objection raised to the Constitution of Oregon on account of the alien suffrage feature in it. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Zollicoffer] in his report quoted a part of the decision of the Supreme Court, bearing upon the Constitutional power of a State so, as to regulate suffrage within her own limits, but stops right in the middle of a sentence. I will read first the extract quoted by the gentleman—italics his—and then read the whole sentence as it stands in Chief Justice Taney's decision in the *Scott* case:

"The Constitution has conferred on Congress the right to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and this right is evidently exclusive, and has always been held by this Court to be so. Consequently, no State since the adoption of the Constitution, can, by naturalizing an alien, invest him with the rights and privileges secured to a citizen of a State under the Federal Government," &c.

There the gentleman stops, with the sentence unfinished as a comment. The Chief Justice goes right on with these words:

"although, so far as the State alone was concerned, he would undoubtedly be entitled to the rights of a citizen, and clothed with all the rights and immunities which the Constitution and laws of the State attach to that character."

In this the Supreme Court says, and says truly, that no State can make an alien by birth a citizen of the United States—that is the exclusive right of Congress; but that each State may clothe an alien with all the rights and privileges they see fit, within their own jurisdiction and limits. The right of suffrage—the right to declare who shall vote at elections—is expressly reserved in the Constitution of the United States to each State. This Government cannot interfere with that power. It is the last right I would have the State to surrender, for