

admission of the state of Maine into the Union, as long as the doctrines were upheld of annexing conditions to the admission of states into the Union from beyond the mountains. Equality, said he, is equity. If we have no right to impose conditions on this state, we have none to impose them on the state of Missouri. Although Mr. C. said, he did not mean to anticipate the argument on this subject, the gentleman from New Hampshire would find himself totally to fail in the attempt to establish the position that, because the territory of Missouri was acquired by purchase, she is our vassal and we have a right to affix to her a admission conditions not applicable to the states on this side of the Mississippi. The doctrine, said Mr. Clay, is an alarming one, and I protest against it now, and whenever or wherever it may be asserted, that there are any rights attaching in the one case which do not in the other; or that any line of distinction is to be drawn between the Eastern and the Western States. It is a distinction which neither exists in reason, nor can you carry it into effect in practice. But, Mr. C. said, he did not mean to go into this subject. It was proper and fitting, however in his opinion, that this bill should be delayed; that the House should not act on the one bill until it could also act on the other for the admission of a State in the West. But it seemed there was a particular aversion to the connection of Maine and Missouri. If he was not much mistaken, Mr. C. said, those who now objected to such an alliance, were the advocates of the alliance in the case which he had quoted as a precedent, and had succeeded in keeping Kentucky out of the Union for some twelve or eighteen months, because Vermont was not ready to come in and, when ready, connected them in the same bill. I am glad to hear, said he, from the gentleman from Massachusetts, that that old and venerable commonwealth has given to Maine till the 3d of March to come into the Union, or rather has allowed to Congress till the 3d of March to admit her. It is a good long time to the 3d of March—at least 60 days—and in that time much light may be shed on the principles which are to govern us in the admission of new states into the Union. What occasion, then, for haste? The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. C. said, was not unwilling to follow a part of the precedent of 1791; but, when the other part of it was suggested for his initiation, it was most unreasonable. The gentleman had himself shown that it was not now proper to act conclusively on this bill, for, has he not told the House, asked Mr. C. that he has not prepared a proposition respecting the representation of Maine? When will he do it? Supposing we have a right to take seven representatives from Massachusetts, and give them to Maine, what will be the condition of the gentlemen who now represent those seven districts of Massachusetts? But, it was a question, he said, whether it was in the power of Congress to disfranchise Massachusetts, by taking from her seven, or any other number, of her representatives. These matters ought to be duly considered; and gentlemen should be prepared to act on them. Why pass this bill with such speed, and, after it passes, proceed to consider the difficulty respecting the subject which gentlemen acknowledged to exist? Suppose, after the law was passed, and difficulties respecting the representation in Congress should be discovered to be so insuperable, that Maine could have no representation, Mr. C. said he presumed, she would not be willing to come into the Union on that footing, whilst her present situation was different, that portion of Massachusetts having in fact seven representatives in Congress. Suppose, said he, I was mistaken in my doctrine respecting restrictions on new states, and that you have a right to measure justice by different standards: why do not the friends of restriction come forward, and propose a restriction on Maine, if not the same that proposed to be imposed on Missouri, on some other point? To pass this bill in its present shape, he said, would be an act of half-legislation; and it ought not to be sent to the other branch of the Legislature, without giving to the state of Maine (what was of essential importance) the representation in the Union which was due to its numbers, and required by its interests. If the gentleman wanted time to prepare the necessary amendments on this subject, Mr. C. said, he would give him time by postponing the bill—at the same time, repeating that he was not desirous to defeat the admission of Maine into the Union.

Mr. WHITMAN, of Massachusetts, said that the gentleman had avowed his object in opposing the progress of this bill, with his usual and character-

would constitute a sure pledge that he would give up his opposition, if it should appear not to be well founded. The gentleman had expressed his wish to unite the two questions of Maine and Missouri. It had sometimes occurred, Mr. W. said, when one branch of a legislature refused its assent to a measure which had passed the other, that the object of the latter was obtained by tacking the obnoxious proposition to some favorite measure of the former; and, as Mr. W. understood the honorable Speaker, he had declared that he would go on this principle in the admission of new states into the Union; and that, in this case, he would not admit Maine unless tacked to Missouri—he would admit both at the same time, and both on the same principles. Now, Mr. W. said, he held that there was no similarity in the two cases. The Speaker would certainly do the gentlemen who were opposed to the admission of Missouri unconditionally into the Union, the justice to believe that they were honest and sincere in their opposition to it, and that they did believe that Congress have a right to impose conditions on her admission, and they did further believe the proposed condition to be expedient. Here, then, was a part, perhaps a majority, of Congress believing in the right of annexing conditions to the admission of Missouri into the Union. How was it with regard to Maine? Why, not one individual number in this house—not the honorable Speaker himself, supposed that any condition ought to be annexed to her admission; on the contrary, he had avowed his belief that she ought to be admitted without condition.

Ought not every case to stand on its own bottom? Would the Speaker consider it consistent with sound principles to say that he believed Maine ought to be admitted, and yet refuse to admit her unless Missouri should also be received as he wishes unconditionally into the Union? Such a refusal would be a mere political expedient; it would be to accomplish, by improper means, what could not otherwise be accomplished—a contrivance to get the house to do what they do not approve, or leave them the alternative of omitting to do what even according to the Speaker's own position, ought to be done. Was it proper, Mr. W. asked, to make the interests of Maine a sacrifice to such a policy? Was it Maine, he asked, who stood in the way of the admission of Missouri, or was it something else? And, if not, ought Maine to fall a sacrifice to a scheme for compelling Congress to admit Missouri without any condition? He hoped the honorable Speaker would revise his decision; and, if he did, Mr. W. was sure he would decide differently.

With regard to other grounds traversed by the Speaker which seemed only to come in aid of his main object, Mr. W. confessed to be in more doubt. He did not believe it was in the power of Congress to say that of twenty Representatives which Massachusetts has on this floor, seven should be sent home; nor did he believe it in the power of Congress to select the seven to be sent home. This difficulty, however, he believed, might be gotten over, but he feared, he not in the way which had been contemplated. He believed Congress might make a provision that the seven Representatives from the districts in Maine should, for the present Congress, be considered as the Representatives of Maine, and the remaining thirteen as the Representatives of Massachusetts. This course, whilst within the power of Congress, could not but be acceptable to Massachusetts as well as to Maine. By authorizing the Convention of the People of Maine to form a constitution of state government, Massachusetts must have been considered as consenting to have her representation curtailed. If the section reported by the select committee had been permitted to remain in the bill, a proviso of this description might have been added, and, in this way, every difficulty have been removed. However, Mr. W. said he had not objected to striking it out, in deference to what he supposed the better judgment of several gentlemen from Maine and Massachusetts who thought it better that this provision should be the subject of a separate bill. With respect to the apportionment of representation, he took occasion to say, he did not believe Congress were under any necessity of making it at the moment after the census was taken; he thought it might be made at any other and intermediate time. Whatever arrangement might be made so as to reserve their respective portions of representation Mr. W. said he was sure both Massachusetts and Maine would be satisfied. The former would not expect to hold her whole present representation, after the severance of

Maine, as Virginia did after the state of Kentucky was formed from territory within her limits.

The honorable Speaker, Mr. W. said, had given the house a piece of history which he had never heard before. He was apprehensive the honorable Speaker might have been misinformed. He understood him to have said that Vermont and Kentucky had been tacked together, and the admission of one had been made necessary to that of the other and, further, that the objection to the admission of Kentucky came from the Eastern and Northern sections of the Union. This, Mr. W. said, he had never heard before. If the gentleman judged from the fact that the statute book showed them both to have been admitted at the same time, it was as far to infer that the objection came from the South as that it came from the North. But, be the fact in that case what it may, said Mr. W. it ought to make no difference in regard to the admission of Maine. Because Congress may at any former period have done wrong will the honorable Speaker insist upon our doing so too? The Speaker, he said, had not commanded, but rather reprobated the alleged delay of the admission of Kentucky for the purpose of including Vermont; and if he reprobated it in that case, it was because the thing was incorrect in itself. If so, certainly the Speaker would not persist now in contending for a measure which was then wrong, but would give it up as incorrect at all times.

With respect to the question of imposing conditions on the admission of new states, Mr. W. pointed to the act of admission of Louisiana into the Union. Were there no conditions there, he asked, which conflicted with the absolute sovereignty of an independent state? There were conditions imposed on Louisiana infinitely more numerous than were proposed to be imposed on Missouri. She was required to make and maintain a variety of municipal regulations, which no other state had been required to do. One stipulation was that the trial by jury should be established and maintained. What principle could be nearer and dearer to the hearts of Americans than the rights of establishing a judiciary, or regulating it as they thought proper? Yet Mr. W. said, he had heard no one object to these restrictions. In relation to the states admitted in the Western country, provisions had been inserted in the act of admission requiring that the lands of the United States should not be taxed; and, not only so, but the lands of individuals, the lands given to soldiers, should not be taxed for a certain number of years. Mr. W. asked, whether the power of laying taxes was not one of the most sovereign which could be exercised; and if, in a particular like this, a condition could be imposed by Congress, could they not likewise impose the condition which had been contemplated in respect to Missouri? Mr. W. concluded by declaring the main ground taken by the honorable Speaker to be wholly untenable, and that the only serious objection he had raised to the progress of this bill could be obviated, by an amendment, with the greatest ease.

Mr. HOLMES again rose. The hon. Speaker, in the course of his remarks, had said, that equality is equity. So it is, said Mr. H.—I am disposed to proceed, and apply that principle to the present case, and I ask the gentleman to go with me and do likewise. The United States were thirteen in number when they formed the present compact; and among its provisions was one, that new states may be admitted into the Union, to be formed out of the original, with the consent of the states and of Congress. And how had equality proceeded since the adoption of the constitution? A state had been formed from a part of the territory of Virginia, and one from North Carolina, and Ohio, Louisiana, Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, and Alabama, had been successively admitted from the territories. No division of any state had in the mean time taken place in the North or East, nor had any new state been erected there. He trusted, he said, that he should not be accused of ever acting contrary to the principles of equality or equity; he had no wish that the north and east should have privileges not enjoyed by the South and West—a doctrine against which he now protested. We are now told that our application is just, and we have certainly not been importunate; yet, unless we will do towards another section of the Union what we ourselves believe to be wrong, you will not do what in your consciences you believe to be right. The hon. Speaker was mistaken, Mr. H. said he believed, with respect to the union of Kentucky with Vermont, in their admission. Vermont Mr. H. said, was a separate state during the war; raised her own troops

and paid them, and had a claim to admission wholly independent of any other state. Two Representatives, however, were given to each state; the same representation being given to Kentucky, who was already represented, as to Vermont, who was before unrepresented. This certainly showed no particular partiality or favoritism, it was not for Congress to decide who were to continue to be, and who to cease to be, Members of the present Congress; but it was for this house, which was the sole judge of the elections and privileges of its own members. Congress had no more power over the representation of any State in congress than this house had over the members of the Senate. The section which related to the representation, therefore, had been properly stricken out of the bill. With regard to the apportionment to be made of the future representation of Maine in this house, until the next enumeration takes place, was there any fear that it would not be made according to the provisions of the constitution? On this subject, there was a perfect accord between Maine and Massachusetts; the latter had consented that the representatives from the districts contained in Maine should be considered as the Representatives of the State of Maine, and that her representation should be proportionally reduced, &c.

Mr. H. hoped that the subject of the representation of Maine in Congress would not be connected in the bill with that of her admission into the Union; neither, he hoped, would the Maine question be connected with that of Missouri. He would not refuse justice in one case unless injustice was done in another. Was it right to do so? Suppose we had said, when questions respecting the admission of new States have been proposed, that we would not admit them unless they would agree that, whenever application was made by the State of Maine for the purpose, she should be admitted. Let each claim stand on its own footing. I ask of gentlemen, said Mr. H. to do as we have done, and as I as an individual, shall do when the other subject presents itself. Do gentlemen calculate on more liberality on the Missouri question, when it comes up, in consequence of the opposition now made to this bill? if they do, they are mistaken: gentlemen in this house are not to be driven from their positions. Mr. H. concluded by saying that he had hoped there would be a fair and liberal vote for the admission of Maine without condition: he yet hoped it though, from what had taken place, there was some reason to fear there would not.

Mr. CLAY said that, with respect to uniting the two states of Maine and Missouri in one act, he had not intimated any intention at present to connect them. But, in reference to the case which he had referred to as a precedent for such a connection, the gentleman from Massachusetts had professed his ignorance of it. The gentleman, Mr. C. said, might never have heard of it, and, as he had so said, doubtless never had heard of it: but, if the gentleman was not informed on the subject, he (Mr. C.) hoped he would allow to him the benefit he had derived from having participated, in some degree, in the transaction of that day. I can assure him, said Mr. Clay, that the proposition came from the North, to delay the admission of Kentucky into the Union, until Vermont was ready to come in. But the gentleman perceived great injustice in such a proceeding on the present day: on that head, Mr. C. said he would recommend to his recollection the old anecdote of the parson and the bull. He professed that he could not see the great injustice of a proposition, if now made, to connect the admission of the two states together. A state in the quarter of the country from which I come, said Mr. Clay, asks to be admitted into the Union. What say the gentlemen who ask the admission of this state of Maine into the Union? Why, they will not admit Missouri without a condition which strips it of an essential attribute of sovereignty. What then do I say to them? That justice is due to all parts of the Union; your state shall be admitted free of condition; but, if you refuse to admit Missouri also free of condition, we see no reason why you shall take to yourselves privileges you deny to her—and, until you grant them also to her, we will not admit you. This notion of an equivalent, Mr. C. said, was not a new one: it was one upon which commonwealths and states had acted from time immemorial. But he did not mean to press this part of the subject—he would put it aside, and confine himself to the single point, whether it was proper to pass this bill, without incorporating in it some provisions on the subject of the representation of Maine? This was the point on which he desired a decision before the bill passed. Were he to permit himself

again to glance at the case of Missouri, he would say, there was a wide difference, in one respect, between that case and the case of Maine; and that the former most urgently required the attention of the house. The one was in the actual enjoyment of the advantages of self government—was already in the confederacy a component part of a highly respectable state—was heard and represented by a phalanx of seven members on this floor. Whilst Missouri was subjected to arbitrary government—for he held that, whenever a people are subject to a government under an authority which is as to them foreign, they being unrepresented, that government is arbitrary, whatever be the character of its measures—no boon from Heaven, in his estimation, being more inestimable than the privilege of people to govern themselves—and no political state more intolerable than that of having laws, and those most solemn of all laws, constitutions, imposed upon a people without their consent. Precedents might be found for such proceedings, but, happily for the world not in this part of the globe, but in the other hemisphere, and recently too, at the close of one of the most memorable struggles in which any portion of the human race had ever been engaged. Missouri was unheard of on this floor; she had not twenty votes to spring up in vindication of her rights and defence of her interests; this infant, distant territory, without a vote on this floor, was in no condition comparable to that in which Maine now stood. But, he said, he would not press this subject further.

To be continued in our next.

WESTERN SUN.

VINCENNES FEBRUARY 5, 1820.

[COMMUNICATED.]

Amongst the resolutions passed at the last session of the legislature of this state, a list of which was published in the last *Centinel*, there appears one, the object of which is not indicated. Is it such an anomaly that completely defying all powers of classification, its designation becomes impossible, or does it mean that the legislature feel a sense of shame and are unwilling to divulge it? In either case, that unceremonious way of treating the citizens, cannot but give rise to surprise and well grounded discontent. If, as it is suspected, it relates to the dismissed Receiver, well they may wish to hide their folly and humiliation.

A QUERIST.

Dana's Geographical Sketches. A work has been recently published at Cincinnati, bearing the above title—which we observe is highly spoken of in some of the public papers. We have given Mr. Dana's publication but a partial perusal—but from what we have read we believe it may be considered a useful production.—We have observed some errors in this work, however, considering the difficulties attending the acquirement of a perfect knowledge of our country, as well as the typographical errors which sometimes occur, the author is entitled to the patronage of those who consider community benefitted by the exertions of men who endeavor to diffuse useful information.

The report of E. Stout, one of the managers of the Vincennes Theatrical Society, came to hand too late to appear in this day's paper.

FOURTH AMERICAN TRIUMPH.

PROCLAMATION.

By BOLIVAR, President of the Republic of New Grenada & Venezuela. *Grenadians.*—From the fields of Venezuela the cry of your afflictions penetrated my soul—and for the third time I have flown with the liberating army to save you. Victory always in front of our standards, has been faithful to us in your country, and twice has your capital seen it triumphant. On this as well as on former occasions, I came not in search of power nor of glory: my ambition has been that of liberating you from the terrible torments inflicted on you by your oppressors, and to restore you to the enjoyment of your rights, in order that you may institute a government by your own spontaneous and free election.

The general congress holding its session in Guiana, from which my authority is derived and to which the liberating army owes obedience, is the depository of the national sovereignty of New Grenadians, as well as to that of Venezuelans. The regulations and laws which that legislative body have ordained, are those by which you are to be at present governed and they are already in operation. Grenadians, the union of New Grenada and Venezuela, in a *republic*, is the ardent wish of every wise citizen and of enlightened foreigners who love and protect the American cause. But this sublime act must be free and unanimous if possible. I expect the sovereign determination of congress to call a national assembly; and then you will either send deputies to represent you in a general con-