THE PRESS,
PUBLISHED DAILY, (SUNDAYS EXCEPTED,)
BY JOHN W. FORNEY.
OFFICE, No. 417 CHESTNUT STREET,

DAILY PRESS,
TWELVE CENTS PER WEEK, payable to the carriers. Mailed to Subscribers out of the City, at SIX DOLLARS PER ANNUM; FOUR DOLLARS FOR EIGHT MONTHS; THREE DOLLARS FOR SIX MONTHS, invariably in advance for the time ordered.

TRI-WEEKLY PRESS,
Mailed to Subscribers out of the City, at THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, in advance.

WEEKLY PRESS.
WEEKLY PRESS will be sent to Subscribers by mail, (per annum, in advance,) at..... $2 00
Three Copies, " " " 5 00
Five Copies, " " " 8 00
Ten Copies, " " " 12 00
Twenty Copies, " " (to one address).... 20 00
Twenty Copies, or over, " (to address of each subscriber), each..... 1 25
For a Club of Twenty-one or over, we will send an extra copy to the getter-up of the Club.
☞ Postmasters are requested to act as Agents for THE WEEKLY PRESS.

Hats.

WARBURTON'S INIMITABLE
COVERINGS FOR THE HEAD,
Embrace all the points necessary to
CENTRAL EFFECT,
and all the details and nicer elegancies which impart FINISH, COMFORT, AND DURABILITY.
Gentlemen are invited to call and examine.
oct26-3m 430 CHESTNUT Street.

Books.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE
AND THE
BRITISH REVIEWS.
L. SCOTT & CO., NEW YORK, continue to publish the following leading British Periodicals, viz:
1.
THE LONDON QUARTERLY, (Conservative.)
2.
THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, (Whig.)
3.
THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, (Free Church.)
4.
THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, (Liberal.)
5.
BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, (Tory.)

These Periodicals ably represent the three great political parties of Great Britain—Whig, Tory, and Radical—but politics form only one feature of their character. As Organs of the most profound writers on Science, Literature, Morality, and Religion, they stand, as they ever have stood, unrivalled in the world of letters, being considered indispensible to the scholar and the professional man, while to the intelligent reader of every class they furnish a more correct and satisfactory record of the current literature of the day, throughout the world, than can be possibly obtained from any other source.

EARLY COPIES.

The receipt of ADVANCE SHEETS from the British publishers gives additional value to these Reprints, inasmuch as they can now be placed in the hands of subscribers about as soon as the original editions.

TERMS.	Per ann.
For any one of the four Reviews	$3 00
For any two of the four Reviews	5 00
For any three of the four Reviews	7 00
For all four of the Reviews	8 00
For Blackwood's Magazine	3 00
For Blackwood and three Reviews	9 00
For Blackwood and the four Reviews	10 00

Payments to be made in all cases in advance. Money current in the State where issued will be received at par.

CLUBBING.

A discount of twenty-five per cent. from the above price will be allowed to Clubs ordering four or more copies of any one or more of the above works. Thus: Four copies of Blackwood, or of one Review, will be sent to one address for $9; four copies of the four Reviews and Blackwood *for $30*, and so on.

POSTAGE.

In all the principal cities and towns these works will be delivered FREE OF POSTAGE. When sent by mail the Postage to any part of the United States will be but *twenty-four cents* a year for "Blackwood," and but *fourteen cents* a year for each of the Reviews

N. B. The price in Great Britain of the five Periodicals here named is $31 per annum.

Remittances for any of the above publications should always be addressed, post-paid, to the Publishers,
LEONARD SCOTT & CO.
delt2-3t No. 54 GOLD Street, New York.

ORIGINAL EDITION OF CHARLES KNIGHT'S PICTORIAL SHAKSPEARE—Including the Doubtful Plays and Biography, and illustrated with very numerous Engravings on Wood, in the highest style of art; forming 8 vols., imperial 8vo.
The subscribers have been enabled to secure three *copies of this magnificent edition of Shakspeare*, which has long been exceedingly scarce. Immediate application will be necessary to prevent disappointment in procuring copies.
C. J. PRICE & CO.,
Importers of English Books,
42-r No. 33 South Sixth St., above Chestnut.

JOHN CAMPBELL & SON, BIBLIOPOLISTS, in the CUSTOM HOUSE Avenue, have always for sale rare and scarce Books. Gentlemen bookworms are invited to call and judge as to prices and variety. Large and miscellaneous books purchased in small or large quantities. Books continually receiving from auction. se24-th tu 3m*

Watches, Jewelry, &c.

BAILEY & CO., CHESTNUT STREET.
Manufacturers of
BRITISH STERLING SILVER WARE,
Under their inspection, on the premises exclusively
Citizens and Strangers are invited to visit our manufactory.

WATCHES.
Constantly on hand a splendid stock of Superior Watches, of all the celebrated makers.

DIAMONDS.
Necklaces, Bracelets, Brooches, Ear-Rings, Finger-Rings, and all other articles in the Diamond line.
Drawings of *NEW DESIGNS* will be made free of charge for those wishing work made to order.

RICH GOLD JEWELRY.
A beautiful assortment of all the new styles of fine Jewelry, such as Mosaic, Stone and Shell Cameo, Pearl, Coral, Carbuncle, Marquisite, Lava, &c., &c.
SHEFFIELD CASTORS, BASKETS, WAITERS, &c.
Also, Bronze and Marble CLOCKS, of newest styles, and of superior quality. aul-4twf&wly

J. E. CALDWELL & CO.,
432 CHESTNUT Street,
Have received, per steamers, new styles.
Jewelry, Chatelaine, Vest Chains.
Splendid Fans, Hair Pins.
Fruit Stands, Sugar Baskets.
Jet Goods and Flower Vases.
Coral, Lava and Mosaic Seals.
Sole Agents to Philadelphia for the sale of Charles Frodsham's LONDON TIME-KEEPERS. del0

FINE WATCHES.
A full supply of all the celebrated London and Geneva Watches constantly on hand.
We sell the *Genuine Frodsham Watch* at *Twenty-five Dollars less* than the agency price, as established at Boston.
Boston Agency price is 250, 275, 300 dollars.
Bailey & Co's price is 225, 250, 275 dollars.
BAILEY & CO.,
no28-stu4w 428 CHESTNUT St.

C. & A. PEQUIGNOT,
MANUFACTURERS OF WATCH CASES
AND IMPORTERS OF WATCHES,
121 SOUTH THIRD STREET, BELOW CHESTNUT,
PHILADELPHIA.
CONSTANT PEQUIGNOT. AUGUSTE PEQUIGNOT.
se19-3mos*

J. S. JARDEN & BRO.
MANUFACTURERS AND IMPORTERS OF
SILVER PLATED WARE,
No. 804 Chestnut Street, above Third, (up stairs,)
Philadelphia.
Constantly on hand and for sale to the Trade,
TEA SETS, COMMUNION SERVICE SETS, URNS, PITCHERS, GOBLETS, CUPS, WAITERS, BASKETS, CASTORS, KNIVES, SPOONS, FORKS,
LADLES, &c. &c.
Gilding and plating on all kinds of metal. se2-1y

SILVER WARE.
WILLIAM WILSON & SON,
MANUFACTURERS OF SILVER WARE,
(ESTABLISHED 1813,)
S. W. CORNER FIFTH AND CHERRY STREETS.
A large assortment of SILVER WARE, of every description, constantly on hand, or made to order to match any pattern desired.
Importers of Sheffield and Birmingham imported ware. se30-dawly

Political.

FOR REGISTER OF WILLS—
WM. HANCOCKS,
TWELFTH WARD.
Subject to Democratic Rules.

FOR SHERIFF—
CALEB S. WRIGHT,
FIFTH WARD.
Subject to Democratic rules no17-1m*

FOR SHERIFF—
ALDERMAN GEORGE MOORE,
FOURTH WARD.
Subject to Democratic Rules. no7-3m*

FOR SHERIFF—
JAMES G. GIBSON,
TWENTY-SECOND WARD.
Subject to Democratic Rules. no6-3m*

FOR SHERIFF,
EDWARD T. MOTT,
TWELFTH WARD.
SUBJECT TO DEMOCRATIC RULES. oct6-2m*

Copartnership Notices.

DISSOLUTION.—The PARTNERSHIP heretofore existing as BAKER & WILLIAMS is THIS DAY dissolved by mutual consent. The business will be continued at the old stand, 1132 MARKET St., by CHARLES WILLIAMS, who is authorized to collect and pay all debts of the late firm.
PETER W. BAKER.
Dec. 1, 1857. CHARLES WILLIAMS.
The undersigned would inform the public, that having bought out Mr. P. W. Baker, his late partner, he will continue the HEATING and VENTILATING business at the old stand, 1132 MARKET Street, where will be found a full assortment of Ranges, Heaters, Ventilators, Registers, Bath Boilers, &c., and hopes, by strict attention to business, to merit a share of the patronage of the public.
d1-1m CHARLES WILLIAMS.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE firm of REISS BROTHERS & CO., heretofore existing in New York and Philadelphia, is this day DISSOLVED by mutual consent, and that the business of the firm will only be carried on for the purpose of liquidation.
Signed,
ENOCH REISS,
ISAAC REISS,
JAMES REISS,
M. GANS,
JOHN POTTER.
November 16. no16-d3t&tuths-tf

WM. D. ROGERS, CARRIAGE REPOSITORY, 1,009 and 1,011 CHESTNUT St., above Tenth, is now open for the sale of every description of Carriages, combining style, durability, and elegance of finish, from the Manufactory, at the corner of SIXTH and MASTER Streets, to which the attention of citizens, and Southern and Western gentlemen is respectfully called.
N. B.—Especial attention given to carriages for repairs, in the shops connected with the Repository. Entrance on Chestnut street. oct17-s tu & th-2m

PUBLIC NOTICE.—E. G. WHITMAN & CO. are now prepared to offer to the public the best and largest assortment of Bonbons, Sugar Toys, Candied Fruits, Sugar and other fancy goods, suitable for Christmas Trees. The candies manufactured by us are made of the best material that can be had, amongst which are fine sugar-coated Almonds, Jelly Drops, Cordial Drops, Moss Paste, Gum Drops, Carawellas, &c., &c. P. S.—Superior Walnut Candies, Cream, and all varieties of plain Candies. Also, dealers in all kinds Foreign Fruits and Nuts. No. 102 South SECOND, one door below CHESTNUT Street, Philadelphia. no28-s tu thw*

SORGHUM, or CHINESE SUGAR-CANE SEED—25 bushels for sale by
CROASDALE, PEROT, & CO.,
no10-tf No. 104 N. Delaware avenue.

CONGRESS RANGE.—SOLD BY CHADWICK & BRO., No. 902 N. SECOND Street.
mp18 2mos.

The Press.

VOL. I—NO. 116. PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1857. TWO CENTS.

The Press.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1857.

GOVERNMENT OF BRITISH INDIA.

The British Ministry, it is said, have determined to assume the entire and exclusive Government of Hindostan. It is full time for this to be done. The East India Company, almost wholly bent upon making money, as traders, have proved themselves unequal to the responsible duty of governing. Nor has the system established by their charter worked well or smoothly. There is, in fact, a double Government of British India. On one side is the Court of Directors, who are the nominal governors of that vast territory; on the other, there is the Board of Control, appointed by the Crown, with its President (for the time being) invariably a member of the British Cabinet. This second is the real Executive, *for it has the most complete control over every* act and deed of the Court of Directors, so much so that the minutest memorandum must be endorsed by the Board of Control before it be sent out by the East India Directors. But, on the other hand, there is no check whatever on the Board of Control, which can send what orders it pleases to Calcutta, without the consent, or even without the knowledge, of the Court of Directors, and is certain of having its commands implicitly obeyed.

If over there were a doubt of the existence of a Circumlocution Office (so graphically described by DICKENS in "Little Dorrit,") it would be removed, at once and for ever, by an examination of the two-fold system which, for such a long period, has been brought to bear upon British India. If the intention had been to do things in the most troublesome, most circuitous, and least satisfactory manner, then that purpose has been amply carried into effect. The tone of despatches from India is grave, dignified, and grandiose. A certain magniloquence is affected, which puts the most commonplace intimations very ludicrously upon stilts. If an Indian civil officer has to communicate so simple a fact as that the rice crop has been prosperous, he will use as many words, worked up into solemn and spun-out sentences, as would cover two or three pages of congenial foolscap. Every line thus sent from India to the Board of Directors has to be copied for the perusal of the Board of Control. Sometimes duplicate copies are required, when Indian matters have to be considered by the British Government—even as many as seventeen separate copies extra (one for the Queen and one for each of her Cabinet Ministers) having sometimes to be made.

Every line sent to India, by the Board of Directors, has to be copied several times—triplicate copies for India, to provide against the loss of one or two mails, being inevitable, besides duplicates for the records in the India House at Leadenhall street, and the office of the Board of Control, in Cannon Row, Westminster. The result of all this eternal writing is—the delay of all business to be transacted. Such a thing as receiving a despatch from India on a Monday, and sending out a reply by the following Saturday, would be considered almost impossible by the retardation corps of the British India Circumlocution Office.

It is not doubted, by those who have resided in the country, and have had amplest and most accurate means of ascertaining the true circumstances, that British India might not only be better governed, directly under the Crown, but with far less expense and much greater pecuniary advantages. The net revenue of British India, which was £20,537,673 in the year 1854, was somewhat about £21,000,000 at the commencement of the present year, before Disaffection reared its flag. The gross revenue is about £27,000,000—but nearly a fourth of this amount comes under the head of cost of collection, leaving twenty-one millions sterling *towards general expenditure.* Not only is every shilling of this money spent, but the East India Company are largely in debt. They owe about £50,000,000, the annual interest on which (payable out of revenue) is nearly £2,500,000. The cost of governing the country, and the heavy dividends paid to the proprietors of India Stock, absorb all the rest of the public revenue. Under a good system, more revenue could be raised, at far less cost, and on a principle of taxation more just to the natives, who have to pay it. The mere expense of a double government may well be spared, particularly as that government only exists in showing the world how *not* to do what it ought. Under the Company's Charter, there is a right reserved to the Crown of becoming *de facto* ruler of Hindostan, on paying off all India Stock, at *six* per cent., which can easily be done as the dividends are as high as *ten!*

The system of double government, now about to be abandoned, was devised by no less a person than WILLIAM PITT, first Earl of Chatham—the same who, a few years later, so eloquently and fruitly protested, in Parliament, against the manner in which the American colonies were misgoverned. When the East India Company received its charter from Queen ELIZABETH, in 1600, no one anticipated the extent of territory, the vastness of wealth, and the immensity of power which it was to accumulate. The mere traders who arose to the rank of Sovereigns, says Lord MAHON, showed no aptness for the new and extraordinary duties which devolved upon them; they rose above a trading company in their fortunes, but not in their conduct and opinions. Lord CHATHAM, as far back as 1766, considered that *the establishment of a good form of government* was "the greatest of all objects," said he, "according to my sense of great." His idea, which he never embodied, was that the Crown, and not the Company, should possess and rule the territorial conquests made by the latter, and that the holders of the Charter were merely entitled to certain commercial privileges, and fair interest on their invested capital. He thought, too, that by governing Hindostan fairly, income could be derived therefrom sufficient to diminish home-taxation, and even gradually to pay off the whole National Debt. His system of double government, continued to this day, was but the precursor of a greater and grander plan, which he never embodied.

The establishment of British rule in India, under a direct delegation from the British Government, ought to commence a new era in that country. There really is no cause why the revenue might not be greatly increased, even with the reduction or the repeal of many taxes which are complained of as oppressive. Such, in particular, is the impost upon salt, an article of necessity, for health among the Hindoos. The sum of three farthings (one cent and a half) is levied on every pound of salt consumed in British India, and this impost alone brings in £3,000,000. Many other taxes might advantageously be modified, and there is no doubt that a better system can readily be introduced.

On many grounds, therefore, there is room for congratulation on the prospect of British India passing out of the grasping hands of the Coompany Sahib—as the Hindoos call the East India Company. There can no longer be that occasional *playing at cross purposes*, between the two Executives, (at Leadenhall street and Cannon Row,) which has sometimes caused so much mischief. England has now the opportunity of doing justice to India, which has so long been denied, and must turn over a new leaf, or look out, every half dozen years or so, for a repetition of the effects, from like causes, which have led to the present position of affairs in Hindostan. Continue in the beaten track of misrule, she cannot, and must prepare for a change as important as ever yet took place in English transactions.

The Reading (Pa.) *Gazette* states that on Saturday, Judge Jones decided against the application for a new trial in the case of Peter D. Ludwig, convicted on the 13th of August last, of setting fire to the barn of William Hain, in Spring township, and sentenced him to an imprisonment of five years in the Eastern Penitentiary—the term of imprisonment to date from the day of his conviction—and to find security in $2,000 to keep the peace for ten years.

DEBATE IN THE U. S. SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1857.

Mr. BIGLER, of Pennsylvania, said: *It is not my* intention, Mr. President, to speak to the mere proposition to print the message and documents; nor do I intend to-day to attempt to address the Senate at length on the grave and difficult subject which has been unhappily precipitated upon this body. I never felt so much responsibility in my life. I never felt a greater anxiety to do my duty. Never since I have been connected with public affairs have I desired in my whole soul so much to do what would be best for this great country. I feel my weakness, and how much I regret the suggestion I made yesterday evening, that I concurred with the President of the United States in the views he had taken, and should endeavor to defend those views, for I now feel how much I am unprepared. But, while I shall not make a speech to-day, I desire very briefly to notice some of the propositions of my friend from Illinois, which have fallen on my ears as most extraordinary.

It would be necessary, Mr. President, to a fair understanding of this question, to trace its history; and nothing have I regretted so much as that the Senator from Illinois did not stop in the first instance to look at this question in its true character. Still more am I pained with the remembrance that his feelings were not such as I had hoped they would be on a question so delicate and so dangerous, which he has labored so long and so arduously to allay.

Sir, I do not think it is entirely the part of a statesman to handle this question as though each particular view which he may hold can be distinctly carried out. The question should occur to his mind, What is best for the country under all the circumstances? It will not do to show to me that the Constitutional Convention of Kansas has been guilty of sins of omission or commission on the one hand, or that the Topeka movement was without authority of law, and in derogation of the authority of the United States Government on the other. I look at this question as it is before us, *in a spirit of concession and compromise*, and I trust that measure of patriotism which will embrace all the States of this Union and the interests and rights of all the people, and inquire, What shall we do? Has my friend from Illinois persuaded himself that, with the present state of feeling in the Territory of Kansas, *it is possible to have any measure* carried out with precision and order? Are there any means to apprehend strife, confusion, and violation of principle there? Has he any guarantee that whatever action Congress may take will secure a peaceful exercise of the elective franchise there to the entire inhabitants of that Territory? What is there in the history of Kansas to bring him to the conclusion that either party in power there will wield that power with moderation? I have long since abandoned that idea, and I have persuaded myself that patriotism and duty would require that Kansas should be admitted into the Union on the first allowable opportunity, for the sake of Kansas and the Union. From the day that Senator offered his bill in this hall, in 1854, to this hour, he has never witnessed the same measure of complication in the affairs of that Territory, or the same menacing aspect to the country.

The extraordinary things in the Senator's remarks that occurred to my mind are these: The importance that he attached to so much of the Kansas-Nebraska bill as declares that the people shall be left perfectly free to select their own domestic institutions. Will the Senator say that it was not contend that the people of Kansas are to look to that act for their right to form their ordinary institutions? Will he tell me that the Missouri line interposed against any of those rights, or that the repeal of it enlarged them or affected them in any possible way? Certainly not. The Missouri line had reference to slavery alone. His act of 1854 had reference to the institutions of slavery only. It is that, and that alone, which has agitated the country. It is that to which we have had reference mainly when speaking of the rights of the people of that Territory. That dangerous and agitating question it was which constrained the wisest men who have ever assembled in this chamber in 1850, to agree that this dangerous issue should be taken from Congress and given to the people. However that great fact may be obscured by logic, however it may be beclouded by a mass of—I shall not say subterfuge or technicality, but I may say special pleading—the great truth is before the people of the United States that it is *the only question to which we have not had reference* in all this long struggle. What I have desired, and what I have thought would be conclusive, was that we should have from the people of Kansas such an unquivocal expression as would give us their will on that subject.

I certainly concur with the President of the United States in that part of his message in which he says he would have preferred that the whole Constitution should be submitted to the people; but the Convention—exercising what he has conceded to be their right to make a Constitution and send it to Congress—submitted only the slavery question. I do not say that the whole of that Constitution would have been adopted or rejected, but I can say to the Senator from Illinois that I was in the Territory before the delegates were elected, and for nearly a month afterwards, and I think I know some circumstances which influenced the action of the people. I know what was said on the one side and on the other from the rostrum, for I heard it. I heard the advocates of the Topeka movement say to men who proposed to form a Constitution under the laws of the Territory: "We will not judge of any instrument you may submit; we will not consider its merits at all." Why? "Because we are determined that the laws, which the President of the United States has said shall be carried out, shall be rendered null and void. Governor Walker has told us that these laws are binding, and that the Convention has been legally convened; we do not intend to adopt your doctrine; we will therefore accept no form of government from a bogus Convention." I heard more than one of them say that even *if the Convention should give to them* the Topeka Constitution, word for word, and letter for letter, they would trample it in the dust, because they denied the authority of the law which the President of the United States was administering there. However unwisely members of the Convention may have acted—and I do not intend to defend the details of their action by any means—it will not do to say that there were no surrounding circumstances to impel them to such action. Probably if the Republicans had the power at that hour, they would have wielded it quite as unwarrantably. The declarations to which I have referred naturally beget retaliation. The answer was, "If you will not judge of this instrument, why should it be submitted to you?" Now, sir, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, in defence of his friend, the President of the Convention, whose idol he has always been, that in all my intercourse with him I never heard from him an unreasonable or an unfair suggestion on the subject. He did say, and he did write, that he would agree to a submission of the Constitution to the people; "but when he was called upon to act on the judge of this," his views were different. He told me and say to the President of the United States that if this spirit was persisted in, if they were to be broken down simply to give the power to their enemies, and not because the Constitution was a bad one, he would not be bound to submit it. He felt that under the organic act, and according to the common understanding of the country, they were under an obligation to submit the slavery clause. That they did not submit it in a proper form I agree. It ought to have been, one way or the other, distinctly. They might have withheld the Constitution entirely, and avoided the difficulty which the Senator raised as to forcing a seeming assent to the Constitution. That, however, is something of a theoretical difficulty, for I never heard any issue in Kansas, nor will the Senator hear any serious issue there, as to the main features of the Constitution. The virtue of the submission is that it withholds the Constitution, except that portion which relates to slavery.

The Senator is perfectly aware that as late as 1818, *when a Constitution was formed for Illinois*, the same monstrous outrage upon popular sovereignty was practised, for a portion of that Constitution was put into operation without being submitted to the people. He was the author of the act of Mr. Toombs's bill, which did not emanate from the people of Kansas. They did not delegate their sovereignty in the first instance; they were not consulted at all; they had not petitioned for it; and yet the Senator advocated and voted for that bill. It provided for an election of delegates, named the times and places, and called together a Convention to whom the people of Kansas were to delegate their sovereignty. It did mere, sir. It put that Constitution into operation without ever consulting the people of Kansas. If the Senator's feelings had been awakened at that time as to the peculiar rights of the people of Kansas, he never could have voted for Mr. Toombs's bill. That was non-intervention—very peculiar, however. I was unwilling, as I remember, in the first instance, to go for a measure of this kind, because I thought it contravened the principle of non-intervention. Now, *if I understand rightly the position of the Sena*tor from Illinois, it comes down to this: Although the Constitution of Kansas, when presented here, may be republican; though there may be in it no incurmountable objection; though it may be a reasonable instrument, made by competent authority, *in accordance with law and in the proper form*, Kansas shall not come into the Union because this right thing was not done through a particular process. Is that consistent with the doctrine of non-intervention? I deny the right of Congress to go behind the organic act, and inquire into all the details of how the people of Kansas have proceeded; but when Kansas presents herself for admission at the doors of Congress with a republican Constitution, formed in order, according to law, the Senator from Illinois is about to say to those people, you shall not come into the Union because you did not do this right thing in the proper way. Sir, when the question involves the peace of the whole country, and, as I know, the prosperity of Kansas, I will not be pledged to say any such thing; but if the measure is right in itself, and if I can see that it imposes no great future wrong on the people of Kansas, in view of the peculiar circumstances which surround the case, the difficulty of getting any law properly administered there, the danger of leaving the question open, I will, so far as I have the power, assist to throw open the portals of the Union and welcome Kansas as a State, thus settling this bitter family feud forever. Sir, I do not intend to follow the subject further to-day. I thought, however, that some of the positions of the Senator from Illinois were so peculiarly forced, that, though entirely unprepared, I should not, *after the intimation I had given, do justice to* myself if I allowed those remarks to pass unnoticed.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I do not mean to go into this debate, because it is now entirely upon questions purely abstract; but I think it due to the honorable Senator from Illinois, to whose remarks I have listened with great attention, to point out to him one, at least, of the fallacies contained in his argument. I use that term with entire respect; and I should be unjust to myself if I did not use it with entire respect to him, because all will admit that his speech was one of great strength and great power, but, in my conception, with great diffidence I say it, was of little moment—in its legal positions, and in its political conclusions, a series of monstrous fallacies. I only desire to point out one now. The honorable Senator said that the effect produced of necessity from the mode of submitting this subject to the people of Kansas was to disfranchise all who did not come to the polls prepared to vote for the Constitution; and thus, he said, all who did vote, whether for or against slavery, were compelled to vote for the Constitution, and those of either class who were not prepared to vote for the Constitution, must necessarily refrain from voting at all; and yet the honorable Senator complained—and it was the *great staple of that part of his argument*—that the Constitution was not submitted to be voted on. At one time he declared that it was withheld from the people; and again he declared that all who came to vote were necessarily obliged to vote for it. Now, I submit to the honorable Senator, how could a man be compelled to vote for that which was not submitted to him to be voted on at all?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Senator understand me to say that it was withheld?

Mr. MASON. So I understood.

Mr. DOUGLAS. *I said just the reverse.*

Mr. MASON. The Senator certainly said they withheld everything from the people except the question of slavery; and yet the Senator declared that whoever voted on the question of slavery, whether for or against it, was obliged to vote for *the Constitution; and the Senator drew* the logical consequence that, of necessity, those who did not choose to vote for the Constitution were obliged to stay away and refuse to vote at all. That was his argument. Now, the fallacy I meant to point out was this: look at that Constitution and you will find that the Convention *withheld the Consti*tution; it was not submitted to the people at all. Whether that was well done or ill done is another question; but the Constitution was withheld from the people, and the only question submitted to them was, whether they would establish or interdict slavery? They might go there and vote upon that, and not vote or express any opinion whatever on anything else contained in the Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. *I am sorry* I was misapprehended by the Senator from Virginia. I certainly took the ground, first, that the Convention had no power to frame a Government and put it in operation without submitting it to the people; secondly, that the Convention showed a consciousness of that fact, by providing that it should be submitted to the people, and should take effect from and after the date of ratification. Hence, from that action of the Convention, whatever vitality the Constitution was ever to have, resulted, not from the Convention, but from a vote of the people. I then showed that while they acknowledged it would be void *but for the ratification of the people*, it provided that it should be submitted for their acceptance or rejection in such a form as to cut off all negative votes, and only count the affirmative. That was my position—a position sustained by the Constitution itself. The Senator *is entirely mistaken if he supposes* that by the remotest inference I intended to infer that Constitution and schedule in saying they withheld it from the people. The schedule says, in so many words, "This Constitution shall be submitted to all the inhabitants in the Territory, on the day of election, for their acceptance or rejection, in the following form." This shows that they provide, not that it shall go into operation without submission, but that it shall be submitted, and they profess to submit it. They then cut off the negative votes, which, of course, makes a sure thing of it. That is my position. If the Senator from Virginia had understood it, I apprehend he would not have discovered any fallacy.

One word in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. BIGLER. If the Senator will allow me at this point, I wish to give some authority I have on the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BIGLER. I desire simply to say that I was exceedingly anxious to understand the precise position of that question. It was difficult to tell, from the language of the schedule. Yesterday I asked Colonel Henderson, of Kansas—who was an active member of the Convention—what it meant. "Why," said he, "it means that there are two entire Constitutions, and the people vote separately *for the Constitution without slavery—the Consti*tution the Convention has formed—or the Constitution with slavery." I understood him to say that there were two Constitutions precisely similar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. *If there are two Constitutions, as* we have before me, I should like to see the other; and, I want to know which one of the two the Senator from Pennsylvania is for, when he says he agrees with the President in going for this.

Mr. BIGLER. I *said* they were precisely similar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there are two copies of the same Constitution I can understand it, but that the Convention made two Constitutions precisely similar, I do not understand. But, if they did, what difference does it make? You may vote for *this Constitution or the other one*; but they are just alike, and you must take one or the other.

Mr. BIGLER. You will make Kansas a free State, and, the other will make it a slave State. That is the difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. You may vote for this or the *other Constitution, and if you vote for either*, you may vote on the slavery question; but unless you do vote for one or the other, you do not. I can say to the Senator from Illinois that I was in the Territory before the delegates were elected, and for nearly a month afterwards, and I think I know some circumstances which influenced the action of the people. I know what was said on the one side and on the other from the rostrum, for I heard it. I heard the advocates of the Topeka movement say to men who proposed to form a Constitution under the laws of the Territory: "We will not judge of any instrument you may submit; we will not consider its merits at all." Why? "Because we are determined that the laws, which the President of the United States has said shall be carried out, shall be rendered null and void. Governor Walker has told us that these laws are binding, and that the Convention has been legally convened; we do not intend to adopt your doctrine; we will therefore accept no form of government from a bogus Convention." I heard more than one of them say that even *if the Convention should give to them* the Topeka Constitution, word for word, and letter for letter, they would trample it in the dust, because they denied the authority of the law which the President of the United States was administering there. However unwisely members of the Convention may have acted—and I do not intend to defend the details of their action by any means—it will not do to say that there were no surrounding circumstances to impel them to such action. Probably if the Republicans had the power at that hour, they would have wielded it quite as unwarrantably. The declarations to which I have referred naturally beget retaliation. The answer was, "If you will not judge of this instrument, why should it be submitted to you?" Now, sir, I will say to the Senator from Illinois, in defence of his friend, the President of the Convention, whose idol he has always been, that in all my intercourse with him I never heard from him an unreasonable or an unfair suggestion on the subject. He did say, and he did write, that he would agree to a submission of the Constitution to the people; "but when he was called upon to act on the judge of this," his views were different. He told me and say to the President of the United States that if this spirit was persisted in, if they were to be broken down simply to give the power to their enemies, and not because the Constitution was a bad one, he would not be bound to submit it. He felt that under the organic act, and according to the common understanding of the country, they were under an obligation to submit the slavery clause. That they did not submit it in a proper form I agree. It ought to have been, one way or the other, distinctly. They might have withheld the Constitution entirely, and avoided the difficulty which the Senator raised as to forcing a seeming assent to the Constitution. That, however, is something of a theoretical difficulty, for I never heard any issue in Kansas, nor will the Senator hear any serious issue there, as to the main features of the Constitution. The virtue of the submission is that it withholds the Constitution, except that portion which relates to slavery.

The Senator is perfectly aware that as late as 1818, *when a Constitution was formed for Illinois*, the same monstrous outrage upon popular sovereignty was practised, for a portion of that Constitution was put into operation without being submitted to the people. He was the author of the act of Mr. Toombs's bill, which did not emanate from the people of Kansas. They did not delegate their sovereignty in the first instance; they were not consulted at all; they had not petitioned for it; and yet the Senator advocated and voted for that bill. It provided for an election of delegates, named the times and places, and called together a Convention to whom the people of Kansas were to delegate their sovereignty. It did mere, sir. It put that Constitution into operation without ever consulting the people of Kansas. If the Senator's feelings had been awakened at that time as to the peculiar rights of the people of Kansas, he never could have voted for Mr. Toombs's bill. That was non-intervention—very peculiar, however. I was unwilling, as I remember, in the first instance, to go for a measure of this kind, because I thought it contravened the principle of non-intervention. Now, *if I understand rightly the position of the Sena*tor from Illinois, it comes down to this: Although the Constitution of Kansas, when presented here, may be republican; though there may be in it no incurmountable objection; though it may be a reasonable instrument, made by competent authority, *in accordance with law and in the proper form*, Kansas shall not come into the Union because this right thing was not done through a particular process. Is that consistent with the doctrine of non-intervention? I deny the right of Congress to go behind the organic act, and inquire into all the details of how the people of Kansas have proceeded; but when Kansas presents herself for admission at the doors of Congress with a republican Constitution, formed in order, according to law, the Senator from Illinois is about to say to those people, you shall not come into the Union because you did not do this right thing in the proper way. Sir, when the question involves the peace of the whole country, and, as I know, the prosperity of Kansas, I will not be pledged to say any such thing; but if the measure is right in itself, and if I can see that it imposes no great future wrong on the people of Kansas, in view of the peculiar circumstances which surround the case, the difficulty of getting any law properly administered there, the danger of leaving the question open, I will, so far as I have the power, assist to throw open the portals of the Union and welcome Kansas as a State, thus settling this bitter family feud forever. Sir, I do not intend to follow the subject further to-day. I thought, however, that some of the positions of the Senator from Illinois were so peculiarly forced, that, though entirely unprepared, I should not, *after the intimation I had given, do justice to* myself if I allowed those remarks to pass unnoticed.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I do not mean to go into this debate, because it is now entirely upon questions purely abstract; but I think it due to the honorable Senator from Illinois, to whose remarks I have listened with great attention, to point out to him one, at least, of the fallacies contained in his argument. I use that term with entire respect; and I should be unjust to myself if I did not use it with entire respect to him, because all will admit that his speech was one of great strength and great power, but, in my conception, with great diffidence I say it, was of little moment—in its legal positions, and in its political conclusions, a series of monstrous fallacies. I only desire to point out one now. The honorable Senator said that the effect produced of necessity from the mode of submitting this subject to the people of Kansas was to disfranchise all who did not come to the polls prepared to vote for the Constitution; and thus, he said, all who did vote, whether for or against slavery, were compelled to vote for the Constitution, and those of either class who were not prepared to vote for the Constitution, must necessarily refrain from voting at all; and yet the honorable Senator complained—and it was the *great staple of that part of his argument*—that the Constitution was not submitted to be voted on. At one time he declared that it was withheld from the people; and again he declared that all who came to vote were necessarily obliged to vote for it. Now, I submit to the honorable Senator, how could a man be compelled to vote for that which was not submitted to him to be voted on at all?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Senator understand me to say that it was withheld?

Mr. MASON. So I understood.

Mr. DOUGLAS. *I said just the reverse.*

Mr. MASON. The Senator certainly said they withheld everything from the people except the question of slavery; and yet the Senator declared that whoever voted on the question of slavery, whether for or against it, was obliged to vote for *the Constitution; and the Senator drew* the logical consequence that, of necessity, those who did not choose to vote for the Constitution were obliged to stay away and refuse to vote at all. That was his argument. Now, the fallacy I meant to point out was this: look at that Constitution and you will find that the Convention *withheld the Consti*tution; it was not submitted to the people at all. Whether that was well done or ill done is another question; but the Constitution was withheld from the people, and the only question submitted to them was, whether they would establish or interdict slavery? They might go there and vote upon that, and not vote or express any opinion whatever on anything else contained in the Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry I was misapprehended by the Senator from Virginia. I certainly took the ground, first, that the Convention had no power to frame a Government and put it in operation without submitting it to the people; secondly, that the Convention showed a consciousness of that fact, by providing that it should be submitted to the people, and should take effect from and after the date of ratification. Hence, from that action of the Convention, whatever vitality the Constitution was ever to have, resulted, not from the Convention, but from a vote of the people. I then showed that while they acknowledged it would be void *but for the ratification of the people*, it provided that it should be submitted for their acceptance or rejection in such a form as to cut off all negative votes, and only count the affirmative. That was my position—a position sustained by the Constitution itself. The Senator *is entirely mistaken if he supposes* that by the remotest inference I intended to infer that Constitution and schedule in saying they withheld it from the people. The schedule says, in so many words, "This Constitution shall be submitted to all the inhabitants in the Territory, on the day of election, for their acceptance or rejection, in the following form." This shows that they provide, not that it shall go into operation without submission, but that it shall be submitted, and they profess to submit it. They then cut off the negative votes, which, of course, makes a sure thing of it. That is my position. If the Senator from Virginia had understood it, I apprehend he would not have discovered any fallacy.

One word in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. BIGLER. If the Senator will allow me at this point, I wish to give some authority I have on the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BIGLER. I desire simply to say that I was exceedingly anxious to understand the precise position of that question. It was difficult to tell, from the language of the schedule. Yesterday I asked Colonel Henderson, of Kansas—who was an active member of the Convention—what it meant. "Why," said he, "it means that there are two entire Constitutions, and the people vote separately *for the Constitution without slavery—the Consti*tution the Convention has formed—or the Constitution with slavery." I understood him to say that there were two Constitutions precisely similar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. *If there are two Constitutions, as* we have before me, I should like to see the other; and, I want to know which one of the two the Senator from Pennsylvania is for, when he says he agrees with the President in going for this.

Mr. BIGLER. I *said* they were precisely similar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there are two copies of the same Constitution I