THE PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.

BY ERASTUS BROOKS & Co.

PITTSBURGH:
WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 28, 1848.

PHILADELPHIA NORTH AMERICAN.
Advertisements and Subscriptions to the North American and United States Gazette, Philadelphia, received and forwarded from this office.

NEW YORK EXPRESS.
We will receive and forward free of expense, advertisements and subscriptions for this paper.

COMMERCIAL LIST AND PHILADELPHIA PRICE CURRENT.
Subscriptions to this valuable paper will be received and forwarded from this office.

Democratic Whig Nominations,
FOR PRESIDENT,
ZACHARY TAYLOR,
OF LOUISIANA.
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
MILLARD FILLMORE,
OF NEW YORK.
FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,
NER MIDDLESWARTH,
OF UNION COUNTY.

Antimasonic and Whig Nominations.
FOR CONGRESS,
MOSES HAMPTON,
OF PITTSBURGH.
FOR ASSEMBLY.
LEWIS C. NOBLE, of Indiana.
CHRISTIAN SNIVELY, of Wilkins.
M. SWARTZWELDER, of Pittsburgh.
HENRY LARGE, of Mifflin.
RECORDER.
HEZEKIAH NIXON, of Lower St. Clair.
REGISTER.
JOHN SCOTT, of Ross.
CLERK OF THE COURTS.
DANIEL M'CURDY, of Elizabeth Borough.
COMMISSIONER.
THOMAS FAIRMAN, of Pittsburgh.
JOHN K. FOSTER, of Baldwin.

See next page for Telegraphic News.

Editorial Correspondence of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

Abolition of Slavery—Politics of the Capitol, &c.

WASHINGTON, June 24, 1848.

The Senate have to-day rejected the Resolution o. Mr. HALE, of N. H., instructing the Committee on the District of Columbia, to bring in a bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. There was no disposition to debate the question, and the vote was taken upon the amendments. The vote was SEVEN to THIRTY-SIX,—*the Democratic Senators from the Free and Slave States, alike voting against the Resolution*, and not one of the Whigs from the free States, recording his vote in opposition to the instructions. There were a good many Senators absent, when the question was taken. Evenshe Barnburning Senators present,—Niles, Dix and Dodge, all voted against the Resolution. The seven votes, the magic and jubilee number, by the way, included Corwin, of Ohio, Davis, of Mass., Upton, of Vermont, Clark, of Rhode Island, Hale, of N. H., and Baldwin, of Conn.

The vote does not seem to strengthen the position of the "free soil" Convention, just held in N. York, and the Barnburners of New York, I fear, do not mean all they pretend. It is indeed, with these but little more than a disaffection, on account of the non-possession of a large share of the spoils. Mr. Van Buren's course is quite as much one of disaffection, as of principle, though it is undoubtedly true that one strong element of his' defeat, was his opposition to the annexation of Texas.—But in this, the whole Northern Democracy went with him at the time. *There was a time indeed, when Lewis Cass was opposed to the annexation of Texas.* But Lewis Cass, was ready soon after to throw himself into the hands of the South, and at the sacrifice of every Northern principle he had. So when Mr. Van Buren went against the annexation of Texas; Mr. Cass went for it, and it was his friends who defeated Mr. Van Buren, at Baltimore, in May, 1844. The "son of New York," no longer "the favorite son," but nevertheless popular with a large division of his party, is taking vengeance now.

Mr. Dodge, of Wisconsin, was quite alarmed by the nomination he had received, and forthwith declined it in a despatch to New York. The power behind the throne overshadowed his independence if he had any.

The Wilmot Proviso sticks fast in the two Houses of Congress, and may to the end of the session. As a Southern man, it cannot be expected that General Taylor will advocate it, although it is said he is not against it. But committed as he is upon the Veto question, and respecting, as he does, the Legislative action of the General Government, the anti-slavery principle is much safer in his hands, that in than of a "Northern Doughface."

I gave you a brief chapter of Mr. Cass' course upon this question yesterday. Here now is another, to be found in the *Union*, of March 24, 1847.—The whole speech has been suppressed up to this time, though a copy to suit the times is in course of preparation.

(From the Union of March 24, 1848.)

"Last year, he, (Mr. Cass, and this was in reply to Mr. Hilliard, of Ala.) should have voted for the proviso, (the Wilmot Proviso) had it come up. *But circumstances had altogether changed.*"

What were these circumstances beyond the prospects of a nomination for the Presidency, and an eager willingness to sacrifice Principle to Expediency. Truth, right, justice, state institutions representative opinion, all remained as they were. The Executive, however, was resolute, the South determined, and the height of ambition of the then Senator from Michigan seemed, to be no more than "a Northern man with Southern principles." This last year he would have "voted for the Wilmot Proviso," as four years ago he voted against the annexation of Texas, and three years ago for it! And to this day, notwithstanding his "forty two years of public service," no man can tell what he would do upon the question of Rivers and Harbors. The Chicago letter is as far as one can venture to quote him in this matter, and that is the sport of every man, woman and child in the land.

The Senate have passed a bill, allowing the Judges of the Supreme Court, to extend their next term into July, with the view of clearing the docket. It is also proposed to limit the appeal cases, from the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia to $2000 instead of $1000 according to the provisions of the present law.

There was a long debate upon a Texas claim, for the moderate sum of *half a million*, in principal, and about the same amount in interest. It is only the beginning of Texas business, and a whole generation of people will hardly pay the amount of Texas indebtedness, for which the Government is held liable.

The Barnburning Convention in New York is a prolific source of debate. The nominee is cursed aloud for his course. I heard some of the Democracy denounce him in unmeasured terms to-day, pronouncing him treacherous, faithless, fit for the whipping post, and "the unkindest cut of all, a *real child of Avon Burr!*" Such a calumny has been whispered before, but never by the so called "Democracy." E. B.

BIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY OF CONGRESS.—One of the most needed and interesting volumes we have recently met with, is from the press of the Harpers in a work giving "A Biographical and Political History of the American Congress." H. G. WHEELER, Esq., is the Biographer, and the book is mainly valuable as being a complete history of the times. Mr. Wheeler has long been a Reporter of the proceedings of Congress, and beyond being skilful and accomplished in his profession, he has been a careful observer of men, and of the public questions of which he speaks. He has written impartially, and relied mainly upon facts, in order that the reader might draw his own conclusions of the public questions of the time. We can vouch for the general justice of his conclusions, and the accuracy of his statements, very many of them being passed under our own observation. The subject upon which the writer has commenced, and of which we have the first volume is exhaustless. The Biographer of the present is but little else than a history of the past, so intimately interwoven in the past with the present, and the chain of events can never be broken while the Government lasts. We commend the volume to all public men, to all political readers and to every library.

To the Editors of the National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON, June 22, 1848.

GENTLEMEN:—A paragraph of mine, in the Pittsburgh Gazette of a late date, having been the cause of some misunderstanding in the Press as to a proposition from Mr. O'Rielly to reconcile the difference between himself and Professor Morse touching the different lines of Telegraph, it is due to Mr. O'Rielley to state that the circumstances at the time indicated, gave to believe that an amicable and successful proposition would be made by Mr. Kendall, as the agent of Mr. Morse. The remarks in the Gazette were written by the editor in the spirit of the common wish of the Press and the public, that the controversy so long existing between the parties at issue might be amicably settled and not as the suggestion, as I have seen intimated, of Mr. O'Rielley or any of his agents.

Very respectfully, E. BROOKS.

Mr. Van Buren's Letter.

We have given up the most of our space to day, to the Letter of Mr. VAN BUREN, which forms a very important item in the history of the present time. We commend it to a careful reading, as containing sound doctrine in relation to the extension of Slavery into territory now free; and for the spirit of moderation which it breathes. He repudiates the nominations of the Baltimore Convention, and avers, if no other nominations are made than those which are now before the country, he shall not vote at all on the Presidential question.

Will Mr. Van Buren accept the nomination?—He declines in his letter a nomination quite emphatically, and yet the Convention proceeded to nominate him by acclamation, notwithstanding. Mr. Butler declared in the Convention, that Mr. Van Buren would not refuse to accept the nomination. It is generally considered by the press of all parties, that he will accept.

It will be interesting and instructive to our readers, to see how this nomination is received. The Barnburners are of course in ecstacies. The name of Mr. Van Buren, the old favorite of the party, is to them a tower of strength. The Whigs look on with a sort of pleased indifference. They were confident of carrying their ticket before—this nomination makes "assurance doubly sure." The groans of the Old Hunkers and Cass organs are distressing. Their "sufferings is intolerable."—The curses against the "Sage of Kinderhook" are "loud and deep."

The *New York Evening Post* announces the nominations in a spirit of calm exultation. 'The intelligence,' it says 'has been received with the highest satisfaction by that large class of the democrats of New York who have no other interest in the coming election than such as arises from an earnest desire to see the government administered with wisdom and ability, and in the spirit of the Constitution—that class who have no favors to hope and no grudges to remember—a class immense in numbers, and, when roused, overwhelming in strength.'

The New York Globe is, of course, in raptures. It says that Mr. Ban Buren's nomination has been made in disregard of his assertions, that his political career has for ever closed, and that the Convention presents him again to the suffrages of the people for an office he does not seek, *but cannot refuse.*

The Old Hunker organ, the New York Sun, is in a paroxysm of fury. We quote a few sentences:

'Where can such an instance of political ingratitude be found? Is he to be the exemplar of a refinement of a political treachery which has never been a parallel? 'Can we believe the story?—Are we to have a second Arnold in the person of Martin Van Buren?' 'The only Chief Magistrate which New York has given to the country—has proved a viper to the party that has nourished him into a political existence.' 'We can only say—we, as well as you, are betrayed! *There is the Traitor! Do with him what you will!*'

FATHER RICHIE, of the Washington Union, gives way to the over flowings of impotent rage. Language fails the poor old man, to express his deep anguish and accumulating horror. He quotes largely from Mr. Van Buren's former writings, when he was a 'Northern man with Southern principles,' and mourns over the '*strange and melancholy change.*' After stating that Mr. Van Buren 'lies in the face of the regular nominations of the delegated Democracy of the Union,' and after charging him with ingratitude to the '*South*,' for whom his warmest sympathies were formerly expressed, 'when she cordially stood by him, and bore him on in the midst of a reckless opposition,' Mr. Riche proceeds as follows:

"Mr. Van Buren was "thoroughly with the South" in 1835 *against the whole gang of the infuriated wolves of abolitionism.* He wrote letter after letter, public as well as private, declaring his sympathies with the South, or rather with the principles of the Constitution. He was then nicknamed and abused by his enemies as "the northern man with southern principles." Mr. Benjamin F. Butler shared, too, in his professions, and he too wrote letter after letter; but now, it seems, "the sober second thought" has changed his views. Unfortunately—we deeply regret to say it—Mr. VAN'S *sympathies are apparently with the spirit of Abolitionism.* Strange and melancholy change! But still worse—*still more deplorable than all these*—is that in spite of the warnings of Washington and Jefferson—in spite, too, of his own past admonitions, he comes forward to assist in laying the platform of a new party, founded upon that unsightly foundation, a sectional interest; and, still more fatal, an interest of all others in our blessed country the most exciting and the most dangerous—indeed, the only rock on which this glorious Republic may split to pieces".

We have not room for more. A long article is closed with the following emphatic declaration:

"*It will seal the* DEATH WARRANT *of some who are concerned in it, or it may seal the fate of this country!*"

This is dreadful, but doubtless the country and Mr. Van Buren will survive it. To come to our own State. Our neighbor of the *Post* seems to be dumb-founded by the extent of the calamity. The '*Pennsylvanian* grows eloquent over the subject:

"What a deed this is to sully the sunset of a life, the morning and the meridian of which were so full of true greatness! He will fulfill his high place in the Democratic affections at once, and will *sink so low as to be beyond all hope of political resurrection.*' The great democratic party will shake him off as the dew-drop from the lion's mane."

We *feel our* compassions excited by reading the remarks of the Locofoco press. There is a melancholy sorrow mixed with their rage, which is quite affecting. True, it is hard to part with old friends, and to receive ingratitude where we expected faithful friendship. "If it had been an enemy, I could have borne it."

We turn to the Whig press. All is cheerfulness here. The Buffalo Commercial says, that the Utica nominations will utterly extinguish the Michigan victim of *circumstances.*' This is the general feeling of the Whig press.

The New York Tribune says that the ticket is a strong one, and that—

'A good many Whigs now intend to vote with them, unless a Whig candidate shall be presented who is unequivocally committed to Free Soil. We think the probability is that Mr. Van Buren will in this State receive more votes than Gen. Cass.—Unless controlled by party machinery, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, are as likely to be for Van Buren as for Cass.'

The Journal of Commerce considers that the nomination will give the Electoral Vote of New York to Taylor by a majority of 100,000 votes.

The Baltimore Patriot remarks that—*for all useful and successful purposes, the Locofoco party may henceforth be said to be dead.*'

As a sign of the times, in this connection—the 'Cincinnati Signal,' formerly a warm supporter of Gen. Taylor, has hoisted the Barnburner ticket. This paper is, we believe, the organ of the Barnburner Democracy in Hamilton County. This will help the Whig ticket in Ohio.

To the Editors of the Pittsburgh Gazette.

JEFFERSON, June 10, 1848.

At the primary meeting of the Whig and Antimasonic voters of the township of Jefferson, the following organization of the party was adopted, and ordered to be published:

Resolved, That an Executive Committee of six be appointed for the township, whose duty will be to hold correspondence with other township or county committees, to distribute any documents that may be for said township, and to do all other matters to the interest of the party; also, power to fill vacancies in said committee, or any of the sub-committees.

Resolved, That there be a sub-committee of three in each sub-school district, whose duty it shall be to act with the Executive Committee, to urge out the whole Whig vote to all elections, and to attend to the general interest of the Whig and Antimasonic party in their respective districts.

The following persons were appointed as the Executive Committee:

David Florence, Amos Pierce, Henry Heth, Joseph Wilson, H. H. McElhenny, James McKee.

The sub-Committees were appointed as follows:

1st District—V. K. Torrence, George Sickman, Jr., and A. M. Work.

2d District—James Kennedy, James McKee, and Josiah Alex.

3d District—John Bradshaw, David Lyle, and E. D. Carry.

4th District—Hugh Kennedy, Robert McElhenny and Lauren Wagner.

5th District—Thomas Pollock, Robert McNutt, and Wm. Hoffman.

6th District—John Payne, John Shepler, and Joseph Lowrie.

7th District—John Chamberlain, Wm. Cochran and Amos Bean, jr.

GEORGE SICKMAN, Chm'n.
V. K. TORRENCE, Sec'y.

GEN. SCOTT ENDORSES TAYLOR.—A correspondent of the National Intelligencer states that Gen. Taylor was vouched for, by General Scott to be "an honest man and a good whig," anterior to the accounts being received at Washington, of the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, as appears by a communication published in the National Intelligencer, of June 27, 1846. It was suggested by a friend of Gen. Scott, that were he to achieve a brilliant victory in Mexico, General Taylor would be elected President. "Suppose he is," was the magnanimous reply, "We shall have for President an honest man and a good Whig."

GREAT SALE OF wines, liquors, store fixtures, &c., by J. D. Davis, auctioneer, will be continued this morning at 10 o'clock, and at 2 o'clock, P. M., at the store of P. O. Martin, corner of Front and Smithfield streets.

MR. VAN BUREN'S LETTER.

READ AT THE UTICA CONVENTION.

The New York City Delegates to Baltimore addressed a letter to Mr. Van Buren, calling upon him for an expression of opinion as to the extension of Slavery in new territories, and also intimating a wish, but rather cautiously expressing it, that his name might be used at Utica for the Presidency. The following is Mr. Van Buren's reply:

LINDENWALD, June 20, 1848.

GENTLEMEN—I have received your kind letter with feelings of no ordinary character. It comes from the representatives of a body of men, who possess unsurpassed claims upon my respect and gratitude. My reception by the lion hearted Democracy of your great city, after my defeat in 1840, was marked by circumstances and displayed a depth of friendship which I can never forget. It made impressions upon my heart which are as vivid now as they were then, and which will never loose their hold upon my affections, until that heart ceases to beat. It is not in my nature to decline a compliance with any request which such men are capable of making, except for reasons of the strongest character, and which they themselves will on further consideration approve.

The determination announced in 1844 in my letter to the N. York Committee, advising my friends to unite in the support of Mr. Polk, to regard my public life as for ever closed, was made upon the most mature reflection, and with an inflexible determination to adhere to it to the end. I beg of you to do me the justice to believe, that it was in no degree influenced by that spirit of resentment which political disappointments are so apt to engender in the best regulated minds. Having been defeated during a highly excited, and as the result has shown, an unsound state of the public mind, for adhering to a financial policy which I believed to be right, the Democratic masses every where, as soon as it became evident that the country had recovered from the delusions of the day, resolved, with extraordinary unanimity, that the policy which had been so successfully descried should be vindicated, and the justice of the people illustrated by my re-election.

This decision of the masses was reversed by their representatives in the convention. More than compensated for any mortification which my discomfiture in 1840 had occasioned, by these expressions of confidence and regard proceeding directly from the people themselves, and nations above all things for the success of the measures for which I had been so unsparingly arraigned, I forebore to scan either the motives by which my opponents in the convention of '44 were actuated, or the means they resorted to for the accomplishment of their object, and united with zeal and alacrity in support of the Democratic candidate.

But while thus in good faith discharging what I regard to be my duty, it did not fail to occur to me that the circumstances by which I was surrounded, presented the occasion I had long desired, when I could retire from public life, consistently with what was due to the country, to my friends and to my own self respect. I embraced it with my whole heart. From that day to the present, my mind has not for a moment wavered in regard to the determination then announced. At an early period in the present canvass, and before the Democratic mind could be regarded as having taken any thing like a distinct direction in reference to its candidate, I affirmed my resolution in this regard in a letter to a worthy citizen of Pennsylvania; which has been extensively published, and in many others with which it was not deemed necessary to trouble the public.

A friendly application from our delegates to the last National Convention, for authority to use my name as a candidate if they could do so under proper circumstances, made it, as you appear to think, necessary, in the emphatic manner in which I felt it my duty to refuse my consent to their doing so under any circumstances whatever. Having thus assumed and so long occupied this position, I trust your friendship and past indulgence to be exerted for my relief, in your unexpectable determination never again to be a candidate for public office. The fact of my having long since retired from public life, with the tacit approbation of my friends, gives me a right to say so. If with the political field, tilling to recent Philadelphia honor and advancement at the hands of my political friends, I did not show myself at all times ready to obey, without regard to personal consequences, their calls to posts of difficulty, I failed to make myself understood by those whom I was most anxious to serve.

The considerations to which I have adverted, are not entitled to the same controlling influence in regard to the remaining subject of your letter. Whatever would be my preference in such matters in ordinary occasions, I feel that I could not, under existing circumstances, refuse to comply with your request, without doing injustice to my Democratic friends in this state. I cannot, without giving your my unreserved opinions upon the questions to which you have called my attention, and in doing so I shall endeavor to observe that respect and courtesy toward the conflicting views of others, which it has always been my desire to preserve and which is now more than ever appropriate to my position.

To give the doings of a Democratic National Convention a claim upon the support of the Democracy of any State, it is indispensably necessary that the Democracy of that State should be fairly represented in such convention, and allowed equal rights and privileges with their political brethren from other States in regulating its proceedings.—Neither of these, although perseveringly demanded, was conceded by the recent convention to the Democracy of New York, and they are of course in no degree considered by its decisions. But, although their rights and their duties are thus clear, it is notwithstanding material to the fraternal relations which have heretofore existed between them and those who composed the convention, that it should be distinctly shown at whose door lies the wrong of their exclusion; whether at that of our own delegation or of the convention. Upon this point, both sets of delegates claiming to represent New York, although differing in almost everything else, appear to have concurred in the opinion that the members of the Southern Territory down to and including 36°30, at least eleven acts of Congress have been passed, organizing territories which have since become States, in all of which the constitutional power of Congress to interfere in introduction of slavery into the territories of the United States, if it existed, directly exercised, or clearly asserted by enactments, which, as matters of authority are tantamount to its exercise; and that at the only period when the peace of the slaveholding States was supposed to be seriously endangered by abolition agitation, there was a spontaneous uprising of the people of the North, of both parties, by which agitation was paralyzed, and the South reassured of our fidelity to the compromises of the Constitution.

In the laws for the organization of the territories which now constitute the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa, slavery was expressly prohibited. The laws for the organization of the territories of Mississippi, Orleans, Arkansas, Alabama, and Florida, contained enactments fully equivalent in regard to the extent of power in Congress over the subject of slavery in the territories to the express exercise of it in the other cases. These acts were approved by Presidents Washington, the elder Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and myself, all bound by our oaths of office to withhold our respective approvals from laws which we believed unconstitutional. It is the passage of these laws during a period of half a century, and under the sanction of so many Presidents, there was any thing like sectional divisions, or a greater or less participation in their enactment on the part of the representatives of the slaveholding or of the non slave holding States, that I have ever been treated and regarded as a valid act. This bill received the constitutional approbation of President Washington, whose highest and sworn duty it was to support the constitution under which it was enacted, cite the honor of the advocates of arbitrary power throughout the world.

Holding these opinions, you have duties to perform as important as they are delicate. In the first place you should adhere inflexibly to your opinions as long as you believe them to be right, and to be safe. This you will do. In the next place you should present your views in regard to them, calmly and distinctly, but firmly, to your political brethren of the slave holding States, with all the fraternal and the slave trade by the Quakers of Philadelphia and New York, and by Dr. Franklin, as President of a society for the promotion of Abolition. These petitions were in the House of Representatives referred to a committee of seven, all of whom were Northern members, whose report as amended in the committee of the whole, affirmed that Congress have no power to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them within any of the States, it remaining with the several states alone to provide any regulation therein which humanity and true policy might require.

The perseverance and good faith with which both branches of policy thus adopted have, until very recently, been recognized and carried out, are highly honorable to the whole country. The peculiar liability of the subject to be converted into an element of political agitation, as well in the slaveholding as in the non-slaveholding states, may have led to occasional attempts so to employ it, but these efforts have been very successfully frustrated by the good sense and good feeling of the people in every quarter of the union. A detailed account of the numerous acts of the Federal government, sustaining and carrying into full effect the policy of its founders upon the subject of slavery in the states and in the extension of its territories, and the steps taken, in the non-slaveholding states, to suppress or neutralize undue agitation in regard to it, would be alike instructive and honorable to the actors in them. But it will be readily perceived, that such a work can not be given within the necessary limits of a communication like the present.

It must therefore suffice to say, and from 1787, the date of the ordinance for the prevention of slavery in the North Western Territory down to and including 1850, in that eventful period of our history, we, their descendants, are called upon to guarantee to the states in which slavery existed, conclusive control over the subject, within their respective jurisdictions, but to prevent by mutual efforts, its extension to territories of the United States in which it did not in fact exist.

On all sides the most expeditious means to carry on this policy were adopted with alacrity and good feeling. Their first step was to interdict the introduction of Slavery into the North-western territory, now covered by the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin. This may justly be regarded as being in the main, a Southern measure. The subject was first brought forward in Congress by Mr. Jefferson. Virginia made the cession of territory upon which the ordinance was intended to operate, and the representatives from all the slave-holding states gave it a unanimous support. Doubts have arisen in the minds of some whether the ordinance of 1787 was authorized by the articles of confederation. A bill was introduced in the new Congress at its first session under the constitution recognizing and adapting it to the new government, and so powerful was the influence of the slave-holding states, that it was enacted. The bill received the signature of Washington, whose highest and sworn duty it was to support the constitution under which it was enacted. Thus the South backward in doing its part to sustain the policy which had been wisely adopted. They assented to the insertion of provisions in the constitution necessary and sufficient to protect that interest in the States, and they did more.

The trouble apprehended at the commencement of the government from this source, began to show itself as early as the year 1790, in the form of petitions presented to Congress upon this subject with a view to the abolition of the African slave trade by the Quakers of Philadelphia and New York, and by Dr. Franklin, as President of a society for the promotion of Abolition. These petitions were in the House of Representatives referred to a committee of seven, all of whom were Northern members, whose report as amended in the committee of the whole, affirmed that Congress have no power to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them within any of the States, it remaining with the several states alone to provide any regulation therein which humanity and true policy might require.

The perseverance and good faith with which both branches of policy thus adopted have, until very recently, been recognized and carried out, are highly honorable to the whole country. The peculiar liability of the subject to be converted into an element of political agitation, as well in the slaveholding as in the non-slaveholding states, may have led to occasional attempts so to employ it, but these efforts have been very successfully frustrated by the good sense and good feeling of the people in every quarter of the union. A detailed account of the numerous acts of the Federal government, sustaining and carrying into full effect the policy of its founders upon the subject of slavery in the states and in the extension of its territories, and the steps taken, in the non-slaveholding states, to suppress or neutralize undue agitation in regard to it, would be alike instructive and honorable to the actors in them. But it will be readily perceived, that such a work can not be given within the necessary limits of a communication like the present.

It must therefore suffice to say, and from 1787, the date of the ordinance for the prevention of slavery in the North Western Territory down to and including 1850, in that eventful period of our history, we, their descendants, are called upon to guarantee to the states in which slavery existed, conclusive control over the subject, within their respective jurisdictions, but to prevent by mutual efforts, its extension to territories of the United States in which it did not in fact exist.

On all sides the most expeditious means to carry on this policy were adopted with alacrity and good feeling. Their first step was to interdict the introduction of Slavery into the North-western territory, now covered by the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin. This may justly be regarded as being in the main, a Southern measure. The subject was first brought forward in Congress by Mr. Jefferson. Virginia made the cession of territory upon which the ordinance was intended to operate, and the representatives from all the slave-holding states gave it a unanimous support. Doubts have arisen in the minds of some whether the ordinance of 1787 was authorized by the articles of confederation. A bill was introduced in the new Congress at its first session under the constitution recognizing and adapting it to the new government