

BY D. W. CRAIG.

TERMS—The ARGUS will be furnished at Three Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, in advance, to single subscribers—Three Dollars each to clubs of ten at one office—in advance. When the money is not paid in advance, Four Dollars will be charged if paid within six months, and Five Dollars at the end of the year.

Two Dollars for six months—No subscriptions received for a less period.

No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the publisher.

Life's Philosophy.

BY MISS EMMELINE ROWLEY.

Oh! why is woman, with wormwood wreath,
Life's honey cup?
And why, the fairest bloom beneath,
Cale the smoke up?
Why shines the smile and falls the tear
O'er the same cheek?
Why are the blessings brought so near
The last we seek?

A word—and hearts the longest proved
Are coldly changed;
An hour—and friends the best beloved
Are far estranged.

We hope—and, rainbow-like, we find
The air we grasp;
We love—and, that which thought may bind
Dust to our clasp.

The ocean in its grandeur rides
O'er forms of death;
The green earth with its beauty hiles
Decay beneath;
Thus love looks with her calmest eye
On interest wrong—
And sorrow hides her heaviest sigh
In lightest song.

Woe that earth hath no power of rest
For weariness;
Woe that no gift may charm man's breast
From wretchedness—
That lightning winds should ever blow,
Or cold storms sweep—
That death's strange sea should ebb and flow
To make us weep!

We mourn not, when the sun is set,
For sunbeams dead;
Nor when from autumn's coronet
The leaves are shed;
Then why o'er friends that, warbling, flee
Like summer birds,
Tuning their last sweet melody
To angel words!

Few may have been the lights that gleamed
In life's dull sky;
And few the dreams we've dreamed
And swift to fly.

Yet oft from the half-cultured vine
Green leaves will start,
And thus some blossoms will outwine
The blighted heart.

And though around the Queen of flowers
Circles the sting,
The violet blooms in lowly bowers
And daisies spring.

Thou dost and sweet—why should we strive
For what is not,
While love's own buds, that round us thrive,
Wither forgo?

The moonless midnight has its stars,
Many and bright;
Robes and gold and untold spurs
Glim cavern light;

A rough shell crimson at the kiss
Of the pearl's lip;
Tun each lone heart with some sweet bliss
Whoe'er to sip.

Life hath no perfect happiness—
No bound of youth;
Yet life hath hours of blessedness,
And this sweet truth,
That each soul hath a hidden string,
Or viewless key,
That sometimes quivers to the spring
Of sympathy.

Thank God! the storms that wreck the heart
May do no more—
And the same power that true friends part,
True friends restore;
Fate bears no shadow of the past
Beyond Time's wave,
And Love moves Love, where dies at last
Death and the Grave.

For the Argus.

The Maiden's Answer.

I am too young, I cannot quit
My mother's side—I am not fit
To leave my early home just yet;
So leave off wooing, your vain pursuing
May lead you to your own undoing—
My heart is free.

I am my father's only pet,
My mother's heart on me is set;
I do not choose to leave them yet—
So go your way, and let me play
While I am young—another day
My mind may change; I will not say
How that shall be.

—ANNIE LACRUE.

POLITICAL.—Hon. A. G. Brown, U. S. Senator from Mississippi, has delivered his political manifesto. It was before the Legislature of his State, Nov. 9. Judging from the report, we should say Mr. Brown is hard to suit. He "abhors Douglas's Squatter Sovereignty, detests the good-Lord-good-devil policy of the President's organ, and is not satisfied with 'Black's Observations,' and he looks with anxiety and some fears for Buchanan's exposure at the opening of Congress." He maintained that slaveholders have the right to carry slaves into the Territories, and to have slavery protected, first, by the Territorial Legislature, that failing, then by Congress. He declared that he would not be satisfied with the reiteration of the Cincinnati Platform at Charleston, as it had two faces. The platform must contain protection to slavery in the Territories by Congress. If this was refused, he was ready to "break up the Charleston Convention, and the National Democratic party of the land." "It will never do to give it up, Mr. Brown."

A couple of journeymen printers in New York, named Wilkins and Hughes, exchanged "hated matter, from pistols, in French's Hotel, a few days since, in a quarrel. Hughes got a "good" in the breast, and his "furn" was taken to the hospital. Wilkins distributed himself as rapidly as possible. "A foul case."

It is impossible to love where we cannot esteem; and no woman can be esteemed by a man who has sense. If she makes herself agreeable in the eyes of a fool. No mistake about that.

Robert Burns once attended a festival given by his fellow-exiles, in the course of which the toast of William Pitt was given. All drank a saucy Burns, who sat with inverted glass. When all had drunk the toast, Burns arose and remarked that he would give them a greater name than the one they had toasted—George Washington.

Providence says Eve was not half so smart as her daughter; she was cheated by Satan, but they generally cheat the devil.

Who struck Billy Patterson?

The Oregon Argus.

—A Weekly Newspaper, devoted to the Interests of the Laboring Classes, and advocating the side of Truth in every issue.—

Vol. V.

OREGON CITY, OREGON, JANUARY 14, 1860.

No. 40.

Speech of Hon. Lyman Trumbull,
OF ILLINOIS,
At Sandusky, Ohio, last September.

A SOUND DOCUMENT.

Without taking up time in preliminary remarks, I will call your attention to the present organization of parties, and the question which divides them. I say *question*, for parties are now organized and divided upon a single question. Both parties are now existing are of but comparatively recent origin. They are both of the same age, twins born together; both date their existence from 1854. I will take a moment to illustrate this, not that I care anything for party names, but there are those who seem to attach importance to the word Democratic and the word Republican.

You all know that in 1850 there were passed by the Congress of the United States a series of measures known as the Compromise Measures. There were five of them, which it is not necessary to enumerate. And although some of these five measures were unacceptable to one portion of the country, and some to another, and although there were persons in all parts of the Union who were very much disinclined to acquiesce in them, yet when the struggle in 1850 was over, and the measures were passed, both parties agreed to abide by them.

The great principle of non-intervention on the subject of slavery by the Congress of the United States, was then said to be established. Some in one portion of the Union disliked the Fugitive Slave Law, some disliked the abolition of the slave trade in the district of Columbia, and others took exception to the admission of California as a free State, but after the measures had passed, the people of this great country, the masses of both parties, actuated by a common desire to be at peace upon this vexed question of slavery, resolved they would resist any and every attempt to agitate the question in Congress, or out of Congress, no matter under what pretense it should be attempted. This was in 1850, when resolutions to that effect were adopted in the National Conventions of both parties. And it was supposed then that we should have quiet and peace upon this subject. We were told that it should be banished from the halls of Congress. Franklin Pierce was elected President of the United States, and, on being inaugurated, he announced in his message that the Compromise measures should receive no shock during his administration which he had the power to prevent.

In the winter of 1854, a measure was introduced in Congress for the organization of the new Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, and a report was prepared by the committee which introduced that measure setting forth that inasmuch as the slavery question had been settled by the measures of 1850, the committee, in introducing this bill for the organization of these Territories, or one Territory, as originally proposed—did not thought proper to interfere with the Missouri Compromise, because it would be a departure from the policy adopted in 1850, which was the policy of non-intervention. When the measures of that year passed, and the Territories of Utah and New Mexico were organized, there was not a Territory belonging to the United States in which slavery was not excluded by law. Washington, Oregon, and Minnesota had been organized, with a clause prohibiting slavery inserted in their organic acts, and Utah and New Mexico had laws prohibiting slavery before we acquired the territory, and which continued in force after its acquisition by us. The great parties agreed that they would not interfere with the then existing condition of the Territories, but leave them free as they were.

Who interfered to disturb this peaceful condition of things? Was there anybody ready to interfere and violate this treaty which had been agreed upon by both parties? Somebody did it. The very next month after that report was made stating that it would be a departure from the policy of 1850 to disturb the Missouri Compromise, the author of the report introduced a proposition to repeal that Compromise, and open the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska to the introduction of slavery. When that proposition was made, both the old parties were disorganized at once. The country was astounded, and instead of slavery agitation being banished the halls of Congress, they have not ceased to resound the speeches upon that subject from that time to this. The proposition was not supported by either party as such. It received almost the unanimous vote of Whigs and Democrats in Congress from the South, while of Northern Representatives, a majority of both Whigs and Democrats voted against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. Those who united in its repeal were then baptized into what was called the Democratic family—a family composed of all men who were in favor of admitting slavery into the Territories. This was the Democratic test. If there is a gentleman here who wishes to get into the Democratic party, whether he be Whig, Federalist, or American, he has only to swear allegiance to the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and he is admitted to the communion table at once.—[Laughter.] Hence you find such men as Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, and others, formerly very good Whigs, who are now the high priests of the Democracy. On the other hand, those who were opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise took the name of Republicans. This was the origin of the Democratic and Republican parties—each party being five years old.—No other question now divides them than slavery, a question never in issue between parties till 1854. The division first arose on the question of extending slavery into the Territories, and that is still the primary question which divides them. It is not in regard to slavery in the States, although Democracy is often made to mix up States with Territories. You will find in the

Kansas-Nebraska bill a pompous declaration that it was the true intent and meaning of this act not to introduce slavery into the States or Territories, nor to exclude it therefrom.

Who before ever thought of introducing it into or excluding it from States? What power has Congress to interfere with slavery in the States? Why was this word inserted in a Territorial bill? For the purpose of misleading somebody who should be so simple as to believe that there was somebody who wanted to exclude slavery from or introduce it into States. [Laughter.] The question now, however, though primarily raised in regard to the introduction of slavery in the Territories, extends further. It was started there, but the power which repealed the Missouri Compromise has gone on demanding more, and now not only the attempt made to introduce slavery into Territories, but all the powers in this great government, in all its departments, are being exerted for strengthening and giving perpetuity to this institution. Not a foreign minister is appointed without first knowing what his view are upon the slavery question; not a treaty is made, but its bearings upon the subject of slavery are looked to. In the attempts to seize foreign territory, whether right or by wrong, the whole foreign policy of the Government is directed with reference to giving strength to the slaveholding interest. Every officer of the Government is selected with reference to this. Not a Judge of the Supreme Court is appointed unless he is known to be in favor of the doctrine of letting slavery into the Territories. Not a man is permitted to hold office unless his influence is known to coincide with the slaveholding Democracy on this question.

Now, the Republican party advocates directly the reverse of this. That party is for keeping the Territories free, and is for managing the affairs of the Federal Government for the advancement of the interests of freedom and free men, not only in the North but in the South. It is not for encroaching upon the rights of the slaveholders, but looks to the interests of the great mass of people in the North and South. One party is for building up an aristocracy, the other is for sustaining the masses. I mean by this that the legislation of this so-called Democratic party looks exclusively to the interests of the slaveholders, who constitute but a very small portion of the people of the United States. If you will refer to the census of 1850, you will find that only 350,000 persons hold slaves. Of the 20,000,000 of white population of the United States, only about one in sixty owns slaves, and only one in about twenty in the slaveholding States owns property in men. Now shall I say we are for encroaching upon the rights of the South when we are for promoting the advancement of the interests of nineteen out of twenty of the white population of that section of the Union? And shall that party be permitted to name itself Democracy which legislates for the benefit of only one man in sixty of the whole population of the United States?

It seems to me if there were any other aristocratic institution to be built up in this country, in which only 350,000 were interested, and the Congress of the United States were called upon to shape its legislation in regard to that interest, at the expense of more than nineteen millions, it would be scouted from Congress and trampled under foot. Why is it that this aristocratic institution of slavery—this combination of capital of a few men invested in other men, should receive the unreserved favor of the government? I would not encroach upon the rights of slaveholders. I am willing to stand by the Constitution in all its parts, as our fathers left it; I know slavery exists by State laws, and let the people have it where it exists, and let it to their lawns until they are tired of it. But when you ask me to extend slavery for the benefit of 350,000 men, it is a very different question.

It is insisted by the great Democratic party that slavery goes into all the Territories of the United States, and that Congress has no right to keep it out so long as the Territorial condition continues. It is also the doctrine of the Democratic party, that the people of the Territory have no right to keep slavery out through the action of their Territorial Legislature, and that there is no power anywhere to exclude slavery from a Territory.

A portion of the Democratic party insist that it is the duty of Congress to pass a slave code for the protection of slavery in the Territories; and another insist upon the revival of the slave trade; but neither of these measures has become a principle of the Democratic party, and I have no idea that the Convention which meets to nominate a candidate for the Presidency at Charleston, will adopt either of them. The party is not ready for that now, any more than it was to favor the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1852. I would like to ask this audience, if you had been told that such results would have followed that repeal as you now see, would you have contemplated the measure? But you were told then that the object was not to extend slavery into Kansas, but simply to get rid of the odious distinction made against the South, and leave the people of the Territories to do just as they please. Now they tell you that popular sovereignty, or self-government, cannot keep slavery out of the Territories. And this is the doctrine of the present Democratic party. They did not then announce it; nor are they ready now to announce the revival of the African slave trade and a slave code for the Territories as Democratic doctrine. Whether they will be and by demand them, I will not undertake to say. Perhaps they will not demand a slave code. They think slavery is sufficiently protected without a slave code. I think so too, if the Constitution of the United States extends slavery into the Territories, and if slavery is to be treated as any other species of property. Let us illustrate this: Suppose one of you,

gentlemen, goes to-morrow into the neighboring State of Indiana with his horse, do you need any special statute of that State to protect your horse? Are not horses recognized as property over the civilized world? If negroes are as much property as horses, have you any need of a special statute or local law to protect you in their possession?

If a man takes your horse away, cannot you bring your action of trespass or trover and recover damages? And if a negro is property, will not the same remedy apply? So long as we have courts which will decide that there is no distinction between slave property and other property, so long slavery needs no positive law to protect it. No proposition has been introduced into Congress for a slave code. So long as the Democracy can appoint Judges who will protect them in their slave property, they want no other law. I believe I have stated fairly what is the creed of the Democratic party; but there is a fragment of that party—a mere fiction, that proclaim another kind of doctrine here in the northern States. They preach it in Illinois, and I understand it has been discussed in this State. They are not ready to come up to the doctrine of the party, but must have some pretense or other to mislead the people. I care not what a man's individual opinions are, so long as he acts with a party whose doctrines are known to all. Suppose the entire delegation sent from this State to Congress was in favor of popular sovereignty, and when they get there they should act with the majority of contrary views, would the delegation amount to anything? They would simply give strength and power to the organization which is the instrument used to crush out popular sovereignty.

But the doctrine of popular sovereignty, as advocated by this fragment, is absurd, it is contradictory, impracticable, inconsistent, revolutionary, and destructive of all civil liberty and constitutional government. I shall occupy your attention for a short time on this question of popular sovereignty or self-government in the Territories, as it is called, which has no foundation upon which to stand. I do not mean by this that popular sovereignty is not an element in our government; but that it is the basis upon which our government rests, I deny; and there is not a man here who does not repudiate it—not one. Not a man of you would be one of nine who would enter into a government where five—the majority—should have absolute control of four—the minority; or where five hundred and one should exercise unlimited dominion, simply by force of a bare numerical majority, over the remaining four hundred and ninety-nine of a thousand persons. The despotism of five men over four is as bad as the despotism of one man over four. Our government rests upon no such basis. It rests upon a broader principle than that a numerical majority shall rule absolutely. How was the Constitution of the United States formed? Did a majority of the people make it? Can a majority of the people of the United States pass a law? I ask you, law-abiding men, you Constitution loving men—are you willing that the Constitution of the United States shall depend for its existence upon the caprice of the majority of the day? Or are you for that Constitution as your fathers made it, full of checks and balances to protect the minority against the majority. Constitutions are made to protect minorities, not majorities.

The Constitution of the United States was not put into operation by a majority of States, but required the assent of nine out of the thirteen States before it could take effect at all, and then it was only to go into operation between the States adopting it. The powers of the Federal Government are defined in that Constitution. The people stated what powers it should have. They did not authorize a popular majority to pass a law. In the House of Representatives this popular principle is represented. That body is composed of members according to population. The Senate is composed of members selected from States as corporate bodies, not according to numbers at all. The little State of Florida has as many representatives in the United States Senate as the great State of Ohio, with forty times the former's population. The President of the United States is not elected by a popular majority. He is chosen by electors, corresponding in number to that of Representatives and Senators in Congress. Can a majority of these popular representatives pass a law? Certainly not. It must be approved by the Senate, representing the State Rights principle in our Confederation, and receive the sanction of the President before it goes into operation. Thus careful were the fathers of the republic to interpose all these checks and balances.

Our government is based upon the consent of the governed, and all the governed, as nearly as it was practicable to ascertain it.

Are you for the Constitution of the United States, or are you for overturning and rendering this government as unstable as that of Mexico? The man who advocates popular sovereignty as mistaken, and if he carries out his doctrine he is a traitor to the Constitution and the Union. [Applause.] There is not a State in the Union that allows a popular majority to make a law, and I do not believe there is a man in this house who would give his consent to a government where his rights depended upon a popular majority. Away with this dogma of popular sovereignty—this catch-word to dupe the unthinking. I do not mean by this that it is not one element in our government; but that the foundation of the government is a principle broader than this single element. Every State in this Union has a Constitution adopted by the people themselves, which restrains the action of popular majorities. Now, in a Territory the organic act which gives it existence stands in the place of a Constitution to the people of the Territory. State Constitutions call into being Legislatures, provide for a judiciary, and Governor, and all the

machinery of government; in a Territory, the Congress of the United States provides all this. The Legislature of a Territory, called into existence by the organic act of Congress, can no more violate that organic act than a State Legislature can violate the Constitution which gave it existence. A Territory has such powers, and such only, as the Federal Government confers upon it, just as the Legislature of Ohio has such powers as its State Constitution confers.

But perhaps you say popular sovereignty means something else. Let me try to be misunderstood, I have brought along a sort of patented popular sovereignty, (holding up a number of Harper's Magazine,) to which I wish to invite the attention of this attentive audience. That I may not deal with it unfairly, I hope it will not be any infringement of the copyright if I read some extracts from it.

The writer says the harmonious Democracy have disputes in regard to the power of the people of the Territories and these opinions arise from the different interpretations of the Constitution. I want you to notice the language of the extract from this manifesto which I read to you:

"There are those in the United States," says the writer, "who believe the Constitution neither establishes or prohibits slavery in the Territories beyond the power of the people legally to control it." Do you believe anybody disputes that? Those who contend that the Constitution establishes slavery in the Territories do not deny the power of the people legally to control it, because any action to exclude it would be unconstitutional and therefore illegal.

If they control it legally, it will be according to the Constitution, will it not? Notice the word *control*. Can you control a thing you have not possession of? The doctrine is there are those who believe the Constitution neither establishes nor prohibits slavery beyond the power of the people legally to control it. Senator Brown of Mississippi believes this. He says the people of the Territories can control slavery but cannot exclude it, because it goes there under the Constitution. This magazine manifesto, you will notice, is silent upon the power to exclude slavery from the Territories.

What is the dispute? As to the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States? Does it determine anything to say the Constitution is to be interpreted according to the Constitution? To illustrate: I will go to my friend and ask what my right to a horse is which is in dispute between a neighbor and myself.

He says "Sir, you are free to take that horse and do with it as you please, subject to the legal rights of your neighbor."

This I have me just as far from ascertaining what my legal rights are, as when I asked the question; and the pompous declaration of these popular sovereignty men in favor of leaving the people of the Territories perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way subject only to the Constitution of the United States is equally unmeaning.

If popular sovereignty is set up in opposition to fundamental law, it is to be scouted as destructive of constitutional liberty. As it is here written, it means just nothing at all.

But this doctrine is not only, as I said, subversive of government and absurd, but it is utterly impracticable. I do not say those who advocate it are all dishonest. Men are sometimes sincere in error. Nor do I claim to be infallible. But the idea that the people of a Territory are left to do as they please, and that parties who advocate this doctrine are in favor of any such practical application of it, it will be seen upon examination, is all a mistake.

It is said by this same writer that the provisions of the Kansas-Nebraska act are believed to be in entire harmony with the Constitution, and under that the people of Kansas possess every right in respect to their domestic institutions exercised by the people of Pennsylvania under their Constitution.

I presume these popular sovereignty men thought they were doing self-government a great service when they imposed upon the people of Kansas a Governor. The Kansas-Nebraska bill provides for the organization of the Territory of Kansas, and directs that the President of the United States shall appoint—with the consent of the Senate—a Governor for the people of that Territory. Now what do you think the people of Pennsylvania would think if the President should send them a Governor? What would you think in Ohio, now while your State is being canvassed by gentlemen for the office of Governor if some one should tell you that you had a right to do as you please, but that a Governor would be appointed for you? This Governor in Kansas has the veto power of two-thirds, and is a part of the legislative department. It takes a two-thirds vote to overcome his veto. The same bill provides even the number of members comprising the Territorial Legislature. Is this consistent with self-government? The popular sovereignty men no doubt think this is permitting the people of Kansas to do as they please. What do you think of it? Not only is the Governor, but the Judges and the Marshal are appointed by the General Government, and a Legislature provided for the people of Kansas. According to this, the *Czar* of Russia is one of the greatest upholders of self-government, for he releases the people from all care in selecting rulers, judges, and the executors of the laws.

When the Kansas-Nebraska bill was pending in the United States Senate, Gov. Chase, then a Senator from Ohio, introduced an amendment that the people of the Territory should have the right to select their own Governor and Judges—which was, indeed, the only truly self-government feature of the bill. This was voted down by the popular sovereignty men, and yet they have the face to come before an intelligent community, and claim that the people of Kansas can do as they wish the people of Pennsylvania can

ADVERTISING RATES.
One square (12 lines or less, brevity measure) one insertion, \$5.00
" " " two insertions, 4.00
" " " Each subsequent insertion, 1.00
Reasonable deductions to those who advertise by the year.

JOB PRINTING.

THE PROPRIETOR OF THE ARGUS is happy to inform the public that he has just received a large stock of JOB TYPE and other new printing material, and will be in the ready receipt of additions suited to all the requirements of the locality. HANDBILLS, POSTERS, BLANKS, CARDS, CIRCULARS, PAMPHLET-WORK and other kinds, done to order, on short notice.

do. The people of Pennsylvania, Quakers though they be, would fight and die in the ditch before they would allow any one to appoint a Governor for them. Who can swallow such monstrous assumptions as are here made? How has this popular sovereignty party acted in times past in regard to their great principles? The author of the Kansas-Nebraska bill is the very man who, when Texas was about to be annexed to this Union, moved an amendment providing that in the States which should be formed out of the Territory to be acquired lying north of 36° 30', slavery should be forever prohibited. What was this but making war upon slavery in the States? I believe none of the Abolitionists go so far as to ask prohibition by Congress of slavery in the States. But here it was put into a resolution for the annexation of Texas. The same person repeatedly moved to extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific Ocean, and voted for it. No doubt he thought he was doing self-government a service, as good old St. Paul thought, when he was persecuting the Christian, he was doing God a service.

He also voted for the Wilmot proviso, and in 1856, struck out what was known as the Toombs bill, the only clause in it allowing the people of Kansas to pass upon the Constitution which the Convention should form for them.

I make these statements, not as personal to any individual, but to expose the inconsistencies of popular sovereignty generally, and to show that its advocates have practically trampled under foot the very doctrines which they preach.

Some persons understand this magazine article as conceding the right to exclude slavery from the Territories. If any person is being misled, I ask him to read it carefully. It does not advocate the doctrine that the people of a Territory have the right to exclude slavery; but the writer says:

"It follows according to the decisions of the Court, that slave property stands upon the same footing as other property, and is entitled to the same rights and immunities, and in like manner is dependent upon the local authorities and laws for protection." This is the language of the author of this article on popular sovereignty. If you concede that, then slavery is in the Territories, the same as any other property. How are you to get rid of it? Is other property subject to confiscation? Can this Legislature of Ohio confiscate your property? If slave property is upon the same footing as other property, slaves can be no more confiscated than other property.

An article attributed to Judge Black, which first appeared in the Washington Constitution, in reply to the magazine essay, takes the same position as the author of the essay, that slave property is the same as any other species of property, and entitled to the same protection in the courts. The magazine writer insists that the courts cannot protect slavery, unless jurisdiction is conferred on them by the Territorial laws. So if the Legislature of the Territory confer no jurisdiction upon the Courts, he asks how can those Courts have jurisdiction upon this subject? If he will look at the Kansas-Nebraska bill, he will find it says the Territorial Courts shall have jurisdiction in all cases arising under the Constitution. If, therefore, the Constitution guarantees slavery in a Territory, its Courts have jurisdiction by the organic act to prevent it.

No other property has a special provision for its benefit. If you will read the Kansas-Nebraska bill, you will find an appeal is allowed from the Territorial Courts to the Supreme Court of the United States, but is limited, with one exception, to cases where the amount in controversy exceeds a thousand dollars—the exception is in favor of suits involving title to slaves, in which the right of appeal is given without regard to the amount in controversy. The man claiming to be his master can take a case involving his title to the Supreme Court of the United States, though the negro be not worth ninety-nine cents. But on the other hand, a citizen of the Territory may have other property involved in litigation to the amount of nine hundred and ninety-nine dollars and ninety-nine cents, and if the Territorial Courts do him injustice, he is without remedy.

Why this special legislation in the Kansas act for the benefit of slave property? The author of the act must have designed to have slavery in Kansas or he would not have provided for litigating the title to such property between different claimants.

According to the Cincinnati Platform, which was the creed of the Democratic party until the Dred Scott decision was made, the people of the Territory have no right to exclude slavery while the Territorial condition continues. It carries out the doctrine of what is known as the National Democracy in every particular. One of its resolutions declares:

"That we recognize 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 domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

By saying that slavery may be excluded or admitted by the inhabitants of a Territory, when their numbers justifies the formation of a State Constitution, it is necessarily implied that all then they have no power. That is the way your child would understand it, you told him when he had hoed three rows of corn he might come into the house. If he came in when he had hoed only two rows you would rebuke and send him back. If any popular sovereignty friends undertake to exclude slavery from a Territory before they have people enough to make a State, the slave power will whip them and send them back.

Popular sovereignty is at war with the