speed to forget the lesson which they have taught.

In the meantime, it is the duty of the government, by all means within its power, to aid in alleviating the suffering of the people occasioned by the suspension of the banks, and to provide against a recurrence of the same calamity. Unfortunately, in either aspect of the case, it can do but little. Thanks to the independent treasury, the government has not suspended payment, as it was compelled to do by the failure of the banks in 1837. It will continue to discharge its liabilities to the people in gold and silver. Its disbursements in coin will pass into circulation, and materially assist in restoring a sound currency. From its high credit, should we be compelled to make a temporary loan, it can be effected on advantageous terms. This, however, shall, if possible, be avoided; but, if not, then the amount shall be limited to the lowest possible sum.

I have, therefore, determined that whilst no useful government works already in progress shall be suspended, new works, not already commenced, will be postponed, if this can be done without injury to the country. Those necessary for its defence shall proceed as though there had been no crisis in our monetary affairs.

But the federal government cannot do much to provide against the recurrence of existing evils. Even if insurmountable con-

[illegible] cre[illegible]ion of a National Bank this would furnish no adequate preventive security. The history of the last Bank of the United States abundantly proves the truth of this assertion. Such a bank could not, if it would, regulate the issues and credits of fourteen hundred State banks in such a manner as to prevent the ruinous expansions and contractions in our currency which afflicted the country throughout the existence of the late bank, or secure us against future suspensions. In 1825 an effort was made by the Bank of England to curtail the issues of the country banks under the most favorable circumstances. The paper currency had been expanded to a ruinous extent, and the bank put forth all its power to contract it in order to reduce prices and restore the equilibrium of foreign exchanges. It accordingly commenced a system of curtailment of its loans and issues, in the vain hope that the joint stock and private banks of the kingdom would be compelled to follow its example. It found, however, that as it contracted they expanded and at the end of the process, to employ the language of a very high official authority "whatever reduction of the paper circulation was effected by the Bank of England (in 1825) was more than made up by the issues of the country banks."

But a Bank of the United States would not if it could, restrain the issues and loans of the State banks, because its duty as a regulator of the currency must often be in direct conflict with the immediate interest of its stockholders. If we expect one agent to restrain and control another their interests must, at least in some degree, be antagonistic. But the directors of a Bank of the United States would feel the same interest and the same inclination with the directors of the State banks to expand the currency, to accommodate their favorites and friends with loans, and to declare large dividens. Such has been our experience with regard to the last bank.

After all, we must mainly rely upon the patriotism and wisdom of the States for the prevention and redress of the evil. If they will afford us a real specie basis for our paper circulation by increasing the denomination of bank notes, first to twenty, and afterwards to fifty dollars; if they will require that the banks shall at all times keep on hand at least one dollar of gold and silver for every three dollars of their circulation and deposites; and if they will provide by a self-executing enactment, which nothing can arrest, that the moment they suspend they shall go into liquidation, I believe that such provisions, with a weekly publication by each bank of a statement of its condition, would go far to secure us against future suspensions of specie payments.

Congress, in my opinion, possesses the power to pass a uniform bankrupt law applicable to all banking institutions throughout the United States, and I strongly recommend its exercise This would make it the irreversible organic law of each bank's existence, that a suspension of specie payments shall reduce its civil death. The instinct of self-preservation would then compel it to perform its duties in such a manner as to escape the penalty and preserve its life.

The existence of banks and circulation of bank paper are so identified with the habits of people, that they cannot at this day be suddenly abolished without much immediate injury to the country. If we could confine them to their appropriate sphere and prevent them from administering to the spirit of wild and reckless speculation by extravagant loans and issues, they might be continued with advantage to the public.

But this I say, after long and much reflection: if experience shall prove it to be impossible to enjoy the facilities which well regulated banks might afford, without at the same time suffering the calamities which the excesses of the banks have hitherto inflicted upon the country it would then be far the lesser evil to deprive them altogether of the power to issue a paper currency and confine them to the functions of banks of deposit and discount.

Our relations with foreign governments are on the whole, in a satisfactory condition.

The diplomatic difficulties which existed between the government of the United States and that of Great Britain at the adjournment of the last Congress have been happily terminated by the appointment of a British minister to this country who has been cordially received.

Whilst it is greatly the interest, as I am convinced it is the sincere desire, of the governments and people of the two countries to be on terms of intimate friendship with each other, it has been our misfortune most always to have had some irritating, if not dangerions outstanding question with Great Britain.

Since the origin of the government we have been employed in negotiating treaties with that power, and afterwards in discussing their true intent and meaning. In this respect, the convention of April 19, 1850, commonly called the Clayton and Bulwer Treaty, has been the most unfortunate of all; because the two governments place directly opposit and contradictory constructions upon its first and most important article. Whilst in the United States, we believed that this treaty would place both powers upon an exact equality by the stipulation that neither will ever "occupy or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over any part of Central America," it is contended by the British Government that the true construction of this language has left them in the rightful possession of all that portion of Central America which was in their occupancy at the date of the treaty; in fact that the treaty is a virtual recognition on the part of the United States of the right of Great Britain, either as owner or protector, to the extensive coast of Central America, sweeping round from the Rio Hondo to the port and harbor of San Joan de Nicaragua, together with the adjacent Bay Islands, except the comparatively small portion of this between the Sarstoom and Cape Honduras.

According to their constuction, the treaty does no more than simply prohibit them from extending their possessions in Central America beyond the present limits. It is not too much to assert, that if in the United States the treaty had been considered susceptible of such a construction, it never would have been negotiated under the authority of the President, nor would it have received the approbation of the Senate. The universal conviction in the United States was, that when our government consented to violate its traditional and time honored policy, and to stipulate with a foreign government never to occupy or acquire territory in the Central American portion of our own continent the consideration for this sacrifice was that Great Britain should, in this respect at least, be placed in the same position, with ourselves.

Whilst we have no right to doubt the sincerity of the British government in their construction of the treaty it is at the same time my deliberate conviction that this construction is in opposition both to its letter and its spirit.

Under the [illegible] negotiations were instituted between the two governments for the purpose, if possible, of removing these difficulties; and a treaty having this laudable object in view was signed at London on the 17th of October, 1856, and was submitted by the President to the Senate on the following 10th of December.—Whether this treaty, either in its original or amended form, would have accomplished the object intended without giving birth to new and embarrassing complications between the two governments, may perhaps be well questioned. Certain it is, however, it was rendered much less objectionable by the different amendments made to it by the Senate. The treaty, as amended, was ratified by me on the 27th of March, 1857, and was transmitted to London for ratification by the British government. That government expressed its willingness to concur in all the amendments made by the Senate with the single exception of the clause relating to Ruatan and the other islands in the Bay of Honduras. The article in the original treaty as submitted to the Senate, after reciting that these islands and their inhabitants "having been by a convention bearing date the 27th day of August, 1856, between her Britanic Majesty and the republic of Honduras, constituted and declared a free territory under the sovereignty of the said republic of Honduras," stipulated that "the two contracting parties do hereby mutually engage to recognise and respect in all future time the independence and right of the said free territory as a part of the republic of Honduras"

Upon an examination of this convention between Great Britain and Honduras of the 27th of August, 1856, it was found that, whilst declaring the Bay Island to be a "free territory under the sovereignty of the republic of Honduras," it deprived that republic of rights without which its sovereignty over them could scarcely be said to exist. It divided them from the remainder of Honduras, and gave to their inhabitants a separate government of their own, with legislative, executive, and judicial officers, elected by themselves.—It deprived the government of Honduras of the taxing power in every form, and exempted the people of the islands from the performance of military duty except for their own exclusive defence. It also prohibited that republic from erecting fortifications for their protection—thus leaving them open to invasion from any quarter; and finally, it provided "that slavery shall not at any time hereafter be permitted to exist therein."

Had Honduras ratified this convention, she would have ratified the establishment of a State substantially independent within her own limits, and a State at all times subject to British influence and control. Moreover, had the United States ratified the treaty with Great Britain in its original form, we should have been bound "to recognize and respect in all future time" those stipulations to the prejudice of Honduras. Being in direct opposition to the spirit and meaning of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty as understood in the United States, the Senate rejected the entire clause, and substituted in its stead a simple recognition of the sovereign right of Honduras to these islands in the following language: The two contracting parties do hereby mutually engage to recognize and respect the island of Ruatan, Bonaco, Utila, Barbaretta, Halena, and Morat, situate in the Bay of Honduras, and off the coast of the republic of Honduras, as under the sovereignty and as a part of the said republic of Honduras."

Great Britain rejected this amendment, assigning as the only reason, that the ratifications of the convention of the 27th August, 1856, between her and Honduras, had not been "exchanged, owing to the hesitation of that government." Had this been done, it is stated that her Majesty's Government would have had little difficulty in agreeing to the modification proposed by the Senate, which then would have had in effect the same signification as the original wording. Whether this would have been the effect; whether the mere circumstance of the exchange of the ratification of the British convention with Honduras prior in point of time to the ratification of our treaty with Great Britain would, "in effect," have had "the same signification as the original wording," and thus have nullified the amendment of the Senate, may well be doubted. It is, perhaps, fortunate that the question has never arisen.

The British government, immediately after rejecting the treaty as amended, proposed to enter into a new treaty with the United States, similar in all respects to the treaty which they had just refused to ratify, if the United States would consent to add to the Senate's clear and unqualified recognition of the sovereignty of Honduras over the Bay Islands the following conditional stipulation: "Whenever and so soon as the Republic of Honduras shall have concluded and ratified a treaty with Great Britain, by which Great Britain shall have ceded, and the Republic of Honduras shall have accepted, the said Islands, subject to the provisions and conditions contained in such treaty."

This proposition was, of course rejected. After the Senate had refused to recognize the British convention with Honduras of the 27th August, 1856, with full knowledge of its contents, it was impossible for me, necessarily ignorant of "the provisions and conditions," which might be contained in a future convention between the same parties, to sanction them in advance.

The fact is that when two nations like Great Britain and the United States, mutually desirous, as they are, and I trust ever may be, of maintaining the most friendly relations with each other, have unfortunately concluded a treaty which they understand in senses directly opposite, the wisest course is to abrogate such a treaty by mutual consent, and to commence anew Had this been done promptly, all difficulties in Central America would most probably ere this have been adjusted to the satisfaction of both parties. The time spent in discussing the meaning of the Clayton and Bulwer treaty would have been devoted to this praiseworthy purpose, and the task would have been the more easily accomplished because the interest of the two countries in Central America is identical, being confined to securing safe transits over all the routes across the Isthmus.

Whilst entertaining these sentiments, I shall nevertheless not refuse to contribute to any reasonable adjustment of the Central American questions which is not practically inconsistent with the American interpretation of the treaty Overtures for this purpose have been recently made by the British government in a friendly spirit, which I cordially reciprocate; but whether this renewed effort will result in success I am not prepared to express an opinion. A brief period will determine.

More than forty years ago, on the 3d March, 1815, Congress passed an act offering to all nations to admit their vessels laden with their national productions into the ports of the U. States upon the same terms with our own vessels, provided they would reciprocate to us similar advantages. This act confirmed the reciprocity to the productions of the respective foreign nations who might enter into the proposed arrangement with the United States The act of May 24, 1828, removed this restriction, and thereby offered a similar [illegible] to the origin of their cargoes. Upon these principles our commercial treaties and arrangements have been founded, except with France, and let us hope that this exception may not long exist.

Our relations with Russia remain, as they have ever been, on the most friendly footing The present Emperor, as well as his predecessors, have never failed, when the occasion offered, to manifest their good will to our country, and their friendship has always been highly appreciated by the government and people of the United States.

With France, our ancient relations of friendship still continue to exist. The French government have in several recent instances which need not be enumerated, evinced a spirit of good will and kindness towards our country, which I heartily reciprocate. It is, notwithstanding, much to be regretted that two nations whose productions are of such a character as to invite the most extensive exchanges and freest commercial intercourse, should continue to enforce ancient and obsolete restrictions of trade against each other. Our commercial treaty with France, is in this respect an exception from our treaties with all other commercial nations. It jealously leaves discriminating duties both on tonnage and on articles, the growth, produce, or manufacture of the one country, when arriving in vessels belonging to the other.

With all the European governments, except that of Spain our relations are as peaceful as we could desire. I regret to say that no progress whatever has been made since the adjournment of Congress, towards the settlement of any of the numerous claims of our citizens against the Spanish government. Besides, the outrage committed on our flag by the Spanish war-frigate Ferrolana, on the high seas, off the coast of Cuba in March, 1855, by firing into the American mail steamer El Dorado and deaining and searching her, remains unacknowledged and unredressed. The general tone and temper of the Spanish government towards that of the United States are much to be regretted. Our present envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Madrid has asked to be recalled, and it is my purpose to send out a new minister to Spain, with special instructions on all questions pending between the two governments, and with a determination to have them speedily and amicably adjusted, if this be possible. In the meantime, whenever our minister urges the just claims of citizens on the notice of the Spanish government, he is met with the objection that Congress has never made the appropriation recommended by President Polk in his annual message of December, 1847, "to be paid to the Spanish government for the purpose of distribution among the claimants in the Amistad case." A similar recommendation was made by my immediate dredece-sor in his message of December, 1853; and entirely concurring with both in the opinion that this indemnity is justly due under the treaty with Spain of the 27th of October, 1795, I earnestly recommen such an appropriation to the favorable consideration of Congress.

A treaty of friendship and commerce was concluded at Constantinople on the 12th December, 1856, between the United States and Persia, the ratifications of which were exchanged at Constantinople on the 13th June, 1857, and the treaty was proclaimed by the President on the 18th August 1857. This treaty, it is believed, will prove beneficial to American commerce. The Shah has manifested an earnest disposition to cultivate friendly relations with our country, and has expressed a strong wish that we should be represented at Tehtran by a minister plenipotentiary; and I recommend that an appropriation be made for this purpose

Recent occurrences in China have been unfavotable to a revision of the treaty with that empire of the 3d July, 1844, with a view to the security and extension of our commerce. The 24th article of this treaty stipulated for a revision of it, in case experience should prove this to be requisite; "in which case the two governments will, at the expiration of twelve years from the date of said convention, treat amicably concerning the same, by means of suitable persons appointed to conduct such negotiations." These twelve years expired on the 3d July; but long before that period it was ascertained that important changes in the treaty were necessary; and several fruitless attempts were made by the commissioner of the United States to effect these changes. Another effort was about to be made for the same purpose by our commissioner, in conjunction with the ministers of England and France, but this was suspended by the occurrence of hostilities in the Canton river between Great Britian and the Chinese Empire. The hostilities have necessarily interrupted the trade of all nations with Canton, which is now in a state of blockade, and have occasioned a serious loss of life and property.—Meanwhile the insurrection within the empire against the existing imperial dynasty still continues, and it is difficult to anticipate what will be the result.

Under these circumstances, I have deemed it advisable to appoint a distinguished citizen of Pennsylvania envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to proceed to China, and to avail himself of any opportunities which may offer to effect changes in the existing treaty favorable to American commerce. He left the United States for the place of his destination in July last, in the war steamer Minnesota. Special ministers to China have also been appointed by the governments of Great Britain and France.

Whilst our minister has been instructed to occupy a neutral position in reference to the existing hostilities at Canton, he will cordially co-operate with the British and French ministers in all peaceful measures to secure by treaty stipulations, those just concessions to commerce which the nations of the world have a right to expect, and which China cannot long be permitted to withhold. From assurances received, I entertain no doubt that the three ministers will act in harmonious concert to obtain similar commercial treaties for each of the powers they represent.

We cannot fail to feel a deep interest in all that concerns the welfare of the independent republics on our own continent as well as of the empire of Brazil.

Our difficulties with New Granada, which a short time since bore so threatening an aspect, are, it is to be hoped, in a fair train of settlement in a manner just and honorable to both parties.

The Isthmus of Central America, including that of Panama, is the great highway between the Atlantic and Pacific, over which a large portion of the commerce of the world is destined to pass The United States are more deeply interested than any other nation in preserving the freedom and security of all the communications across this isthmus. It is our duty, therefore, to take care that they shall not be interrupted either by invasions from our own country or by wars between the independent States of Central America. Under our treaty with New Granada of the 12th December, 1846, we are bound to guaranty the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama, through which the Panama railroad passes, "as well as New Granada has and possesses over the said Territory" This obligation is founded upon equivalents granted by the treaty to the government and the people of the United States.

Under these circumstances, I recommend to Congress the passage of an act authorizing the President, in case of necessity to employ the land and naval forces of the United States to carry into effect this guarantee of neutrality and protection. I also recommend similar legislation for the security of any other route across the isthmus in which we may acquire an interest by treaty.

With the independent republics on this continent it is both our duty and our interest to cultivate the most friendly relations We can never fell indifferent to their fate, and must always rejoice in their prosperity. Unfortunately, both for them and for us, our example and advice have lost much of their influence in consequence of the lawless expeditions which have been fitted out against some of them within the limits of our country. Nothing is better calculated to retard our steady material progress, or impair our character as a nation, than the toleration of such enterprizes in violation of the law of nations.

It is one of the first and highest duties of any independent State, in its relations with the members of the great family of nations, to restrain its people from acts of hostile aggression against their citizens or subjects. The most eminent writers on public law do not hesitate to denounce such hostile acts as robbery and murder.

Weak and feeble States like those of Central America, may not feel themselves able to assert and vindicate their rights. The case would be far different if expeditions were set on foot within our own territories to make private war against a powerful nation. If such expedition were fitted out from abroad against any portion of our own country, to burn down our cities, murder and plunder our people, and usurp our government, we shall call any power on earth to the strictest account for not preventing such enormities.

Ever since the administration of General Washington, acts of Congress have been in force to punish severely the crime of setting on foot a military expedition within the limits of the United States, to proceed from thence against a nation or State with whom we are at peace. The present neutrality act of April 20th, 1818, is but little more than a collection of pre-existing laws. Under this act the President is empowered to employ the land and naval forces and the militia "for the purpose of preventing the carrying on of any such expedition or enterprise from the territories and jurisdiction of the United States," and the collectors of customs are authorized and required to detain any vessel in port when there is reason to believe that she is about to take part in such lawless enterprises.

When it was first rendered probable that an attempt would be made. To get up another unlawful expedition against Nicaragua, the Secretary of State issued instructions to the marshals and district attorneys, which were directed by the Secretaries of War and the Navy to the appropriate army and navy officers, requiring them to be vigilent, and to use their best exertions in carrying into effect the provisions of the act of 1818. Notwithstanding these precautions, the expedition has escaped from our shores. Such enterprises can do no possible good to the country, but have already inflicted much injury both on its interests and its character. They have prevented peaceful emigration from the United States to the states of Central America which could not fail to prove highly beneficial to all the parties concerned. In a pecuniary point of view alone our citizens have sustained heavy losses from the seizure and closing of the transit route by the San Juan between the two oceans.

The leader of the recent expedition was arrested at New Orleans, but was discharged on giving bail for his appearance in the insufficient sum of two thousand dollars.

I commend the whole subject to the serious attention of Congress believing that our duty and our interest, as well as our national character requires that we should adopt such measures as will be effectual in restraining our citizens from committing such outrages.

I regret to inform you that the President of Paraguay has refused to ratify the treaty between the United States and that State, as amended by the Senate, the signature of which was mentioned in the message of my predecessor to Congress at the opening of its session in December 1853. The reasons assigned for this refusal will appear in the correspondence herewith submitted.

It being desirable to ascertain the fitness of the river La Plata and its tributaries for navigation by steam, the United States steamer Water Witch was sent thither for that purpose in 1853. This enterprise was successfully carried on until February, 1855, when, whilst in the peaceful prosecution of her voyage up the Parana river, the steamer was fired upon by a Paraguayan fort. The fire was returned; but as the Water Witch was of small force, and not designed for offensive operations, she retired from the conflict. The pretext upon which the attack was made was a decree of the President of Paraguay of October 1854, prohibiting foreign vessels of war from navigating the rivers of that State. As Paraguay, however, was the owner of but one bank of the river of that name, the other belonging to Corrientes, a State of the Argentine Confederation, the right of its government to expect that such a decree would be obeyed cannot be acknowledged. But the Water Witch was not properly speaking, a vessel-of-war. She was a small steamer engaged in a scientific enterprise intended for the advantage of commercial states generally. Under these circumstances, I am constrained to consider the attack upon her as unjustifiable, and as calling for satisfaction from the Paraguayan government.

Citizens of the United States, also, who were established in business in Pariguay, have had their property seized and taken from them and have otherwise been treated by the authorities in an insulting and arbitrary manner, which requires redress.

A demand for these purposes will be made in a firm but conciliatory spirit. This will the more probably be granted if the Executive shall have authority to use other means in the event of a refusal. This is accordingly recommended.

It is unnecessary to state in detail the alarming condition of the Territory of Kansas at the time of my inauguration. The opposing parties then stood in hostile array against each other, and any accident might have relighted the flame of civil war. Besides, at this critical moment, Kansas was left without a governor by the resignation of Governor Geary.

On the 19th of February previous, the territorial legislature had passed a law providing for the election of delegates on the third Monday of June to a convention to meet on the first Monday of September, for the purpose of framing a constitution preparatory to admission into the Union. This law was in the main fair and just; and it is to be regretted that all the qualified electors had not registered themselves and voted under its provisions.

At the time of the election for delegates an [illegible] whose avowed object it was if need be to put down the lawful government by force, and to establish a government of their own under the so called Topeka constitution. The persons attached to this revolutionary organization abstained from taking any part in the election.

The act of the territorial legislature had omitted to provide to submitting to the people the constitution which might be framed by the convention; and in the excited state of public feeling throughout Kansas an apprehension extensively prevailed that a design existed to force upon them a constitution in relation to slavery against their will. In this emergency it became my duty, as it was my unquestionable right, having in view the union of all good citizens in support of the territorial laws to express an opinion on the true construction of the provisions concerning slavery contained in the organic act of Congress of the 30th May, 1854. Congress declared it to be "the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way." Under it Kansas, when admitted as a State," was to "be received into the Union, with or without slavery, as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."

Did Congress mean by this language that the delegate elected to frame a constitution should decide this question of slavery, or did they intend by leaving it to the people that the people of Kansas themselves should decide this question by a direct vote? On this subject I confess I had never entertained a serious doubt and therefore in my instructions to Governor Walker of the 28th March last, I merely said that when "a constitution shall be submitted to the people of the Territory, they must be protected in the exercise of their right of voting for or against that instrument, and the fair expression, of the popular will must not be interrupted by fraud or violence."

In expressing this opinion it was far from my intention to interfere with the decision of the people of Kansas, either for or against slavery. From this I have always carefully abstained. Intrusted with the duty of taking "care that the laws be faithfully executed," my only desire was that the people of Kansas should furnish to Congress the evidence required by the organic act, whether for or against slavery; and in this manner smooth their passage into the Union. In emerging from the condition of territorial dependence into that of a sovereign State, it was their duty, in my opinion, to make known their will by the votes of the majority, on the direct question whether this important domestic institution should or should not continue to exist. Indeed, this was the only possible mode in which their will could be authentically ascertained.

The election of delegates to a convention must necessarily take place in seperate districts. From this cause it may readily happen, as has often been the case, that a majority of the people of a State or Territory are on one side of the question, whilst a majority of the representatives from the several districts into which it is divided may be upon the other side. This arises from the fact that in some districts delegates may be elected by small majorites, whilst in others those of different sentiments may receive majorities sufficiently great not only to overcome the votes given for the former, but to leave a large majority of the whole people in direct opposition to a majority of the delegates. Besides, our history proves that influences may be brought to bear on the representative sufficiently powerful to induce him to disregard the will of his constituents. The truth is, that no other authentic and satisfactory mode exists of ascertaining the will of a majority of the people of any State or Territory on an important and exciting question like that of slavery in Kansas, except by leaving it to a direct vote. How wise, then, was it for Congress to pass over all subordinate and intermediate agencies, and proceed directly to the source of all legitimate power under our institutions!

How vain would any other principle prove in practice! This may be illustrated by the case of Kansas. Should she be admitted into the Union, with a constitution either maintaining or abolishing slavery, against the sentiment of the people, this could have no other effect than to continue and to exasperate the existing agitation during the brief period required to make the constitution conform to the irresistable will of the majority.

The friends and supporters of the Nebraska and Kansas act, when struggling on a recent occasion to sustain its wise provisions before the great tribunal of the American people, never differed about its true meaning on this subject. Everywhere throughout the Union they publicly pledged their faith and their honor, that they would cheerfully submit the question of slavery to the decision of the *bona fide* people of Kansas, without any restriction or qualification whatever. All were cordially united upon the great doctrine of popular sovereignty, which is the vital principle of our free institutions. Had it then been insinuated from any quarter that it would be a sufficient compliance with the requisitions of the organic law for the members of a convention, thereafter to be elected, to withhold the question of slavery from the people, and to substitute their own will for that of a legally ascertained majority of all their constituents this would have been instantly rejected. Everywhere they remained true to the resolution adopted on a celebrated occasion recognising "the right of the people of all the Territories—including Kansas and Nebraska acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a constitution, with or without slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

The convention to frame a constitution for Kansas met on the 1st Monday of September last. They were called together by virtue of the territorial legislature, whose lawful existence had been recognised by Congress in different forms and by different enactments A large proportion of the citizens of Kansas did not think proper to register their names and to vote at the election for delegates; but an opportunity to do this having been fairly afforded, their refusal to avail themselves of their right could in no manner affect the legality of the convention.

This convention proceeded to frame a constitution for Kansas, and finally adjourned on the 7th day of November. But little difficulty occurred in the convention, except on the subject of slavery. The truth is that the general provisions of our different State constitutions are so similar—and, I may add, so excellent—that the difference between them is not essential. Under the earlier practice of the government, no constitution framed by the convention of a Territory preparatory to its admission into the Union as a State had been submitted to the people. I trust, however, that example set by the last Congress, requiring that the constitution of Minnesota "should be subject to the approval and ratification of the people of the proposed State" may be followed on future occasions. [illegible] vention of Kansas would act in accordance with this example founded as it is, on correct principles; and hence my instructions to Gov. Walker, in favor of submitting the constitution to the people, were expressed in general and unqualified terms.

In the Kansas Nebraska act, however this requirement, as applicable to the whole constitution, had not been inserted, and the convention were not bound by its terms to submit any other portion of the instrument to an election, except that which relates to the "domestic institution" of slavery. This will be rendered clear by a simple reference to its language It was "not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way." According to the plain construction of the sentence, the words "domestic institutions" are limited to the family. The relation between master and slave and a few others are "domestic institutions," and are entirely distinct from institutions of a political character. Besides, there was no question then before the people of Kansas or the country, except that which relates to the "domestic institution" of slavery.

The convention, after an angry and excited debate, finally determined, by a majority of only two, to submit the question of slavery to the people, though at the last forty three of the fifty delegates present affixed their signatures to the constitution.

A large majority of the convention were in favor of establishing slavery in Kansas.—They accordingly inserted an article in the constitution for this purpose similar in form to those which had been adopted by other territorial conventions. In the schedule, however, providing for the transition from a territorial to a State government, the question has been fairly and explicity referred to the people whether they will have a constitution "with or without slavery." It declares that, before the constitution adopted by the convention "shall be sent to Congress for admission into the Union as a State" an election shall be held to decide this question, at which all the white male inhabitants of the Territory above the age of twenty one are entitled to vote. They are to vote by ballot; and "the ballot cast at said election shall be endorsed 'constitution with slavery,' and 'constitution with no slavery'" If there be a majority in favor of the "constitution with slavery," then it is to be transmitted to Congress by the president of the convention in its original form. If, on the contrary, there shall be a majority in favor of the "constitution with no slavery," "then the article providing for slavery shall be stricken from the construction by the president of this convention;" and it is expressly declared that "no slavery shall exist in the State of Kansas, except that the right of property in slaves now in the Territory shall in no manner be interferred with;" and in that event it is made his duty to have the constitution thus ratified transmitted to the Congress of the United States for the admission of the States into the Union.

At this election every citizen will have an opportunity of expressing his opinion by his vote "whether Kansas shall be received into the Union with or without slavery," and thus this exciting question may be peacefully settled in the very mode required by the organic law. The election will be held under legitimate authority, and if any portion of the inhabitants shall refuse to vote, a fair opportunity to do so having been presented, this will be their own voluntary act, and they alone will be responsible for the consequences.

Whether Kansas shall be a free or a slave State must eventually, under some authority, be decided by an election; and the question can never be more clearly or distinctly presented to the people than it is at the present moment. Should this opportunity be rejected, she may be involved for years in domestic discord, and possibly in civil war, before she can again make up the issue now so fortunately tendered, and again reach the point she has already attained.

Kansas has for some years occupied too much of the public attention. It is high time this should be directed to far more important objects. When once admitted into the Union, whether with or without slavery, the excitement beyond her own limits will speedily pass away, and she will then for the first time be left, as she ought to have been long since, to manage her own affairs in her own way. If her constitution on the subject of slavery, or on any other subject, be displeasing to a majority of the people, no human power can prevent them from changing it within a brief period. Under these circumstances, it may well be questioned whether the peace and quiet of the whole country are not of greater importance than the mere temporary triumph of either of the political parties in Kansas.

Should the constitution without slavery be adopted by the votes of the majority, the rights of property in slaves now in the Territory are reserved. The number of these is very small; but if it were greater the provision would be equally just and reasonable. These slaves were brought into the Territory under the constitution of the United States, and are now the property of their masters. The point has at length been finally decided by the highest tribunal of the country—and this upon the plain principle that when a confederacy of sovereign-