PRESBYTERIAN BANNER & ADVOCATE.

Presbyterian Banner, Vol. VII, No. 13.
Presbyterian Advocate, Vol. XXI, No. 8.

"ONE THING IS NEEDFUL:" "ONE THING HAVE I DESIRED OF THE LORD:" "THIS ONE THING I DO."

WHOLE NO. 325

DAVID McKINNEY, Editor and Proprietor. PUBLICATION OFFICE, GAZETTE BUILDING, FIFTH STREET, ABOVE SMITHFIELD, PITTSBURGH, PA. Philadelphia, South West Corner of Seventh and Chestnut Streets.

TERMS.—IN ADVANCE.

FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1858.

By Mail, or at the Office, $1.50 per Year, Delivered in the City, 1.75 " " } SEE PROSPECTUS.

Original Poetry.

A Psalm of Isaiah.*

1. O Lord, my Saviour and my King,
My faithful Shepherd, constant Friend;
To thee my song of praise I bring,
The grateful knee to thee I bend.

Though long thine anger fiercely burned,
And long thy face was hid from me,
O, sweetest grace! thy wrath is turned,
And now thy presence comforts me.

2. Behold! the Lord my Saviour is;
JEHOVAH is my strength and song;
My fears, henceforth, will I dismiss,
And trust the love I've proved so strong.

3. Henceforth, with joy my thirsty soul
Shall draw Salvation from those wells—
Whose living waters, pure and cool,
Cleanse all my guilt, sooth all mine ills.

4. O, join with me to praise the Lord!
His deeds through all the earth proclaim;
And that his power may be adored,
Make mention of his glorious name!

5. Sing to the Lord, ye nations sing!
Great things, and wondrous hath he done;
Let all the earth his praises ring,
For all the earth his works hath known!

6. Sing to the Lord, ye ransom'd throng
That dwell on Zion's sacred hill!
The grateful melody prolong
Till earth and heaven his praises fill!

Sing to the Lord, the living God,
The Holy One of Israel;
Who makes our Zion his abode,
And in her midst shall ever dwell!

* Isaiah, chapter xii.

Steubenville, Ohio. H.C.M.

From our London Correspondent.

The Bishop of London's Visitation—The Charge to the Clergy—Its Leading Topics—Extent of the Diocese—Church Rates—Ritualistic Practices—The Confessional—Justification by Faith—The Tercentenary of Protestantism—The Bishop of Ripon on the Social Blessings of the Reformation—The Presbytery of London and its action—The Dissenters and their Silence—A Quaker Revolution—The Evangelization of London—Lord Brougham and the Religious Press—Memorial to Lord Derby, on India—The "Funny Pulpit"—Mr. Spurgeon's Recovery—Postscript.

LONDON, November 18th, 1858.

THE PRIMARY CHARGE of the Bishop of London has excited, this week, much public interest. I went to the Cathedral of St. Paul's, and found some Episcopal clerical friends there to give me a seat on one of the chairs set apart for the Metropolitan Presbyters, and was doubtless regarded by all the clergy around me as one of the "clergy" of the diocese. If so, this was a mistake; but thinking of the apostolicity of Presbyterian ordination, I ventured to think that I was as really and truly a Presbyter as any of them.

The Bishop's charge was delivered under the mighty dome in the vast area of the nave, which has just been fitted up most admirably and comfortably for the intending Sabbath evening sermons to the working classes. The *usual* mode has been for the Bishop to address the clergy in the choir of the Cathedral, in batches, so to speak, for four or five days in succession, reading to them the same charge. But on this occasion the Bishop summoned and addressed the whole of the clergy of his diocese at once, and there were at least one thousand present, including rectors, vicars, and curates, not to speak of canons and prebendaries connected with the Cathedral itself.

The Bishop walked up the church, followed by his chaplains and a body of the clergy. Immediately after they were seated, the Litany was gone through, two precentors intoning it, and the organ choristers and the assembly (including a large background of laity, male and female,) giving the responses. Several collects and forms of prayer were added, but the whole service did not occupy more than half an hour.

Dr. Tait entered the temporary desk, and after a short prayer, proceeded at once to the delivery of his Charge. It was a most elaborate document, and comprehensive, also, as well as weighty and impressive. Its delivery occupied not less than four hours. He commenced by noticing the fact that the day on which he spake (17th November,) was the 300th anniversary of the accession of Queen Elizabeth, and of the consequent cessation of Romish persecution, and of the establishment of the Protestant religion in England. He next passed a eulogium on his predecessor, Bishop Blomfield, especially in his having consecrated one hundred and ninety-eight churches, of the building of which, for the masses, he had been the chief promoter. He adverted, in this part of the charge, to the vast population in the diocese of London. It comprises the East, North, and West side of the Thames and of the metropolis. (The Bishop of Winchester is diocesan on the Surrey and Southern side of the river.) This area, with rural suburban parishes, comprises a population of about two millions four hundred thousand souls. Of these, a large proportion frequent no place of worship whatever.

The Bishop referred to the vexed question of Church Rates, and the probability of a settlement of it next session of Parliament. The great lesson which these secular matters taught, was that the days were gone by when the Church of England could look to be propped up by the adventitious aid of secular authority, if it was not true to its mission and its Great Head. "Above all things, it is important for us to remember that our strength is not in the temporal, but the spiritual."

On Ritualistic Observances, the Bishop spoke out fully and strongly. This part of the charge was listened to with great interest. On the one hand, he deprecated the "morose Puritanism" which ignored all architectural beauty in church architecture, and the bringing in of music the most solemnly beautiful into the service of the house of the Lord. But if any man's love of the beautiful leads him to think more of good singing than of faithful preaching, or if he resolutely insist on his own views, his zeal proceeds to a dangerous extreme. Then, as to Romanizing practices, it was asked, "Why should any clergyman make his church such that a common man, placed suddenly within it, would not be able to say whether he was in a Church of England, or in a Romish place of worship? Excessive floral decorations, and continual bowings and genuflections, and candles lighted in broad day, and peculiar scarfs and vestments, and the other mimicry of the outside of Rome, may be acceptable to a few of the laity, but the mass of religious persons among common sense Englishmen look upon such things as folly, at the best.

"The great body of the educated cannot endure them, because they are trifling with holy worship, and in miserable taste; while the common sort of the well disposed and religious are not only irritated by them, but rendered suspicious, not without ground, that something really dangerous lurks behind."

Your readers can conceive how the Evangelical clergy looked—smiling and nodding—at one another, at such pithy passages as these, and how the Tractarians would look black as Erebus. I saw only a few, in the cut of whose dress, and in the parting in the middle of whose hair, as well as that priestly aspect of the face which Tractarianism gives, whom I could identify as of the party. The mass of faces were of the honest, open, English type.

Some of these Tractarian gentry had to hand in, last week, with others, their papers, proving their titles to their parishes or incumbencies. One of these, (I have it on good clerical authority,) a notorious Tractarian, near Oxford Street, came up to the Bishop, who said: "Mr. R, I am told you have candles burning on the communion table during Divine service." "Yes, my Lord." "Are you aware, sir, that it is illegal?" After a pause—"Yes, my Lord." "You will remove them, then?" "Yes, my Lord!"

The influence of these priests *over women*, is greatly to be deplored. I know a lady, the widow of a Presbyterian and a Scotchman, (born herself in the English Church,) who settled, after her husband's death, near a Tractarian church, in the North-West of London. She is now a devotee; spent, last Christmas, large sums for floral decorations for "the altar;" and, though left well off, is actually embarrassed in circumstances by her excessive gifts. When her son was lately ill of fever, (her residence is next door to the church,) the clergy and people offered prayer in front of the house, for his recovery. Thus the whole family is being perverted.

The exaggerated idea of the authority of the Presbyter, in the Bishop's opinion, finds its full development in the attempt to set up the Confessional. He dwelt with great power on the *silence* of the Church of England formularies, as compared with those of Rome, in treating of systematic confession. Here he read extracts from the Tridentine Catechism, in the original Latin. Never have I heard Latin read so well, and so distinctly. It was hardly possible for any one who knew the language moderately well, not to be able to follow the meaning.

He also showed the marked difference between the first prayer-book of Edward VI., (1549,) and the revised prayer-book of 1552. He also quoted from the Book of Homilies, the famous passage in which, on the text, "Confess your faults one to another," it is distinctly said, that "if this binds the laity to confess to the clergy, it equally binds the clergy to confess to the laity," showing that the Reformers did not believe in the priestly and absorbing power of the Presbyter. The danger now is, "lest a mode of teaching should gain ground, which will exalt the sacraments into superstitious charms, and would make the clergy spiritual despots over the laity." "Depend upon it, that real faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, such as our Church teaches, is the effectual cause of the soul's salvation, is not strengthened by teaching our people thus to lean on *the unauthorized mediation of man.*" That the Bishop thus holds justification by faith only, "the *articulus stantis, vel cadentis ecclesiæ,*" is very satisfactory. He seems to me, however, too ready to recognize the piety and soundness of faith, *in the main*, of the Romanizers. This is the weakness of his position as a consistent Bishop of a "compromise" Church. The Evangelicals, as a body, do *not* go with him here, and his attempts to fuse the parties together will necessarily fail.

I must leave other parts of the charge unnoticed, for the present.

The TERCENTENARY OF THE REFORMATION, (on the 17th November,) has been celebrated in different parishes and districts, both metropolitan and country. Dr. Hugh McNeil preached very eloquently on the subject, before the Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, and the officers and pupils of King Edward's School, in Christ church, Newgate Street, while Dr. Trench preached at Westminster Abbey. Dr. Cumming also gave two discourses on the subject.

The Bishop of Ripon, the previous evening, opened the Winter Series of Lectures, in Exeter Hall, before the Young Men's Christian Association, by a stirring address on "The Social Blessings of the Reformation." The results which flowed from it, he said, were three fold—political, social, and religious. "There is not an inhabitant of the Kingdom, who does not at this hour reap benefit, directly or indirectly, from the Reformation—not a noble, not a peasant, not a Roman Catholic, not a Churchman, or a Dissenter, who was not freer and happier than he would have been, had not the great conflict of the sixteenth century issued in the downfall of the Papal domination in this country." This statement was received with great enthusiasm. The Bishop also quoted the Duke of Wellington to the same effect, who said, in 1844, "not only our whole system of religion, but of toleration, depended on the Reformation."

In enumerating the "*social benefits*," the first mentioned was, the deliverance of the country from that tyranny of the Papacy, which had, by its bulls, made monarchs tremble on their thrones, and plunged whole nations into confusion and anarchy. The effects of a papal interdict, as described by Hume, were here quoted with great effect.

Another social benefit, was, deliverance from the terrors of excommunication, exercised on a superstitious and priest-ridden population. Deliverance also from obligation to engage in foreign wars to further Papal designs—from the power of Rome to present to vacant benefices—from the enormous expense—from appeals to the Pope in judicial cases—the suppression of Monasteries, (containing fifty thousand idle persons, preying on the people in the reign of Henry VIII;) all these were among the negative, yet important benefits of the Reformation.

But the benefits of a positive kind were immense. The human intellect was disenchained, and the diffusion of philosophy and science were not to be forgotten. Here the Bishop quoted a powerful passage from Robert Hall's writings, adding, that had that great man lived now, and have seen the astonishing mental activity that prevailed, and the rich results of the last twenty five years, it would have put his imagination and eloquence to the test, to depict their glory.

Again: to the Reformation was to be attributed the elevation of public morality. Before the Reformation the clergy were dissolute in their lives, and the people very wicked. Seventy-two thousand thieves were executed in one reign.

The Bishop of Ripon concluded by a denunciation of the Confessional, and of the attempts recently made to unprotestantize England. The religious conflict of the day turned on the question, "Shall we cling tenaciously to the principles of the Reformation, or, one by one, shall we surrender those principles, till, at length, the distinction between the two creeds is lost, and Protestant England, faithless to the Reformation, is folded again into the embrace of the Papacy?"

This well-timed lecture was received with great enthusiasm, and was worthy of the nephew of the lamented Edward Bickersteth. The manifold testimony this week lifted up on behalf of the Reformation, throughout the country, is most providentially seasonable, and I trust and believe will be crowned with a blessing.

The PRESBYTERIANS OF LONDON have had a demonstration of their own, in commemoration of Elizabeth's accession. It was agreed that a public meeting should be held, in one of our churches in the West End. Dr. McCrie read a paper on "Elizabeth and the Reformation," and Dr. Hamilton, and other members of the Presbytery, addressed the Assembly. Of course the Presbytery knew well, and did not hesitate to condemn the act, that Elizabeth persecuted the Puritans. But looking at the death of Bloody Mary, in connexion with the inauguration of a new era in England's history, they expressed their thankfulness to God accordingly. Even Neale, the Puritan Historian, acknowledges how greatly the country was indebted to Elizabeth. She was the firm supporter of the Protestant Lords of the Congregation in Scotland against Mary of Guise, and the designs of France, and the foreign Protestants also shared in her practical sympathy and support. The destruction of the Spanish armada in her reign, makes that reign immortal to all haters of spiritual despotism.

The Dissenters, *as a body*, have *not* joined in this commemoration, although a strong appeal was made to them by Sir Culling Eardley. There were, however, a number of exceptions to the general statement which I have made, and it is not to be supposed that the English Nonconformists do not love the principles of the Reformation because of their silence on this occasion. The truth is, that while the Puritanism of the Church of England *now* furnishes the party which commemorates Elizabeth's accession, she was the persecutor of the Puritan clergy. Nay, she suspended an Archbishop who favored the "prophesyings" of the clergy, (meetings for the study of the Scriptures,) and she declared that one preacher was enough for a whole county!

Turning to a very *quiet* body of people, THE QUAKERS, it may not be uninteresting to Pennsylvanians to be informed that a conference of three hundred of the members has been held in London, at which it has been agreed so far to sanction marriages between individuals of the community, (though not in membership,) as to allow them to take place in religious meetings. Besides this, all restrictions in regard to what is called plainness of speech, behavior, and apparel, may also be discontinued; but confirming its ancient testimony in favor of Christian moderation in these matters. It is thus that the Society of Friends finds it necessary to yield to the spirit of the age, and is undergoing a gradual revolution. The diminution of the numbers of this excellent body of citizens is considerable, and a very large number of essays have been sent in, in connexion with the prizes offered for the best solution of the causes which have arrested the progress of Quakerism in England.

The EVANGELIZATION OF LONDON occupies the increasing attention of Protestant Nonconformists. The idea of *individual responsibility* is beginning to be solemnly realized. "A contribution," said S. Morley, Esq., at a recent meeting, "toward the support of a City Missionary, would not compound for individual neglect, and free a man from responsibility. If a man or woman could not go beyond the household to call upon sick persons, work at home might be found among domestic servants." The importance of bringing individual effort to bear on young men in warehouses, and upon the working men, was also dwelt upon. This very week a conference has been held at Birmingham, as to the best mode of spiritual access to the males of the working classes.

THE RELIGIOUS PRESS has been harshly animadverted on by Lord Brougham, and in return, he has received such severe handling from Dr. Campbell, of the *British Standard*, that he (Lord B.) referred to the matter a second time, in the way of self-justification. He made no answer to the just accusation that he had once affirmed, before the students of Glasgow, that a man was no more responsible for his belief than for the color of his skin or the height of his stature. Once on a time he had presented the Socialist, Robert Owen, to the Queen; that he does not deny; but he "only introduced him as the Father of Infant Schools," and he (Lord B.) had nothing to do with Owen's "*opinions*." At the same time, he takes occasion to bespatter with praise the Bishop of Oxford, and with abuse those who hissed him at Bradford.

The real truth of the matter is, that Lord Brougham was always a Secularist, even in his philanthropy—hates Evangelism, and has no sympathy, I fear, with Bible Christianity. This is much to be deplored.

A FRESH MEMORIAL on India has been presented to Lord Derby, and a meeting, at which the Duke of Argyle presided, has been held at Edinburgh, urging on the Government the adoption of the Christian policy suggested and advocated by Sir John Lawrence.

The "FUNNY PULPIT," as it has been called, has commenced a fresh Winter campaign. Thus, Mr. Mursell has lectured at Manchester, the last two Sabbaths, on "Stand at Ease," and "Lodgings to Let." This is going quite far enough out of the beaten track. Still greater flippancy is shown in the title of lectures at Huddersfield, "Breach of Promise," and at Halifax, where a Rev. Mr. Walters has taken as subjects, "Love's Labor Lost," and "Light of Other Days."

MR. SPURGEON is recovering from his illness, and preached in the Surry Music Hall, last Lord's day, on the text, "Though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness, through manifold temptations." There is a fine, healthy conservatism about his mind, which is of the true Saxon style, and better still, the *fullness* of the Gospel is grasped and preached by him. J.W.

P. S.—Count D'Alembert's trial is postponed till the 24th inst.

Lords Palmerston and Clarendon are on a visit to the Emperor, at Compiegne, for four days. He cultivates the society of Ex-Ministers, not knowing but that some day they may be in office again.

President's Message.

Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and House of Representatives:

When we compare the condition of the country at the present day with what it was one year ago, at the meeting of Congress, we have much reason for gratitude to that Almighty Providence, which has never failed to interpose for our relief, at the most critical periods of our history. One year ago, the sectional strife between the North and South, on the dangerous subject of slavery, had again become so intense as to threaten the peace and perpetuity of the confederacy. The application for the admission of Kansas as a State into the Union, fostered this unhappy agitation, and brought the whole subject once more before Congress. It was the desire of every patriot that such measures of legislation might be adopted as would remove the excitement from the States and confine it to the Territory where it legitimately belonged. Much has been done, I am happy to say, towards the accomplishment of this object, during the last session of Congress.

KANSAS.

The Supreme Court of the United States had previously decided, that all American citizens have an equal right to take into the Territories, whatever is held as property under the laws of any of the States, and to hold such property there under the guardianship of the federal constitution, so long as the territorial condition shall remain.

This is now a well-established position, and the proceedings of the last session were alone wanting to give it practical effect. The principle has been recognized, in some form or other, by an almost unanimous vote of both houses of Congress, that a territory has a right to come into the Union either as a free or a slave State, according to the will of its people. The just equality of all the States has been thus vindicated, and a fruitful source of dangerous dissensions among them has been removed.

Whilst such has been the beneficial tendency of your legislative proceedings outside of Kansas, their influence has nowhere been so happy as within that Territory itself. Left to manage and control its own affairs in its own way, without the pressure of external influence, the revolutionary Topeka organization and all resistance to the Territorial Government established by Congress, have been finally abandoned. As a natural consequence, that fine Territory now appears to be tranquil and prosperous, and is attracting increasing thousands of immigrants to make it their happy home.

The past unfortunate experience of Kansas has enforced the lesson, so often already taught, that resistance to lawful authority, under our form of government, cannot fail in the end to prove disastrous to its authors. Had the people of the Territory yielded obedience to the laws enacted by their legislature, it would at the present moment have contained a large additional population of industrious and enterprising citizens, who have been deterred from entering its borders by the existence of civil strife and organized rebellion.

It was the resistance to rightful authority and the persevering attempts to establish a revolutionary government under the Topeka Constitution, which caused the people of Kansas to commit the grave error of refusing to vote for delegates to the convention to frame a constitution, under a law not denied to be fair and just in its provisions. This refusal to vote has been the prolific source of all the evils which have followed. In their hostility to the Territorial Government, they disregarded the principle, absolutely essential to the working of our form of government, that a majority of those who vote—not the majority who may remain at home, from whatever cause—must decide the result of an election. For this reason, seeking to take advantage of their own error, they denied the authority of the Convention thus elected to frame a constitution.

The Convention, notwithstanding, proceeded to adopt a Constitution unexceptionable in its general features, and providing for the submission of the slavery question to a vote of the people, which, in my opinion, they were bound to do, under the Kansas and Nebraska act. This was the all-important question which had alone convulsed the Territory; and yet the opponents of the lawful Government, persisting in their first error, refrained from exercising their right to vote, and preferred that slavery should continue, rather than surrender their revolutionary Topeka organization.

A wiser and better spirit seemed to prevail before the first Monday of January last, when an election was held under the constitution. A majority of the people then voted for a Governor and other State officers, for a member of Congress, and members of the State Legislature. This election was warmly contested by the two political parties in Kansas, and a greater vote was polled than at any previous election. A large majority of the members of the legislature elect belonged to that party which had previously refused to vote. The anti slavery party were thus placed in the ascendant, and the political power of the State was in their own hands. Had Congress admitted Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton constitution, the Legislature might, at its very first session, have submitted the question to a vote of the people, whether they would or would not have a convention to amend their Constitution, either on the slavery or any other question, and have adopted all necessary means for giving speedy effect to the will of the majority. Thus the Kansas question would have been immediately and finally settled.

Under these circumstances, I submitted to Congress the Constitution thus framed, with all the officers already elected necessary to put the State government into operation, accompanied by a strong recommendation in favor of the admission of Kansas as a State. In the course of my long public life I have never performed any official act which, in the retrospect, has afforded me more heartfelt satisfaction. Its admission could have inflicted no possible injury on any human being, whilst it would, within a brief period, have restored peace to Kansas and harmony to the Union. In that event, the slavery question would ere this have been finally settled, according to the legally expressed will of a majority of the voters, and popular sovereignty would thus have been vindicated in a constitutional manner.

With my deep convictions of duty, I could have pursued no other course. It is true, that, as an individual, I had expressed an opinion, both before and during the session of the Convention, in favor of submitting the remaining clauses of the Constitution, as well as that concerning slavery, to the people. But, acting as an official character, neither myself nor any human authority had the power to rejudge the proceedings of the Convention, and declare the constitution which it had framed as a nullity. To have done this would have been a violation of the Kansas and Nebraska act, which left the people of the Territory "perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution of the United States." It would equally have violated the great principle of popular sovereignty, at the foundation of our institutions, to deprive the people of the power, if they thought proper to exercise it, of confiding to delegates elected by themselves the trust of framing a Constitution, without requiring them to subject their constituents to the trouble, expense and delay of a second election. It would have been in opposition to many precedents in our history, commencing in the very heritage of the Republic, of the admission of Territories as States into the Union, without a previous vote of the people approving their Constitution.

It is to be lamented that a question so insignificant when viewed in its practical effects on the people of Kansas, whether decided one way or the other, should have kindled such a flame of excitement throughout the country. This reflection may prove to be a lesson of wisdom and of warning for our future guidance. Practically considered, the question is simply whether the people of that Territory should first come into the Union and then change any provision in their Constitution not agreeable to themselves, or accomplish the very same object by remaining out of the Union and framing another Constitution in accordance with their will? In either case, the result would be precisely the same. The only difference in point of fact is, that the object would have been much sooner attained, and the pacification of Kansas more speedily effected, had it been admitted as a State during the last session of Congress.

My recommendation, however, for the immediate admission of Kansas, failed to meet the approbation of Congress. They deemed it wiser to adopt a different measure for the settlement of the question. For my own part, I should have been willing to yield my assent to almost any constitutional measure to accomplish this object. I, therefore, cordially acquiesced in what has been called the English Compromise, and approved the "Act for the admission of the State of Kansas into the Union" upon the terms therein prescribed.

Under the ordinance which accompanied the Lecompton constitution, the people of Kansas had claimed double the quantity of public lands for the support of common schools, which have ever been previously granted to any State upon entering the Union; and also the alternate sections of land for twelve miles on each side of two railroads, proposed to be constructed from the northern to the southern boundary, and from the eastern to the western boundary of the State. Congress, deeming these claims unreasonable, provided, by the act of May 4, 1858, to which I have just referred, for the admission of the State on an equal footing with the original States, but "upon the fundamental condition precedent" that a majority of the people thereof, at an election to be held for that purpose, should, in the place of the very large grants of public lands which they had demanded under the ordinance, accept such grants as had been made to Minnesota and other new States. Under this act should a majority reject the proposition offered them, "it shall be deemed and held that the people of Kansas do not desire admission into the Union with said Constitution under the conditions set forth in said proposition." In that event, the act authorizes the people of the Territory to elect delegates to form a Constitution and State government for themselves, "whenever, and not before, it is ascertained by a census, duly and legally taken, that the population of said Territory equals or exceeds the ratio of representation required for a member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States." The delegates thus assembled "shall first determine by a vote whether it is the will of the people of the proposed State to be admitted into the Union at that time, and, if so, shall proceed to form a Constitution, and take all necessary steps for the establishment of a State government in conformity with the federal constitution." After this Constitution shall have been formed, Congress, carrying out the principles of popular sovereignty and non-intervention, have left the "mode and manner of its approval or ratification by the people of the proposed State" to be "prescribed by law," and they "shall then be admitted into the Union as a State under such Constitution thus fairly and legally made, with or without slavery, as said Constitution may prescribe."

An election was held throughout Kansas, in pursuance of the provisions of this act, on the second day of August last, and it resulted in the rejection, by a large majority, of the proposition submitted to the people by Congress. This being the case, they are authorised to form another Constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union, but not until their number, as ascertained by a census, shall equal or exceed the ratio required to elect a member to the House of Representatives.

It is not probable, in the present state of the case, that a third Constitution can be lawfully framed and presented to Congress by Kansas, before its population shall have reached the designated number. Nor is it to be presumed that, after their sad experience in resisting the Territorial laws, they will attempt to adopt a Constitution in express violation of the provisions of an act of Congress. During the session of 1856, much of the time of Congress was occupied on the question of admitting Kansas under the Topeka constitution. Again, nearly the whole of the last session was devoted to the question of its admission under the Lecompton constitution. Surely it is not unreasonable to require the people of Kansas to wait, before making a third attempt, until the number of their inhabitants shall amount to ninety-three thousand four hundred and twenty. During this brief period, the harmony of the States, as well as the great business interests of the country, demand that the Union shall not for a third time be convulsed by another agitation on the Kansas question.—By waiting for a short time and acting in obedience to law, Kansas will glide into the Union, without the slightest impediment.

NEW STATES.

This excellent provision, which Congress have applied to Kansas, ought to be extended and rendered applicable to all Territories which may hereafter seek admission into the Union.

Whilst Congress possesses the undoubted power of admitting a new State into the Union, however small may be the number of inhabitants, yet this power ought not, in my opinion to be exercised before the population shall amount to the ratio required by the act for the admission of Kansas. Had this been previously the rule, the country would have escaped all the evils and misfortunes to which it has been exposed by the Kansas question.

Of course, it would be unjust to give this rule a retrospective application, and exclude a State which, acting upon the past practice of the government, has already formed its Constitution, elected its Legislature and other officers, and is now prepared to enter the Union.

The rule ought to be adopted, whether we consider its bearing on the people of the Territories or upon the people of the existing States. Many of the serious dissensions which have prevailed in Congress and throughout the country, would have been avoided, had this rule been established at an earlier period of the Government.

Immediately upon the formation of a new Territory, people from different States and from foreign countries rush into it, for the laudable purpose of improving their condition. Their first duty to themselves is to open and cultivate farms, to construct roads, to establish schools, to erect places of religious worship, and to devote their energies generally to reclaim the wilderness and to lay the foundations of a flourishing and prosperous Commonwealth. If, in this incipient condition, with a population of a few thousand, they should prematurely enter the Union, they are oppressed by the burden of State taxation, and the means necessary for the improvement of the Territory and the advancement of their own interests, are thus diverted to very different purposes.

The Federal Government has ever been a liberal parent to the Territories, and a generous contributor to the useful enterprises of the people who live in them. It has met the expenses of their governments and legislative assemblies out of the common treasury, and thus relieved them from a heavy charge. Under these circumstances, nothing can be better calculated to retard their material progress, than to divert them from their useful employments, by prematurely exciting angry political contests among themselves, for the benefit of aspiring leaders. It is surely no hardship for aspiring Territories, Senators, and members of Congress, to wait until the number of inhabitants shall equal those of a single congressional district. They surely ought not to be permitted to rush into the Union, with a population less than one-half of several of the large counties in the interior of some of the States. This was the condition of Kansas when it made application to be admitted under the Topeka constitution. Besides, it requires some time to remove the mass of a population collected in a new Territory, at all homogeneous, and to unite them on any thing like a fixed policy. Establish the rule, and all will look forward to it and govern themselves accordingly.

But justice to the people of the several States requires that this rule should be established by Congress. Should the people of the States fail to elect a Vice President, the power devolves upon the Senate to select this officer from the two highest candidates on the list. In case of the death of the President, the Vice President thus elected by the Senate, becomes President of the United States. On all questions of legislation, the Senators from the smallest States of the Union have an equal vote with those from the largest. The same may be said in regard to the ratification of treaties, and of Executive appointments. All this has worked admirably in practice, whilst it conforms in principle with the character of a government instituted by sovereign States. I presume no American citizen would desire the slightest change in the arrangement. Still is it not unjust and unequal to the existing States to invest some forty or fifty thousand people collected into a Territory with the attributes of sovereignty, and place them on an equal footing with Virginia and New York in the Senate of the United States?

For these reasons, I earnestly recommend the passage of a general act, which shall provide that upon the application of a Territorial legislature, declaring their belief that the Territory contains a number of inhabitants which, if in a State, would entitle them to elect a member of Congress, it shall be the duty of the President to cause a census of the inhabitants to be taken, and if found sufficient, then by the terms of this act to authorize them to proceed "in their own way" to frame a State constitution preparatory to admission into the Union. I also recommend that an appropriation may be made, to enable the President to take a census of the people of Kansas.

UTAH.

The present condition of the Territory of Utah, when contrasted with what it was one year ago, is a subject for congratulation. It was then in a state of open rebellion, and cost what it might, the character of the government required, that this rebellion should be suppressed and the Mormons compelled to yield obedience to the Constitution and the laws. In order to accomplish this object, and as I informed you in my last annual message, I appointed a new Governor instead of Brigham Young, and other federal officers to take the place of those who, consulting their personal safety, had found it necessary to withdraw from the Territory. To protect these civil officers, and to aid them as a *posse comitatus*, in the execution of the laws in case of need, I ordered a detachment of the army to accompany them to Utah. The necessity for adopting these measures is now demonstrated.

On the 15th September, 1857, Governor Young issued his proclamation, in the style of an independent sovereign, announcing his purpose to resist by force of arms the entry of the United States troops into our own Territory of Utah. By this he required all the forces in the Territory, to "hold themselves in readiness to march at a moment's notice to repel any and all such invasion," and established martial law from its date throughout the Territory. These proved to be no idle threats. Forts Bridger and Supply were vacated and burnt down by the Mormons, to deprive our troops of a shelter after their long and fatiguing march. Orders were issued by Daniel H. Wells, styling himself "Lieutenant General, Nauvoo Legion," to stampede the animals of the United States troops on their march to set fire to their trains, to burn the grass and the whole country before them and on their flanks, to keep them from sleeping by night surprises, and to blockade the road by felling trees, and destroying the fords of rivers, &c., &c., &c.

These orders were promptly and effectually obeyed. On the 4th October, 1857, the Mormons captured and burned on Green River, three of our supply trains, consisting of seventy-five wagons, loaded with provisions and tents for the army, and carried away several hundred animals. This diminished the supply of provisions so materially that General Johnston was obliged to reduce the ration, and even with this precaution, there was only sufficient left to subsist the troops until the first of June.

Our little army behaved admirably in their encampment at Fort Bridger, under these trying privations. In the midst of the mountains, in a dreary, unsettled, and inhospitable region, more than a thousand miles from home, they passed the severe and inclement winter without a murmur. They looked forward with confidence for relief from their country in due season, and in this they were not disappointed.

The Secretary of War employed all his energies to forward them the necessary supplies, and to muster and send such a military force to Utah as would render resistance on the part of the Mormons hopeless, and thus terminate the war without the effusion of blood. In his efforts he was efficiently sustained by Congress. They granted appropriations sufficient to cover the deficiency thus necessarily created, and also provided for raising two regiments of volunteers, for the purpose of quelling disturbances in the Territory of Utah, for the protection of supply and emigrant trains, and the suppression of Indian hostilities on the frontiers. Happily, there was no occasion to call these regiments into service. If there had been, I should have felt serious embarrassment in selecting them, so great was the number of our brave and patriotic citizens anxious to serve their country in this distant and apparently dangerous expedition. Thus it has ever been, and thus may it ever be!

The wisdom and economy of sending sufficient reinforcements to Utah, are established not only by the event, but in the opinion of those who, from their position and opportunities, are the most capable of forming a correct judgment. General Johnston, the commander of the forces, in addressing the Secretary of War from Fort Bridger, under date of October 18, 1857, expresses the opinion that "unless a large force is sent here, from the mature of the country, a protracted war on their (the Mormons) part is inevitable." This he considered necessary, to terminate the war "speedily and more economically than if attempted by insufficient means."

In the meantime, it was my anxious desire that the Mormons should yield obedience to the Constitution and the laws, without rendering it necessary to resort to military force. To aid in accomplishing this object, I deemed it advisable, in April last, to dispatch two distinguished citizens of the United States, Messrs. Powell and M'Culloch, to Utah. They bore with them a Proclamation addressed by myself to the inhabitants of Utah, dated on the sixth day of that month, warning them of their true condition, and how hopeless it was on their part to persist in rebellion against the United States, and offering all those who should submit to the laws a full pardon for their past seditious and treasons. At the same time, I assured those who should persist in rebellion against the United States, that they must expect no further lenity, but look to be rigorously dealt with according to their deserts. The instructions to these agents, as well as a copy of the Proclamation, and their reports, are herewith submitted. It will be seen by their report of the 3d of July last, that they have fully confirmed the opinion expressed by Gen. Johnston in the previous October, as to the necessity of sending reinforcements to Utah. In this they state, that they "are firmly impressed with the belief that the presence of the army here and the large additional force that had been ordered to this Territory, were the chief inducements that caused the Mormons to abandon the idea of resisting the authority of the United States. A less decisive policy would probably have resulted in a long, bloody and expensive war."

These gentlemen conducted themselves to my entire satisfaction, and rendered useful services in executing the humane intentions of the government.

It also affords me great satisfaction to state that Governor Cumming has performed his duty in an able and conciliatory manner, and with the happiest effect. I cannot, in this connection, refrain from mentioning the valuable services of Col. Thomas L. Kane, who, from motives of pure benevolence, and without any official character or pecuniary compensation, visited Utah during the last inclement winter, for the purpose of contributing to the pacification of the Territory.

I am happy to inform you that the governor and other civil officers of Utah are now performing their appropriate functions without resistance. The authority of the Constitution and the laws has been fully restored, and peace prevails throughout the Territory.

A portion of the troops sent to Utah are now encamped in Cedar valley, forty-four miles Southwest of Salt Lake City, and the remainder have been ordered to Oregon to suppress Indian hostilities.

The march of the army to Salt Lake City, through the Indian territory has had a powerful effect in restraining the hostile feelings against the United States, which existed among the Indians in that region, and in securing emigrants to the Far West against their depredations. This will also be the means of establishing military posts and promoting settlements along the route.

I recommend that the benefits of our Land laws and pre-emption system be extended to the people of Utah, by the establishment of a Land office in that Territory.

CHINA.

I have occasion, also, to congratulate you on the result of the negotiations with China.

You were informed by my last annual message that our Minister had been instructed to occupy a neutral position in the hostilities conducted by Great Britain and France against Canton. He was, however, at the same time, directed to cooperate cordially with the British and French Ministers in all peaceful measures to secure by treaty those just concessions to foreign commerce which the nations of the world had a right to demand. It was impossible for me to proceed further than this, on my own authority, without usurping the war-making power, which, under the Constitution, belongs exclusively to Congress.

Besides, after a careful examination of the nature and extent of our grievances, I did not believe they were of such a pressing, and aggravated character, as would have justified Congress in declaring war against the Chinese Empire, without first making an earnest attempt to adjust them by peaceful negotiation. I was the more inclined to this opinion, because of the severe chastisement which had then but recently been inflicted upon the Chinese by our squadron, in the capture and destruction of the Barrier forts, to avenge an alleged insult to our flag.

The event has proved the wisdom of our neutrality. Our Minister has executed his instructions with eminent skill and ability. In conjunction with the Russian plenipotentiary, he has peacefully, but effectually, co-operated with the English and French plenipotentiaries; and each of the four powers has concluded a separate treaty with China, of a highly satisfactory character. The treaty concluded by our own plenipotentiary will immediately be submitted to the Senate.

I am happy to announce that, through the energetic yet conciliatory efforts of our Consul-General in Japan, a new treaty has been concluded with that Empire, which may be expected materially to augmeut our trade and intercourse in that quarter, and remove from our countrymen the disabilities which have heretofore been imposed upon the exercise of their religion. The treaty shall be submitted to the Senate for approval without delay.

GREAT BRITAIN.

It is my earnest desire that every misunderstanding with the government of Great Britain should be amicably and speedily adjusted. It has been the misfortune of both countries, almost ever since the period of the Revolution, to have been annoyed by a succession of irritating and dangerous questions, threatening their friendly relations. This has partially prevented the full development of those feelings of mutual friendship between the people of the two countries, so natural in themselves and so conducive to their common interest. Any serious interruption of the commerce between the United States and Great Brittain, would be equally injurious to both. In fact, no two nations have ever existed on the face of the earth, which could do each other so much good or so much harm.

Entertaining these sentiments, I am gratified to inform you, that the long pending controversy between the two Governments, in relation to the question of visitation and search, has been amicably adjusted. The claim on the part of Great Britain, forcibly to visit American vessels on the high seas in time of peace, could not be sustained under the law of nations, and it had been overruled by her own most eminent jurists.

This question was recently brought to an issue, by the repeated acts of British cruisers, in boarding and searching our merchant vessels in the Gulf of Mexico and the adjacent seas. These acts were the more injurious and annoying, as these waters are traversed by a large portion of the commerce and navigation of the United States, and their free and unrestricted use is essential to the security of the coastwise trade between different States of the Union.—Such vexatious interruptions could not fail to excite the feelings of the country, and to require the interposition of the Government. Remonstrances were addressed to the British Government against these violations of our rights of sovereignty, and a naval force was at the same time ordered to the Cuban waters, with directions "to protect all vessels of the United States on the high seas, from search or detention by the vessels of war of any other nation."—These measures received the unqualified and even enthusiastic approbation of the American people. Most fortunately, however, no collision took place, and the British Government promptly avowed its recognition of the principles of international law upon this subject, as laid down by the Government of the United States, in the note of the Secretary of State to the British Minister at Washington, of April 10, 1858, which secure