

# The Union and Eastern Journal.

"ETERNAL HOSTILITY TO EVERY FORM OF OPPRESSION OVER THE MIND OR BODY OF MAN."—JEFFERSON.

BIDDEFORD, MAINE, FRIDAY, AUGUST 22, 1856.

VOLUME XII—NUMBER 34.

LOUIS O. COWAN, Editor and Proprietor.

## UNION AND EASTERN JOURNAL.

The Union and Eastern Journal is published every Friday, at No. 1, Central Street, opposite the Biddeford House. Terms—\$10 per annum, or \$1.50 per month in advance. Single copies 5 cents. The paper is sent by mail to subscribers in the United States and Canada. It is also sent by mail to subscribers in Europe, at the rate of \$5 per annum. The paper is published by Louis O. Cowan, at No. 1, Central Street, Biddeford, Maine.

MARCUS WATSON, Printer.

## Agricultural.

### What a poor Farmer Cannot Afford.

The following remarks are from an address of Horace Greeley, at the annual fair in Erie County, N. Y., last autumn. Mr. Greeley had a pretty thorough agricultural training while a boy, so that nearly all the processes of the art are familiar to him. To this he has added a close and discriminating observation, and thus qualified himself to write as good an agricultural address as we read from any source.

"The truth I am most anxious to impress, is that no poor man can afford to be a poor farmer. When I have recommended agricultural improvements, I have often been told, 'this expensive farming will do well enough for rich people, but we who are in moderate circumstances can't afford it.' Now, it is not ornamental farming that I recommend, but profitable farming. It is true that the amount of a man's capital must fix the limit of his business, in agriculture as in everything else. But however poor you may be, you can afford to cultivate land well if you can afford to cultivate it at all. It may be out of your power to keep a large farm under a high state of cultivation, but then you should sell a part of it, and cultivate a small one. If you are a poor man, you cannot afford to raise small crops; you cannot afford to accept half a crop from land capable of yielding a whole one. If you are a poor man you cannot afford to fence two acres to secure the crop that ought to grow on one; you cannot afford to pay for loss the interest on the cost of a hundred acres of land to get the crops that will grow on fifty. No man can afford to raise twenty bushels of corn to an acre, not even if the land given him, for twenty bushels to the acre will not pay the cost of the miserable cultivation that produces it.

"No poor man can afford to cultivate his land in such a manner as will cause it to deteriorate in value. Good farming improves the value of land, and the farmer who manages his farm so as to get the largest crop is capable of yielding, increases its value every year.

"No farmer can afford to produce weeds. They grow, to be sure, without cultivation; they spring up spontaneously on all land, and especially rich land, but though they cost no toll, a farmer cannot afford to raise them. The same elements that feed them, would, with proper cultivation, nourish a crop, and no farmer can afford to expend on weeds, the natural wealth which was bestowed by Providence to fill his granaries. I am accustomed, my friends, to estimate the Christianity of the localities through which I pass, by the absence of weeds on and about the farms. When I see a farm covered by the gigantic growth of weeds, I take it for granted that the owner is a heathen, a heretic, or an infidel—a Christian he cannot be, or he would not allow the heritage which God gave him to draw and keep, to be defiled and profaned. And if you will allow me to make an application of the doctrine I preach, I must be permitted to say that there is a great field for missionary effort on the farms between here (East Hamburg) and Biddeford. Nature has been bountiful to you, but there is great need of better cultivation.

"Farmers cannot afford to grow a crop on a soil that does not contain the natural elements that enter into its composition. When you burn a vegetable, a large part of the bulk passes away during the process of combustion into air. But there is always a residue of mineral matter, consisting of lime, potash, and other ingredients that enter into its composition. Now, the plant draws these materials out of the earth, and if you attempt to grow that plant in soil that is deficient in these ingredients, you are driving an unsuccessful business. Nature does not make vegetables out of nothing, and you cannot expect to take crop off from a little field that does not contain the elements of which it is formed. If you wish to maintain the fertility of your farms, you must constantly restore to them the materials which are withdrawn in cropping. No farmer can afford to sell his ashes. You annually export from Western New York a large amount of potash. Depend upon it there is nobody in the world to whom this is worth so much as to yourself. You can't afford to sell it, but a farmer can well afford to buy ashes at a higher price than is paid by anybody that does not wish to use them as fertilizers of the soil. Situated as the farmers of this country are in the neighborhood of a city that burns large quantities of wood for fuel, you should make it a part of your system of farming to secure all the ashes it produces. When your teams go to town with loads of wood, it would cost comparatively little to bring back loads of ashes and other fertilizers that would improve the productiveness of your farms.

"No poor farmer can afford to keep fruit trees that do not bear good fruit. Good fruit is always valuable, and should be raised by the farmer, not only for market, but for large consumption in his own family. As more enlightened views of diet prevail, fruit is destined to supplant the expensive quantities of animal food that are consumed in this country. This change will produce better health, greater vigor of body, activity of mind, and elasticity of spirits, and I cannot doubt that the time will come when farmers, instead of putting down the large quantities of meat they do at present, will

give their attention in autumn to the preservation of large quantities of excellent fruit, for consumption as a regular article of diet, the early part of the following summer. Fruit will then appear on the table as it does now, only as dessert after dinner, but will come with every meal, and be reckoned a substantial aliment.

"No poor farmer can afford to work with poor implements, with implements that either do not do the work well, or that require an unnecessary expenditure of power. To illustrate this, it will be necessary to ask your attention to the nature and office of the mechanical operation requisite for the production of good crops. It is essential to the healthy growth of a plant that the air should have free access to every part of it, the roots as well as the leaves, and that the soil in which it grows should be moist, but not too moist, and should have a certain degree of warmth. These necessities of vegetation will enable us to understand the mechanical operations on the soil demanded by good farming.

"The soil should be light and be finely pulverized, in order that the little fibres sent out by the roots in search of nourishment may be easily permeated in all directions. It should be porous to be easily penetrated by air and water, and as its own weight and the filtering of rains tend constantly to bed it down into a compact mass, it needs frequent stirring."

### Preserving Shingles on Roofs.

Some paint roof shingles after they are laid. This makes them rot sooner than they otherwise would. Some paint the courses as they are laid; this is a great preservative, if each shingle is painted the length of three courses. But about as sure a way to preserve shingles, and that with little or no expense, is a mode recommended in a letter to us by Hon. David Hunter, of Clinton, on the 23d of Feb. last. We publish so much of his letter as relates to this subject, in hopes that it may be of service to many of our readers.

"There is one thing more, that nearly all people know, if they would only attend to it; that is, to sprinkle slacked lime on the roofs of their buildings, in rainy days. Put it on considerably thick, so as to make the roof look white, and you never will be troubled with moss, and if the shingles are covered over so thick with moss, by putting the lime on twice, it will take it all off and leave it as white and clean, and will look as well as if it had been painted. It ought to be done once a year, and, in my opinion, the shingles will last almost twice as long as they will let the roof all grow over to moss. I tried it on the back side of my house ten years ago, when the shingles were all covered over with moss, and they appeared to be nearly rotten. I gave the roof a heavy coat of lime, and have followed it nearly every year since, and the roof is better now than it was then, and to all appearance, if I follow my hand, it will last ten or fifteen years longer. The shingles have been on the roof for thirty years. There is no more risk about sparks catching on the roof than on a newly shingled roof. Those who do not have lime near by, can use good strong wood ashes, and these will answer a very good purpose to the same end."

"The action of the lime is to cleanse the surface of all impediments to the free and rapid passage of the rain-water off. This enables the shingles to dry, very soon, and consequently prevents rotting. Moss-covered roofs will rot very rapidly.—*Rural Intelligence.*

**Fruits in Summer.**—It is a beautiful fact, that while the warmth and exposure of summer tend to biliousness and fevers, the free use of fruit, and berries counteracts that tendency. Artificial acids are found to promote the separation of the bile from the blood, with great mildness and certainty; this led to the supposition, that the natural acids, available, and being more available, would necessarily be preferred. Experience has verified the theory, and within a very late period, Allopathic writers have suggested the use of fresh, ripe, perfect, raw fruits, as a reliable remedy in the diarrhoea of summer.

How strongly the appetite yearns for a pickle, when nothing else could be relied on, is the experience of most of us. It is the instinct of nature pointing to a cure. The want of a natural appetite is the result of the bile not being separated from the blood, and if not remedied fever is inevitable, from the slightest dropsy of that bilious, congestive, and yellow. "Fruits are cooling," is a by-word, the truth of which has forced itself on the commonest observer. But why they are so, they had not the time, opportunity, or inclination to inquire into. The reason is, the acid of the fruit stimulates the liver to greater activity in separating the bile from the blood, which is its proper work, the result of which, the bowels become free, and the pores of the skin are open. Under such circumstances, fevers and want of appetite are impossible.

**How to Use Fruits.**—To derive from the employment of fruits and berries all that healthful and nutritive effect which belong to that nature, we should

First—Use fruits that are ripe, fresh, perfect, raw.

Second—They should be used in their natural state, without sugar, cream, milk, or any other form of food or drink.

Third—Fruits have their best effect when used in the early part of the day; hence we do not advise their employment at a later hour than the middle of the afternoon; not that, if perfect and ripe, they may not be eaten largely by themselves, within two hours of bedtime, with advantage, but if the sources of decay should happen to taint them, or any liquor should inadvertently be largely drunk afterwards, even cold water, acidity of the whole mass may follow, resulting in a night of distress, if

not actual or dangerous sickness. So it is better not to run the risk.

To derive a more decided medicinal effect, fruits should be largely eaten soon after rising in the morning, and about midday between breakfast and dinner.

An innumerable amount of sickness and suffering would be prevented every year if the whole class of desserts were swept from our tables during summer, and fresh, ripe, perfect fruits and berries were substituted, while the amount of money that would be saved thereby, at the New York prices of fruits, would in some families amount to many dollars—dollars enough to educate an orphan child, or support a colporteur a half year, in some regions of our country. *Hill's New York Journal of Health for July.*

### Farmers' Gardens.

As a general thing, farmers do not provide themselves with good gardens; at least, so far as the writer has travelled, he has seldom seen what he would call a good garden on farms. The excuse for this neglect is generally the same with all of them—they "have no time to attend to such small matters." And yet it may safely be asserted that an acre of ground appropriated to a good garden will be more profitable to the farmer than any other ten acres of the farm. The interests of the farmer, the comforts of his family, the good condition and health of his whole household, require such a garden on every farm in the country. And it should be a garden—not a mere excuse for one, a mere weedy patch. It should be one so managed and arranged that every vegetable of a wholesome quality for human food, should be raised in it in perfection, and at the earliest season. After a winter's diet on solid and generally salt animal food, the human constitution requires the deterring operations of free vegetable and fruit diet, and, as a general rule, no one can dispense with it safely. Besides this, the natural appetite calls for it, and there are few pleasures that may be so safely and even beneficially indulged in. In the latter part of Winter and early in the Spring, measures should be taken to secure early vegetables of all kinds capable of early cultivation. Details will not be expected here; there are other books and papers appropriate to such information; but I cannot help saying, that when I am at a farm-house, at a season when early peas, beans, cabbages, cucumbers, potatoes, green corn, lettuce, &c., are properly in season, and find none of these luxuries on the table—nothing but the *blue beef*, salt pork and beans or potatoes of winter—I am free to say I do not envy that farmer's life nor his family their enjoyments. These very people are fond enough of such things when they go to the city, and it is not therefore want of taste. It is simply the fault of negligence. Why may not every farmer in the State have every kind of early vegetables on his table as early as any gardener near the cities can raise them? There is not a single reason why he should not, while there are a great many why he should. The gardeners have to incur a very considerable expense in procuring hot manure for their hot-beds, while the farmer has it in his barn-yard. The gardener has every thing to purchase, and draw a considerable distance, while the farmer has nothing to buy. The small quantity of lumber required is probably rotting on his premises. It would only be a source of amusement during Winter for him to construct the frame of a hot bed, and prepare the manure and bed for use. Having done this, and got his plants in a thriving state, he can, in a short time, when the season arrives, get his garden ground in order and make his plantations. And then he will have those vegetable luxuries as early as many of his town friends can purchase them. It only requires a little industry and attention to accomplish this, and, as said before, his enjoyment, his health, and even his interest, as well as the comfort of his family, will be benefited by it.—*Exchange.*

**PLANT ONE ACRE LESS.**—Plant one acre less," advises the *Rural New Yorker*, in opposition to the advice given by the *New York Tribune*. The *New Yorker* says: Farmers cannot afford to cultivate as much land as has been their wont. If proof of this assertion is required, just hitch up some day, drive through your own neighborhood, and examine the farms therein; you don't want the trouble; then just look at your own, and if not convinced, we will set you down as incorrigible. The preparation that would be required before sowing the seed, is an exemplification of the "one acre more," dogma. Your plowing is like beauty, but skin deep.

"What is the matter with your potatoes?"

"Oh, they want rain!"

"Is that all? Indeed!"

"Your cornfields look as though they would need powerful tonics to be enabled to survive the season."

"Yes, they don't look very healthy, but I have been so hurried, had so much to do, and so little to do with, that I find it utterly impossible to give each and every crop the attention I suppose it ought to receive."

"Then, my dear sir, pardon a little frankness; you have mistaken your vocation, and have no business upon a farm. You can no more afford to have such crops of wheat, potatoes and corn, than you can afford to keep a poor horse, cow or hog. You can't afford to raise such luxuriant crops of weeds as you do. You can't afford to use such poor tools. If your state and country should offer premiums for the poorest farmer, you can't afford to live upon them, even if you should win, which is not at all unlikely. Above all, you can't afford to plant one acre more! Sell off a portion, and apply the funds therefrom to the benefit of the remainder."

Have good implements, good help, and we will warrant good crops and also good times. *plant one acre less, and do it well.*

The cultivation of a large amount of land, as the process is performed by many agriculturists, is a waste of labor and of fertility impoverishing both the tiller and the soil. Sound judgment, we think, will demonstrate that large crops per acre, as a general rule, are the most profitable, and experiment will verify it. It should be the aim of the farmer to sustain the richness of his land, and this can be done only by reducing the breadth under the plow, proportionately to his capacity for applying such fertilizing materials as will return the elements taken therefrom by the crops. "A little farm well tilled" gladdeneth the heart, but a great breadth of acres cultivated in a slovenly manner, is a blight upon the interests of its owner, and an evil in the sight of all men.

### Remedy for the Borer.

Mr. TRUCKER:—With your approval, the following prescription is most respectfully and with great pleasure dedicated, through your valuable paper, to the New York State Agricultural Society.

*Sure and total destruction to the Apple, Quince and Peach Borer; and at the same time a decided stimulant and safe fertilizer to the tree.*

Make a concave mound of mellow earth around the tree, rising about six inches above the work of the insect. Thoroughly saturate this mound with a strong common salt brine, at an interval of four weeks, at any time of the year when the ground is not frozen; stale beef or pork brine, in its full strength, is just the thing. The mound of earth holds the liquid in suspension round the tree, until by capillary attraction it is carried into the holes and burrows of the insect—where the salt is sure destruction to every grade of this ravaging and pestilent enemy. Vary the quantity of the dose with the size of the tree. Be cautious with small trees. Old, large trees, three feet round, may have a pailful at a time.

I have revived trees by this application from apparent death. Apple trees, 30 years old, with their trunks perforated very badly, are now perfectly healthy, and their wounds are now healing over. Two Golden Sweetings, 8 years old last June, withered and showed signs of death. On examination, I found the trunks full of borers, and more than half the surface eaten off. I made the application twice. Both trees revived, and made new wood the same season. This spring, I have treated every other tree with the application. These trees are in bloom and the wounds made by the insect are rapidly healing over. I would not now, without trial, recommend the application to any other than the apple, quince and peach.

N. S. SWETT.

Buffalo N. Y.—Country Gentleman.

## Miscellaneous.

### The Dog Noble, and the Empty Hole.

BY HENRY WARD BEECHER.

The first summer which we spent in Lenox, we had along a very intelligent dog named Noble. He was learned in many things, and by his dog-like earnestness and admiration of all the children. But there were some things which Noble could never learn. Having on one occasion seen a red squirrel run into a hole in a stone wall he could not be persuaded that he was not there for evermore.

Several red squirrels lived close to the house and had become familiar, but not tame. They kept up a regular romp with Noble. They would come down from the maple trees with provoking coolness; they would run along the fence almost within reach; they would cock their tails and sail across the road to the barn; and yet there was such a well timed calculation under all this apparent rashness, that Noble invariably arrived at the critical spot just as the squirrel left it.

On one occasion Noble was so close upon his red-backed friend that, unable to get up the maple tree, he dodged into a hole in the wall, ran through the chinks, emerged at a little distance, and sprang into the tree. The intense enthusiasm of the dog at that hole can hardly be described. He filled it full of barking. He pawed and scratched as if underrunning a bastion. Standing off with a gaze as intense and fixed as if he were trying magnetism on it. Then, with tail extended, and every hair thereon electrified, he would rush at the empty hole with a prodigious outburst.

This imaginary squirrel haunted Noble night and day. The very squirrel himself would run up before his face into the tree, and crouched in a crotch, would sit silently watching the whole process of bombarding the empty hole, with great sobriety and relief. But Noble would allow of no doubts. His conviction that that hole had a squirrel in it continued unshaken for six weeks. When all other occupants failed this hole remained to him. When there were no more chickens to harry, no pigs to bite, no cattle to chase, no children to romp with, no expeditions to make with the grown folks, and when he had slept all that his dog-skin would hold, he would walk out of the yard, yawn and stretch himself, and then look wistfully at the hole, as if thinking to himself, "Well, as there is nothing else to do I may as well try that hole again!"

We had almost forgotten this little trait, until the conduct of the New York Express in respect to Col. Fremont's religion brought it ludicrously to mind. Col. Fremont is, and always has been, as sound a Protestant as John Knox ever was. He was bred in the Protestant faith, and has never changed. He is unacquainted with the doctrines and ceremonies of the Catholic Church, and has never attended the services of that Church, with two or three exceptions, when curiosity or some extrinsic reason, led him as a witness. We do not state this upon vague be-

lief. We know what we say. We say it upon our own personal honor and proper knowledge. Col. Fremont never was, and is not now, a Roman Catholic. He has never been wont to attend that Church. Nor has he in any way, directly or indirectly, given occasion for this report.

It is a gratuitous falsehood, utter, barren, absolute and unqualified. The story has been got up for political effect. It is still circulated for that reason, and like other political lies, it is a sheer, unscrupulous falsehood, from top to bottom, from the core to the skin, and from the skin back to the core again. In all its parts, in pulp, tunic, rind, cell and seed, it is a thorough and total untruth, and they who spread it bear false witness. And as to all the stories of the Palmer, etc., as to supposed conversations with Fremont, in which he defended the mass, and what not, they are pure fictions. They never happened. The authors of them are slanders; the men to believe them are dupes; the men who spread them become endorsers of wilful and corrupt libels.

But the Express, like Noble, has opened on this hole in the wall, and can never be done barking at it. Day after day, it reports to this empty hole. When everything else fails this resource remains. There they are, indefinitely—the Express and Noble—a church without a Fremont, and a hole without a squirrel in it!

In some respects, however, the dog had the advantage. Sometimes we thought that he really believed that there was a squirrel there. But at other times he apparently had an inkling of the ridiculousness of his conduct, for he would drop his tail, and walk towards us with his tongue out and his eyes a little vacant, seeming to say, "My dear sir, you don't understand a dog's feelings. I should of course much prefer a squirrel, but if I can't have that, an empty hole is better than nothing. I imagine how I would catch him if he was there. Besides, people who pass by don't know the facts. They think that I have got something. It is useful to keep up my reputation for sagacity. Besides, to tell the truth I have looked into that hole so long that I have half persuaded myself that there is a squirrel there, or will be, if I keep on."

Well, every dog must have his day, and every dog must have his way. No doubt if we were to bring back Noble now, after two summers' absence, he would make straight for that hole in the wall with just as much zeal as ever.

We never read the Express, now-a-days, without thinking involuntarily, "Goodness! the dog is letting off at that hole again."—*New York Independent.*

### White Men to be made Slaves.

A Buchanan paper openly proposing to sell white parents and their children into slavery when by misfortune they may become unable to earn a living.

The *New York Day Book*, one of the two papers in the city of New York that support James Buchanan, not long since proposed that those persons in our large cities who might be unable to earn a living should be sold into SLAVERY, just as the negroes of the South are. After depicting the misery of those poor white people, and the crimes into which they were led, the *Day Book* said:

"Sell the parents of these children into SLAVERY. Let our Legislature pass a law that whoever will take those parents and take care of them and their OFFSPRING, in sickness and in health,—clothe them, feed them, and house them,—shall be legally entitled to their services; and let the same Legislature decree that whoever receives those parents and their CHILDREN, and obtains their services, shall take care of them AS LONG AS THEY LIVE."

The Buchanan papers of the South very generally maintain that slavery is not to be confined to color, but that the "laboring classes everywhere should be SLAVES."

From the above extract it will be seen that this doctrine has traveled northward, and has been openly advocated in New York by the leading Buchanan paper in that city. Should their doctrine prevail we should find New York and Philadelphia, (Boston too, perhaps,) converted into slave markets, which would equal if they did not surpass those of Charleston and New Orleans. The markets of New York and Philadelphia would be very choice ones, too, from the fact that all the slaves offered for sale would probably be white. A poor American mechanic, if he got into difficulties and misfortunes, and hampered with debt, would have all his miseries at once relieved by this new "Democratic" doctrine of selling him, his wife and children to some good master, who, according to the *Day Book*, "would be legally entitled to their services as long as they might live." So also any German or Irish emigrant who might, on first landing in this country, find it hard to get work, would at once be taken care of by being sold on the auction block into slavery; and yet we are not all exaggerating or mistaking the truth when we declare that a large number of the papers advocating the election of James Buchanan, are in favor of doctrines that lead to just this result—openly avowing as they do that "laboring men have no right to vote, and that their natural and proper condition is one of inferiority and servitude."

The working man, the free man of the North, who in view of these facts casts a vote for the so-called "Democratic" party, votes to declare that he himself should be made a slave. Is any man willing to do this?—*Kenned Journal.*

A GOOD HIT.—The Washington correspondent of the New York Times furnishes the following anecdote: A good story is told at the expense of those who protest that Fremont's election will lead to disunion. A few evenings since, a company of gentlemen were assembled in this city at a quiet game of whist. Among the party was a distinguished New York

politician, and several Southern Members of Congress. The conversation turned upon the Presidential election, and all the horrid train of evils to follow upon Fremont's election were set forth in glowing colors. It was asserted that his must necessarily be a sectional administration, under which no Southern man could or would take office—the consequence of which calamity, it was voted, must uproot the pillars of the Republic. One of the Southern M. C.'s, after listening for some time to these grave arguments, instead of assenting to their force, suggested that he desired no larger fortune than he would undertake to collect in the way of toll across the Long Bridge over the Potomac, from the applicants for office under Fremont's Administration from the State of Virginia alone!

### Speech of Hon. W. P. Fessenden, ON THE TOOMBS BILL.

In the Senate, July, 1856.

It was certainly not my intention, when I made the few remarks which I submitted this morning, in relation to the motion to print, to give occasion to the debate which has followed. I carefully avoided all allusion, by way of argument, to the proceedings which had taken place here in relation to this bill. If anybody is responsible for this debate, I think it must be the honorable Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. TUCKER) who chose to avail himself of this occasion to give us a re-touch of the argument which we heard yesterday, and upon previous days. I think our friends in the majority have no reason to complain of us for introducing this discussion to-day. It has, however, taken such a range, that I feel called upon to say a few words in self defense; although I do not design to enter into the argument upon the general question, and have had no such intention from the beginning, because my opinion has been, that the question must be fought before the people, and we should gain nothing on either side by debating it here in the manner in which it has been, and is likely to be, discussed. Sir, I made a remark last week, which I reiterated this morning; that I had my own opinion with reference to the object of this bill; and that opinion was that the bill was designed to make Kansas a Slave State. I stated that I entertained this opinion, and believed it to be perfectly parliamentary to express it; because, while I cannot with propriety, single out any Senator, and say, "Sir, you have motives which you choose now to avow," I have a right to examine any measure, and to consider the surrounding circumstances, its antecedents and consequences, in order to form an opinion as to what the result would be; and from that to infer that such result must have been contemplated by those who introduced and supported it. Such a course of argument I believe to be perfectly parliamentary and logical.

For that remark, I have been alluded to, among others, by the honorable Senator from Illinois, (Mr. DOUGLASS) who intimated, somewhat plainly, that Senators would have occasion, from the course which he should adopt, to regret having introduced a topic of that description, or having adverted to motives. Sir, I suppose he thought that his own severity of language, and his own overpowering majority of manner, were such as to make us feel very sorrowful whenever he chose to rebuke us. I wish to inform the honorable Senator that, with all the respect I may entertain for his ability, as shown on this floor, I do not feel very sensibly any rebuke coming from him in relation to questions of this description, and the opinions I hold in regard to them. My respect for his ability is not at all enhanced by the manner in which he chooses to express his opinions, and the demeanor which he delights to assume towards members on this side of the chamber, whether generally or individually.

Sir, I am opposed, always, to the use of unparliamentary language. I do not think it justifiable to call gentlemen by names which they do not wish to assume. I do not wish to assume a distinctive name, I do not wish to think either parliamentary or becoming to apply an epithet intended to be an epithet of reproach or of degradation, to the party having taken its name, or to the individuals who use it. We call ourselves Republicans. The honorable Senator never speaks of us without calling us Black Republicans. We call ourselves Republicans; we never speak of us without calling us abolitionists. Here, on the floor of the Senate, in his own peculiar manner, when he speaks to the body with reference to us, he designates us as "the Abolitionists," taking, for contemptuous bitterness, his very expressive features, and thinking, I suppose, he wounds our sensibilities very deeply, and places us in a very uncomfortable attitude. I think, sir, the only attitude in which he places anybody is not one creditable to himself.

I do not deal in epithets. If the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber choose to call themselves democrats, I call them democrats. I may not be perfectly willing to agree that they are entitled to be considered democrats, in the true sense of the word, but that is the appellation by which they choose to be distinguished, and I am willing to allow them all the benefit they can derive from it. I do not call you, sir, a speckled, or spotted, red or blue democrat, but a democrat; and whether you are a good democrat or not, is for you to settle with the country and with your constitution, not with me. I would merely suggest to gentlemen that it would probably be quite as well to let us be distinguished by the name we select for ourselves, instead of amusing themselves by trying to affix another which we do not choose to assume. Understand me; I have no objection, personally; it does not change my relation to my country, or to any party, in any way; it does not change the nature or character of that party. It only shows that

in the Senate of the United States, which should be the highest body in the land in manners as well as in ability, individuals may sometimes forget the first principles recognized in communication between gentlemen, and attempt to take out an argument by affixing what are called nick-names upon parties and persons, which they do not choose to recognize. If Senators think they can make anything of this, let them do it; I shall not follow their example.

I stated, Mr. President, that I believe, as I do believe, that the object of this bill was to impose slavery upon Kansas. I believe that was the object of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Why? I believe it in the first place, because no other sensible reason can be given for the repeal of that compromise. If it was not designed—if it was not supposed, that the effect would be to make Kansas a Slave State, why was it meddled with at all? Why not leave it as it was? By the original compromise, slavery could not go north of 36 deg. 30 min.—If you did not wish it to go there—if you did not suppose it might go there in consequence of the repeal, why was the compromise interfered with? What was the object? Was it to try a merely useless experiment? Was it that a few words put upon paper, and passed through the forms of legislation, were to establish a principle? Gentlemen pretend to say that the object was to establish the great principle of the right of the people of the Territories to govern themselves. What necessity existed for promulgating any such principle at that particular time, if you did not believe it would result in the manner I have supposed?

Mr. President, it cannot be forgotten that when this doctrine was first promulgated, it was received with amazement—not to a derision throughout the country. It was denied both north and south, and hardly found an advocate in either section. The south affirmed that settlers in a Territory had no power to prohibit slavery, and claimed a constitutional right to hold slaves in any territory until the adoption of a State constitution should otherwise determine.

The north claimed that Congress had all power over the subject-matter. It will be recollected, sir, that every Free State in the Union, except Iowa, had passed resolutions against the extension of slavery over free territory, and in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. This doctrine of squatter sovereignty, then, found favor nowhere. It had no advocate—no friend—and, in my judgment, it deserved none. It involves too many absurdities. It assumes that the people of this Union have no power over their own property; that a few settlers—located, under existing laws, upon lands, not their own, with a view to purchase, become masters of the destiny of all about them—may determine the value of the public domain, without the assent of Congress, by adopting institutions which may seriously and injuriously affect that value—may so shape the character of an incipient State as to make it a burden upon all the others, instead of a new pillar in the national edifice—may entail upon the country such calamities as they please, unchecked by the people of the country—may legalize crime, and may turn a land of freedom and virtue into a citadel of oppression and wickedness at their pleasure. Sir, the doctrine, as applied to new and weak settlements, is absurd. I hold it to be the duty of this government to afford its protection to the Territories. The duty of protection implies the power to govern. All governments have acted on this principle since the creation of the world. Our government has mainly, and wisely, left the power of passing local laws to the people of the Territories, subject to the revision of Congress. This restriction had always exercised—undisputed—unquestioned; and this fact alone, is a conclusive answer to the whole doctrine of squatter sovereignty. If it exists at all, it must exist in the whole. The power to make laws is not a sovereign power, if it has any superior.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous unpopularity of this doctrine, which no party had assumed, or incorporated into its creed, yet, suddenly, when the Missouri restriction was to be abrogated, it sprang into new life; it was at once vitalized. Southern gentlemen discovered that the people of the slave States had been suffering with constitutional wounds for many years, and northern gentlemen found that the sovereign rights of the people had been trampled upon from the foundation of the government. This doctrine, sir, had become convenient. It would answer a purpose, and was fit for the occasion. The people were to shape their institutions as they wished, and Congress was, for the first time, relieved from all supervision of territorial legislation. The settlers in Kansas and Nebraska were apparently left in the exclusive, unlimited exercise of popular sovereignty, so far as legislation was concerned.

Sir, I had little faith then, and time has not increased it in these new revelations. They came, to use a common expression, wrong end foremost. They did not give birth to the act, but the act gave birth to them. The Kansas and Nebraska Bill was not, in my belief, a consequence, but a cause. The thing preceded the principle. I affirm, Mr. President, that no recognition of this doctrine is to be necessarily inferred from the compromise measure of 1850. Such inference is an afterthought. And here let me say to the Senator from Georgia, that he erred in asserting that it was which nominated Gen. Scott. It is a mistake to suppose that the convention acknowledged the power now claimed for the people of the Territories, to form such institutions as they please, irrespective of any control by Congress.

There was no such thing in the platform adopted by the convention in 1852. All they agreed to was, that the measures of 1850 which had been passed should be considered a finality, and that there should be no further excitement, if they could prevent it, on the subject of slavery.

Mr. TOOMBS. The Senator does not quote the resolution correctly.

Mr. FESSENDEN. I state the substance of it, for I was a member of the convention, and also a member of the committee that framed the resolutions. I was opposed to that part of the platform which related to this subject. It was presented, originally, by a Southern gentleman in the committee, and amended by another, a Mr. Scott, of Virginia. I remember all about it. There is no such principle in that platform as the Senator from Georgia seems to suppose. It is a bare assumption. By saying that it is an assumption, I do not mean that the gentleman does not suppose it to be as he states. Nor do I believe it was incorporated into the democratic platform of that year. The democrats never resolved, that there should be an end to the agitation of slavery, and that the measures of 1850 were to be considered a finality and nothing more. Neither of these conventions adopted the principle which the Senator has stated, and I hold that it was never adopted anywhere until brought forward here in order to afford an excuse for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

When, Mr. President, it is perfectly manifest that there was no necessity for repealing that compromise, unless it was designed and intended that Kansas should be open to slavery, and when the principle assumed as the basis of that repeal, had before been repudiated, laughed at and derided, North and South, from the time when it was promulgated down to the time when it was thus assumed, I may fairly conclude the object and design of that bill could have been no other than to afford an opportunity for the slave power to get a footing in Kansas, and to place territory, which, up to that time, had been free by the compromise of 1820, in such a position that slavery might be enabled to overrun and appropriate it.

This opinion, sir, is strengthened by another fact, which, I believe, has been elsewhere adverted to. I allude to the geographical boundaries of Kansas, which necessarily place that territory under the control of the slave power. It will be recollected that the first bill reported from the committee on territories embraced what now constitute both territories—Kansas and Nebraska. That scheme was abandoned, and a new bill introduced, as an amendment, which Nebraska was divided. How was it divided? Equally? Not at all. By any natural boundary? No; but by the fortieth parallel of north latitude. Why was this done? Observe, that by the first bill the Territory organized would abate, in part, upon the slave State of Missouri and upon the free Territory of Iowa, and the free Territory of Minnesota. By the division the north line of Kansas is made to fall below the north line of Missouri; the whole eastern border of Kansas is exposed to the border counties of Missouri, and no single inch of it can be approached from free Territory. Had the division been equal, or even natural, or convenient, it would have been less noticeable. But that division was grossly unequal. Nebraska is far the largest. A natural line would have been the Plate River, but this would have left a small portion of Kansas adjoining Iowa. Why, sir, was the











