Hon. Edward Everett at the New York Douglas Mass Meeting.

ANNAPOLIS, May 19, 1860.

DEAR SIR: I regret that I am unable to accept your kind invitation to be present at the meeting to be held in New York on the 23d inst. Believing that the letter of your State delegation in the Charleston Convention already contains the true platform of principles, which will command the support of the Constitutional Union men of the country, I would not deem my presence necessary to secure the election if it should receive.

On this platform, I stand, unreservedly, distrusting the sectional, and therefore ill-grounded clamor for change, and confiding in the intelligence and patriotism of the country to secure the election of a candidate for the Presidency of a character whose qualifications, and public services are eminent and well known, the most likely, in that large general interest, when fully understood, they will be found to be either just to all sections or the reverse.

The Compromises of 1850 and 1854, it was confidently predicted, would put to rest forever the slavery agitation which has, for years, so alarmingly convulsed the land. The great end was to be achieved by removing the subject altogether from the halls of Congress, and confining it exclusively to the people of the Territories themselves. That the extinction of sectional discord is one of the triumphs of Japanese legislation is a fact. For a long time, when subjects entered the presence of the Tycoon, nothing would do but a substantive march upon the knees. This mode of progress, at last, became too much for the lively fellow, with genius quickened by the advancing spirit of a new age, conceived the plan of developing forward to the extent of a few feet, so that the dignity of the position might be maintained, even with the body in an upright position. Thus was a usual ease and deference are harmonized, and the forms of courtly humility no longer involve the laceration of the sentimental knee.

There were also attempts to foment dissension at the President's house, and Mr. Buchanan himself appeared in less elaborate attire than on the day of welcoming. In company with the three ambassadors were the three Japanese officers next in rank, and the first interpreter, Mr. Heusken, who had visited Washington before, and was attended only by three of the secretary of the Cabinet. Also present were but more than twenty persons from the visiting Captains Dupont and Lee, and Mr. Wise.

The Japanese said it did not please the State Department that they were received by Mr. Cass, who at once, in a few words of the same purport as those spoken by the President. He also observed that arrangements for the final departure of the embassy would be made with Secretary Floyd. They all asked what is Americanese, would answer in reference to the terms of re-credence, and in reply to the President, he stated that it would, according to the Western usage, be sent to Mr. Buchanan, President of the United States of America, instead of to the Tycoon. It is to the Tycoon, however, that the letter, headed to the Ambassadors, is addressed.

The Japanese Ambassadors, Mr. Wise, members of the Cabinet, and some of the foreign ministers, were present at the dinner. Upon the rising of the latter, the Ambassadors manifested none of that exceeding precision and constraint which distinguished their first appearance before the President. They overcame some of state, also, were fully wishing, after seeing the ladies, to salute them, and would it not be astonishing how an open nation, as it was when the Compromise of '54 was passed? Why should the South continue to agree, as they did then, to abide in good faith by the words of that act? Of their acting it is impossible. Congress, subject to the restrictions referred to, has not the power to prohibit slavery in the District and the territories, any more than it has the power to prohibit it in the States, whatever over such district.

The exercise of such a power would be rank and grossly inexpedient in the existing state of the country, but of the mere power there can be no doubt. Sound and able lawyers, who have already argued the case twice, as the friend of the South and bestowed upon all the questions it involved the most careful study I could, first, and a perfect confidence that the question was not fairly not decided by the court, but was settled argued nor in any way presented for decision. The single inquiry in this connection was, had Congress the power to prohibit slavery in a Territory? Chief Justice Taney, after a premature, and, I think, unfortunate declaration that the Territorial Legislature could do so, but before the court either directly or indirectly, I maintained, however, then, as I think now, that the power was with a Legislature by proposition, and for reasons stated at length in all that paragraph, that the constitutional power that slavery could neither be established nor prohibited by Congress, but that the people of a Territory, when organized by Congress, can establish or prohibit it. Mr. Justice Curtis, in his opinion, has given the same view. I certainly never supposed that there existed in any part of the civilized world a Government where slavery existed in which there was not, somewhere, the authority to abolish it. Such a proposition to my mind is perfectly incomprehensible. And, after all, on the great and good men to whom we are indebted for our admirable political institutions There is not a word in the opinion of either of the judges, even tending to prove that the court, or any judge, intended to express an opinion that Congress could not, before them. They examined only the power of Congress, the sole one presented for judgment. Inference for or against the territorial power from the court's judgment regulating the Congressional power may be drawn, but the court has not, as I understand, given an opinion of the latter question. Indeed, the President stated he was attended only by three of the members