

THE JEFFERSONIAN

Devoted to Politics, Literature, Agriculture, Science, Morality, and General Intelligence.

VOL 18.

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA. DECEMBER 15, 1859.

NO. 50.

Published by Theodore Schoch.

TERMS.—Two dollars per annum in advance.—Two dollars and a quarter, half yearly—and if not paid before the end of the year, Two dollars and a half. No advertisements until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Editor.

Advertisements of one square (ten lines) or less, one or three insertions, \$1.00. Each additional insertion, 25 cents. Longer ones in proportion.

JOB PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large, plain and ornamental type, we are prepared to execute every description of

BOOK PRINTING.

Cards, Circulars, Bill Heads, Notes, Blank Receipts, Justices, Legal and other Blanks, Pamphlets, &c., printed with neatness and dispatch, on reasonable terms at this office.

J. Q. DUCKWORTH. JOHN HAYN

To Country Dealers.

DUCKWORTH & HAYN,

WHOLESALE DEALERS IN

Groceries, Provisions, Liquors, &c.

No. 80 Dey street, New York.

June 16, 1859.—17.

A Railroad Adventure.—A Lesson for Women.

"Is this seat engaged?"

The questioner was a gentle voiced, modest looking woman in very plain though neat travelling attire. The scene was a railroad car, with passengers two and two occupying every seat except one, which contained only a lady and her retainer.

She could scarcely have failed to observe the other as she entered at the front of the car and passed through the entire length, casting her eyes right and left in unsuccessful search, but she made no movement until addressed with a proposal for a seat by her side.

She responded by gathering up, in no very amiable manner, an exquisite traveling basket, a parasol, a bouquet, a fan, a bottle of smelling salts, and an embroidered handkerchief, last of all, narrowing the sweep of her rich silk bonnet.

The little woman quietly took the vacant seat. Work-box, bouquet, fan, and handkerchief were now displayed in the lap of the owner, who from time to time brought them severally into requisition; now drawing up from the box a little mirror by which to examine her eyebrows and water ringlets; now fanning her head affectively, now smelling demurely at the flowers, and now applying to her lips the extravagant bit of gossamer.

It was fortunate that she who shared the settee with her required but a limited space, for the mass of flounces, though drawn back periodically, would still come in contact with the dress of the plebeian neighbor, and at times threaten to quite envelope and to hide from view the little person.

A dandy seated immediately before, occasionally threw a glance back; the magnificent lady was evidently creating a sensation under his latest style hat. He shortly managed to begin a conversation.

Facing about, with a touch at the minute tuft of furze, that might have been mistaken for a hair mole, at either corner of his mouth, and a bow and a smile intended to be charmingly irresistible, he inquired whether the "aish did not cut too freely to suit her pleasure?"

Receiving a smile in return, and being graciously permitted to serve the regal lady by lowering the window, the exquisite felt at liberty to promise further acquaintance. After an allusion to the merits of "Hot Corn," a copy of which he held in his hand, the seated gentleman introduced more personal topics, when it was presently elicited that the lady was destined to the village of N——, to visit a friend.

Here the little woman in the Quaker like habit looked up with sudden interest. The great lady curbed up her lip, her new devotee twisted his feeble moustache around his finger and affected a smirk of conceit. The little woman then looked down again.

"I think you informed me," drawled the dandy, upon sufficiently recovering himself, "if I rightly understood you, a moment since, that you were, as—intending to visit relatives at N?"

"Not relatives," corrected the lady, sweetly smiling, "I said friend; I should rather have said a friend—it is the lady of Judge S——; I shall probably spend some weeks with her."

"Ah how foine—how very foine," remarked his dandyship. "I have had the honor of a passing acquaintance with his honor, the Judge—that is, an—I have frequently seen him on the bench, having been myself an important witness in several important cases which at different times were tried before his honor."

The lady rejoined that she had never seen the Judge or his lady, but that some recent circumstances induced a correspondence between the latter and herself which resulted in an invitation with which she was going to comply. She ended with a toss of the head, such as indicated that she was fully aware of the self a grandmistress attached to so delightful a mission.

Before the dandy had time to respond, the train halted at a station, and his attention was diverted to the business of investing a bright copper in an evening paper, offered by a newsboy. The plain little woman embraced the opportunity when it would not be interrupting to inquire of the person at her side:

"Were you ever in N——?" adding "my home is there."

Not a syllable of reply was deigned, but the proprietor of the many flounces, by an impatient movement, turned more away from the inquirer, while her countenance expressed most palpable contempt. Her admirer returned to his privilege seasonably to reinforce her by an exhibition of positive disgust, and issued a corresponding exclamation against rustic forwardness.

The little woman leaned back in her seat and very singularly evinced quiet amusement, rather than any stronger sentiment, in return for this insolence.

"As I am to pass through N——," said the sop to the flounced lady, "it would really be the highest pleasure to attend you from the depot to the Judge's—ah—residence; it would be most especially delightful to call upon the lady, and I can go on—that is, I can proceed in the next train."

The offer was coquetically accepted. In a short time the whistle sounded, the train began to break up, and the conductor put his head in at the door to announce, in a shout, that they were arrived at N——. The dandy stood up with his slender cane and his showy cigar case; and the train stopped; the great lady swept past in to the aisle, delivered over a half a score of miscellaneous articles to the care of her new attendant, took his arm, and was conducted to the ladies' room, to wait while a carriage should be ordered.

They soon had seats in the coach, and the exquisite had exerted himself beyond what had before seemed possible, to induce the driver to set off without any other passengers. "It is so exceedingly annoying," he declared, "to be continually forced into contact with vulgar people."

But the coachman either considered too well what was for his own pocket interest or indulged a desire to torture our fine-grained hero, so the wheels never moved till the coach had a large fill of passengers, among them a dirty Irish woman, and a fragrant negress with two or three woolly headed responsibilities.

HISTORY VINDICATED: A LETTER

TO THE HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLASS ON HIS "HARPER" ESSAY.

MR. SENATOR: Your late magazine article on "Popular Sovereignty in the Territories" has already received adequate attention. That it has failed to conciliate opponents, but has rather increased their number and confirmed their resolution, is now evident. I had had this result both at the North and at the South and for a very intelligible reason. Most of the American People who have any purpose whatever, earnestly desire either that slavery should or that it should not be enabled to diffuse itself through the Federal Territories, growing with the growth and being strengthened with the strength of the American Republic. Very few are indifferent to this overshadowing issue; few except professional politicians even affect to be. You preach, therefore, the gospel of indifference, of negation, of impotence, to mainly unwilling ears. I cannot feel, in reading your lubrication, that you believe it yourself. Think me not uncharitable, but answer to yourself this question: Suppose that you were officially apprised that a majority of the Squatter Sovereigns of one of our Territories—we will say Utah, for example—had voted that the minority should be reduced to and held in Slavery for the benefit of the majority, and had proceeded to enforce that determination by fire and sword—would you, as a Senator, hesitate to decide and declare that this rapacious, iniquitous purpose must be resisted and defeated by the power of the Federal Government? I know you would not. You would, in that case, inevitably recognize and affirm the duty of Congress to maintain Justice in the Territories—to protect every innocent man in the peaceful enjoyment of the fair rewards of his own industry, and in the possession and enjoyment of Liberty, Family, and honestly acquired Property. The matter is too plain for argument, too certain for doubt. If then, you uphold the right of some men to hold others as slaves in the Territories, you do it on the assumption that those ought to be masters and these slaves—that the Slave laws of Virginia or Texas have rightful force and effect in Kansas or New Mexico—or on some other ground than the naked assumption of "Popular Sovereignty" in the Territories. That you must allow me to tell you, is but a politician's dodge, devised in 1848 by Gen. Cass, under the spur of a pressing danger, an urgent necessity, and only accepted by those who discern in it a means of escape from similar perils—a handy neck-yoke to enable them to carry water on both shoulders. The Sovereignty you defer to is that of a political necessity, not that of the People of the Territories.

But I do not propose to traverse all the logical subtleties and hair-splitting distinctions of your late elaborate essay. I did, indeed, at one time cherish a strong desire to reply to it at length through the pages of the magazine which gave it to the world; but, on intimating that purpose to its editor, I was denied a hearing in his columns, though it was graciously intimated that a similar demand from one of "the leading Republicans" might perhaps be favorably considered. Of course, that put me out of court; but whom does it let in? I cannot tell. Republicans are rather unused to being led; hence a natural scarcity of Republican leaders.—Gov. Seward, to whom you seem willing to accord the character of a leader, is known to be absent in Europe, and not likely to return for two months yet; so is Mr. Sumner; other "leading Republicans" are hardly within easy reach of the documents essential to your systematic refutation. Yet it seems to me important that your misstatements of fact should be clearly exposed, even though the task should devolve on one so far from being a leader. Though the pages of *Harper* are shut against me, and those who have read your monstrous perversion of History will never see their exposure, I am impelled to undertake the task, confining myself strictly to the historical features of your essay.

Your fundamental proposition is this: The genius and spirit of our free institutions plainly require that the people of a Territory should be enabled and encouraged to establish and maintain Human Slavery on the soil of such Territory, if they see fit. The Republicans deny this, insisting that no Government has any right to deprive innocent human beings of their liberty, accounting and holding them the mere chattels of others. They deny the right of any Territorial Government to uphold such Slavery, insisting that Congress is in duty bound to prohibit and prevent any such injustice and mischief in the Territories which are the common domain of the whole American People. On this main question, we are utterly, irreconcilably at variance. I do not propose to argue it, nor to review your arguments upon it. But you proceed to assert, and to make history uphold your assertion, that your doctrine is that of the Revolutionary Fathers—that the Revolution was made in its behalf—that it was paramount in the earlier and purer days of the Republic. On this point I take issue, and appeal to the indubitable records. Here is their testimony:

The IXth Continental Congress, under the Articles of Confederation, assembled at Philadelphia, Nov. 3, 1783, but adjourned next day to Annapolis, Md., where it was to have convened on the 26, but a quorum was not obtained until Dec. 13th, and the attendance continued so meager that no important business was taken up until Jan. 13th, 1784. The Treaty of Independence and Peace with Great Britain was unanimously ratified on the 14th—nine States represented.—The House was soon left without a quorum, and so continued most of the time—of course, doing no business—till the 1st of March, when the delegates from Virginia, in pursuance of instructions from the Legislature of that State, signed the conditional deed of cession to the Confederation of her claims to territory north west of the Ohio River. New-York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts had already made similar concessions to the Confederation of their respective claims to territory westward of their present limits. Congress hereupon appointed Messrs. Jefferson of Virginia, Chase of Maryland, and Howell of Rhode Island, a Select Committee to report a Plan of Government for the Western Territory.—This plan, drawn up by Thomas Jefferson provided for the government of all the Western Territory, including that portion which had not yet been, but which, it was reasonably expected, would be, surrendered to the Confederation by the States of North Carolina and Georgia. (and which now forms the States of Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi), as well as that which had already been conceded by the more northern States. All this territory acquired and as yet unacquired, Mr. Jefferson and his associates on this Select Committee proposed to divide into seventeen prospective or new (embryo) States, to each of which the Report gave a name, eight of them being situated below the parallel of the Falls of Ohio (Louisville, Ky.), and nine above that parallel—which is very nearly the boundary between the present Free and Slave States. To all these embryo or new States, the Committee proposed to apply this restriction:

"That after the year 1800 of the Christian era, there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the said party shall have been convicted to be personally guilty."

April 19, this reported plan came up for consideration in Congress. Mr. Spaight of N. C. moved that the above-quoted passage be stricken out of the plan or ordinance, and Mr. Read of S. C. seconded the motion. The question was put in this form: "Shall the words moved to be stricken 'out stand!' and on this question the Ays and Nocs were taken, and resulted as follows:

N. HAMPSHIRE.	Mr. Foster,	ay	✓
	Mr. Blanchard,	ay	✓
MASSACHUSETTS.	Mr. Gerry,	ay	✓
	Mr. Partridge,	ay	✓
	Mr. Eliot,	ay	✓
RHODE ISLAND.	Mr. Howell,	ay	✓
CONNECTICUT.	Mr. Sherman,	ay	✓
	Mr. Wadsworth,	ay	✓
NEW-YORK.	Mr. De Witt,	ay	✓
	Mr. Pattee,	ay	✓
PENNSYLVANIA.	Mr. Dick,	ay	✓
	Mr. Milfin,	ay	✓
	Montgomery,	ay	✓
	Hastel,	ay	✓
MARYLAND.	Mr. McHenry,	no	✓
	Stone,	no	✓
VIRGINIA.	Jefferson,	ay	✓
	Bardley,	no	✓
	Mercer,	no	✓
N. CAROLINA.	Williamson,	ay	✓
	Swain,	no	✓
S. CAROLINA.	Read,	no	✓
	Beresford,	no	✓

*No quorum.

Here we find the votes sixteen in favor of Mr. Jefferson's restriction to barely seven against it, and the States divided six in favor to three against it. But the Articles of Confederation (Art. IX) required an affirmative vote of a majority of all the States—that is, the vote of seven States—to carry a proposition; so this clause was defeated through the absence of one delegate from New Jersey, in spite of a vote of more than two to one in its favor. Had the New-Jersey delegation been full, it must, to a moral certainty, have prevailed; had Delaware been then represented, it would probably have carried even without New Jersey. Yet, it is of this vote, so given and recorded, but by you suppressed, that you say, in your account of the action of Congress on the bill, after amplifying on the ordinance as it passed, and claiming it as indorsement of your views:

"The fifth article, which relates to the prohibition of Slavery after the year 1800, having been rejected by Congress, never became a part of the Jeffersonian plan of Government for the Territories, as adopted April 23, 1784."

—Is this a statesman's reading of American History for the instruction and guidance of his countrymen? It certainly reminds me strongly of a blackleg turning up the knave from the bottom or middle of his pack as though it came from the top. Who could not prove anything he wished by such unscrupulous manipulation of his authorities?

—But there is no denying the fact that the last Continental Congress—that of 1787—did unanimously pass Nathan Dane's Ordinance for the Government of the Territory North-west of the Ohio, whereby Slavery is perpetually excluded from said Territory in the following terms:

"There shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall be duly convicted."

How do you get along with this? I will quote your very words. You are seeming to argue that by the term 'States' or 'new States,' the Congress of that day often implied what we now designate as Territories, and you say:

THE WORD 'STATES' IS USED IN THE SAME SENSE IN THE ORDINANCE OF THE 13TH JULY, 1787, FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TERRITORY NORTHWEST OF THE RIVER OHIO, WHICH WAS PASSED BY THE REMNANT OF THE CONGRESS OF THE CONFEDERATION, SITTING IN NEW-YORK WHILE ITS MOST EMINENT MEMBERS WERE AT PHILADELPHIA, AS DELEGATES TO THE FEDERAL CONVENTION, AIDING IN THE FORMATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES."

—Let us see about this: You give us your bare word for this belittling and setting aside of the Congress of 1787, as a mere "remnant." There may be those with whom your assertion suffices, but I prefer to look at the record.

The Ordinance of 1787 just referred to, and containing the inhibition of Slavery quoted above, passed Congress on the 13th of July; and, on recurring to the journals, I find the vote on its passage recorded as follows:

MASS.	Mr. Holten,	ay	✓
	Mr. Dane,	ay	✓
NEW-YORK.	Mr. Smith,	ay	✓
	Mr. Haring,	ay	✓
	Mr. Yates,	no	✓
NEW-JERSEY.	Mr. Clark,	ay	✓
	Mr. Scheurman,	ay	✓
DELAWARE.	Mr. Kearney,	ay	✓
	Mr. Mitchell,	ay	✓
VIRGINIA.	Mr. Grayson,	ay	✓
	Mr. Richard H Lee,	ay	✓
	Mr. Covington,	ay	✓
N. CAROLINA.	Mr. Blount,	ay	✓
	Mr. Hawkins,	ay	✓
S. CAROLINA.	Mr. Kean,	ay	✓
	Mr. Huger,	ay	✓
GEORGIA.	Mr. Few,	ay	✓
	Mr. Baldwin,	ay	✓

—Here was Virginia and every State south of her represented and voting—voting unanimously *ay*. The only negative vote cast came from New York. It is quite true that New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Maryland were not represented on this vote; but the first four of them unanimously voted to sustain Mr. Jefferson's original restriction, and no man can doubt that they would have voted in 1787 as they did in 1784, not that even the Carolinas and Georgia had come over to the support of the policy of Restriction. The members absent from their seats in order to attend the sitting of the Convention at Philadelphia were Rufus King and Nathaniel Gorham of Massachusetts, William Samuel Johnson of Connecticut, Mr. Madison of Virginia, and C. Pinckney of South Carolina, and possibly one or two others whose names I have not detected—for I can find no list of the members of the Congress, save as I pick it up from page to page of the journal as they severally dropped in from day to day. That a few members of this Congress were transferred to seats in the Convention is true; but in no single instance was a State left by such transfer unrepresented in Congress nor is there a shadow of reason for supposing that the Slavery Inhibition embodied in the glorious Ordinance would have been struck out or modified had no Convention been sitting. What becomes, then, of your sneer at "the remnant of the Congress?"

—Here, then, we have two distinct declarations by overwhelming majorities of the Continental Congress in favor of the principle of Slavery Inhibition—the first, by more than two to one (though not enough to carry it under the Articles of Confederation) acting under the lead of Thomas Jefferson, backed by such men as Elbridge Gerry and Roger Sherman, assembled directly after the close of the Revolution, and while New-York was still held by a British army; the second by a vote of eight States to none in the last Confederated or Continental Congress, sitting in New York simultaneously with the Convention which framed our present Federal Constitution at Philadelphia.—Here are two explicit affirmations of the Revolutionary Fathers of the right and duty of Congressional Inhibition of Slavery in the Territories. Can there be any honest doubt as to their views on the subject?

—But the Federal Constitution was framed and adopted: perhaps this abolished or modified the power over Slavery in Territories claimed and exercised by the Continental Congress. Certainly, the presumption is strongly the other way; for the Constitution was framed to strengthen, not to weaken, the Federal authority. Let us again consult the records:

The first Federal Congress convened at New York, March 4, 1789; of its Members the following had been also Members of the Convention which had just before framed the Federal Constitution:

From New Hampshire—John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman.
"Massachusetts—Elbridge Gerry, Caleb Strong.
"Connecticut—Wm. Sam'l Johnson, Roger Sherman, Oliver Ellsworth.
"New York—Rufus King.*
"New Jersey—William Paterson.
"Pennsylvania—Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas Fitzsimons.
"Delaware—George Read, Richard Bassett.
"Maryland—Daniel Carroll.
"Virginia—James Madison, Jr.
"Georgia—William Few, Ab'm Baldwin.

*Elected to the Convention from Mass.

—In the first Congress under the Federal Constitution, composed in large measure of the most eminent of the framers of that Constitution, Mr. Fitzsimons of Pennsylvania (himself a member also of the Convention), reported (July 16, '89) a bill to provide for the government of the Territory Northwest of the Ohio, which was then read for the first time;

the next day had its second reading, and was committed; on the 20th was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported and engrossed; on the 21st read a third time and passed without dissent. It was received that day in the Senate, and had its first reading; was read a second time on the 31st; was further considered Aug. 3d; and had its third reading next day, when it passed without a voice raised. It is a good deal shorter and sweeter than your Nebraska bill, and refers to the same subject. Here it is:

AN ACT to provide for the Government of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio: Whereas, in order that the ordinance of the United States, in Congress assembled for the government of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio, may continue to have full effect, it is requisite that certain provisions be made so as to adapt the same to the present Constitution of the United States.

Be it enacted, &c. That in all cases in which, by the said ordinance, any information is to be given or communication made by the Governor of said Territory to the United States in Congress assembled, or to any of their officers, it shall be the duty of the said Governor to give such information and to make such communication to the President of the United States; and the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint, all officers which by the said ordinance were to have been appointed by the United States in Congress assembled, and all officers so appointed shall be commissioned by him; and in all cases where the United States in Congress assembled might, by the said ordinance, revoke any commission, or remove from any office, the President is hereby declared to have the same powers of revocation and removal.

2. And he further enacted, That in case of the death, removal, resignation, or necessary absence, of the Governor of the said Territory, the Secretary thereof shall be and he is hereby authorized and required to execute all the powers and perform all the duties of the Governor during the vacancy occasioned by the removal, resignation, or necessary absence of said Governor.

Approved Au. 7, 1789.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

—Are you reading, Mr. Senator? Here is the act passed by the first Congress under the Federal Constitution—James Madison, Roger Sherman, Rufus King, Elbridge Gerry, John Langdon, Robert Morris, and other eminent members of the Constitutional Convention being also members of this Congress—to give full effect to the Ordinance of '87 and to adapt it to the Federal Constitution—not one voice being raised from any quarter against either the avowed purpose or the especial provisions of the act. Do you doubt that Washington, Madison, Gerry, Sherman, &c., understood the Constitution which they had framed scarcely two years before? This, at least, was no "remnant of a Congress." Its members were not absent from their seats concerning a new Constitution. Why then, in giving what purports to be a history of the action of Congress on this subject, do you ignore them and their act of '89? Are they beyond even your power of manipulation?

Yet once more, I leave you to your reflections. The matter on which we are at variance is no vague abstraction but a grave practicality. Indian Territory, embracing the State you now represent, and all else between the Ohio and the Mississippi except the State of Ohio, early evinced dissatisfaction with the Slavery Inhibition embodied in the Ordinance of '87 and kept in force under the act of '89. Her former settlers were nearly all immigrants from Slave States, and they bankered after negroes. They held a Convention in 1802—Gen. Harrison, their Governor, presiding—and memorialized Congress in favor of temporary removal of the Slavery Inhibition.—That memorial was presented to the Congress of 1802-3, Mr. Jefferson being then President, and Congress largely Republican. It was referred by the House to a Select Committee of three, two of them from the slave States, John Randolph being Chairman. March 2, 1803, Mr. Randolph presented their unanimous Report, denying the prayer of the petitioners, and saying that

"The Committee deem it highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the north-western country," &c., &c.

Congress thought so, too, and refrained from any action on the subject.

The next year, the memorial aforesaid was referred to a new Committee—Cassas Rodney of Del., Chairman—who (Feb. 17, 1804) reported in favor of the prayer of the petitioners. No vote of the House took no action on the subject. Feb. 14, 1806, another Report was made—this time by Mr. Garnett of Va., in favor of the temporary suspension prayed for; but Congress persisted in its policy of non-action. Feb. 12, 1807, a third Report was made, by Mr. Parke (Delegate) of Indiana, in favor of letting the squatter sovereigns of Indian Territory have liberty to hold slaves therein for a limited term; but Congress still declined to take the subject up for consideration. Finally, a memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Indiana, asking permission to import and temporarily hold slaves, was submitted, Jan. 21, 1807, to the Senate, by which it was referred (Nov. 7) to a Select Committee, of which Mr. Franklin of N. C. was Chairman, who reported (Nov. 13) that "it is not expedient" to let up on the slavery Restriction; and there the subject rested forever—the Indiana sovereigns having

the next day had its second reading, and was committed; on the 20th was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported and engrossed; on the 21st read a third time and passed without dissent. It was received that day in the Senate, and had its first reading; was read a second time on the 31st; was further considered Aug. 3d; and had its third reading next day, when it passed without a voice raised. It is a good deal shorter and sweeter than your Nebraska bill, and refers to the same subject. Here it is:

AN ACT to provide for the Government of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio: Whereas, in order that the ordinance of the United States, in Congress assembled for the government of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio, may continue to have full effect, it is requisite that certain provisions be made so as to adapt the same to the present Constitution of the United States.

Be it enacted, &c. That in all cases in which, by the said ordinance, any information is to be given or communication made by the Governor of said Territory to the United States in Congress assembled, or to any of their officers, it shall be the duty of the said Governor to give such information and to make such communication to the President of the United States; and the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint, all officers which by the said ordinance were to have been appointed by the United States in Congress assembled, and all officers so appointed shall be commissioned by him; and in all cases where the United States in Congress assembled might, by the said ordinance, revoke any commission, or remove from any office, the President is hereby declared to have the same powers of revocation and removal.

2. And he further enacted, That in case of the death, removal, resignation, or necessary absence, of the Governor of the said Territory, the Secretary thereof shall be and he is hereby authorized and required to execute all the powers and perform all the duties of the Governor during the vacancy occasioned by the removal, resignation, or necessary absence of said Governor.

Approved Au. 7, 1789.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

—Are you reading, Mr. Senator? Here is the act passed by the first Congress under the Federal Constitution—James Madison, Roger Sherman, Rufus King, Elbridge Gerry, John Langdon, Robert Morris, and other eminent members of the Constitutional Convention being also members of this Congress—to give full effect to the Ordinance of '87 and to adapt it to the Federal Constitution—not one voice being raised from any quarter against either the avowed purpose or the especial provisions of the act. Do you doubt that Washington, Madison, Gerry, Sherman, &c., understood the Constitution which they had framed scarcely two years before? This, at least, was no "remnant of a Congress." Its members were not absent from their seats concerning a new Constitution. Why then, in giving what purports to be a history of the action of Congress on this subject, do you ignore them and their act of '89? Are they beyond even your power of manipulation?

Yet once more, I leave you to your reflections. The matter on which we are at variance is no vague abstraction but a grave practicality. Indian Territory, embracing the State you now represent, and all else between the Ohio and the Mississippi except the State of Ohio, early evinced dissatisfaction with the Slavery Inhibition embodied in the Ordinance of '87 and kept in force under the act of '89. Her former settlers were nearly all immigrants from Slave States, and they bankered after negroes. They held a Convention in 1802—Gen. Harrison, their Governor, presiding—and memorialized Congress in favor of temporary removal of the Slavery Inhibition.—That memorial was presented to the Congress of 1802-3, Mr. Jefferson being then President, and Congress largely Republican. It was referred by the House to a Select Committee of three, two of them from the slave States, John Randolph being Chairman. March 2, 1803, Mr. Randolph presented their unanimous Report, denying the prayer of the petitioners, and saying that

"The Committee deem it highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the north-western country," &c., &c.

Congress thought so, too, and refrained from any action on the subject.

The next year, the memorial aforesaid was referred to a new Committee—Cassas Rodney of Del., Chairman—who (Feb. 17, 1804) reported in favor of the prayer of the petitioners. No vote of the House took no action on the subject. Feb. 14, 1806, another Report was made—this time by Mr. Garnett of Va., in favor of the temporary suspension prayed for; but Congress persisted in its policy of non-action. Feb. 12, 1807, a third Report was made, by Mr. Parke (Delegate) of Indiana, in favor of letting the squatter sovereigns of Indian Territory have liberty to hold slaves therein for a limited term; but Congress still declined to take the subject up for consideration. Finally, a memorial of the Territorial Legislature of Indiana, asking permission to import and temporarily hold slaves, was submitted, Jan. 21, 1807, to the Senate, by which it was referred (Nov. 7) to a Select Committee, of which Mr. Franklin of N. C. was Chairman, who reported (Nov. 13) that "it is not expedient" to let up on the slavery Restriction; and there the subject rested forever—the Indiana sovereigns having

the next day had its second reading, and was committed; on the 20th was considered in Committee of the Whole, reported and engrossed; on the 21st read a third time and passed without dissent. It was received that day in the Senate, and had its first reading; was read a second time on the 31st; was further considered Aug. 3d; and had its third reading next day, when it passed without a voice raised. It is a good deal shorter and sweeter than your Nebraska bill, and refers to the same subject. Here it is:

AN ACT to provide for the Government of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio: Whereas, in order that the ordinance of the United States, in Congress assembled for the government of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio, may continue to have full effect, it is requisite that certain provisions be made so as to adapt the same to the present Constitution of the United States.

Be it enacted, &c. That in all cases in which, by the said ordinance, any information is to be given or communication made by the Governor of said Territory to the United States in Congress assembled, or to any of their officers, it shall be the duty of the said Governor to give such information and to make such communication to the President of the United States; and the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint, all officers which by the said ordinance were to have been appointed by the United States in Congress assembled, and all officers so appointed shall be commissioned by him; and in all cases where the United States in Congress assembled might, by the said ordinance, revoke any commission, or remove from any office, the President is hereby declared to have the same powers of revocation and removal.

2. And he further enacted, That in case of the death, removal, resignation, or necessary absence, of the Governor of the said Territory, the Secretary thereof shall be and he is hereby authorized and required to execute all the powers and perform all the duties of the Governor during the vacancy occasioned by the removal, resignation, or necessary absence of said Governor.

Approved Au. 7, 1789.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

—Are you reading, Mr. Senator? Here is the act passed by the first Congress under the Federal Constitution—James Madison, Roger Sherman, Rufus King, Elbridge Gerry, John Langdon, Robert Morris, and other eminent members of the Constitutional Convention being also members of this Congress—to give full effect to the Ordinance of '87 and to adapt it to the Federal Constitution—not one voice being raised from any quarter against either the avowed purpose or the especial provisions of the act. Do you doubt that Washington, Madison, Gerry, Sherman, &c., understood the Constitution which they had framed scarcely two years before? This, at least, was no "remnant of a Congress." Its members were not absent from their seats concerning a new Constitution. Why then, in giving what purports to be a history of the action of Congress on this subject, do you ignore them and their act of '89? Are they beyond even your power of manipulation?

Yet once more, I leave you to your reflections. The matter on which we are at variance is no vague abstraction but a grave practicality. Indian Territory, embracing the State you now represent, and all else between the Ohio and the Mississippi except the State of Ohio, early evinced dissatisfaction with the Slavery Inhibition embodied in the Ordinance of '87 and kept in force under the act of '89. Her former settlers were nearly all immigrants from Slave States, and they bankered after negroes. They held a Convention in 1802—Gen. Harrison, their Governor, presiding—and memorialized Congress in favor of temporary removal of the Slavery Inhibition.—That memorial was presented to the Congress of 1802-3, Mr. Jefferson being then President, and Congress largely Republican. It was referred by the House to a Select Committee of three, two of them from the slave States, John Randolph