LEWISBURG CHRONICLE.

H. C. HICKOK, EDITOR.
O. N. WORDEN, PRINTER.

LEWISBURG, UNION COUNTY, PENN., FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1854.

VOLUME XI.—NO. 6.
WHOLE NUMBER, 526.

The Lewisburg Chronicle.

AN INDEPENDENT FAMILY JOURNAL.

Issued on Friday Mornings, at Lewisburg, Union county, Pennsylvania.

TERMS—$1.50 per year, for cash actually in advance; $1.75, if paid within three months; $2,00 if paid within a year; $2,50 if not paid before the year expires; 5 cts. for a single number. Subscriptions for six months or less to be paid in advance. Any old patron procuring one or more new patrons, shall have the Chronicle at $1 each for himself and the new patrons (for one year only,) cash in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS handsomely inserted at 50 cents per square one week, 25 cents each subsequent insertion. $5 a year. Two squares, $1 for six months, $7 for a year. Mercantile advertisements not exceeding one fourth of a column, $10 a year. Half squares, a half price. Yearly advertisements under half a square, 50 cents per line—15 lines to a square long primer, 16 brevier, 12 nonpareil.

Discontinuances optional with the Publisher, when all dues are not paid; and Interest on all accounts due.

Communications solicited on topics of general interest not within the range of party or sectarian contest. All letters to come post-paid, accompanied by the name and address of the writer, to receive attention. ☞Those relating exclusively to the Editorial Department, to be directed to HENRY C. HICKOK, Esq., *Editor*—and those on business matters to O. N. WORDEN, *Publisher*.

The MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH is located in the office of the *Chronicle*, and arrangements are made to obtain News from the East in advance of the Mails.

Connected with the Office are ample materials for most kinds of JOB PRINTING, which will be executed with neatness and despatch and on reasonable terms.

☞Office on Market Square, north side, second story, 3d door above the Post Office.

O. N. WORDEN, Proprietor.

LEWISBURG CHRONICLE

MAY 12, 1854.

Important to School Directors.

The new school bill which recently passed the Legislature, and received the sanction of the Executive, makes it the duty of the School Directors of the several counties of the Commonwealth to meet in convention at the seat of justice of the proper county, on the *first Monday of June next*, and on the first Monday of May in each third year thereafter, and select *viva voce* by a majority of the whole number of directors present, one person of literary and scientific acquirements and of skill and experience in the art of teaching, as County Superintendent for the three succeeding school years, and the School Directors, or a majority of them in such convention, shall determine the amount of compensation for the County Superintendent, which said compensation shall be paid by the Superintendent of Common Schools by his warrant drawn upon the State Treasurer in half yearly instalments if desired, and shall be deducted from the amount of the State appropriation to be paid the several school districts for said county.

From Wisconsin.

[Correspondence of the Lewisburg Chronicle]

MADISON, Wis., April 29, 1854.

MR. EDITOR: After enduring the storms and snows of a winter of remarkable severity and length, we are enjoying one of the most delightful seasons. Spring, with all her beauty, is here, changing nature from the "sear and yellow leaf," to that of vegetable life and beauty. The prairies, which but a short time ago, had the appearance of a wild and barren waste, are now clothed with verdure. All nature smiles, and we anticipate summer as

"Well apparelled April, on the heel
Of limping Winter treads."

The Legislature of this State adjourned on the 3d inst. The Prohibitory Liquor Bill—as I predicted in my last—was killed by the Senate refusing to recede from their submissive clause, and gasped its last in the hands of a conference committee, thus acquitting either House of directly causing its defeat. The Act of 1853, abolishing capital punishment, was repealed by the passage of a bill reviving the death penalty, and providing for the execution of persons convicted of the crime of murder, at the expiration of *ten years* from the time the murder is committed, during which period the murderer is to be confined in prison. The passage of this bill is certainly a step from the sublime to the ridiculous. The repealed law admitted the murderer to bail, and, consequently, temporary freedom, and frequently—if fortunate enough to elude the summary proceedings of Judge Lynch—resulting in his entire liberty. The present law condemns him to certain death, after enduring the suspense of a half score years' incarceration in a gloomy cell, with his awful destiny constantly before him, that when he leaves what might be termed his *living* charnel house, it will be but to be taunted by a moment's sunshine, and then die the murderer's death. One is too severe—the other too lenient. But the Legislature of the sovereign State of Wisconsin, in their assembled wisdom, have so willed it, and its violators will have to abide its workings. The recent Legislature has certainly not been characterized by a unanimity of action, or a desire to do the "greatest good for the greatest number;" but, on the contrary, by a reckless and profligate expenditure of the people's money that has entirely superseded all previous sessions, and has called down on them the condemnation of a large portion of the press of the State, and certainly not without cause, for their appropriations of money—principally to individuals—was prodigal, and, in many instances, to persons whose claims were very doubtful, and had been rejected by previous Legislatures. The Treasury of Wisconsin has become an enormous drain upon the tax-payers of the State, and it, in turn, is the carcass from which the political leeches are filling their coffers—emulating their party, and enjoying the emoluments of office. This system of State robbing by intelligent and influential, yet unprincipled and corrupt men, is much to be deplored, and ill-becomes the dignity of a nation whose motto and boasted pride is "Equal and exact justice to all men." Yet the hard-working, honest mechanic and farmer, to whom is guarantied by the Constitution his "inalienable rights," is compelled to deprive his children of benefits and advantages, to sustain in responsible stations drunkards and blacklegs, whose moral depravity is only equalled by the total disregard to economy and justice with which they discharge the duties devolving on their respective offices. This system of misrule and the corruption of the men conducting her Public Works, has been the prolific, the *direct* cause of the enormous debt that is now crippling the energies of the Old Keystone, and the greatest curse that ever humbled her national dignity. As long as Pennsylvania retains her Public Works, her debt will never be diminished by the revenue which she *ought* to receive from them; and her Capital will ever be infested by a menial and despicable gang of lazaroni, supplicating in unmanly and degrading humiliation, the elevation to the honorary dignity of "mud-boss," or some equally glorious distinction, where they can gratify their insatiable thievish propensities, and yet more irretrievably plunge the State in debt. (Let not my democratic friends think that I have departed from the faith and gone over to the ranks of the enemy, but be assured that I am "game to the pique" where democratic principles or a question of national policy is involved; but I do not believe that State plundering and self-aggrandizement is an element of democracy, and ought to be discountenanced by every votary of Jackson and Jefferson.) Sell the Public Works, divide Union county, and elect the democratic State ticket, and the "good time coming" will be enjoyed and appreciated by the good people of Pennsylvania. Whether my advice will be *appreciated* and followed, it is not my province to say; but, if not, I will console myself with the assurance that *good* advice rejected returns to enrich the giver's bosom.

—The situation of Madison, both in regard to business and pleasure, can not be equaled by any inland town of the West. Already the elements of a large and prosperous city are apparent, and at no distant day it will be known and visited by both the seekers of wealth and health. By the former to take advantage of its immense manufacturing facilities; the latter to find an asylum in its pure and healthy climate, and a restorative in its picturesque and beautiful Lakes of limpid water. Over 200 buildings are now in course of erection, and as many more will be erected before the season closes. Its improvements are substantial and rapid, and is an earnest of the energy and industry of its citizens. The Milwaukee & Mississippi Railroad is finished within five miles, and will be opened to this place in about two weeks, which will yet greatly enhance the prosperity of the town, and greatly facilitate the speed and comfort of persons coming to it.

—A few days ago, S. M. Booth, of the Milwaukee *Free Democrat*, was met in the streets of that place, by Harvey Burchard—against whom Both had published a libelous article—who forthwith proceeded to deal out sundry kicks, cuffs, and gouges, and pulled his whiskers most lustily—of which latter commodity he (Booth) has a "magnificent luxuriance," being gifted by nature with a very hairy face, and which gift he has never mutilated, but allowed it free, untrammeled, uncombed, but not unpulled sway. Contrary to the injunction of the "higher law," he has entered suit against Burchard, laying his damages at $5,000. Verily, such whiskers are worth possessing! F.

Col. Benton's Nebraska Speech.

(*Concluded.*)

My answer to such a motion is to be found in the whole volume of my political life. I have stood upon the Missouri compromise for above thirty years; and mean to stand upon it to the end of my life; and in doing so shall act, not only according to my own cherished convictions of duty, but according to the often-declared convictions of the General Assembly of my State. The inviolability of that compromise line has often been declared by that General Assembly; and as late as 1847, in these words:

"*Resolved*, That the peace, permanency, and welfare of our national Union depend upon a strict adherence to the letter and spirit of the eighth section of the act of Congress of the United States, entitled, '*An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit slavery in certain territories*,' approved March 6, 1820"—

with an instruction to the Senators, and a request to the Representatives in Congress, to vote accordingly.

"The peace, permanency, and welfare of the Union depend upon a strict adherence to the Missouri compromise line of 1820." So resolved the whole General Assembly of Missouri as late as 1847. I believed the Assembly was right then: I believe it now: and so believing, shall "adhere" to the compromise now, as then, "in spirit and in letter."

I should oppose any movement to impair that compromise, made in an open, direct, manly manner: much more shall I oppose it if made in a covert, indirect, and unmanly way. The bill, or bills before us, undertake to accomplish their object without professing it—upon reasons which are contradictory and unfounded—in terms which are ambiguous and inconsistent—and by throwing on others the responsibility of its own act. It professes not to interfere with the sovereign right of the people to legislate for themselves; and the very first line of this solemn profession throws upon them a horse-load of law, which they have no right to refuse, or time to read, or money to purchase, or ability to understand. It throws upon them all the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable; and that comprehends all that are not specially made for other places; also, it gives them the Constitution of the United States, but without the privilege of voting at presidential or congressional elections, or of making their own judiciary. This is non-interference with a vengeance. A community to be buried under a mountain of strange law, and covered with a constitution under which they are not to have one single political right. Why this circumlocution? this extension of a mountain of irrelevant law, with the exception of the only one relevant and applicable? Sir, it is the crooked, insidious, and pusillanimous way of effecting the repeal of the Missouri compromise line. It includes all law for the sake of leaving out one law; and effects a repeal by an omission, and legislates by an exception. It is a new way of repealing a law, and a bungling attempt to smuggle slavery into the Territory, and all the country out to the Canada line and up the Rocky Mountains. The crooked line of this smuggling process is this: "abolish the compromise line, and extend the Constitution over the country: the Constitution recognizes slavery: therefore, slavery is established as soon as the line is abolished, and the Constitution extended: and being put there by the Constitution, it can not be legislated out." This is the English of this smuggling process; and certainly nothing more unworthy of legislation—more derogatory to a legislative body—was ever attempted to be made into law. Sir, the Constitution was not made for Territories, but for States. Its provisions are all applicable to States, and can not be put in operation in Territories. They can not vote for President, or Vice President, or members of Congress, nor elect their own officers, or prescribe the qualifications of voters, or administer their own laws by their own judges, sheriffs, and attorneys; and the clause extending the Constitution to them is a cheat and an illusion, and a trick to smuggle slavery into the Territory. Nor is it intended that they shall have any legislative right under the Constitution, even in relation to slavery. They may admit it because it is to be there by the Constitution: they can not exclude it because the Constitution puts it there. That is the argument; and it is a juggle worthy of the trick of one egg under three hats at the same time—and under neither at any time. Besides, the Constitution is an organic, not an administrative act. It is a code of principles, not of laws. Not a clause in it can be executed except by virtue of a law made under it—not even the clause for recovering fugitive slaves.

But I am not done yet with the beauties of this mode of repealing a law by an exception. There is a further consequence to be detected in it. The Missouri compromise consists of two distinct parts: first, an abolition of slavery in all the ancient Louisiana north and west of Missouri; secondly, a provision for the recovery of fugitive slaves in the territory made free. By the omitted extension of this section, both these parts are repealed. A tract of country larger than the old thirteen Atlantic States, and bordering a thousand miles on the British dominions, is made an asylum for fugitive slaves. There will be no law to recover a slave from all that vast region. The constitutional provision is limited to States; the provision in the act 1787 is limited to the Northwest Territory; the second part of the Missouri compromise extended this right to all the territory north and west of Missouri; and that being repealed, that right of recovery is lost. I object to this on the part of the State of Missouri—the State to be most injured by converting all the territory north and west of her, quite out to the British line, into an asylum for runaway slaves. The blunder can not be corrected (at least in the opinion of those who deny the constitutional power of Congress to legislate on slavery in Territories) by an act of Congress.

Then comes the reason for excepting the Missouri compromise from the extension which is given to a mass of laws which are not there, and denied to itself which is there. If the reason had been because it was already there, it would have been a logical and comprehensible reason; but that is not the cause assigned; and those which are assigned are actually numerous and curious, and worthy of examination. First, because it was superseded by certain acts of 1850; next, that it is inconsistent with those acts; then that it is inoperative; and finally, that it never was there, being dead in its birth under the Constitution, and void from the beginning.

Let us look into these reasons, *seriatim*, as the lawyers say: and first of supersession. It is said that the measures of 1850 superseded this compromise of 1820. If so, why treat it now as still existing, and therefore to be repealed by an exception in order to get rid of it? If it was repealed in 1850, why do it over again in 1854? Why kill the dead? But it was not superseded; but acknowledged and confirmed by every speaker in 1850 that referred to the subject, and by every act that mentioned it. This being matter of fact, and proven by all sorts of testimony—parole, written, and record—it had to be given up, (though a test of political orthodoxy as long as it stood;) and something else put in its place. Thereupon supersession was itself superseded by "inconsistent." Out of the frying-pan into the fire! Inconsistent signifies inability to stand together—two things which can not stand together—from *con* and *sisto*. Now, what is the fact with respect to the compromises of 1820 and 1850? Can they not stand together? And if not, why knock the one down that is already down? It is now four years since this inability to stand together took effect; and how do the two sets of measures make out together at the end of this time? Perfectly well. They are both on their feet—standing bolt upright—and will stand so forever, unless Congress knocks one or the other of them down. This is fact, known to everybody, and admitted by the bill itself; for if the first is inconsistent with the second, and unable to stand, why all this trouble to put it down? Why trip up the heels of the man already flat on his back on the ground? Then comes another reason—that this compromise of 1820 is inoperative and void. If so, those who are against its operation should be content. It is in the very condition they wish it—useless, powerless, inactive, dead—and no bar to the progress of slavery to the North. Void is vacant, empty, nothing of it. Now, if the line of 36° 30′ is inoperative and void, it is in the condition of a fence pulled down, and the rails carried away, and the field left open for the stock to enter. But the fence is not pulled down yet. The line is not yet inoperative and void. It is an existing substantive line, alive and operating; and operating effectually to bar the progress of slavery to the North; and will so continue to operate until Congress shall stop its operation. Then comes the final reason, that there never was any such line in the world—that it was unconstitutional and void—that it had no existence from the beginning; and that it must not be repealed by a direct act, for that would be to acknowledge its previous existence, and to nullify the Constitutional argument; and, what is more terrible, involve the authors of the doctrine in an inconsistency of their own; and thereby make them, themselves, inoperative and void. And this is the analysis of the reasons for the Nebraska bill—that part of it which is to get rid of the compromise of 1820: untrue, contradictory, suicidal, and preposterous. And why such a farrago of nullities, incongruities, and inconsistencies? Purely and simply to throw upon others—upon the Congress of 1850 and the innocent Constitution—the blame of what the bill itself is doing; the blame of destroying the compromise of 1820; and with it, destroying all confidence between the North and the South, and arraying one half the Union against the other in deadly hostility. It is to be able to throw blame upon the innocent that this farrago is served up to us.

And what is all this hotch-potch for? It is to establish a principle, they say—the principle of non-intervention and of squatter sovereignty. Sir, there is no such principle. The Territories are the children of the States. They are minors under twenty-one years of age; and it is the business of the States, through their delegations in Congress, to take care of these minors until they are of age—until they are ripe for State government, and admit them to an equality with their fathers. That is the law, and the sense of the case; and has been so acknowledged since the first ordinance in 1784, by all authorities, Federal and State, legislative, judicial, and executive. The States in Congress are the guardians of the Territories, and are bound to exercise the guardianship; and can not abdicate it without a breach of trust and a dereliction of duty. Territorial sovereignty is a monstrosity, born of timidity and ambition, hatched into existence in the hot incubation of a presidential canvass, and revolting to the beholders when first presented. Well do I remember that day when it was first shown in the Senate. Mark Antony did not better remember that day when Cæsar first put on that mantle through which he was afterwards pierced with three-and-twenty "envious stabs." It was in the Senate in 1848, and was received as nonsense—as the essence of nonsense—as the quintessence of nonsense—as the five-times distilled essence of political nonsensicality. Why, sir, the Territory itself is the property of the States, and they do what they please with it—permit it to be settled or not, as they please; cut it up by lines, as they please; sell it, or give it away, as they please; chase white people from it, as they please. After this farrago—this *olla-podrida*—comes a little stump speech, injected in the belly of the bill, and which must have a prodigious effect when recited in the prairies, and out towards the frontiers, and up towards the heads of the creeks. I will read it, and I hope without fatiguing the House; for it is both brief and beautiful, and runs thus:

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

This is the speech, and a pretty little thing itself, and very proper to be spoken from a stump in the prairie. It has intent, and a true intent; which is neither to legislate slavery into, or out of any State or Territory. Then why legislate at all? Why all this disturbance if no effect is produced, and things to remain just as they were? Let well enough alone, was the old doctrine; to make well enough still better, is the doctrine of progress; and that in spite of the Italian epitaph, which says: "I was well, and would be better; took physic, and here I am." But the States must be greatly delighted at the politeness and forbearance of this bill. It puts States and Territories upon precise equality with respect to the power of Congress over them. Congress does not mean to put slavery in or out of any State or Territory. To all that polite abnegation, I have to say that, in respect of the States, it is the supererogation of modesty and humility, as Congress happens to have no power to put slavery in them, or out of them; and in respect of the Territories, it is an abdication of a constitutional power and duty; it being the right of Congress to legislate upon slavery in the Territories, and its duty to do so when there is occasion for it—as in 1787 and 1820.

I object to this shilly-shally, willy-won't, don't-can't, style of legislation. It is not legislative. It is not parliamentary. It is not manly. It is not womanly. No woman would talk that way. No shilly-shally in a woman. Nothing of the female gender was ever born young enough, or lived long enough, to get befogged in such a quandary as this. It is one thing or the other with them; and what they say they stick to. No breaking bargains with them. But the end of this stump speech is the best of the whole. Different from good milk, in which the cream rises to the top, it here settles to the bottom, and is in these words:

"Leave it to the people thereof, that is to say, of the States and of the Territories, to regulate slavery for themselves as they please, only subject to the Constitution of the United States."

Certainly this is a new subjection for the States. Heretofore they have been free to regulate slavery for themselves—admit it, or reject it; and that not by virtue of any grant of power in the Constitution, but by virtue of an unsurrendered part of their old sovereignty. It is also new of the Territories. Heretofore they have been held to be wards of Congress, and entitled to nothing under the Constitution but that which Congress extended to them. But this clause is not accidentally here: it is to keep up the dogmas of the Constitution in Territories; but only there in relation to slavery, and that for its admission—not rejection.

Three dogmas now afflict the land: *videlicet*, squatter sovereignty, non-intervention, and no power in Congress to legislate upon slavery in Territories. And this bill asserts the whole three, and beautifully illustrates the whole three, by knocking each on the head with the other, and trampling each under foot in its turn. Sir, the bill does deny squatter sovereignty, and it does intervene, and it does legislate upon slavery in Territories; and for the proof of that, see the bill; and see it, as the lawyers say, *pavim*; that is to say, here, and there, and everywhere. It is a bill of assumptions and contradictions—assuming what is unfounded, and contradicting what it assumes—and balancing every affirmation by a negation. It is a see-saw bill; but not the innocent see-saw which children play on a plank stuck through a fence; but the up and down game of politicians, played at the expense of the peace and harmony of the Union, and to the sacrifice of all business in Congress. It is an amphibological bill, stuffed with monstrosities, hobbled with contradictions, and Badgered with a proviso.

Amphibology is a cause for the rejection of bills, not only by Congress, but by the President when carried to him for his approval. General Jackson rejected one for that cause, and it was less amphibological than this: it was the last night of the last day of his last administration, and a quarter before midnight. Congress had sent him a bill to repeal the specie circular, and to inaugurate the paper money of a thousand local banks as the currency of the Federal Government. It was an object not to be avowed, nor to be done in any direct or palpable manner. Paraphrases, circumlocution, ambidexterity, and ambiguity, were necessary to cover up the design; and it was piled on until it was unintelligible. The President read it, and could make nothing of it: he sent it to his Attorney General, who was equally puzzled. He then returned it, with a message to the Senate, refusing to sign the bill for amphibology. We should reject this bill for the same cause, if for nothing else. Hard is the fate of party fealty. It has to keep up with the everchanging measure. Often have these bills changed; and under every phase they had to be received as a test of orthodoxy; and have more changes to undergo yet; and continue to be a test under all mutations.

And now, what is the object of this movement, which so disturbs Congress and the country? What does it propose to accomplish? To settle a principle, is the answer—the principle of non-intervention, and the right of the people of the Territory to decide the question of slavery for themselves. Sir, there is no such principle. The Territories are the children of the States. They are minors, under age, and it is the business of the States, thro' their delegations in Congress, to take care of them until they are of age—until they are ripe for State Government; then to give them that government, and admit them to an equality with their fathers. That is law, and has been so admitted since the first ordinance, in 1784. The States in Congress are the guardians of the Territories, and are bound to exercise that guardianship; and can not abdicate it without a breach of trust and a dereliction of duty. Way, sir, the Territory itself is the property of the States, and they do with it what they please—permit it to be settled or not, as they please; cut it up by lines, as they please; sell it or give it away, as they please; chase white people from it, as they please. This has been always the case. There is a proclamation now extant of the old Congress of the Confederation, describing the first settlers in the Northwest Territory as "disorderly persons;" and ordering them to be driven off by the military. I remember many such military expulsions in the early settlement of the western country, often executed with severity: burning houses, cutting up corn, destroying fences, and driving off the people at the point of the bayonet, and under the edge of the sabre. As late as 1835–'36, and after the extinction of the Indian title to the Platte country in Missouri, similar orders were given to the then colonel of dragoons commanding on that frontier, the now Senator in Congress, Henry Dodge, to expel the people from that purchase; orders which he executed in gentleness and mercy, going alone, explaining his business, and requiring them to go away; which they did, like good and orderly people; and when he was gone, came back like sensible and industrious people, and secured their pre-emptions. Not only settled, but organized, has been so treated by the Federal Government, and worse; the people driven off and their homes given away. This happened in Arkansas, in 1828, when twelve thousand square miles of her organized territory was given away to the Cherokees, and the people driven away. Why, sir, this very line of 36° 30′, with all the territory on one side of it, and two degrees on the other side, were given away to the King of Spain. This has been the seventy years' practice of the Government—to treat the Territories as property, and the people as uninvited guests, to be entertained, or turned out, as the owner of the house chooses. Five sovereigns these! chased off by the military, and their homes given to Indians or Spaniards. The whole idea of this sovereignty is a novelty, scouted from Congress when it first appeared in the Senate, contradicted by the Constitution, and the whole action of the Government, in all time; and contradicted by the bill itself, which is to secure it. The provisions of the bill are a burlesque upon sovereignty. It gives to the people, instead of receiving from them, an organic act. And what an organic act! One in which they are denied every attribute of sovereignty. Denied freedom of elections; denied freedom of voting; denied choice of their own laws; denied the right of fixing the qualification of voters; subjected to a foreign supervision; and controllable by the Federal Government, which they have no hand in electing; and only allowed to admit, and not reject, slavery. Their sovereignty only extends to the subject of slavery, and only to one side of that—the admitting side; the other half of the power being held to be denied by the Constitution which is extended over them, and which, (according to the reading of the supporters of this bill), forbids any law to be made which will prevent any citizen from going there with his slaves. This is squatter sovereignty, non-intervention, and no power to legislate in Territories upon slavery. And this called a principle—the principle of non-intervention—letting the people alone to settle the question of slavery for themselves. How settle it? That can only be done in an organic act; and they have no such act, nor can have one till they make a constitution for a State government. All the rest is legislation, which settles nothing, and produces contention at every election. Sir, this principle of non-intervention is but the principle of contention—a bone given to the people to quarrel and fight over at every election, and at meetings of their Legislature, until they become a State government. Then, and then only, can they settle the question.

For seventy years—since the year 1784, when the organizing mind of Jefferson drew the first territorial ordinance—we had a uniform method of providing for the government of Territories, all founded upon the clause in the Constitution which authorizes Congress to dispose of, and make rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property in the United States. This mode of government has consisted of three grades, all founded in the right of Congress to govern them. First grade: a Governor and judges, appointed by the United States, to adopt laws from other States, to be in force until disapproved by Congress. Second grade: a Territorial Legislature, when the inhabitants shall amount to five thousand men above the age of twenty-one, composed of a council partly appointed by the United States, and a House of Representatives elected by the people, at the rate of one representative for every five hundred voters, its legislation subject to the approval of Congress. Third grade: entrance on the State government, in full equality with the other States. This is the way these Territories have been governed for seventy years; and I am for adhering to it.

And now what is the excuse for all this disturbance of the country; this breaking up of ancient compromises; arraying one half of the Union against the other, and destroying the temper and business of Congress? What is the excuse for all this turmoil and mischief? We are told it is to keep the question of slavery out of Congress! Great God! It was out of Congress! completely, entirely, for ever out of Congress, unless Congress dragged it in by breaking down the sacred laws which settled it. The question was settled, and done with. There was not an inch square of territory in the Union on which it could be raised without a breach of compromise. The ordinance of '89 settled it in all the remaining part of the Northwest Territory beyond Wisconsin: the compromise line of 36° 30′ settled it in all country north and west of Missouri to the British line, and up to the Rocky Mountains: the organic act of Oregon, made by the people, and sanctioned by Congress, settled it in all that region: the acts for the government of Utah and New Mexico settled it in those two Territories: the compact with Texas, determined the number of slave States to be formed out of that State, settled it there: and California settled it for herself. Now, where was there an inch square of Territory within the United States on which the question could be raised? Nowhere! Not an inch! The question was settled everywhere, not merely by law, but by fact. The work was done, and there was no way to get at the question but by undoing the work! No way for Congress to get the question in, for the purpose of keeping it out, but to break down compromises which kept it out.