

The President and Mr. Douglas.

It is well in politics as in navigation to take observations, and determine latitudes and longitudes. It is not easy to say where we are going, without knowing where we are. The difference which exists between the political reckonings of the President and Mr. Senator Douglas ought surely to be fully examined. They start from the same point, and have a common destination. They are both identified with the same great party, and there is at least a strong presumption that they are equally interested in its preservation and triumph in the future. These facts go far to render it possible that any difference of opinion which may exist between them touching the reception and treatment of the Lecompton constitution may be removed. At all events, it is the obvious duty of all to comprehend the exact nature of the case, and to remove all possible erroneous causes which may exist, tending to under the breach.

Now, then, does Judge Douglas differ from the President? They concur in the principle that the majority should rule. They equally endorse the policy of submitting State constitutions to the people for ratification or rejection. They regard the Territorial Government of Kansas as a legal government. They concede that the Territorial legislature was fully authorized and empowered to call into existence the Lecompton convention, and, of course, that that convention legally, if not numerically, represented the people of the Territory. They do not essentially differ upon the fact connected with the action of the people in calling and electing that convention. They both understand that there was and is now in the Territory a strong party, possibly embracing a majority of the people, who have sought to defeat all efforts to organize a State system through the agency of the territorial authorities. Up to this point there is no essential divergence of opinion between the President and the distinguished Senator; but it must be confessed that inasmuch as they are substantially upon a basis so broad, there ought to be strong hopes that they may yet come together.

The Lecompton constitution having been framed by a duly authorized and organized convention, and having determined upon the sub-

stitution of the slaves, the question at this time is the authority of Congress over both, are to be taken together. It is manifest, indeed, that it was the intention of Congress to place the Territories and the States upon an equal footing in respect to the establishment of their local institutions.

If this is the true construction of the Kansas-Nebraska act, how is it possible to go behind the Lecompton Constitution without a clear violation of its provisions? The obvious purpose of that act was to effect the entire separation of Territorial from Federal politics, and to settle the principle, without touching questions of detail, such as the admission numbers and local organization, upon which new States are to be organized and admitted. We see no necessity for enabling any, or Congress is divested of all right to interfere in Territorial affairs. The principle of non-interference being settled, and Territorial and State independence, in reference to all domestic institutions declared, what reason is there to be urged in favor of special permissive legislation?

Now, then, does Judge Douglas differ from the President?

They concur in the principle that the majority should rule.

They equally endorse the policy of submit-

ting State constitutions to the people for ratification or rejection.

They regard the Territorial Government of

Kansas as a legal government.

They concede that the Territorial legislature was fully authorized and empow-

ered to call into existence the Lecompton

convention, and, of course, that that

convention legally, if not numerically, repre-

sented the people of the Territory.

They do not essentially differ upon the fact connected with the action of the people in calling and electing that convention.

They both understand that there was and is now in the Territory a strong

party, possibly embracing a majority of the people, who have sought to defeat all efforts to organize a State system through the agency of the territorial authorities.

Up to this point there is no essential divergence of opinion between the President and the distinguished Senator;

but it must be confessed that inasmuch as they

are substantially upon a basis so broad, there

ought to be strong hopes that they may yet come together.

The Lecompton constitution having been

framed by a duly authorized and organized con-

vention, and having determined upon the sub-

stitution of the slaves, the question at this time

is the authority of Congress over both,

are to be taken together. It is manifest, indeed,

that it was the intention of Congress to

place the Territories and the States upon an

equal footing in respect to the establish-

ment of their local institutions.

If this is the true construction of the Kansas-

Nebraska act, how is it possible to go behind the

Lecompton Constitution without a clear violation

of its provisions?

The obvious purpose of that

act was to effect the entire separation of

Territorial from Federal politics, and to settle

the principle, without touching questions of

detail, such as the admission numbers and

local organization, upon which new States are

to be organized and admitted.

We see no necessity for enabling any, or

Congress is divested of all right to interfere in

Territorial affairs. The principle of non-inter-

ference being settled, and Territorial and State

independence, in reference to all domestic in-

stitutions declared, what reason is there to be urged

in favor of special permissive legislation?

Now, then, does Judge Douglas differ from

the President?

They concur in the principle that the majority

should rule.

They equally endorse the policy of submit-

ting State constitutions to the people for ratification

or rejection.

They regard the Territorial Government of

Kansas as a legal government.

They concede that the Territorial legislature was

fully authorized and empow-

ered to call into existence the Lecompton

convention, and, of course, that that

convention legally, if not numerically, repre-

sented the people of the Territory.

They do not essentially differ upon the fact connected with the action of the people in calling and electing that convention.

They both understand that there was and is now in the Territory a strong

party, possibly embracing a majority of the people, who have sought to defeat all efforts to organize a State system through the agency of the territorial authorities.

Up to this point there is no essential divergence of opinion between the President and the distinguished Senator;

but it must be confessed that inasmuch as they

are substantially upon a basis so broad, there

ought to be strong hopes that they may yet come together.

The Lecompton constitution having been

framed by a duly authorized and organized con-

vention, and having determined upon the sub-

stitution of the slaves, the question at this time

is the authority of Congress over both,

are to be taken together. It is manifest, indeed,

that it was the intention of Congress to

place the Territories and the States upon an

equal footing in respect to the establish-

ment of their local institutions.

If this is the true construction of the Kansas-

Nebraska act, how is it possible to go behind the

Lecompton Constitution without a clear violation

of its provisions?

The obvious purpose of that

act was to effect the entire separation of

Territorial from Federal politics, and to settle

the principle, without touching questions of

detail, such as the admission numbers and

local organization, upon which new States are

to be organized and admitted.

We see no necessity for enabling any, or

Congress is divested of all right to interfere in

Territorial affairs. The principle of non-inter-

ference being settled, and Territorial and State

independence, in reference to all domestic in-

stitutions declared, what reason is there to be urged

in favor of special permissive legislation?

Now, then, does Judge Douglas differ from

the President?

They concur in the principle that the majority

should rule.

They equally endorse the policy of submit-

ting State constitutions to the people for ratification

or rejection.

They regard the Territorial Government of

Kansas as a legal government.

They concede that the Territorial legislature was

fully authorized and empow-

ered to call into existence the Lecompton

convention, and, of course, that that

convention legally, if not numerically, repre-

sented the people of the Territory.

They do not essentially differ upon the fact connected with the action of the people in calling and electing that convention.

They both understand that there was and is now in the Territory a strong

party, possibly embracing a majority of the people, who have sought to defeat all efforts to organize a State system through the agency of the territorial authorities.

Up to this point there is no essential divergence of opinion between the President and the distinguished Senator;

but it must be confessed that inasmuch as they

are substantially upon a basis so broad, there

ought to be strong hopes that they may yet come together.

The Lecompton constitution having been

framed by a duly authorized and organized con-

vention, and having determined upon the sub-

stitution of the slaves, the question at this time

is the authority of Congress over both,

are to be taken together. It is manifest, indeed,

that it was the intention of Congress to

place the Territories and the States upon an

equal footing in respect to the establish-

ment of their local institutions.

If this is the true construction of the Kansas-

Nebraska act, how is it possible to go behind the

Lecompton Constitution without a clear violation

of its provisions?

The obvious purpose of that

act was to effect the entire separation of

Territorial from Federal politics, and to settle

the principle, without touching questions of

detail, such as the admission numbers and

local organization, upon which new States are

to be organized and admitted.

We see no necessity for enabling any, or

Congress is divested of all right to interfere in

Territorial affairs. The principle of non-inter-

ference being settled, and Territorial and State

independence, in reference to all domestic in-

stitutions declared, what reason is there to be urged

in favor of special permissive legislation?

Now, then, does Judge Douglas differ from

the President?

They concur in the principle that the majority

should rule.

They equally endorse the policy of submit-

ting State constitutions to the people for ratification

or rejection.

They regard the Territorial Government of

Kansas as a legal government.

They concede that the Territorial legislature was

fully authorized and empow-

ered to call into existence the Lecompton