THE DAILY BEE,
PUBLISHED BY
G. F. WEISSE & CO.,
EDITORS AND PROPRIETORS.
G. F. WEISSE, S. MARSY,
R. DEVERGNE, N. DUFOUR.
[illegible] (per year in advance) ..... $[illegible]
[illegible] (semi weekly, (one year in advance) ..... [illegible]
[illegible] subscribers must give one week's notice [illegible] before they can be allowed to discontinue.

OFFICE, 83 CHARTRES ST.

The New Orleans Bee.

NEW ORLEANS, MONDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 8, 1856. VOL. XVII—NEW SERIES. VOL. XXX—WHOLE NO. 10,201.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.
One Dollar for every Ten Lines, in each [illegible] for the first insertion, and half [illegible] for every subsequent insertion. No advertisement [illegible] than one dollar to be charged. Advertisements on the first page $[illegible] per [illegible] each insertion. All advertisements inserted at intervals [illegible] to be charged one dollar for every Ten Lines [illegible] each insertion. The privilege of Annual Advertisers [illegible] to advertisements strictly within their business, and to extend to one [illegible] year.

THE DAILY BEE.

MONDAY MORNING, DEC. 8, 1856.

Subscriptions by the Week.

[illegible] Bees are authorized to [illegible] by the week, at the [illegible]

THE MESSAGE.

[illegible] columns, we cannot [illegible] a word or two [illegible] the most interest[illegible] that devoted [illegible] discussions at issue [illegible] the South. These [illegible] approached. The President's [illegible] earnest and convincing [illegible] kindness of sectional [illegible] the exile it has already [illegible] those still greater [illegible] he looked, it must [illegible] ornament in defense of [illegible] of the South is [illegible] Pinkney has uttered for [illegible] the early part of [illegible] manly and honorable [illegible] to the two last [illegible] and honorable [illegible] is scarcely fair, and [illegible] expect from his [illegible]

THE HUGHES TELEGRAPH.

[illegible] published to the [illegible] Magnetic Tele[illegible] in the Northern papers. Some months [illegible] of Mr. Hughes [illegible] that vast superiority [illegible] was claimed to [illegible] years, yet [illegible] practicability [illegible] and from the di[illegible] time and on the [illegible] seems to have [illegible] magnetic machine [illegible] of the New York [illegible] phies of the [illegible] and the [illegible] difference, that [illegible] the letters are [illegible] readily resolves, the [illegible] an apparatus [illegible] proper letter [illegible] expect before [illegible] the alphabet [illegible]

[illegible] House.—The [illegible] at the [illegible] Mr. Phelps [illegible]

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and of the House of Representatives:

The Constitution requires that the President shall from time to time, give to Congress information of the state of the Union. To do this fully involves exposition of all matters in the actual condition of the country, domestic or foreign, which shall essentially concern the general welfare. While performing his constitutional duty in this respect, the President does not speak merely to express his personal convictions, but as the executive minister of the government, enabled by his position, and called upon by his official obligations, to scan with an impartial eye the interests of the whole and of every part of the United States.

Of the condition of the domestic interests of the Union, its agriculture, mines, manufactures, navigation and commerce, it is necessary only to say that the internal prosperity of the country, its continuous and steady advancement in wealth and population, and in prosperity, with the public well being, attest the wisdom of our institutions, and the predominant spirit of intelligence and patriotism which, notwithstanding occasional irregularities of opinion or active resistance from popular freedom, has distinguished and characterized the whole of America.

In the brief interval between the termination of the last and the commencement of the present session of Congress, the public mind has been occupied with the care of selecting, for another constitutional term, the President and Vice President of the United States.

The determination of the persons, who are of right, or contingently, to preside over the administration of the government, is, under our system, committed to the States and the people. We appeal to them, by their voice pronounced in the forms of law, to call whomsoever they will to the high post of Chief Magistrate.

And thus it is that as the senators represent the respective States of the Union, and the members of the House of Representatives the several constituencies of each State, so the President represents the aggregate population of the United States. Their election of him is the explicit and solemn act of the sole sovereign authority of the Union.

It is superfluous to say, I suppose, that the principles which, by their recent political action, the people of the United States have sanctioned and announced.

They have asserted the constitutional equality of each and all of the States of the United States; they have affirmed the constitutional equanimity of each and all of the citizens of the United States as citizens, whatever their religion, wherever their birth, or their pursuits; they have maintained the inviolability of the constitutional rights of the different sections of the Union, and they have proclaimed their determined purpose to maintain the attachment to the Union and to the Constitution, as objects of interest superior to all subjects of local or sectional controversy, as the safeguard of the rights of all, as the spirit and the essence of the liberty, peace, and greatness of the Republic.

In doing this, they have, at the same time, emphatically condemned the idea of organizing in these United States mere geographical parties, of marshaling in hostile array towards each other the different parts of the country, North or South, East or West.

Schemes of this nature, fraught with incalculable mischief, and which the considerate sense of the people has rejected, could have had no existence in no part of the country, had they not been disguised in specious plausible in appearance, acting upon an excited state of the public mind, induced by causes temporary in their operation, and is to be hoped, transient in their influence.

Perfect liberty of association for political objects, and of the widest scope of discussion are the received and ordinary conditions of government in our country. Our institutions, framed in the spirit of confidence in the intelligence and integrity of the people, do not forbid citizens, either individually or associated together, to seek, by all fair writing, speech, or any other methods short of physical force, the Constitution and the very existence of the Union. Under the shelter of this great liberty, and protected by the laws and usages of the government they assail, associations have been formed, in some of the States, of individuals, who, pretending to seek only to prevent the spread of the institution of slavery into the present or future incipient States of the Union, have openly inflamed with desire to change the domestic institutions of existing States. To accomplish their objects, they deduce from the premise the odious task of depreciating the government under which stands in their way, and of calumniating, with undiscriminate invective, not only the citizens of particular States with which laws they find fault, but all others of their fellow citizens throughout the country, who do not participate in their views, and who, upon the Constitution, framed and adopted by our fathers, and claiming for the privileges it has secured, the steady support and grateful reverence of their children. They seek an object they well know is a forbidden one. They are perfectly aware that the change in the relative condition of the white and black races in the slaveholding States, which they would promote, is beyond their lawful authority; that to them it is a foreign object; that it cannot be effected by any peaceful instrumentality of theirs; that for them, and the States of which they are citizens, the only path to its accomplishment is through burning cities, and ravaged fields, and slaughtered populations, and all there is most terrible in foreign, complicated with civil and servile war; and that this fearful path in the attempt is the forcible disruption of a political compact, the most benignant of a free and happy people, the amount of individual and public prosperity, in their present political period in history, and substituting in its place a state of civil commotion, driven at once and inevitably into military devastation and fratricidal carnage, transforming the now placed, happy and fraternal brotherhood into a vast permanent camp of armed men, like the armies of Europe and Asia. Well knowing that such, and such only, are the means and consequences of their boldly adopted purpose, they endeavor to prepare the people of the South for their fate, for civil war by doing everything in their power to deprecate the Constitution and the laws of moral authority, and to undermine the fabric of the Union by appeals to passion and sectional prejudice, by inflamed appeals to the kindly and reciprocal regard, and by educating them to stand face to face as enemies, rather than shoulder to shoulder as friends.

It is by the agency of such unwarrantable misrepresentations, foreign and domestic, that the minds of citizens of otherwise good citizens, have been so inflamed into the passionate condemnation of the domestic institutions of the Southern States, and of the Southern people, as to almost rival in bitterness and hostility towards their fellow citizens of those States, and thus ready to do any thing which may tend to sever the avowed and active enemies of the Constitution. Ardently attached to liberty in the abstract, they stop not to consider practically how the objects they desire would at last can be accomplished, nor to reflect that, even if the evil were as great as they deem it, it can be rendered tolerable by equal and that it can be only aggravated by their violence and unconstitutional action. A question, which all the efforts of the most difficult of all the problems of social institution, political economy and statesmanship, they treat with unreasoning intemperance and with bad and bad language. Extremes beget extremes. Violent attack from the North finds its inevitable consequence in the growth of a spirit of angry defiance at the South. Thus in the progress of events, we had reached that consummation, which the voice of the people has now so pointedly rebuked, if the attempt of a portion of the States, by a sectional organization and movement, to usurp the control of the government of the United States.

I confidently believe that the great body of those who unconsiderately took this fatal step are sincerely attached to the Constitution and the Union. They would, upon deliberation, shrink with unaffected horror from any evidence of the disunion or civil war. But they have entered into a path which leads to nowhere, unless it be to civil war and disunion, and which has no other possible outlet. They have proceeded thus far in that direction in consequence of the successive stages of their progress, which has consisted of a series of secondary issues, each of which professed to be confined within its constitutional and peaceful limits, but which attempted indirectly what few men were willing to do directly, that is, to act aggressively against the constitutional rights of nearly one half of the thirty one States.

In the long series of acts of indirect aggression, the first was the strenuous agitation by certain citizens of the Northern States, in Congress and out of it, of the question of ending emancipation in the Southern States.

The second step in this path of evil consisted of acts of the people of the Northern States, and in several instances of their governments, aimed to facilitate the escape of persons held to service in the Southern States, and to prevent their extradition when claimed according to law and in virtue of express provisions of the Constitution. To promote this object, legislative enactments and other means were adopted to take away or defeat rights which the Constitution solemnly guaranteed. In order to [illegible] the then existing act of Congress concerning the extradition of fugitives from service, laws were enacted in Northern States, forbidding their officers, under the severest penalties, to participate in the execution of any act of Congress whatever. In this way, that system of harmonious co-operation between the authorities of the United States and of the several States, for the maintenance of their common institutions, which existed in the early years of the Republic, was destroyed; conflicts of jurisdiction came to be frequent; and Congress found itself compelled, for the support of the Constitution and the vindication of its power, to authorize the appointment of new officers, charged with the execution of its acts, as if they and the officers of the States were the ministers, respectively, of foreign governments in a state of mutual hostility, rather than fellow magistrates of a common country, peacefully sustaining under the protection of one well-constituted Union. Thus here, also, aggression was followed by reaction; and the attacks upon the Constitution at this point did not serve to raise up new barriers for its defense and security.

The third stage of this unhappy sectional controversy was in connection with the organization of territorial governments, and the admission of new States into the Union. When it was proposed to admit the State of Maine, by separation of territory from that of Massachusetts, and the State of Missouri, formed of a portion of the territory ceded by France to the United States, representatives in Congress objected to the admission of the latter, unless with conditions annexed to particular views of public policy. The application of such a condition was successfully resisted. But at the same period, the proposition was presented of imposing restrictions upon the residue of the territory ceded by France. That question was, for the time, disposed of by the adoption of a geographical line of limitation.

In that transaction it should not be forgotten that Congress, of her own accord, yielding to considerations of the most far-seeing sagacity, to cede Louisiana to the United States, and that accession was accepted by the United States, the latter expressly engaged that "the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess—that is to say, while it remains in a territorial condition, its inhabitants are maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, with a right then to pass into the condition of States on a footing of perfect equality with the original States.

The enactment which established the restrictive geographical line was acquiesced in rather than approved by the States of the Union. It stood on the statute-book, however, for a number of years; and the people of the respective States acquiesced in the re-enactment of the principle as applied to the State of Texas and it was proposed to acquiesce in its further application to the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico. But this proposition was successfully resisted by the representatives from the Northern States, who, regardless of the statute line, insisted upon applying restriction, not without consideration, to the territory lying North or South of it, thereby repealing it as a legislative compromise, and, on the part of the North, persistently violating the compact, if compact there was.

Thereupon this enactment ceased to have binding virtue in any sense, whether as respects the North or the South; and so in effect it was regarded on the occasion of the admission of the State of California, and the organization of the Territories of New Mexico, Utah and Washington.

Such was the state of this question when the time arrived for the organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. In the progress of constitutional inquiry and reflection, it had now at length come to be seen clearly that Congress does not possess constitutional power to impose restrictions of this character upon present or future States of the Union. In a long series of decisions, on the fullest argument, and after the most deliberate consideration, the Supreme Court of the United States had finally determined this point, in every form under which the question could arise, whether as affecting public or private rights—in questions of the public domain, of religion, of navigation, and of servitude.

The several States of the Union are, by force of the Constitution, coequal in domestic legislative powers. Congress cannot change a law of domestic relation in the State of Maine; no more can it in the State of Missouri. Any statute which proposes to do this is a mere nullity; it takes away no right—it confers none. If it remains on the statute-book unrepealed, it remains there only as a monument of error, and a beacon of warning to the legislator and the statesman. To repeal it will be only to remove imperfections from the statutes, without affecting either in the sense of permission or of prohibition, the action of the States, or of their citizens.

Still, when the nominal restriction of this nature, already a dead letter in law, was in terms repealed by the last Congress, in a clause of the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, this proposal was made the occasion of a wide-spread and dangerous agitation.

It was alleged that the original enactment being a compact of perpetual moral obligation, its repeal constituted an odious breach of faith.

An act of Congress, while it remains unrepealed, more especially if it be constitutional, ought in the judgment of those public functionaries whose duty it is to execute it, on that point, is undoubtedly binding on the conscience of every honest citizen of the Republic. But in what sense can it be said that the enactment in question was invested with the sanctity and entitled to the respect of a solemn compact? No distinct parties formed citizens, either individually or associated together, to adopt it, by writing, speech, or any other methods short of physical force. The Constitution and the very existence of the Union, under the shelter of this great liberty, and protected by the laws and usages of the government they assail, associations have been formed, in some of the States, of individuals, who, pretending to seek only to prevent the spread of the institution of slavery into the present or future incipient States of the Union, have openly inflamed with desire to change the domestic institutions of existing States. To accomplish their objects, they deduce from the premise the odious task of depreciating the government under which stands in their way, and of calumniating, with undiscriminate invective, not only the citizens of particular States with which laws they find fault, but all others of their fellow citizens throughout the country, who do not participate in their views, and who, upon the Constitution, framed and adopted by our fathers, and claiming for the privileges it has secured, the steady support and grateful reverence of their children. They seek an object they well know is a forbidden one. They are perfectly aware that the change in the relative condition of the white and black races in the slaveholding States, which they would promote, is beyond their lawful authority; that to them it is a foreign object; that it cannot be effected by any peaceful instrumentality of theirs; that for them, and the States of which they are citizens, the only path to its accomplishment is through burning cities, and ravaged fields, and slaughtered populations, and all there is most terrible in foreign, complicated with civil and servile war; and that this fearful path in the attempt is the forcible disruption of a political compact, the most benignant of a free and happy people, the amount of individual and public prosperity, in their present political period in history, and substituting in its place a state of civil commotion, driven at once and inevitably into military devastation and fratricidal carnage, transforming the now placed, happy and fraternal brotherhood into a vast permanent camp of armed men, like the armies of Europe and Asia. Well knowing that such, and such only, are the means and consequences of their boldly adopted purpose, they endeavor to prepare the people of the South for their fate, for civil war by doing everything in their power to deprecate the Constitution and the laws of moral authority, and to undermine the fabric of the Union by appeals to passion and sectional prejudice, by inflamed appeals to the kindly and reciprocal regard, and by educating them to stand face to face as enemies, rather than shoulder to shoulder as friends.

It is by the agency of such unwarrantable misrepresentations, foreign and domestic, that the minds of citizens of otherwise good citizens, have been so inflamed into the passionate condemnation of the domestic institutions of the Southern States, and of the Southern people, as to almost rival in bitterness and hostility towards their fellow citizens of those States, and thus ready to do any thing which may tend to sever the avowed and active enemies of the Constitution. Ardently attached to liberty in the abstract, they stop not to consider practically how the objects they desire would at last can be accomplished, nor to reflect that, even if the evil were as great as they deem it, it can be rendered tolerable by equal and that it can be only aggravated by their violence and unconstitutional action. A question, which all the efforts of the most difficult of all the problems of social institution, political economy and statesmanship, they treat with unreasoning intemperance and with bad and bad language. Extremes beget extremes. Violent attack from the North finds its inevitable consequence in the growth of a spirit of angry defiance at the South. Thus in the progress of events, we had reached that consummation, which the voice of the people has now so pointedly rebuked, if the attempt of a portion of the States, by a sectional organization and movement, to usurp the control of the government of the United States.

I confidently believe that the great body of those who unconsiderately took this fatal step are sincerely attached to the Constitution and the Union. They would, upon deliberation, shrink with unaffected horror from any evidence of disunion or civil war. But they have entered into a path which leads to nowhere, unless it be to civil war and disunion, and which has no other possible outlet. They have proceeded thus far in that direction in consequence of the successive stages of their progress, which has consisted of a series of secondary issues, each of which professed to be confined within its constitutional and peaceful limits, but which attempted indirectly what few men were willing to do directly, that is, to act aggressively against the constitutional rights of nearly one half of the thirty one States.

In the long series of acts of indirect aggression, the first was the strenuous agitation by certain citizens of the Northern States, in Congress and out of it, of the question of ending emancipation in the Southern States.

The second step in this path of evil consisted of acts of the people of the Northern States, and in several instances of their governments, aimed to facilitate the escape of persons held to service in the Southern States, and to prevent their extradition when claimed according to law and in virtue of express provisions of the Constitution. To promote this object, legislative enactments and other means were adopted to take away or defeat rights which the Constitution solemnly guaranteed. In order to [illegible] the then existing act of Congress concerning the extradition of fugitives from service, laws were enacted in Northern States, forbidding their officers, under the severest penalties, to participate in the execution of any act of Congress whatever. In this way, that system of harmonious co-operation between the authorities of the United States and of the several States, for the maintenance of their common institutions, which existed in the early years of the Republic, was destroyed; conflicts of jurisdiction came to be frequent; and Congress found itself compelled, for the support of the Constitution and the vindication of its power, to authorize the appointment of new officers, charged with the execution of its acts, as if they and the officers of the States were the ministers, respectively, of foreign governments in a state of mutual hostility, rather than fellow magistrates of a common country, peacefully sustaining under the protection of one well-constituted Union. Thus here, also, aggression was followed by reaction; and the attacks upon the Constitution at this point did not serve to raise up new barriers for its defense and security.

The third stage of this unhappy sectional controversy was in connection with the organization of territorial governments, and the admission of new States into the Union. When it was proposed to admit the State of Maine, by separation of territory from that of Massachusetts, and the State of Missouri, formed of a portion of the territory ceded by France to the United States, representatives in Congress objected to the admission of the latter, unless with conditions annexed to particular views of public policy. The application of such a condition was successfully resisted. But at the same period, the proposition was presented of imposing restrictions upon the residue of the territory ceded by France. That question was, for the time, disposed of by the adoption of a geographical line of limitation.

In that transaction it should not be forgotten that Congress, of her own accord, yielding to considerations of the most far-seeing sagacity, to cede Louisiana to the United States, and that accession was accepted by the United States, the latter expressly engaged that "the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess—that is to say, while it remains in a territorial condition, its inhabitants are maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, with a right then to pass into the condition of States on a footing of perfect equality with the original States.

The enactment which established the restrictive geographical line was acquiesced in rather than approved by the States of the Union. It stood on the statute-book, however, for a number of years; and the people of the respective States acquiesced in the re-enactment of the principle as applied to the State of Texas and it was proposed to acquiesce in its further application to the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico. But this proposition was successfully resisted by the representatives from the Northern States, who, regardless of the statute line, insisted upon applying restriction, not without consideration, to the territory lying North or South of it, thereby repealing it as a legislative compromise, and, on the part of the North, persistently violating the compact, if compact there was.

Thereupon this enactment ceased to have binding virtue in any sense, whether as respects the North or the South; and so in effect it was regarded on the occasion of the admission of the State of California, and the organization of the Territories of New Mexico, Utah and Washington.

Such was the state of this question when the time arrived for the organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. In the progress of constitutional inquiry and reflection, it had now at length come to be seen clearly that Congress does not possess constitutional power to impose restrictions of this character upon present or future States of the Union. In a long series of decisions, on the fullest argument, and after the most deliberate consideration, the Supreme Court of the United States had finally determined this point, in every form under which the question could arise, whether as affecting public or private rights—in questions of the public domain, of religion, of navigation, and of servitude.

The several States of the Union are, by force of the Constitution, coequal in domestic legislative powers. Congress cannot change a law of domestic relation in the State of Maine; no more can it in the State of Missouri. Any statute which proposes to do this is a mere nullity; it takes away no right—it confers none. If it remains on the statute-book unrepealed, it remains there only as a monument of error, and a beacon of warning to the legislator and the statesman. To repeal it will be only to remove imperfections from the statutes, without affecting, either in the sense of permission or of prohibition, the action of the States, or of their citizens.

Still, when the nominal restriction of this nature, already a dead letter in law, was in terms repealed by the last Congress, in a clause of the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, this proposal was made the occasion of a wide-spread and dangerous agitation.

It was alleged that the original enactment being a compact of perpetual moral obligation, its repeal constituted an odious breach of faith.

An act of Congress, while it remains unrepealed, more especially if it be constitutional, ought in the judgment of those public functionaries whose duty it is to execute it, on that point, is undoubtedly binding on the conscience of every honest citizen of the Republic. But in what sense can it be said that the enactment in question was invested with the sanctity and entitled to the respect of a solemn compact? No distinct parties formed citizens, either individually or associated together, to adopt it, by writing, speech, or any other methods short of physical force. The Constitution and the very existence of the Union. Under the shelter of this great liberty, and protected by the laws and usages of the government they assail, associations have been formed, in some of the States, of individuals, who, pretending to seek only to prevent the spread of the institution of slavery into the present or future incipient States of the Union, have openly inflamed with desire to change the domestic institutions of existing States. To accomplish their objects, they deduce from the premise the odious task of depreciating the government under which stands in their way, and of calumniating, with undiscriminate invective, not only the citizens of particular States with which laws they find fault, but all others of their fellow citizens throughout the country, who do not participate in their views, and who, upon the Constitution, framed and adopted by our fathers, and claiming for the privileges it has secured, the steady support and grateful reverence of their children. They seek an object they well know is a forbidden one. They are perfectly aware that the change in the relative condition of the white and black races in the slaveholding States, which they would promote, is beyond their lawful authority; that to them it is a foreign object; that it cannot be effected by any peaceful instrumentality of theirs; that for them, and the States of which they are citizens, the only path to its accomplishment is through burning cities, and ravaged fields, and slaughtered populations, and all there is most terrible in foreign, complicated with civil and servile war; and that this fearful path in the attempt is the forcible disruption of a political compact, the most benignant of a free and happy people, the amount of individual and public prosperity, in their present political period in history, and substituting in its place a state of civil commotion, driven at once and inevitably into military devastation and fratricidal carnage, transforming the now placed, happy and fraternal brotherhood into a vast permanent camp of armed men, like the armies of Europe and Asia. Well knowing that such, and such only, are the means and consequences of their boldly adopted purpose, they endeavor to prepare the people of the South for their fate, for civil war by doing everything in their power to deprecate the Constitution and the laws of moral authority, and to undermine the fabric of the Union by appeals to passion and sectional prejudice, by inflamed appeals to the kindly and reciprocal regard, and by educating them to stand face to face as enemies, rather than shoulder to shoulder as friends.

It is by the agency of such unwarrantable misrepresentations, foreign and domestic, that the minds of citizens of otherwise good citizens, have been so inflamed into the passionate condemnation of the domestic institutions of the Southern States, and of the Southern people, as to almost rival in bitterness and hostility towards their fellow citizens of those States, and thus ready to do any thing which may tend to sever the avowed and active enemies of the Constitution. Ardently attached to liberty in the abstract, they stop not to consider practically how the objects they desire would at last can be accomplished, nor to reflect that, even if the evil were as great as they deem it, it can be rendered tolerable by equal and that it can be only aggravated by their violence and unconstitutional action. A question, which all the efforts of the most difficult of all the problems of social institution, political economy and statesmanship, they treat with unreasoning intemperance and with bad and bad language. Extremes beget extremes. Violent attack from the North finds its inevitable consequence in the growth of a spirit of angry defiance at the South. Thus in the progress of events, we had reached that consummation, which the voice of the people has now so pointedly rebuked, if the attempt of a portion of the States, by a sectional organization and movement, to usurp the control of the government of the United States.

I confidently believe that the great body of those who unconsiderately took this fatal step are sincerely attached to the Constitution and the Union. They would, upon deliberation, shrink with unaffected horror from any evidence of disunion or civil war. But they have entered into a path which leads to nowhere, unless it be to civil war and disunion, and which has no other possible outlet. They have proceeded thus far in that direction in consequence of the successive stages of their progress, which has consisted of a series of secondary issues, each of which professed to be confined within its constitutional and peaceful limits, but which attempted indirectly what few men were willing to do directly, that is, to act aggressively against the constitutional rights of nearly one half of the thirty one States.

In the long series of acts of indirect aggression, the first was the strenuous agitation by certain citizens of the Northern States, in Congress and out of it, of the question of ending emancipation in the Southern States.

The second step in this path of evil consisted of acts of the people of the Northern States, and in several instances of their governments, aimed to facilitate the escape of persons held to service in the Southern States, and to prevent their extradition when claimed according to law and in virtue of express provisions of the Constitution. To promote this object, legislative enactments and other means were adopted to take away or defeat rights which the Constitution solemnly guaranteed. In order to [illegible] the then existing act of Congress concerning the extradition of fugitives from service, laws were enacted in Northern States, forbidding their officers, under the severest penalties, to participate in the execution of any act of Congress whatever. In this way, that system of harmonious co-operation between the authorities of the United States and of the several States, for the maintenance of their common institutions, which existed in the early years of the Republic, was destroyed; conflicts of jurisdiction came to be frequent; and Congress found itself compelled, for the support of the Constitution and the vindication of its power, to authorize the appointment of new officers, charged with the execution of its acts, as if they and the officers of the States were the ministers, respectively, of foreign governments in a state of mutual hostility, rather than fellow magistrates of a common country, peacefully sustaining under the protection of one well-constituted Union. Thus here, also, aggression was followed by reaction; and the attacks upon the Constitution at this point did not serve to raise up new barriers for its defense and security.

The third stage of this unhappy sectional controversy was in connection with the organization of territorial governments, and the admission of new States into the Union. When it was proposed to admit the State of Maine, by separation of territory from that of Massachusetts, and the State of Missouri, formed of a portion of the territory ceded by France to the United States, representatives in Congress objected to the admission of the latter, unless with conditions annexed to particular views of public policy. The application of such a condition was successfully resisted. But at the same period, the proposition was presented of imposing restrictions upon the residue of the territory ceded by France. That question was, for the time, disposed of by the adoption of a geographical line of limitation.

In that transaction it should not be forgotten that Congress, of her own accord, yielding to considerations of the most far-seeing sagacity, to cede Louisiana to the United States, and that accession was accepted by the United States, the latter expressly engaged that "the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess—that is to say, while it remains in a territorial condition, its inhabitants are maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, with a right then to pass into the condition of States on a footing of perfect equality with the original States.

The enactment which established the restrictive geographical line was acquiesced in rather than approved by the States of the Union. It stood on the statute-book, however, for a number of years; and the people of the respective States acquiesced in the re-enactment of the principle as applied to the State of Texas and it was proposed to acquiesce in its further application to the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico. But this proposition was successfully resisted by the representatives from the Northern States, who, regardless of the statute line, insisted upon applying restriction, not without consideration, to the territory lying North or South of it, thereby repealing it as a legislative compromise, and, on the part of the North, persistently violating the compact, if compact there was.

Thereupon this enactment ceased to have binding virtue in any sense, whether as respects the North or the South; and so in effect it was regarded on the occasion of the admission of the State of California, and the organization of the Territories of New Mexico, Utah and Washington.

Such was the state of this question when the time arrived for the organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. In the progress of constitutional inquiry and reflection, it had now at length come to be seen clearly that Congress does not possess constitutional power to impose restrictions of this character upon present or future States of the Union. In a long series of decisions, on the fullest argument, and after the most deliberate consideration, the Supreme Court of the United States had finally determined this point, in every form under which the question could arise, whether as affecting public or private rights—in questions of the public domain, of religion, of navigation, and of servitude.

The several States of the Union are, by force of the Constitution, coequal in domestic legislative powers. Congress cannot change a law of domestic relation in the State of Maine; no more can it in the State of Missouri. Any statute which proposes to do this is a mere nullity; it takes away no right—it confers none. If it remains on the statute-book unrepealed, it remains there only as a monument of error, and a beacon of warning to the legislator and the statesman. To repeal it will be only to remove imperfections from the statutes, without affecting, either in the sense of permission or of prohibition, the action of the States, or of their citizens.

Still, when the nominal restriction of this nature, already a dead letter in law, was in terms repealed by the last Congress, in a clause of the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, this proposal was made the occasion of a wide-spread and dangerous agitation.

It was alleged that the original enactment being a compact of perpetual moral obligation, its repeal constituted an odious breach of faith.

An act of Congress, while it remains unrepealed, more especially if it be constitutional, ought in the judgment of those public functionaries whose duty it is to execute it, on that point, is undoubtedly binding on the conscience of every honest citizen of the Republic. But in what sense can it be said that the enactment in question was invested with the sanctity and entitled to the respect of a solemn compact? No distinct parties formed citizens, either individually or associated together, to adopt it, by writing, speech, or any other methods short of physical force. The Constitution and the very existence of the Union. Under the shelter of this great liberty, and protected by the laws and usages of the government they assail, associations have been formed, in some of the States, of individuals, who, pretending to seek only to prevent the spread of the institution of slavery into the present or future incipient States of the Union, have openly inflamed with desire to change the domestic institutions of existing States. To accomplish their objects, they deduce from the premise the odious task of depreciating the government under which stands in their way, and of calumniating, with undiscriminate invective, not only the citizens of particular States with which laws they find fault, but all others of their fellow citizens throughout the country, who do not participate in their views, and who, upon the Constitution, framed and adopted by our fathers, and claiming for the privileges it has secured, the steady support and grateful reverence of their children. They seek an object they well know is a forbidden one. They are perfectly aware that the change in the relative condition of the white and black races in the slaveholding States, which they would promote, is beyond their lawful authority; that to them it is a foreign object; that it cannot be effected by any peaceful instrumentality of theirs; that for them, and the States of which they are citizens, the only path to its accomplishment is through burning cities, and ravaged fields, and slaughtered populations, and all there is most terrible in foreign, complicated with civil and servile war; and that this fearful path in the attempt is the forcible disruption of a political compact, the most benignant of a free and happy people, the amount of individual and public prosperity, in their present political period in history, and substituting in its place a state of civil commotion, driven at once and inevitably into military devastation and fratricidal carnage, transforming the now placed, happy and fraternal brotherhood into a vast permanent camp of armed men, like the armies of Europe and Asia. Well knowing that such, and such only, are the means and consequences of their boldly adopted purpose, they endeavor to prepare the people of the South for their fate, for civil war by doing everything in their power to deprecate the Constitution and the laws of moral authority, and to undermine the fabric of the Union by appeals to passion and sectional prejudice, by inflamed appeals to the kindly and reciprocal regard, and by educating them to stand face to face as enemies, rather than shoulder to shoulder as friends.

It is by the agency of such unwarrantable misrepresentations, foreign and domestic, that the minds of citizens of otherwise good citizens, have been so inflamed into the passionate condemnation of the domestic institutions of the Southern States, and of the Southern people, as to almost rival in bitterness and hostility towards their fellow citizens of those States, and thus ready to do any thing which may tend to sever the avowed and active enemies of the Constitution. Ardently attached to liberty in the abstract, they stop not to consider practically how the objects they desire would at last can be accomplished, nor to reflect that, even if the evil were as great as they deem it, it can be rendered tolerable by equal and that it can be only aggravated by their violence and unconstitutional action. A question, which all the efforts of the most difficult of all the problems of social institution, political economy and statesmanship, they treat with unreasoning intemperance and with bad and bad language. Extremes beget extremes. Violent attack from the North finds its inevitable consequence in the growth of a spirit of angry defiance at the South. Thus in the progress of events, we had reached that consummation, which the voice of the people has now so pointedly rebuked, if the attempt of a portion of the States, by a sectional organization and movement, to usurp the control of the government of the United States.

I confidently believe that the great body of those who unconsiderately took this fatal step are sincerely attached to the Constitution and the Union. They would, upon deliberation, shrink with unaffected horror from any evidence of disunion or civil war. But they have entered into a path which leads to nowhere, unless it be to civil war and disunion, and which has no other possible outlet. They have proceeded thus far in that direction in consequence of the successive stages of their progress, which has consisted of a series of secondary issues, each of which professed to be confined within its constitutional and peaceful limits, but which attempted indirectly what few men were willing to do directly, that is, to act aggressively against the constitutional rights of nearly one half of the thirty one States.

In the long series of acts of indirect aggression, the first was the strenuous agitation by certain citizens of the Northern States, in Congress and out of it, of the question of ending emancipation in the Southern States.

The second step in this path of evil consisted of acts of the people of the Northern States, and in several instances of their governments, aimed to facilitate the escape of persons held to service in the Southern States, and to prevent their extradition when claimed according to law and in virtue of express provisions of the Constitution. To promote this object, legislative enactments and other means were adopted to take away or defeat rights which the Constitution solemnly guaranteed. In order to [illegible] the then existing act of Congress concerning the extradition of fugitives from service, laws were enacted in Northern States, forbidding their officers, under the severest penalties, to participate in the execution of any act of Congress whatever. In this way, that system of harmonious co-operation between the authorities of the United States and of the several States, for the maintenance of their common institutions, which existed in the early years of the Republic, was destroyed; conflicts of jurisdiction came to be frequent; and Congress found itself compelled, for the support of the Constitution and the vindication of its power, to authorize the appointment of new officers, charged with the execution of its acts, as if they and the officers of the States were the ministers, respectively, of foreign governments in a state of mutual hostility, rather than fellow magistrates of a common country, peacefully sustaining under the protection of one well-constituted Union. Thus here, also, aggression was followed by reaction; and the attacks upon the Constitution at this point did not serve to raise up new barriers for its defense and security.

The third stage of this unhappy sectional controversy was in connection with the organization of territorial governments, and the admission of new States into the Union. When it was proposed to admit the State of Maine, by separation of territory from that of Massachusetts, and the State of Missouri, formed of a portion of the territory ceded by France to the United States, representatives in Congress objected to the admission of the latter, unless with conditions annexed to particular views of public policy. The application of such a condition was successfully resisted. But at the same period, the proposition was presented of imposing restrictions upon the residue of the territory ceded by France. That question was, for the time, disposed of by the adoption of a geographical line of limitation.

In that transaction it should not be forgotten that Congress, of her own accord, yielding to considerations of the most far-seeing sagacity, to cede Louisiana to the United States, and that accession was accepted by the United States, the latter expressly engaged that "the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess—that is to say, while it remains in a territorial condition, its inhabitants are maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, with a right then to pass into the condition of States on a footing of perfect equality with the original States.

The enactment which established the restrictive geographical line was acquiesced in rather than approved by the States of the Union. It stood on the statute-book, however, for a number of years; and the people of the respective States acquiesced in the re-enactment of the principle as applied to the State of Texas and it was proposed to acquiesce in its further application to the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico. But this proposition was successfully resisted by the representatives from the Northern States, who, regardless of the statute line, insisted upon applying restriction, not without consideration, to the territory lying North or South of it, thereby repealing it as a legislative compromise, and, on the part of the North, persistently violating the compact, if compact there was.

Thereupon this enactment ceased to have binding virtue in any sense, whether as respects the North or the South; and so in effect it was regarded on the occasion of the admission of the State of California, and the organization of the Territories of New Mexico, Utah and Washington.

Such was the state of this question when the time arrived for the organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. In the progress of constitutional inquiry and reflection, it had now at length come to be seen clearly that Congress does not possess constitutional power to impose restrictions of this character upon present or future States of the Union. In a long series of decisions, on the fullest argument, and after the most deliberate consideration, the Supreme Court of the United States had finally determined this point, in every form under which the question could arise, whether as affecting public or private rights—in questions of the public domain, of religion, of navigation, and of servitude.

The several States of the Union are, by force of the Constitution, coequal in domestic legislative powers. Congress cannot change a law of domestic relation in the State of Maine; no more can it in the State of Missouri. Any statute which proposes to do this is a mere nullity; it takes away no right—it confers none. If it remains on the statute-book unrepealed, it remains there only as a monument of error, and a beacon of warning to the legislator and the statesman. To repeal it will be only to remove imperfections from the statutes, without affecting, either in the sense of permission or of prohibition, the action of the States, or of their citizens.

Still, when the nominal restriction of this nature, already a dead letter in law, was in terms repealed by the last Congress, in a clause of the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, this proposal was made the occasion of a wide-spread and dangerous agitation.

It was alleged that the original enactment