

Joe East

THE STAR OF THE NORTH.

H. W. Weaver, Proprietor.

Truth and Right—God and Country.

[Two Dollars per Annum.]

VOLUME 9. BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA. WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1857. NUMBER 37.

THE STAR OF THE NORTH
 IS PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY MORNING BY
H. W. WEAVER,
OFFICE—Up stairs, in the new brick building, on the south side of Main Street, third square below Market.
TERMS—Two Dollars per annum, if paid within six months from the time of subscribing; two dollars and fifty cents if not paid within the year. No subscription received for a less period than six months; no discontinuance permitted until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the editor.
 ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding one dollar will be inserted three times for five dollars, and twenty-five cents for each additional insertion. A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year.

Choice Poetry.

NOBODY'S SONG.

Swift never wrote anything better in verse than the following lines from an unknown correspondent:

I.
 I'm thinking just now of Nobody,
 And all that Nobody's done,
 For I've a passion for Nobody,
 That Nobody else would own;
 I hear the name of Nobody,
 For from Nobody I sprang;
 And I sing the praise of Nobody,
 As Nobody, mine has sang.

II.
 In life's young morning Nobody
 To me was tender and dear,
 And my cradle was rocked by Nobody,
 And Nobody was ever near;
 I was patted and praised by Nobody,
 And Nobody brought me up,
 And when I was hungry, Nobody
 Gave me to dine or to sup.

III.
 I went to school to Nobody,
 And Nobody taught me to read;
 I played in the street with Nobody,
 And to Nobody ever gave heed;
 I recounted my tale to Nobody,
 For Nobody was willing to hear;
 And my heart it clung to Nobody,
 And Nobody shed a tear.

IV.
 And when I grew older, Nobody
 Gave me a helping turn;
 And by the good aid of Nobody
 I began my living to earn;
 And hence I courted Nobody,
 And said Nobody's I'd be,
 And asked me to marry Nobody,
 And Nobody married me.

V.
 Thus I frudge along with Nobody,
 And Nobody cheers my life,
 And I have a love for Nobody,
 Which Nobody has for his wife;
 So here's a health to Nobody,
 For Nobody's now in "COWY,"
 And I've a passion for Nobody,
 That Nobody else would own.
 New York Evening Post.

From the Pennsylvania.

MONEY.

Coin and bank notes are commonly called money. Yet the difference between the two commodities is very great. Their characteristic distinction not being clearly understood by the people, is a source of incalculable mischief. As they said, that we, as a nation, overrate the value of bank notes, which, of course, proportionally diminishes in our eyes, that of coin. Relying upon our abundant supply of paper-money, we look with stolid indifference upon the exports of the precious metals. Some eight or nine years ago we had the good fortune to discover the California gold deposit. When their rich yield was fairly ascertained, it was confidently expected by many intelligent persons, that we should soon be relieved from the dependence on European money lenders; that henceforth we should be enabled to pay for necessary improvements, the construction of railroads, canals, etc., without being compelled to borrow abroad; and that we should no longer be subject to the prostrating influences of strictures in the money market. But the financial millennium did not arrive. Notwithstanding the large consignments of California gold dust, our monetary resources are, at this moment, at a low ebb, as the unusually high rates of interest indicate. Several causes may have co-operated to produce that effect, but the main reason, will be found in the drain of precious metals. No sooner was the property, consequent upon the gold productions of California felt here, than we doubled and tripled the importation of foreign fabrics and luxuries, to be paid in domestic produce, and this not sufficing, the balance had to be made up in bullion and coin. Previous to 1851 that balance never exceeded \$9,500,000 for any one year. The total excess of exportations over importations of precious metals, for a period of thirty years, from 1821 to 1850 inclusive, was, according to official statistics, \$42,865,756; whereas, for the six years, from 1851 to 1856 inclusive, it amounts to no less than \$273,037,841.

The excess of exportation of Coin over importation, was

In 1851	\$24,019,160
1852	37,189,091
1853	23,285,493
1854	34,438,713
1855	62,587,521
1856	41,887,858

This drain is beyond all doubt, the principal cause of the present scarcity of money. Had the national mind been more deeply impressed with the real, intrinsic value of gold, we should have unhesitatingly sacrificed acquisition, and the advantages of California would not have been lost to the country; money would now be plenty, interest low, and business flourishing. We frequently hear the opinion expressed that gold and silver coin represent value. Not so; they do not merely represent, but are, in the strictest sense of the word, value or property, as much

as iron, coal, copper, lead, ivory, furniture or land. The price of all these things is determined by their utility in the first instance, and in the second, by the quantity in which they exist; or, in a few words, by demand and supply. The uses to which iron can be put are multifarious. They determine its absolute value, which is equally great, here, in England and Russia; but iron-ore being more scarce in Russia, the relative value of iron ore is higher there than in England or America; that is to say, the same weight of iron will fetch the greatest weight of silver or gold or other marketable goods, in Russia. Now, gold and silver, like other metals, are of the greatest importance in the arts. They are on account of certain properties, such as incorrosiveness, great malleability and ductibility, etc., indispensable, and no substitute has yet been found for them. Without them chemistry would probably up to this day have remained a mere speculative science; and the practical arts could not have advanced to their present eminence of utility. Were gold more abundantly found in the crevices of the rocks and the sands of the rivers, its utility would remain the same; only its relative price would diminish, and such has been to a certain, but inconsiderable extent, the consequence of the supplies from Australia and California. Silver has risen as gold went down; which effect, partly owing to the cause just assigned, was increased by the large shipments to China. The same excellent properties, on account of which gold and silver are so useful in the arts, pre-eminently fit them to serve as a circulating medium. Capable of infinite subdivision, incorrosive and easily transportable, they are, besides pliable, the only metals fully answering the purpose of money. Their particular adaptability for specie, however, only enhances their intrinsic value, as the price of iron would be enhanced should a new extensive use for it be discovered. The stamp on gold and silver coin is but a convenience in exchange, indicating its weight or value. The stamp wholly obliterated, the coin would retain the same value, only less the trifling expense of coinage, provided the weight has not been diminished. Gold and silver therefore have an intrinsic, universally recognized worth. In all parts of the world they are readily and at the shortest notice convertible into every description of services or property, simply because they are themselves the most useful, the most desirable kind of property, of all things least subject to depreciation and fluctuation. They do not represent, but are actually property; whereas bank notes having no intrinsic value, are in fact, nothing more than their representatives. The credit of the parties who issue them not being universally known, they cannot have but a limited scope of circulation. Every note must be backed by security, or else it is worthless, hence the amount of security offered by a company determines its credit, or capacity for issuing notes. Gold and silver coin is security in itself and as it forms the basis of all banking operations, expanding or contracting them, according as it is plentiful or scarce; thus reacting either beneficially or injuriously upon every department of business, it is of the utmost importance, that we should always be adequately supplied with it. In the United States the necessity for national activity is infinitely greater than in the countries of the Old World, where past ages have to a great extent anticipated the wants of the living generation. For every addition to the population, we have to make new provisions, which requires money, and money being therefore of a much higher value here than elsewhere, we should adopt such measures as will prevent effectually the excessive exportation of the precious metals—which alone are money.

The Philosopher and the Child.

"Have you a soul?" a philosopher once enquired of a little girl. She looked up into his face with an air of astonishment and offended dignity and replied:
 "To be sure I have."
 "What makes you think you have?"
 "Because I have," she promptly answered.
 "But how do you know you have a soul?"
 "Because I do know," she answered again.
 It was a child's reason, but the philosopher could hardly have given a better one.
 "Well then," said he, after a moment's consideration, "if you know you have a soul, can you tell me what your soul is?"
 "Why?" said she, "I am six years old, and don't you suppose that I know what my soul is?"
 "Perhaps you do. If you will tell me, I shall find out whether you do or not."
 "Then you think I don't know," she replied, "but I do—it is my think."
 "Your think?" said the philosopher, astonished in his turn; "who told you so?"
 "Nobody. I should be ashamed if I did not know that without being told."
 The philosopher had puzzled his brain a great deal about the soul, but he could not have given a better definition of it in so few words.

A newly married couple took up their residence in Poplar street. At breakfast next morning the gentleman said to the lady: "My dear, this is Poplar street, and by putting a (you) in it becomes popular." "And by putting an (us) in it," promptly replied his better half, "will very naturally become populous."

"How is it," said a man to his neighbor, "that our parson, the laziest man in the world, can preach such long sermons?"
 "Why," said the neighbor, "he is too lazy to stop."

SPEECH OF SENATOR BIGLER, AT CLARION, ON THE 8TH INST.

In reply to the address of the Hon. David Wilmot, delivered at Philadelphia, 24th ult.

After giving a brief history of the Democratic party, showing how eminently wise and successful its policy had been in all exigencies, in war or peace, stood by the true interests of the country, and had advanced its growth and prosperity, and elevated the dignity and prowess of the nation, claiming for that party a higher degree of purity, wisdom and patriotism than were possessed by any similar association of men in modern times; and having also paid a compliment to the character and qualifications of General Paeker and his associates on the Democratic ticket, he proceeded as follows:

Judge Wilmot, the Republican candidate, has evinced his entire willingness to make his views known to the people, and seems quite unhappy that the State Committee would not agree that the Democratic candidate should waste his time with him in personal controversy, and still more displeased that the Committee should have suggested that the discussion of the slavery question is not essential in a gubernatorial contest. Failing to secure the attractions of General Paeker to get up large meetings and excitement for him, he has bravely dashed into the field alone. I am in possession of a copy of his first address delivered at Philadelphia on the 24th ultimo, and published in the Evening Bulletin, to the leading features of which I shall ask your attention before I take my seat. I find no fault in Mr. Wilmot for appearing before the public to make known his views. I think candidates for any office may properly do so. I see no want of dignity or propriety in the practice, if pursued in the proper spirit. In doing this, no candidate properly appreciating his position will solicit votes; he will simply declare his views on pending questions, foregrounding as best he can the policy he will maintain if elected, so the intelligent elector may vote for or against him, as may seem proper. But I have searched in vain for any such foreshadowing in the late speech of Mr. Wilmot. It is devoted exclusively to the subject of slavery, except only a brief reference to his letter on Americanism. State affairs seem to have had no attractions for him. It is an almost incredible fact that in a long speech occupying columns of the Bulletin, he should not have alluded to any one of the many interests which would come under his charge, were he elected Governor, nor discussed a single question connected with the duties of the office for which he is candidate, or over which the political authority of the State Government could in any way be exerted. From beginning to end he has talked out side of the true purpose of his appearing before the public, and has failed, therefore, to give the people the means to decide whether he would make a good Governor or not. He has talked about Slavery, and questions incidental and collateral; but not a word about State affairs. He should certainly have given us his view on the question of more Banks and paper currency. Many of the people would be glad to know whether he intends to maintain to the policy of the present incumbent, his political friend, on these vital questions. What does he think of the policy of giving away the largest share of the Public Works for an inadequate compensation, payable to the next generation; and if elected, will he favor a disposition of the remainder on the same condition? Why not give the people his views on these State questions, as also on the subject of paying the public debt, maintaining and extending our system of free schools; on the granting of special privileges to facilitate the ends of private gain, and especially on the pending amendments to the Constitution, embracing questions of grave concern for the people. All these subjects, vitally important, and within the range of the legitimate duties of the Executive, seem to have been lost sight of in the smoke and dust of a kind of Quixotic onslaught upon Slavery and the Slave power.

But another fact, equally singular, is, that although his address abounds with graphic descriptions of the evils of slavery, and coarse imputations upon the motives of its advocates, it does not contain a single practical suggestion as to a remedy for the evils it laments. Mr. Wilmot declares it to be a "question of vital practical importance which lies at the foundation of everything valuable to us as freemen," and yet he has not attempted to show the people of Pennsylvania in what way they can apply the remedy. Not only this, but I shall prove to you that, according to his own showing, the people of a free State have no Constitutional right to interfere for or against the evils he affects to deplore, whether in a State or Territory. If Mr. Wilmot found it necessary to make his address on national issues strictly foreign to the Executive duties, it is to be regretted that he did not devote a portion of his time to his favorite topic, the tariff. The old friends of "protection for the sake of protection," whom he expects to rally under his flag, would doubtless be delighted to hear from the man whom they used to designate as the advocate of "British free trade," the successful betrayer of Pennsylvania's best interests, and as a "vile traitor to the State of his birth." Possibly he could have convinced the manufacturers of iron in Clarion and elsewhere, that they are specially his debtor, and permitting the dead past to bury its dead, they should come to his rescue in this hour of need. Perhaps there were among his auditors at Philadelphia, those who had assisted to give Mr. Dallas to the flames in

officy, for following the Wilmot lead on the Tariff in 1845, and he could have induced them to repeat that great wrong on Mr. Dallas, as also their oft repeated imputations upon his own motives and conduct. He certainly could have shown those who abused myself and others, last spring, for agreeing to a modification of the tariff when we had no power left to resist it, that they were unreasonable in that complaint, or are now mistaken in their support of the distinguished advocate of "British free trade." But let that pass; we will leave the distinguished advocate of free trade in the embrace of the protectionists, and the protectionists under the leadership of the distinguished free trader. The new alliance only furnished another verification of the homely adage, that political necessity makes bad men better fellows.

But to the speech, and I will give you its best sentiment first, so that his friends may not complain. It reads as follows:
 "I hold that under the Constitution of the United States we have no right to meddle directly with the question of Slavery in the States where it already exists; it is a State institution, and can only be controlled by State laws, and we in Pennsylvania have no more right to legislate for Virginia upon the subject of Slavery than Virginia has the right to legislate for Pennsylvania upon the subject of our Public Schools. But in the territories the question is different. The territories are the common property of the Union, and we have the common right to control them."
 Then again, speaking of Slavery, he says: "The question is no mere abstraction, nor is it simply a question of right and wrong, a question of morals; it is a question of vital practical importance, which lies at the foundation of everything valuable to us as free men."

Touching the Dred Scott decision he remarks:
 "And as I am on this point, I wish to say that I bow to the Dred Scott decision as a matter of law. I raise no arm against the law, and I would never advise any one to do so; but there is no law on earth which can bind my reason or my conscience. I can, and will think, and vote for what I believe right."
 Now let us consider the doctrines of these quotations for a few minutes. In the first he says we have "no right to meddle with Slavery in the States where it already exists," but that "the Territories are the common property of the Union, and we have the common right to control them." In the second he presents the effects of Slavery as "vital practical questions, involving every thing valuable to us as free men." And in the third he informs us that he "bows to the Dred Scott decision as a matter of law."
 Of course I agree that we have no right to interfere with Slavery in the States, but "bowing to the Dred Scott decision," how does Mr. Wilmot propose to reach the institution in the Territories? What becomes of the "common right" of the States to control its existence? How can that right be brought to mean that Congress has no right to legislate on the subject for the Territories; that a Congressional interdiction against its extension is unconstitutional, and Mr. Wilmot agrees that that decision is law; then what of his common right to control it in the Territories; and of the "vital practical questions" he has presented for our consideration.
 Now this is the point to which I wish your special attention. Though acknowledging in his own peculiar phrase the binding effects of the decision of the Supreme Court, Mr. Wilmot is very careful to control the influence of that decision upon his position and arguments; he has not told the people frankly that by virtue of the decision he so reluctantly recognizes as binding, slavery in a territory is almost as completely out of the reach of the people of the government of a free State, as it is in the State of Virginia. He dare not be explicit on this point; for he would thereby illustrate the utter impracticability of his doctrines on the subject. In deed, his whole theory goes to pieces at this point, and he must necessarily conceal as much as possible, the effect of this decision, or the deceptive character of his speeches would become so transparent that he would be obliged to abandon the discussion entirely.

Bowing to the Dred Scott decision as matter of law, it will not do to say only that "Pennsylvania has no right to legislate for Virginia, on the subject of Slavery, than Virginia has to legislate for Pennsylvania on the subject of Public Schools." Mr. Wilmot cannot stop at this point; he must, and does virtually agree by that "bow" to neither Pennsylvania nor Virginia has any right to legislate for Kansas or Nebraska, on either subject, and they have no power to interfere for or against the institutions of the Territories directly or indirectly. The citizens of each may go to Kansas, and when bona fide residents, they can give effect to their will. He or I can do that; but as citizens of this State we cannot influence the question in either Kansas or Virginia. Prior to the Dred Scott decision, the Republican party contended for the power of Congress over the subject in the Territories; but that decision has settled the question against them, and has closed the channel through which the free States could reach the question. It has swept away the entire stock in trade of the Republican orators; the Missouri line, the Wilmot proviso, and every other scheme of Congressional interference. They have no occasion longer to seek even the election of anti-Slavery men to Congress,

for that body cannot touch the question. Their long cherished business of agitation is therefore gone—gone forever. Wherein, then is the fitness of Mr. Wilmot's inflammatory address about Slavery to the exclusion of every other topic. Having no power over the subject, it cannot be of vital practical importance in Pennsylvania, unless, indeed, Mr. Wilmot in his feverish sensitiveness, has allowed himself to conclude that some dough-faced Democrat, in obedience to the Slave powers, is about to propose to re-establish the institution in this State. Until this be done the question cannot be so practical as he alleges. But is it not singular that Mr. Wilmot should seek to agitate the public mind in behalf of measures which have been declared unconstitutional and to which decision he agrees? What can be accomplished by such efforts? Though he could convince a majority of the people that the measure would work practical good to the country, the constitution, until changed, is an insurmountable barrier to their adoption. Would it not be wiser to accept the philosophy of the true saying, that "it is useless to cry over spilt milk." When the election is over he will need the benefit of some such reflection, for I think his chances are better to become the successor of Judge Bullock, than of Gov. Pollock.

I do not mean to say that the candidate for Governor may not properly allude to Slavery; but Mr. Wilmot insists that measures which have been declared unconstitutional shall be recognized issues in the gubernatorial contest, and continues to discuss these measures as though they could be made available to the country, and insists that the people should take one side or the other. He says slavery is the only question involved, and has so far declined to speak on State questions at all.

He says that Virginia has the same right to interfere with our public schools, that Pennsylvania has with Slavery in Virginia; and that is true; but did it not occur to his mind, at the same time, that it would be a most singular, if not ludicrous spectacle, to witness a candidate for Governor in Virginia, resting his claims to popular favor solely on his views about public schools in Pennsylvania, and confiding his discussions to that topic alone? Why the people of the Old Dominion would get a straight jacket for any man who might attempt to play such a trick before high heaven. And what would Pennsylvania think of such impudent interference? They would most certainly invite the Virginia applicant to take care of his slaves and leave the public schools to them. Mr. Wilmot would be sure to do this, and yet he talked for hours about Virginia negroes, and said not one word about Pennsylvania schools; so determined does he seem to rest his claims on questions belonging to other States and over which his has no control. Perhaps his friends can explain all this, but I think I can safely assure them of one thing, if he does not get more votes in States where his address would be appropriate, than in his own, he will be badly beaten. He will be almost convinced that he has not only been speaking for other States, but running for Governor some where else than at home.

Mr. Wilmot's prompt recognition of the binding effect of the Dred Scott decision has certainly surprised and disappointed some of his fanatical adherents. But they should notice that he dare not raise his voice against the Constitution, when asking to be permitted to take an oath to support it. That he has yielded reluctantly, and with exceeding bad grace, is evident from the low terms in which he impugns the motives of the Court. He says "it is easy enough for the Executive to find corrupt Judges to carry out corrupt designs." This is coarse, exceedingly coarse, scarcely a lowable in a common place politician, and utterly inadmissible in a candidate for Governor. Very many who intend to vote for the author of the base allegation, will despise his foul aspersions. Even they will not agree that it is becoming in David Wilmot to warn the country against the corruptions of James Buchanan and Roger B. Taney. But in his anger at court, he has gone out of his way still further to make an onslaught upon the integrity of the Supreme Court of his own State, and broadly alleges that its decisions are often contradictory, and it is common talk among the bar, that a decision must be revived every five years to have binding effect. The courts should take warning, for failing to be Governor, as this gentleman certainly will, he may still retain the office of Judicial Conspirator.

Fearing to repudiate the decision of the Supreme Court in express terms many of Mr. Wilmot's school of politicians are industriously engaged in efforts to destroy the confidence of the people in its integrity. As a means of doing this, they are in the habit of expatiating on the extraordinary circumstance that the ordinance of 1787 should have been declared unconstitutional at the end of sixty years after its adoption, and the Missouri Compromise so declared after having stood for nearly forty years. They certainly know that the Ordinance of 1787 did not derive its authority from the present Constitution—that it was the work of the Congress of the old Confederation, and was agreed to by the States; and was merely perpetuated under the present Constitution as a measure to which the States had agreed to. This notion of history they prefer to suppress, so that the action of the Court may seem more strange. They know, too, that the Missouri Compromise was an arbitrary arrangement between the North and the South, forced by an exigency that endangered the peace of the country, and that its Constitutional authority, though con-

stantly denied by many wise statesmen, had not been directly tested prior to the late decision. The history of the renowned Proviso is re-written in this speech, and Mr. W. has manifested special delight in exhibiting what he considers the inconsistencies of the Democratic party on this subject, and more especially those of Gen. Cass, Hon. Richard Brodhead and myself. He alleges in substance, that if the General had voted before he reflected, he would have gone for the Proviso, and that Mr. Brodhead had said he would vote for it if offered to the proper bill, and that I had been very careful to record my name in the affirmative, when a similar sentiment passed the State Legislature. The course of General Cass and Mr. Brodhead needs no explanation or defense at my hands. Their sentiments are too well known to the country to be successfully misrepresented. And, indeed, admitting all that Mr. W. alleges, I do not see that he makes out any man's destruction. The wisest men in the nation have often been wrong in their impressions as to the expediency of suddenly proposed measures, and to be mistaken on a constitutional question is no uncommon thing among able lawyers. As to the Pennsylvania resolution, it certainly did not receive that consideration to which it was entitled. I do not believe it was under consideration in the Senate, exceeding a half hour before it passed finally. For myself I knew but little about it until it came from the House of Representatives, the day it passed the Senate, and had only thought of it as an abstract sentiment against the acquisition of territory, with the view to the extension of Slavery, and as affecting the question of peace with Mexico. As a proposition involving the rights of the States, and the powers of Congress, I had at that time given it no thought. Reflection upon these things soon after, and long before I knew that Mr. Wilmot intended to press the principle as admissible when applied to Territory which had been long previously acquired by the common blood and treasure of all the States, without any such original condition, convinced my mind that its practical operation would do injustice to the slaveholding States, and I discarded its doctrines entirely. Four years after the advent of the proviso, when the Democratic nominee for Governor, I certainly was not charged with a want of sympathy for the South. The reverse was the constant allegations of my political enemies. The execution of the fugitive slave law and the doctrine of non-interference were topics in that contest, and I advocated the affirmative of both on all occasions. Mr. Wilmot himself publicly dissenting from my views on these points at a meeting in his own town where we stood face to face. But it is of little moment whether I have been consistent or not. I trust I may always be more ambitious to be right, and never vain enough to pretend to great wisdom or foresight. If I did not mistake the meaning of the proviso, when first proposed, I certainly misinterpreted its author, for I thought him a Democrat, and he has turned out to be anything else. But has Mr. W. relieved his position by what he has said on the point? If it even be true that certain Democrats inclined to favor the proviso before they discovered their wrong, he was not thereby warranted in sustaining it when the injustice of the practical working had become apparent by discussion, and especially since it has been shown to be unconstitutional.

But the candidate and his party are great on consistency. They are in the habit of arraigning Mr. Buchanan, Judge Douglas, and other Democratic Statesmen, on the charge of inconsistency, because at one time they sustained the policy of settling the slavery question by a geographical division, and have since embraced the policy of referring the question to the people of the territories, to be settled as they may deem best. There is very little sense and less patriotism in such criticisms. The whole history of the subject shows that the controversy, at the different periods when the excitement attained to a dangerous height, was treated as a subject of compromise, implying at once the concession of principle and peculiar views. Statesmen and patriots felt required to yield much in the way of opinion, to secure the peace of the country. Mr. Buchanan favored the Missouri line so long as the policy of settling the question by territorial division was maintained; and Mr. Douglas, in 1848, proposed to extend the parallel of that line to the Pacific Ocean as a final adjustment of the dangerous feud. But the very men who now, and since 1854, have not ceased to bewail the abandonment of this policy, were united in their opposition to its extension and perpetuity on that occasion. They repudiated it; scouted and reviled it. Another mode of settlement became absolutely necessary to save the country from civil war, and that of non-interference, as now found in the Kansas law, was wisely adopted in 1850; and is maintained by the statesmen I have named. What inconsistency is there in such action? And what is to be said for the inconsistency of those who continued to denounce the Missouri line up to the time of its repeal. The party who in Connecticut burnt James Lanman in effigy for voting for it, and Isaac Toucy near the same spot, for voting to repeal it, and who labored to reject the principle in 1849. They are not in a condition to talk about consistency. Having so conspired against this mode of adjustment, and secured its overthrow, they now have Mr. Wilmot engaged in a clumsy imitation of Mark Antony with the dead body of Cæsar, by using the lifeless remains of the unconstitutional measure from place to place over the State, giving utterance to his deep grief in pathetic appeals to the passions and prejudices of the people, to draw

down their vengeance on the destroyer of this once favorite scheme. On Kansas affairs Mr. Wilmot becomes quite belligerent, and hurls vindictive aspersions on the National Administration. He talks as though he did not know that the odious test laws enacted by the first Legislature had been repealed by the last; that his party friends in Kansas are daily availing themselves of these bogus laws; that Mr. Robinson, the Topeka Governor, had petitioned Mr. Stanton, when acting Governor, to confer the appointment of commissioner to acknowledge deeds on his friend, by virtue of the territorial laws. He seems determined to give the version of affairs that will best suit his purpose. Having presented a startling picture of the wrongs and outrages which, according to his story, have been wantonly inflicted upon the free State party of that unhappy Territory, he makes the following sweeping declamation:

"I affirm that the Administration know all about these outrages, and yet they uphold them. They sustain the Missouri usurpation, and they dare not be just, because they are the slaves of the slave power who created them and upholds them."

This is terrific indeed, coming from a candidate for Governor, but Mr. Wilmot's language is tame and feeble compared with the sparkling rhetoric of Col. Keitt, of South Carolina, on the other side of the question. The Colonel, in his letter dated at White Sulphur Springs, imputes to the Administration altogether different action and purpose. He alleges that its first act was to appoint a Governor to "debauch Kansas from all-allegiance to the South and deliver her into the hands of Free Soil fanatics," and that, "to say that the cause of the South was lost in Kansas prior to the appointment of Walker, is to palliate fraud by falsehood." Here is a wide difference between big doctors. But the Southerner seems to have the best of the contest. Indeed the best attempts of Wilmot and his school of orators, to show the subservience of the Administration to the slave power, fall far below the most ordinary efforts of Col. Keitt, the Charleston Mercury and the New Orleans Delta, to demonstrate its Free Soil tendencies and its treachery to the South. With such fire in front and rear who will say that Col. Keitt may not reasonably imagine the fanatics to be hereafter played by "shivering Cabinets," and "convulsive Administrations?"

Then, again, Mr. Wilmot and his party seem to be in great tribulation lest the slave power should deprive some of the citizens of Kansas of the opportunity of raising their voices against the institution at the ballot-box, lest some be deprived of that high and sacred prerogative, the right of suffrage. They decant eloquently on the sacredness of this right, and hurl destructive anathemas upon the heads of all who shall attempt to restrict or usurp this proud function of American freemen. The people and the whole people must be heard. Now this is all very well, and they cannot go further on this point than will the Democracy; but does not this sickly concern for the rights of the people who come with exceeding bad grace from Mr. Wilmot and his party, who in the convention that nominated Col. Fremont, laid it down as a principle, that not only a portion, but all the citizens of Kansas should be deprived of the right of saying whether they would have slavery or not. They claimed that right for Congress; and virtually held that though nine-tenths of the people might desire slavery, the interdiction of Congress should be conclusive. It was no half way business with them. It was a part of their faith to deprive all the people of the sacred opportunity which they falsely allege the Democracy are attempting to take from some. They execrate the interference of Missouri in the settlement of the Slavery question in Kansas, and yet according to their own doctrine not only Missouri, but Massachusetts and all the North and South are invited to interfere through their representatives in Congress. The practical effect of their doctrine being that the power to decide the question for Kansas is to be found everywhere else in the United States except in that and the other territories—that the people of the States who do not go to Kansas shall have a voice on the subject, but those who do, shall not. How absurd, then, their affected distress lest by design or accident some citizen of Kansas may be deprived of the opportunity of giving effect to his will on the subject. Why even now Mr. Wilmot and his party will not say that they will be content with the decision of the people, and admit Kansas as a State unless that decision be against slavery. They will agree to take her into the Union when she obeys their dictation and not till then. It was in this connection, in the contest last Fall, that we ridiculed their pretensions to exclusive friendship for freedom in Kansas, whilst holding that the people should not be free to select their own institutions. We claimed that the Democracy were more friends of "Free Kansas," because they wished to have the people perfectly free to select all their domestic institutions. They holding that Kansas should not come into the Union unless she adopted their views, and the Democracy maintaining that she should come in, no matter how she might decide as to Slavery. The question in the Presidential issue was not whether she should be free or slave, but simply whether her own bona fide citizens should be permitted to decide for themselves. That question was affirmed by the people at the polls, and Mr. Buchanan and his advisors, in my judgment, are honestly endeavoring to carry out that decision, in good faith, regardless of denunciation from the North or South, and so pat-

ternally denied by many wise statesmen, had not been directly tested prior to the late decision. The history of the renowned Proviso is re-written in this speech, and Mr. W. has manifested special delight in exhibiting what he considers the inconsistencies of the Democratic party on this subject, and more especially those of Gen. Cass, Hon. Richard Brodhead and myself. He alleges in substance, that if the General had voted before he reflected, he would have gone for the Proviso, and that Mr. Brodhead had said he would vote for it if offered to the proper bill, and that I had been very careful to record my name in the affirmative, when a similar sentiment passed the State Legislature. The course of General Cass and Mr. Brodhead needs no explanation or defense at my hands. Their sentiments are too well known to the country to be successfully misrepresented. And, indeed, admitting all that Mr. W. alleges, I do not see that he makes out any man's destruction. The wisest men in the nation have often been wrong in their impressions as to the expediency of suddenly proposed measures, and to be mistaken on a constitutional question is no uncommon thing among able lawyers. As to the Pennsylvania resolution, it certainly did not receive that consideration to which it was entitled. I do not believe it was under consideration in the Senate, exceeding a half hour before it passed finally. For myself I knew but little about it until it came from the House of Representatives, the day it passed the Senate, and had only thought of it as an abstract sentiment against the acquisition of territory, with the view to the extension of Slavery, and as affecting the question of peace with Mexico. As a proposition involving the rights of the States, and the powers of Congress, I had at that time given it no thought. Reflection upon these things soon after, and long before I knew that Mr. Wilmot intended to press the principle as admissible when applied to Territory which had been long previously acquired by the common blood and treasure of all the States, without any such original condition, convinced my mind that its practical operation would do injustice to the slaveholding States, and I discarded its doctrines entirely. Four years after the advent of the proviso, when the Democratic nominee for Governor, I certainly was not charged with a want of sympathy for the South. The reverse was the constant allegations of my political enemies. The execution of the fugitive slave law and the doctrine of non-interference were topics in that contest, and I advocated the affirmative of both on all occasions. Mr. Wilmot himself publicly dissenting from my views on these points at a meeting in his own town where we stood face to face. But it is of little moment whether I have been consistent or not. I trust I may always be more ambitious to be right, and never vain enough to pretend to great wisdom or foresight. If I did not mistake the meaning of the proviso, when first proposed, I certainly misinterpreted its author, for I thought him a Democrat, and he has turned out to be anything else. But has Mr. W. relieved his position by what he has said on the point? If it even be true that certain Democrats inclined to favor the proviso before they discovered their wrong, he was not thereby warranted in sustaining it when the injustice of the practical working had become apparent by discussion, and especially since it has been shown to be unconstitutional.

But the candidate and his party are great on consistency. They are in the habit of arraigning Mr. Buchanan, Judge Douglas, and other Democratic Statesmen, on the charge of inconsistency, because at one time they sustained the policy of settling the slavery question by a geographical division, and have since embraced the policy of referring the question to the people of the territories, to be settled as they may deem best. There is very little sense and less patriotism in such criticisms. The whole history of the subject shows that the controversy, at the different periods when the excitement attained to a dangerous height, was treated as a subject of compromise, implying at once the concession of principle and peculiar views. Statesmen and patriots felt required to yield much in the way of opinion, to secure the peace of the country. Mr. Buchanan favored the Missouri line so long as the policy of settling the question by territorial division was maintained; and Mr. Douglas, in 1848, proposed to extend the parallel of that line to the Pacific Ocean as a final adjustment of the dangerous feud. But the very men who now, and since 1854, have not ceased to bewail the abandonment of this policy, were united in their opposition to its extension and perpetuity on that occasion. They repudiated it; scouted and reviled it. Another mode of settlement became absolutely necessary to save the country from civil war, and that of non-interference, as now found in the Kansas law, was wisely adopted in 1850; and is maintained by the statesmen I have named. What inconsistency is there in such action? And what is to be said for the inconsistency of those who continued to denounce the Missouri line up to the time of its repeal. The party who in Connecticut burnt James Lanman in effigy for voting for it, and Isaac Toucy near the same spot, for voting to repeal it, and who labored to reject the principle in 1849. They are not in a condition to talk about consistency. Having so conspired against this mode of adjustment, and secured its overthrow, they now have Mr. Wilmot engaged in a clumsy imitation of Mark Antony with the dead body of Cæsar, by using the lifeless remains of the unconstitutional measure from place to place over the State, giving utterance to his deep grief in pathetic appeals to the passions and prejudices of the people, to draw

down their vengeance on the destroyer of this once favorite scheme. On Kansas affairs Mr. Wilmot becomes quite belligerent, and hurls vindictive aspersions on the National Administration. He talks as though he did not know that the odious test laws enacted by the first Legislature had been repealed by the last; that his party friends in Kansas are daily availing themselves of these bogus laws; that Mr. Robinson, the Topeka Governor, had petitioned Mr. Stanton, when acting Governor, to confer the appointment of commissioner to acknowledge deeds on his friend, by virtue of the territorial laws. He seems determined to give the version of affairs that will best suit his purpose. Having presented a startling picture of the wrongs and outrages which, according to his story, have been wantonly inflicted upon the free State party of that unhappy Territory, he makes the following sweeping declamation:
 "I affirm that the Administration know all about these outrages, and yet they uphold them. They sustain the Missouri usurpation, and they dare not be just, because they are the slaves of the slave power who created them and upholds them."
 This is terrific indeed, coming from a candidate for Governor, but Mr. Wilmot's language is tame and feeble compared with the sparkling rhetoric of Col. Keitt, of South Carolina, on the other side of the question. The Colonel, in his letter dated at White Sulphur Springs, imputes to the Administration altogether different action and purpose. He alleges that its first act was to appoint a Governor to "debauch Kansas from all-allegiance to the South and deliver her into the hands of Free Soil fanatics," and that, "to say that the cause of the South was lost in Kansas prior to the appointment of Walker, is to palliate fraud by falsehood." Here is a wide difference between big doctors. But the Southerner seems to have the best of the contest. Indeed the best attempts of Wilmot and his school of orators, to show the subservience of the Administration to the slave power, fall far below the most ordinary efforts of Col. Keitt, the Charleston Mercury and the New Orleans Delta, to demonstrate its Free Soil tendencies and its treachery to the South. With such fire in front and rear who will say that Col. Keitt may not reasonably imagine the fanatics to be hereafter played by "shivering Cabinets," and "convulsive Administrations?"
 Then, again, Mr. Wilmot and his party seem to be in great tribulation lest the slave power should deprive some of the citizens of Kansas of the opportunity of raising their voices against the institution at the ballot-box, lest some be deprived of that high and sacred prerogative, the right of suffrage. They decant eloquently on the sacredness of this right, and hurl destructive anathemas upon the heads of all who shall attempt to restrict or usurp this proud function of American freemen. The people and the whole people must be heard. Now this is all very well, and they cannot go further on this point than will the Democracy; but does not this sickly concern for the rights of the people who come with exceeding bad grace from Mr. Wilmot and his party, who in the convention that nominated Col. Fremont, laid it down as a principle, that not only a portion, but all the citizens of Kansas should be deprived of the right of saying whether they would have slavery or not. They claimed that right for Congress; and virtually held that though nine-tenths of the people might desire slavery, the interdiction of Congress should be conclusive. It was no half way business with them. It was a part of their faith to deprive all the people of the sacred opportunity which they falsely allege the Democracy are attempting to take from some. They execrate the interference of Missouri in the settlement of the Slavery question in Kansas, and yet according to their own doctrine not only Missouri, but Massachusetts and all the North and South are invited to interfere through their representatives in Congress. The practical effect of their doctrine being that the power to decide the question for Kansas is to be found everywhere else in the United States except in that and the other territories—that the people of the States who do not go to Kansas shall have a voice on the subject, but those who do, shall not. How absurd, then, their affected distress lest by design or accident some citizen of Kansas may be deprived of the opportunity of giving effect to his will on the subject. Why even now Mr. Wilmot and his party will not say that they will be content with the decision of the people, and admit Kansas as a State unless that decision be against slavery. They will