

FOR PRESIDENT IN 1860, STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, OF THE UNITED STATES. FOR VICE-PRESIDENT, ANDREW JOHNSON, OF TENNESSEE.

Don't Like Our Course.

The Nemaha City Herald, an ultra Republican sheet, and the Nebraska City News, an ultra Administration sheet, are greatly exercised at late, at what they are pleased to term the inconsistent course of "R. W. Furnas, Editor of the Brownville Advertiser."

Now we challenge the editors of those papers, or any one else, to show a single instance in which we have varied a hair's breadth in our political course! We mean just what we say. Politically, we have always been, and are yet, governed in our actions, and the course we pursue, by what we conceive to be principles, and we make these principles a sine qua non, in our course; and we further tell gentlemen who differ from us, either in principle or policy, that the position we occupy upon the "issue of the day" is backed by the masses of the people throughout the length and breadth of the land, and they will yet force politicians, who ride hobbies only for a day, to come to them.

We are not disposed to notice, or devote time, or space in our paper, to every little thrust that may be made at us; prompted only by feelings of jealousy, or because we will not become the slave or tool of blind and dishonest partisans.

We are pleased to discuss, upon their merits, any questions that may arise, in which are involved the interests of the people, or welfare of the Territory; but will never condescend to low personalities or scurrility.

As to the Herald's intimation, that we "lead the Douglasites in this county," that's all bosh, and we understand perfectly well why it thus talks. We neither profess, nor propose to lead anybody, nor do we allow any one to lead us. This thing of leading people is something we do not believe in; its entirety out of place among the American people.

For our own sake, we do our own reading, thinking and acting; and are quite sure the people of Nemaha County, "Douglasites" or not, are fully competent to do the same. Such "flings" are downright insults; call in question the intelligence of our people, and the Herald ought to have sufficient good sense to know it—does know it.

The News thinks us inconsistent because we publish in our paper the call for a Republican Convention in this county, and charges us with quoting from the Republican Press in this Territory in our review of Gov. Black's veto message.

In regard to quoting from the Republican Press, the News knows better; not a syllable have we quoted from the Republican Press. We have studiously avoided quoting from any other than the Democratic Press, or Democratic Speakers, for the simple reason that the principle we are contending for was a Democratic principle, and we proposed to sustain it from Democratic authors. Are the quotations in another column—from the Chicago Times, Philadelphia Press, Cincinnati Enquirer, and Pittsburg Post—from the Republican Press?

As to the call for a Republican Convention; our paper is a local one, and anything our patrons desire to give publicity, shall find a place in our columns. The News speaks of "the friends of Mr. Douglas spitting upon such miserable trickery," &c., i. e., acting with the Republicans or any body else who advocate his principles. Does that paper mean or refer to our course in the Legislature upon the Bill to prohibit slavery in Nebraska? If so, we have only to say, Mr. Douglas, himself, in the U. S. Senate thought it not "inconsistent" to be found voting with Seward, Hale, Wilson and others, in sustaining the principles enunciated by him in opposition to the Kansas Lecompton Constitution; Douglas Democrats in the election of Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, found it not "inconsistent" to vote for Republicans for the "Bill to prohibit Slavery in Nebraska." And we are pleased to find it not "inconsistent" to act with Republicans or anybody else, who will act with us, in sustaining Mr. Douglas' position upon the rights of the people of the Territories. If Democrats choose to prove recreant to the professions they have made in regard to Popular Sovereignty, and Republicans choose to take the Kansas Nebraska Act as given us, and act it out, we are willing to work with them upon that question. We quote from good authority—better than from either a Republican or Democratic Press—when we copy from Holy Writ, which reads:

"He answered and said, I will not, but afterward he repented, and went. "And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir; and went not. "Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first."

The Democratic Party said "I will" carry out certain principles, but when the time and place arrives to practically demonstrate these principles, they fail to prove true. The Republican party in Nebraska, especially, said, "I will not," but repeat and do the will of the people. Our readers can draw their own conclusions. We go for the principles Mr. News, and we are willing to work with any set of men who will carry them out. Do you understand us? We hope you do.

Talking about "consistency," the editor of the News in a letter written to the Chicago Times attempts to explain why Douglas Democrats voted against the bill to prohibit slavery in Nebraska! "No such thing in the book." Mr. Reynolds claims to be a Douglas Democrat! (?) and to speak for others in his letter to the Times, giving as a reason why he voted against the bill, which simply was to prohibit slavery in Nebraska, that by voting for the bill he would thereby recognize the existence of slavery in Nebraska! You might as well say that voting for a Homestead Bill, you thereby recognized the previous existence of such a law. The Times in reply to Mr. Reynolds, very appropriately and sensibly, says:

"We do not agree with Mr. Reynolds in supposing that an act to prohibit, recognizes the presence of the thing proposed to be prohibited. An act to 'abolish,' pre-supposes the existence of the thing to be abolished. The act before Legislature was to prohibit, and not to abolish. We agree with him, however, in his opinion of the absurdity of the whole act. It was an absurdity only equalled by Gov. Black's very unsound, injudicious attempt to carry out the attorney general's exploded 'political axioms.'"

Is Mr. Reynolds satisfied with the answer to the interrogatory he propounded to the Editor of the Times?—viz: "I ask you who were the most consistent and true popular sovereignty Democrats—those who voted for or against this ridiculous and nonsensical proposition to prohibit slavery in Nebraska?" "This little pig went to market!"—and was sold.

While Mr. Reynolds is "explaining," would it not be well for him to "explain" why he offered an amendment to the bill to prohibit slavery, the provisions of which was that a negro should be allowed to testify in our courts against a white man, and that his evidence should have equal weight with that of the white man; which reads as follows:

"He answered and said, I will not, but afterward he repented, and went. "And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir; and went not. "Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first."

The Convention which met in this place on Saturday last presents the names of T. W. Tipton and Dr. McPherson of this city, D. C. Sanders of Nemaha City precinct, S. A. Chambers of Peru precinct, and J. D. N. Thompson of Long's precinct.

We were prevented by other engagements from witnessing the deliberations of the Convention; but are informed that it was well attended by persons from every section of the county, and that its proceedings were characterized by moderation, yet firmness and determination in reference to the rights and interests of the people. From our personal knowledge of the character and number of citizens from all parts of the county we met on the street that day, we have no hesitancy in indorsing the representation.

The gentlemen whose names are presented are too well known to require any commendation, or suffer from condemnation; they are from the ranks of our most reliable, substantial, and intelligent citizens. Messrs. Tipton, Chambers and Thompson possess a goodly amount of legislative experience; and Dr. McPherson and Judge Sanders are unsurpassed as sound practical business men.

Four out of the five of the above named gentlemen were "born and bred" Democrats—never voted any other kind of a ticket when party lines were drawn; but recreancy to professed party principles has driven them to seek other party affiliations. If Nemaha County is made irredeemably Republican, Opposition, Union, or by whatever name it may be called in the future, such a result can only be attributable to the no-Congress-Legislature-or-human-power doctrine of Mr. Buchanan, and the "soft delusion" of Gov. Black.

We are at last permitted to announce to our readers that a Speaker is elected. Ex-Governor PENNINGTON of New Jersey, upon whom was concentrated the Republican, and a sufficiency of Anti-Lecompton Democrats, and American votes, succeeded by a vote of 117 to 85 cast for McCLERNAND. Mr. Pennington is an Old Line Whig, but has for several years been acting with the Republican party.

JOHN W. FORNEY, Douglas Democrat, and the able editor of the Philadelphia Press, was elected Clerk. We regard the election of these two officers as a triumph of the conservative feeling of the country over the ultraists, who seem to think their mission to be to create and enlarge a feeling of enmity between the different sections of the country. However much hot-headed politicians may denounce conservative men and measures, they and they alone have always been the oil poured upon troubled waters. It is a source of rejoicing to the country that such men and measures are yet to be found in the land; and when they cease to exist, then indeed may we have cause to tremble for the safety and perpetuity of our free Republican form of government.

We may now look for Congress to go to work and do something for the country! The gas has been pretty much used up within the past eight weeks. "The Soft Delusion." The Press throughout the States, both Democratic and Republican—with the exception of course of those owned by the Administration—are out upon Gov. Black's veto message. We quote a few extracts from Democratic papers only.

The Chicago Times in speaking of the message says: "In his message, the Governor—Hon. Samuel W. Black, furnishes the legislature with a literary and legal production, which is a weak, very weak, condensation of the other Black's famous arguments. As a matter of history proper to be recorded, and not because of any remarkable merit in the paper itself, we give the message a place in our columns. It is possibly the poorest effort yet made against the right of the people to govern themselves. It resembles in spirit and tone, some of the veto messages of old Dunmore, the royal governor in Virginia, in which that officer, in obedience to royal commands, employed the executive negative to defeat all acts of the colonial legislature which denied to British subjects the right to carry slaves into any of the royal dominions. Lacking Dunmore's ability and polish, Gov. Black, of Nebraska, insists in his message that the people of Nebraska have no political rights which are not subject to the laws of other states. Each slaveholder in Missouri, derives the legal title to his slaves from the laws of Missouri; Gov. Black insists that the Missourian who brings his slaves into Nebraska brings with him the title to his property which was approved by the laws of Missouri; and that wherever he may go, outside of the State, the law of Missouri overrides all other laws, and continues to afford protection and title to the slave property. This doctrine is absolutely subversive of all state authority. If the right to hold slaves in a Territory be a right which is secured by the Constitution of the United States, then slavery becomes of its own force an institution superior to all laws, except the constitution. If slavery cannot be repealed or prohibited in Nebraska by the legislature because the constitution protects and guarantees security to it as property, how can Gov. Black, as a lawyer, (he was once a judge,) maintain that the people of Nebraska, by a state convention, can displace and overrule the Constitution of the United States? A State convention has no more authority to deprive a citizen of a right, held by him in virtue of the Constitution of the

United States, than can a territorial legislature. Both bodies are necessarily limited in their powers by that instrument, and yet, Gov. Sam Black, in feeble imitation of Attorney General Jeremiah Black, holds that the Territorial Legislature cannot over ride the Constitution of the United States, that being the special prerogative of a state convention. The argument is flimsy, idle and preposterous, and the legislature inflicted the severest possible punishment upon its author by having the message printed and circulated. No one who reads it will fail to pity the individual who has, in order to screen and support the president, put his name to a document so full of glaring and blundering absurdities.

The Philadelphia Press, the editor of which is an old political associate of Gov. Black, says of him and his message: "The Executive authority of the Territory is vested in Col. Samuel W. Black, of Pittsburg, who was appointed Governor by Mr. Buchanan, and who, while always an ardent Democrat, was at no very remote period, a warm advocate of the Wilmot Proviso, and we believe the author of the resolution incorporated into the Platform of the Democratic State Convention, adopted at Pittsburg in 1849 in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. In the campaign of 1856, Col. Black was an earnest champion of the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty as then understood in our State; and few who heard his eloquent speeches at that time could have doubted that when he advocated the right of the people of the Territories to control their domestic institutions," with special reference to the slavery question, would have supposed that he entertained the slightest doubt about the power to decide whether slavery should or should not be tolerated among them. However, since the recreancy of Mr. Buchanan to his pledges in 1856, and the dissemination of the peculiar and abstruse doctrines of the Jeremiah S. Black pamphlet, Governor Samuel W. Black has felt himself constrained to veto the law published above. The reasons assigned in his veto are of so intangible a character that it is difficult to comprehend them; but they appear to be based partly upon the provisions of the Louisiana treaty, by which the Territory of Nebraska was acquired, and partly upon the reasoning of the Attorney General, in his reply to the Harper Magazine article of Judge Douglas. The argument based upon the Louisiana treaty unfortunately proves too much; because treaties are the paramount law of the land, and if, in consequence of that treaty, the people of a Territory, during the continuance of that Territory, cannot abolish slavery, it is idle to suppose that the people of a State, when a State Constitution is formed, or after they have been admitted into the Union, can abolish slavery. This same objection applies, to a great extent, to the supposed arguments founded upon the alleged unconstitutionality of the law quoted above. If the Constitution prohibits the abolition of slavery by the people of a Territory; it is difficult to understand how the people of a State formed out of a new Territory, acquire that right.

The Pittsburg Post, of which place Gov. Black was a resident, before coming to Nebraska, thus speaks of it: "Governor Black is an appointee of the President, and not a Governor elected by the people. It would seem from this fact, that the doctrine of non-intervention with slavery in the Territories has been repudiated, for, in vetoing this bill Gov. Black has interfered with the will of the people, expressed through their chosen representatives. The only true doctrine is, that the people of the Territories, as of the States, must be left to decide upon this question as they may choose. Gov. Black's fine-drawn arguments that the Legislature is not the people in the sense of the organic act, will not do. His veto of this bill is directly in the teeth of the doctrine of the majority of the Democratic party on popular sovereignty."

The Cincinnati Enquirer says: "The action of Governor Black of Nebraska, in vetoing a law which the people of the Territory had passed prohibiting slavery, thus violating the great principle of local self-government, meets with the condemnation of the Democratic press. "The veto, in every respect, was mis-chosen and improper. "The people of the Territories, since they have been told by the ultra Southern politicians that they should have slavery whether they want it or not, are much more likely to legislate hostile to the institution than if such threats had never been made. The people of the States and Territories will do as they please about slavery."

Mr. Douglas and the Disunionists. So soon as Mr. Douglas had sufficiently recovered his health as to appear in his seat in the Senate, he was pounced upon simultaneously by Davis, Clay, Green, Mason, and all others of that stripe, who are for his annihilation and the dissolution of the Union. He however, pinned them all to the wall. We would like to lay before our readers the entire debate, but it is too lengthy for our columns. We make a few short extracts from Mr. Douglas' remarks to show what he always held and yet holds to be the power of a Territorial Legislature over the subject of slavery.

Mr. Davis, in course of debate, charged Mr. Douglas with having changed his opinions or positions as to the power of a Territorial Legislature. Mr. Douglas replied: "When the time comes for discussing it, I will show that at that period, on the very night the Kansas-Nebraska bill was passed, I stated that the sole object of the repeal of the Missouri restriction was that the people of the Territory might introduce or exclude slavery through the Territorial Legislature while a Territory as well as after they became a State, and no man who heard me then can have an excuse for not knowing that I held the Territorial Legislature, in the Territorial capacity, could do it. The record in the Globe will sustain me."

"I believe I can show from the record that a majority of the Democracy of the

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention.

The Convention which met in this place on Saturday last presents the names of T. W. Tipton and Dr. McPherson of this city, D. C. Sanders of Nemaha City precinct, S. A. Chambers of Peru precinct, and J. D. N. Thompson of Long's precinct.

We were prevented by other engagements from witnessing the deliberations of the Convention; but are informed that it was well attended by persons from every section of the county, and that its proceedings were characterized by moderation, yet firmness and determination in reference to the rights and interests of the people. From our personal knowledge of the character and number of citizens from all parts of the county we met on the street that day, we have no hesitancy in indorsing the representation.

The gentlemen whose names are presented are too well known to require any commendation, or suffer from condemnation; they are from the ranks of our most reliable, substantial, and intelligent citizens. Messrs. Tipton, Chambers and Thompson possess a goodly amount of legislative experience; and Dr. McPherson and Judge Sanders are unsurpassed as sound practical business men.

Four out of the five of the above named gentlemen were "born and bred" Democrats—never voted any other kind of a ticket when party lines were drawn; but recreancy to professed party principles has driven them to seek other party affiliations. If Nemaha County is made irredeemably Republican, Opposition, Union, or by whatever name it may be called in the future, such a result can only be attributable to the no-Congress-Legislature-or-human-power doctrine of Mr. Buchanan, and the "soft delusion" of Gov. Black.

We are at last permitted to announce to our readers that a Speaker is elected. Ex-Governor PENNINGTON of New Jersey, upon whom was concentrated the Republican, and a sufficiency of Anti-Lecompton Democrats, and American votes, succeeded by a vote of 117 to 85 cast for McCLERNAND. Mr. Pennington is an Old Line Whig, but has for several years been acting with the Republican party.

JOHN W. FORNEY, Douglas Democrat, and the able editor of the Philadelphia Press, was elected Clerk. We regard the election of these two officers as a triumph of the conservative feeling of the country over the ultraists, who seem to think their mission to be to create and enlarge a feeling of enmity between the different sections of the country. However much hot-headed politicians may denounce conservative men and measures, they and they alone have always been the oil poured upon troubled waters. It is a source of rejoicing to the country that such men and measures are yet to be found in the land; and when they cease to exist, then indeed may we have cause to tremble for the safety and perpetuity of our free Republican form of government.

We may now look for Congress to go to work and do something for the country! The gas has been pretty much used up within the past eight weeks. "The Soft Delusion." The Press throughout the States, both Democratic and Republican—with the exception of course of those owned by the Administration—are out upon Gov. Black's veto message. We quote a few extracts from Democratic papers only.

The Chicago Times in speaking of the message says: "In his message, the Governor—Hon. Samuel W. Black, furnishes the legislature with a literary and legal production, which is a weak, very weak, condensation of the other Black's famous arguments. As a matter of history proper to be recorded, and not because of any remarkable merit in the paper itself, we give the message a place in our columns. It is possibly the poorest effort yet made against the right of the people to govern themselves. It resembles in spirit and tone, some of the veto messages of old Dunmore, the royal governor in Virginia, in which that officer, in obedience to royal commands, employed the executive negative to defeat all acts of the colonial legislature which denied to British subjects the right to carry slaves into any of the royal dominions. Lacking Dunmore's ability and polish, Gov. Black, of Nebraska, insists in his message that the people of Nebraska have no political rights which are not subject to the laws of other states. Each slaveholder in Missouri, derives the legal title to his slaves from the laws of Missouri; Gov. Black insists that the Missourian who brings his slaves into Nebraska brings with him the title to his property which was approved by the laws of Missouri; and that wherever he may go, outside of the State, the law of Missouri overrides all other laws, and continues to afford protection and title to the slave property. This doctrine is absolutely subversive of all state authority. If the right to hold slaves in a Territory be a right which is secured by the Constitution of the United States, then slavery becomes of its own force an institution superior to all laws, except the constitution. If slavery cannot be repealed or prohibited in Nebraska by the legislature because the constitution protects and guarantees security to it as property, how can Gov. Black, as a lawyer, (he was once a judge,) maintain that the people of Nebraska, by a state convention, can displace and overrule the Constitution of the United States? A State convention has no more authority to deprive a citizen of a right, held by him in virtue of the Constitution of the

United States, than can a territorial legislature. Both bodies are necessarily limited in their powers by that instrument, and yet, Gov. Sam Black, in feeble imitation of Attorney General Jeremiah Black, holds that the Territorial Legislature cannot over ride the Constitution of the United States, that being the special prerogative of a state convention. The argument is flimsy, idle and preposterous, and the legislature inflicted the severest possible punishment upon its author by having the message printed and circulated. No one who reads it will fail to pity the individual who has, in order to screen and support the president, put his name to a document so full of glaring and blundering absurdities.

The Philadelphia Press, the editor of which is an old political associate of Gov. Black, says of him and his message: "The Executive authority of the Territory is vested in Col. Samuel W. Black, of Pittsburg, who was appointed Governor by Mr. Buchanan, and who, while always an ardent Democrat, was at no very remote period, a warm advocate of the Wilmot Proviso, and we believe the author of the resolution incorporated into the Platform of the Democratic State Convention, adopted at Pittsburg in 1849 in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. In the campaign of 1856, Col. Black was an earnest champion of the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty as then understood in our State; and few who heard his eloquent speeches at that time could have doubted that when he advocated the right of the people of the Territories to control their domestic institutions," with special reference to the slavery question, would have supposed that he entertained the slightest doubt about the power to decide whether slavery should or should not be tolerated among them. However, since the recreancy of Mr. Buchanan to his pledges in 1856, and the dissemination of the peculiar and abstruse doctrines of the Jeremiah S. Black pamphlet, Governor Samuel W. Black has felt himself constrained to veto the law published above. The reasons assigned in his veto are of so intangible a character that it is difficult to comprehend them; but they appear to be based partly upon the provisions of the Louisiana treaty, by which the Territory of Nebraska was acquired, and partly upon the reasoning of the Attorney General, in his reply to the Harper Magazine article of Judge Douglas. The argument based upon the Louisiana treaty unfortunately proves too much; because treaties are the paramount law of the land, and if, in consequence of that treaty, the people of a Territory, during the continuance of that Territory, cannot abolish slavery, it is idle to suppose that the people of a State, when a State Constitution is formed, or after they have been admitted into the Union, can abolish slavery. This same objection applies, to a great extent, to the supposed arguments founded upon the alleged unconstitutionality of the law quoted above. If the Constitution prohibits the abolition of slavery by the people of a Territory; it is difficult to understand how the people of a State formed out of a new Territory, acquire that right.

The Pittsburg Post, of which place Gov. Black was a resident, before coming to Nebraska, thus speaks of it: "Governor Black is an appointee of the President, and not a Governor elected by the people. It would seem from this fact, that the doctrine of non-intervention with slavery in the Territories has been repudiated, for, in vetoing this bill Gov. Black has interfered with the will of the people, expressed through their chosen representatives. The only true doctrine is, that the people of the Territories, as of the States, must be left to decide upon this question as they may choose. Gov. Black's fine-drawn arguments that the Legislature is not the people in the sense of the organic act, will not do. His veto of this bill is directly in the teeth of the doctrine of the majority of the Democratic party on popular sovereignty."

The Cincinnati Enquirer says: "The action of Governor Black of Nebraska, in vetoing a law which the people of the Territory had passed prohibiting slavery, thus violating the great principle of local self-government, meets with the condemnation of the Democratic press. "The veto, in every respect, was mis-chosen and improper. "The people of the Territories, since they have been told by the ultra Southern politicians that they should have slavery whether they want it or not, are much more likely to legislate hostile to the institution than if such threats had never been made. The people of the States and Territories will do as they please about slavery."

Mr. Douglas and the Disunionists. So soon as Mr. Douglas had sufficiently recovered his health as to appear in his seat in the Senate, he was pounced upon simultaneously by Davis, Clay, Green, Mason, and all others of that stripe, who are for his annihilation and the dissolution of the Union. He however, pinned them all to the wall. We would like to lay before our readers the entire debate, but it is too lengthy for our columns. We make a few short extracts from Mr. Douglas' remarks to show what he always held and yet holds to be the power of a Territorial Legislature over the subject of slavery.

Mr. Davis, in course of debate, charged Mr. Douglas with having changed his opinions or positions as to the power of a Territorial Legislature. Mr. Douglas replied: "When the time comes for discussing it, I will show that at that period, on the very night the Kansas-Nebraska bill was passed, I stated that the sole object of the repeal of the Missouri restriction was that the people of the Territory might introduce or exclude slavery through the Territorial Legislature while a Territory as well as after they became a State, and no man who heard me then can have an excuse for not knowing that I held the Territorial Legislature, in the Territorial capacity, could do it. The record in the Globe will sustain me."

"I believe I can show from the record that a majority of the Democracy of the

United States, than can a territorial legislature. Both bodies are necessarily limited in their powers by that instrument, and yet, Gov. Sam Black, in feeble imitation of Attorney General Jeremiah Black, holds that the Territorial Legislature cannot over ride the Constitution of the United States, that being the special prerogative of a state convention. The argument is flimsy, idle and preposterous, and the legislature inflicted the severest possible punishment upon its author by having the message printed and circulated. No one who reads it will fail to pity the individual who has, in order to screen and support the president, put his name to a document so full of glaring and blundering absurdities.

The Philadelphia Press, the editor of which is an old political associate of Gov. Black, says of him and his message: "The Executive authority of the Territory is vested in Col. Samuel W. Black, of Pittsburg, who was appointed Governor by Mr. Buchanan, and who, while always an ardent Democrat, was at no very remote period, a warm advocate of the Wilmot Proviso, and we believe the author of the resolution incorporated into the Platform of the Democratic State Convention, adopted at Pittsburg in 1849 in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. In the campaign of 1856, Col. Black was an earnest champion of the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty as then understood in our State; and few who heard his eloquent speeches at that time could have doubted that when he advocated the right of the people of the Territories to control their domestic institutions," with special reference to the slavery question, would have supposed that he entertained the slightest doubt about the power to decide whether slavery should or should not be tolerated among them. However, since the recreancy of Mr. Buchanan to his pledges in 1856, and the dissemination of the peculiar and abstruse doctrines of the Jeremiah S. Black pamphlet, Governor Samuel W. Black has felt himself constrained to veto the law published above. The reasons assigned in his veto are of so intangible a character that it is difficult to comprehend them; but they appear to be based partly upon the provisions of the Louisiana treaty, by which the Territory of Nebraska was acquired, and partly upon the reasoning of the Attorney General, in his reply to the Harper Magazine article of Judge Douglas. The argument based upon the Louisiana treaty unfortunately proves too much; because treaties are the paramount law of the land, and if, in consequence of that treaty, the people of a Territory, during the continuance of that Territory, cannot abolish slavery, it is idle to suppose that the people of a State, when a State Constitution is formed, or after they have been admitted into the Union, can abolish slavery. This same objection applies, to a great extent, to the supposed arguments founded upon the alleged unconstitutionality of the law quoted above. If the Constitution prohibits the abolition of slavery by the people of a Territory; it is difficult to understand how the people of a State formed out of a new Territory, acquire that right.

The Pittsburg Post, of which place Gov. Black was a resident, before coming to Nebraska, thus speaks of it: "Governor Black is an appointee of the President, and not a Governor elected by the people. It would seem from this fact, that the doctrine of non-intervention with slavery in the Territories has been repudiated, for, in vetoing this bill Gov. Black has interfered with the will of the people, expressed through their chosen representatives. The only true doctrine is, that the people of the Territories, as of the States, must be left to decide upon this question as they may choose. Gov. Black's fine-drawn arguments that the Legislature is not the people in the sense of the organic act, will not do. His veto of this bill is directly in the teeth of the doctrine of the majority of the Democratic party on popular sovereignty."

The Cincinnati Enquirer says: "The action of Governor Black of Nebraska, in vetoing a law which the people of the Territory had passed prohibiting slavery, thus violating the great principle of local self-government, meets with the condemnation of the Democratic press. "The veto, in every respect, was mis-chosen and improper. "The people of the Territories, since they have been told by the ultra Southern politicians that they should have slavery whether they want it or not, are much more likely to legislate hostile to the institution than if such threats had never been made. The people of the States and Territories will do as they please about slavery."

Mr. Douglas and the Disunionists. So soon as Mr. Douglas had sufficiently recovered his health as to appear in his seat in the Senate, he was pounced upon simultaneously by Davis, Clay, Green, Mason, and all others of that stripe, who are for his annihilation and the dissolution of the Union. He however, pinned them all to the wall. We would like to lay before our readers the entire debate, but it is too lengthy for our columns. We make a few short extracts from Mr. Douglas' remarks to show what he always held and yet holds to be the power of a Territorial Legislature over the subject of slavery.

Mr. Davis, in course of debate, charged Mr. Douglas with having changed his opinions or positions as to the power of a Territorial Legislature. Mr. Douglas replied: "When the time comes for discussing it, I will show that at that period, on the very night the Kansas-Nebraska bill was passed, I stated that the sole object of the repeal of the Missouri restriction was that the people of the Territory might introduce or exclude slavery through the Territorial Legislature while a Territory as well as after they became a State, and no man who heard me then can have an excuse for not knowing that I held the Territorial Legislature, in the Territorial capacity, could do it. The record in the Globe will sustain me."

"I believe I can show from the record that a majority of the Democracy of the

United States, than can a territorial legislature. Both bodies are necessarily limited in their powers by that instrument, and yet, Gov. Sam Black, in feeble imitation of Attorney General Jeremiah Black, holds that the Territorial Legislature cannot over ride the Constitution of the United States, that being the special prerogative of a state convention. The argument is flimsy, idle and preposterous, and the legislature inflicted the severest possible punishment upon its author by having the message printed and circulated. No one who reads it will fail to pity the individual who has, in order to screen and support the president, put his name to a document so full of glaring and blundering absurdities.

The Philadelphia Press, the editor of which is an old political associate of Gov. Black, says of him and his message: "The Executive authority of the Territory is vested in Col. Samuel W. Black, of Pittsburg, who was appointed Governor by Mr. Buchanan, and who, while always an ardent Democrat, was at no very remote period, a warm advocate of the Wilmot Proviso, and we believe the author of the resolution incorporated into the Platform of the Democratic State Convention, adopted at Pittsburg in 1849 in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. In the campaign of 1856, Col. Black was an earnest champion of the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty as then understood in our State; and few who heard his eloquent speeches at that time could have doubted that when he advocated the right of the people of the Territories to control their domestic institutions," with special reference to the slavery question, would have supposed that he entertained the slightest doubt about the power to decide whether slavery should or should not be tolerated among them. However, since the recreancy of Mr. Buchanan to his pledges in 1856, and the dissemination of the peculiar and abstruse doctrines of the Jeremiah S. Black pamphlet, Governor Samuel W. Black has felt himself constrained to veto the law published above. The reasons assigned in his veto are of so intangible a character that it is difficult to comprehend them; but they appear to be based partly upon the provisions of the Louisiana treaty, by which the Territory of Nebraska was acquired, and partly upon the reasoning of the Attorney General, in his reply to the Harper Magazine article of Judge Douglas. The argument based upon the Louisiana treaty unfortunately proves too much; because treaties are the paramount law of the land, and if, in consequence of that treaty, the people of a Territory, during the continuance of that Territory, cannot abolish slavery, it is idle to suppose that the people of a State, when a State Constitution is formed, or after they have been admitted into the Union, can abolish slavery. This same objection applies, to a great extent, to the supposed arguments founded upon the alleged unconstitutionality of the law quoted above. If the Constitution prohibits the abolition of slavery by the people of a Territory; it is difficult to understand how the people of a State formed out of a new Territory, acquire that right.

The Pittsburg Post, of which place Gov. Black was a resident, before coming to Nebraska, thus speaks of it: "Governor Black is an appointee of the President, and not a Governor elected by the people. It would seem from this fact, that the doctrine of non-intervention with slavery in the Territories has been repudiated, for, in vetoing this bill Gov. Black has interfered with the will of the people, expressed through their chosen representatives. The only true doctrine is, that the people of the Territories, as of the States, must be left to decide upon this question as they may choose. Gov. Black's fine-drawn arguments that the Legislature is not the people in the sense of the organic act, will not do. His veto of this bill is directly in the teeth of the doctrine of the majority of the Democratic party on popular sovereignty."

The Cincinnati Enquirer says: "The action of Governor Black of Nebraska, in vetoing a law which the people of the Territory had passed prohibiting slavery, thus violating the great principle of local self-government, meets with the condemnation of the Democratic press. "The veto, in every respect, was mis-chosen and improper. "The people of the Territories, since they have been told by the ultra Southern politicians that they should have slavery whether they want it or not, are much more likely to legislate hostile to the institution than if such threats had never been made. The people of the States and Territories will do as they please about slavery."

Mr. Douglas and the Disunionists. So soon as Mr. Douglas had sufficiently recovered his health as to appear in his seat in the Senate, he was pounced upon simultaneously by Davis, Clay, Green, Mason, and all others of that stripe, who are for his annihilation and the dissolution of the Union. He however, pinned them all to the wall. We would like to lay before our readers the entire debate, but it is too lengthy for our columns. We make a few short extracts from Mr. Douglas' remarks to show what he always held and yet holds to be the power of a Territorial Legislature over the subject of slavery.

Mr. Davis, in course of debate, charged Mr. Douglas with having changed his opinions or positions as to the power of a Territorial Legislature. Mr. Douglas replied: "When the time comes for discussing it, I will show that at that period, on the very night the Kansas-Nebraska bill was passed, I stated that the sole object of the repeal of the Missouri restriction was that the people of the Territory might introduce or exclude slavery through the Territorial Legislature while a Territory as well as after they became a State, and no man who heard me then can have an excuse for not knowing that I held the Territorial Legislature, in the Territorial capacity, could do it. The record in the Globe will sustain me."

"I believe I can show from the record that a majority of the Democracy of the

United States, than can a territorial legislature. Both bodies are necessarily limited in their powers by that instrument, and yet, Gov. Sam Black, in feeble imitation of Attorney General Jeremiah Black, holds that the Territorial Legislature cannot over ride the Constitution of the United States, that being the special prerogative of a state convention. The argument is flimsy, idle and preposterous, and the legislature inflicted the severest possible punishment upon its author by having the message printed and circulated. No one who reads it will fail to pity the individual who has, in order to screen and support the president, put his name to a document so full of glaring and blundering absurdities.

The Philadelphia Press, the editor of which is an old political associate of Gov. Black, says of him and his message: "The Executive authority of the Territory is vested in Col. Samuel W. Black, of Pittsburg, who was appointed Governor by Mr. Buchanan, and who, while always an ardent Democrat, was at no very remote period, a warm advocate of the Wilmot Proviso, and we believe the author of the resolution incorporated into the Platform of the Democratic State Convention, adopted at Pittsburg in 1849 in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. In the campaign of 1856, Col. Black was an earnest champion of the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty as then understood in our State; and few who heard his eloquent speeches at that time could have doubted that when he advocated the right of the people of the Territories to control their domestic institutions," with special reference to the slavery question, would have supposed that he entertained the slightest doubt about the power to decide whether slavery should or should not be tolerated among them. However, since the recreancy of Mr. Buchanan to his pledges in 1856, and the dissemination of the peculiar and abstruse doctrines of the Jeremiah S. Black pamphlet, Governor Samuel W. Black has felt himself constrained to veto the law published above. The reasons assigned in his veto are of so intangible a character that it is difficult to comprehend them; but they appear to be based partly upon the provisions of the Louisiana treaty, by which the Territory of Nebraska was acquired, and partly upon the reasoning of the Attorney General, in his reply to the Harper Magazine article of Judge Douglas. The argument based upon the Louisiana treaty unfortunately proves too much; because treaties are the paramount law of the land, and if, in consequence of that treaty, the people of a Territory, during the continuance of that Territory, cannot abolish slavery, it is idle to suppose that the people of a State, when a State Constitution is formed, or after they have been admitted into the Union, can abolish slavery. This same objection applies, to a great extent, to the supposed arguments founded upon the alleged unconstitutionality of the law quoted above. If the Constitution prohibits the abolition of slavery by the people of a Territory; it is difficult to understand how the people of a State formed out of a new Territory, acquire that right.

The Pittsburg Post, of which place Gov. Black was a resident, before coming to Nebraska, thus speaks of it: "Governor Black is an appointee of the President, and not a Governor elected by the people. It would seem from this fact, that the doctrine of non-intervention with slavery in the Territories has been repudiated, for, in vetoing this bill Gov. Black has interfered with the will of the people, expressed through their chosen representatives. The only true doctrine is, that the people of the Territories, as of the States, must be left to decide upon this question as they may choose. Gov. Black's fine-drawn arguments that the Legislature is not the people in the sense of the organic act, will not do. His veto of this bill is directly in the teeth of the doctrine of the majority of the Democratic party on popular sovereignty."

The Cincinnati Enquirer says: "The action of Governor Black of Nebraska, in vetoing a law which the people of the Territory had passed prohibiting slavery, thus violating the great principle of local self-government, meets with the condemnation of the Democratic press. "The veto, in every respect, was mis-chosen and improper. "The people of the Territories, since they have been told by the ultra Southern politicians that they should have slavery whether they want it or not, are much more likely to legislate hostile to the institution than if such threats had never been made. The people of the States and Territories will do as they please about slavery."

Senate, at that time, understood the Kansas-Nebraska bill as I then did, and now do."

Mr. Davis then replied by throwing up to Mr. Douglas his removal from the chairmanship of the Committee on Territories, and giving as a reason for his removal that he had changed; to which Mr. Douglas replied:

"I have never complained of my removal from the chairmanship of the Committee on Territories, and I never intended to allude to that subject in this body; but I do assert that the record prove that the Senate knew for eleven years that I held the identical opinions which I expressed in my Freeport speech, and which are now alleged as the cause of my removal; and during those eleven years, with a knowledge of those opinions, which are repeated over and over again in this body, within the hearing of every member of the Senate, I was, by the unanimous vote of the body, made chairman of that committee. At the end of eleven years I was removed, and the cause assigned for my removal is that I held the identical opinions that I had expressed for the eleven years when I was unanimously made chairman of the committee."

"If this be the true state of the facts, what does it prove? That those who removed me changed at the end of the eleven years, and I was not sound because I did not change as suddenly as they. My only offence consists in fidelity to the principles that