



Lincoln Lore

Bulletin of The Lincoln National Life Foundation . . . Dr. R. Gerald McMurtry, Editor
Published each month by The Lincoln National Life Insurance Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana

No. 1523

FORT WAYNE, INDIANA

January, 1965

Printing Lincoln's Inaugural Address

Editor's Note: Following Abraham Lincoln's inauguration as President of the United States, a special session of the Senate met on Wednesday, March 6, 1861. At this session Senator James Dixon, a Republican from Connecticut, offered the following resolution: "Resolved, that there be printed for the use of the Senate, the usual number of copies of the inaugural address of the President of the United States."

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution. This motion to print the inaugural speech of the President was a most unusual procedure. Likely, the real reason for the motion was to give the political friends of the President an opportunity to expound the views of Lincoln as set forth in his paper. This motion led to a debate that lasted two days. The Southern senators professed to read in Lincoln's inaugural a declaration of war and this contention was vigorously expressed by Senator Thomas L. Clingman, a Democrat from North Carolina. Finally, on March 8, 1861, the Dixon resolution to print the inaugural was adopted.

Throughout the long debate Senator Stephen A. Douglas, a Democrat from Illinois, assumed a surprising position by declaring that Mr. Lincoln's inaugural was not equivalent to a war declaration, rather that it would lead to a peaceful solution of our national difficulties. His speech (Monaghan No. 96) follows:

"Mr. President: I cannot assent to the construction which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Clingman] has placed upon the President's inaugural. I have read it carefully, with a view of ascertaining distinctly what the policy of the Administration is to be. The inaugural is characterized by ability, and by directness on certain points; but with such reservations and qualifications as require a critical analysis to arrive at its true construction on other points. I have made such an analysis, and come to the conclusion that it is a peace offering rather than a war message. Having examined it critically, I think I can demonstrate that there is no foundation for the apprehension which has been spread through the country that this message is equivalent to a declaration of war; that it commits the President of the United States to recapture the forts in the seceded States, and to hold them at all hazards, to collect the revenue under all circumstances, and to execute the laws in all the States, no matter what may be the circumstances that surround him. I do not understand that to be the character of the message. On the contrary, I understand it to contain a distinct pledge that the policy of the Administration shall be conducted with exclusive reference to a peaceful solution of our national difficulties. True, the President indicates a certain line of policy which he intends to pursue, so far as it may be consistent with the peace of the country, but he assures us that this policy will be modified and changed whenever necessary to a peaceful solution of these difficulties.

"The address is not as explicit as I could desire on certain points; on certain other points it is explicit. The message is explicit and certain upon the point that the President will not, directly or indirectly, interfere with

the institution of slavery within the States — is specific upon the point that he will do everything in his power to give a faithful execution to the Constitution and the laws for the return of fugitive slaves — is explicit upon the point that he will not oppose such amendments to the Constitution as may be deemed necessary to settle the slavery question and restore peace to the country. Then, it proceeds to indicate a line of policy for his Administration. He declares that, in view of the Constitution and laws, the Union remains unbroken. I do not suppose any man can deny the proposition, that in con-

templation of law, the Union remains intact, no matter what the fact may be. There may be a separation *de facto*, temporary or permanent, as the sequel may prove; but, in contemplation of the Constitution and the laws, the Union does remain unbroken. I think no one can deny the correctness of the proposition, as a constitutional principle. Let us go further and see what there is in the address that is supposed to pledge the President to a coercive policy. He says: 'I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States.' This declaration is relied upon as a conclusive evidence that coercion is to be used in the seceding States; but take the next sentence: 'Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part. I shall perform it, so far as is practicable, unless' — unless what? Let us see what the condition is on the happening of which he will not enforce the laws — 'unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or in some other authoritative manner direct the contrary.'

"This condition, on which he will not enforce the laws in the seceding States, is not as explicit as I could desire. When he alludes to his 'rightful masters, the American people,' I suppose he means the action of Congress in withholding the requisite means. Query: Does he wish to be understood as saying that the existing laws confer upon him 'the requisite means?' or, does he mean

to say that inasmuch as the existing laws do not confer the requisite means, he cannot execute the laws in the seceding States unless those means shall be conferred by Congress? The language employed would seem to imply that the President was referring to the future action of Congress as necessary to give him the requisite means to enforce obedience to the laws in the seceding States. Doubtless the President was not uninformed of the fact that his friends in the House of Representatives had prepared a force bill, conferring these requisite means to coerce obedience in the seceding



From the Lincoln National Life Foundation

Stephen A. Douglas, running on the Northern Democratic ticket, was one of three candidates defeated by Lincoln in the Presidential Campaign of 1860. He received 12 electoral votes but ranked second to Lincoln with a popular vote of 1,376,957.

States, and that that bill was defeated in the House. He must be aware, historically, that in 1832, General Jackson deemed additional legislation necessary to enforce the revenue laws at Charleston, and that a force bill was then passed, which expired by its own limitation in a short time, I think two years, and is not now in force. Does Mr. Lincoln consider that he has any more power to coerce the collection of the revenue in Charleston harbor without further legislation than General Jackson had in 1832? When he pledges himself to collect the revenue and to enforce the laws in those States, unless Congress withholds the requisite means to enable him to do so, is he not to be understood that whether he does enforce them or not depends upon the future action of Congress? I think that is the proper construction of his language.

"In a subsequent paragraph he says: 'The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government, and to collect the duties and imposts.' What power? Does he mean that which has been confided, or that which may be confided? Does he mean that he will exercise the power unless Congress directs the contrary, or that he will exercise it when Congress confers it? I regret that this clause is understood by some persons as meaning that the President will use the whole military force of the country to recapture the forts, and other places, which have been seized without the assent of Congress. If such was his meaning, he was unfortunate in the selection of words to express the idea. He does not say that he will recapture or retake, hold and occupy the forts and other places. Nor does he say that he will recommend to Congress to furnish him men and money for such a purpose; but 'the power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government.' To say the least of it, this is equivocal language. I am not going to condemn him for it; my present object is not to censure, but to ascertain the true meaning of the inaugural, in order to learn whether the Administration is committed to an aggressive policy, which must inevitably involve us in civil war, or to a peaceful solution of our national troubles. He says further, 'but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere.' He will use the power confided to him to hold, occupy, and possess the forts and other property, and to collect the revenue; but beyond these objects he will not use that power. I am unable to understand the propriety of the distinction between enforcing the revenue laws and all other laws. If it is his duty to enforce the revenue laws, why is it not his duty to enforce the other laws of the land? What right has he to say that he will enforce those laws that enable him to raise revenue, to levy and collect these taxes from the people, and that he will not enforce the laws which protect the rights of persons and property to the extent that the Constitution confers the power in those States? I reject the distinction; it cannot be justified in law or in morals. If taxes are to be collected, and the revenue laws are to be enforced, the laws that afford protection, as a compensation for the taxes, must also be enforced.

"The next paragraph is also objectionable. I will read it:

'Where hostility to the United States in any interior locality shall be so great and universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable withal, I deem it better to forego, for the time, the uses of such offices.'

"I rejoice to know that he will not attempt to force obnoxious strangers to hold office in the interior places where public sentiment is hostile; but why draw the distinction between 'interior localities' and exterior places? Why the distinction between the States in the interior and those upon the sea-board? If he has the power in the one case, he has it in the other; if it be his duty in one case, it is his duty in the other. There is no provision of the Constitution or the laws which authorizes a distinction between the places upon the sea-board and the places in the interior.

"This brings me to the consideration of another clause

in the message which I deem the most important of all, and the key to his entire policy. I rejoiced when I read this declaration, and I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to it especially, as showing conclusively that Mr. Lincoln stands pledged to that policy which will lead to a peaceful solution, and against every policy that leads to the contrary. I will read the paragraph:

'The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper, and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised according to the circumstances actually existing, and with a view and hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.'

"After indicating the line of policy which he would pursue, if consistent with the peace of the country, he tells us emphatically that that course will be followed unless modifications and changes should be necessary to a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and if in any case or exigency a change of policy should be necessary, it will be made 'with a view and hope of a peaceful solution.' In other words, if the collection of the revenue leads to a peaceful solution, it is to be collected; if the abandonment of that policy is necessary to a peaceful solution, the revenue is not to be collected; if the recapture of Fort Moultrie would tend to a peaceful solution, he stands pledged to recapture it; if the recapture would tend to violence and war, he is pledged not to recapture it; if the enforcement of the laws in the seceding States would tend to facilitate a peaceful solution, he is pledged to their enforcement; if the omission to enforce those laws would best facilitate peace, he is pledged to omit to enforce them; if maintaining possession of Fort Sumter would facilitate peace, he stands pledged to retain its possession; if, on the contrary, the abandonment of Fort Sumter and the withdrawal of the troops would facilitate a peaceful solution, he is pledged to abandon the fort and withdraw the troops.

"Sir, this is the only construction that I can put upon this clause. If this be not the true interpretation, for what purpose was it inserted? The line of policy that he had indicated was stated vaguely; but there is not a pledge to use coercion; there is not a pledge to retain a fort; there is not a pledge to recapture an arsenal; there is not a pledge to collect revenue; there is not a pledge to enforce the laws unless there is attached to each the condition; and the condition is, that he will do it only when that course tends to a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and that he will not do it in any case where it does not tend to a peaceful solution.

"I submit, then, to the Senator whether the friends of peace have not much to rejoice at in the inaugural address of the President. It is a much more conservative document than I had anticipated. It is a much more pacific and conciliatory paper than I had expected. I would not venture the expression of an opinion upon it on hearing it delivered, until I had carefully examined and analyzed it. After examination, I am clearly of the opinion that the Administration stands pledged by the inaugural to a peaceful solution of all our difficulties, to do no act that leads to war, and to change its policy just so often and whenever a change is necessary to preserve the peace.

"So much, sir for the policy of the Administration. Now a few words upon the President's views of the causes of the present difficulties and the remedies for those difficulties. In a manner peculiar to himself and to his usual course of argument, he proceeds to show, first, what did not produce the trouble. Let us see what did not do it:

'All profess to be content in the Union, if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right, plainly written in the Constitution, has been denied? I think not. Happily the human mind is so constituted that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly-written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly-written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point of view, justify revolution; certainly would if such right were a vital one. But such is not our case.'

"Here we are told that these difficulties have not grown out of the violation of any express provision of the Constitution; they have not arisen from the denial of any right guaranteed by an express provision. He then

proceeds to show that is the cause of the trouble. Here it is:

'But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities.'

'From questions of this class spring' all our troubles. What class? The attempt of Congress to exercise power on the slavery question where there is no 'express' provision of the Constitution conferring the power; the attempt on the one side to prohibit slavery, and the attempt on the other side to protect it, where there is no 'express' provision authorizing either — these are the causes of our present troubles, according to the statement of the President. The causes are to be traced to the absence of any constitutional provision defining the extent of the power of Congress over this subject. If the President has stated the causes of our difficulties fairly and truly; if they all arise from the absence of a constitutional provision on the subject of slavery in the Territories, what is the remedy? The remedy must be to adopt an amendment that will make an express constitutional provision on the subject. The absence of such a provision being the cause, the supplying of such a provision must be the remedy. Hence the President has demonstrated with great clearness and force the absolute necessity of such amendments to the Constitution of the United States as will define and settle the question whether or not Congress has the power to prohibit slavery; whether or not it has the power to protect slavery; whether or not it has the power to legislate on the subject at all. He gives us to understand that there will never be peace until that question is settled; it cannot be settled except by amendments to the Constitution; and hence he proceeds to tell us how such amendments can be obtained. He tells us that these amendments to the Constitution may be obtained in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument: the one where Congress takes the initiative, as we did the other day, and submits the proposed amendments to the States; the other is where the States take the initiative, and demand a national convention to amend the Constitution.

'The President says that he prefers a national convention as the most appropriate mode, but he has no insuperable objections to the other mode, and he will not oppose, but gives us to understand he will favor the ratification by the States of the amendment already proposed prohibiting any future amendment whereby Congress may be authorized to interfere with slavery in the States. He assigns for his preference for a national convention a very plausible, in fact a very satisfactory reason. It is that if Congress originated the amendments it might not devise such as the people would like, whereas if you allow the people to take the initiative, they will make such amendments as they want. The President stands pledged by his inaugural 'to allow the people to devise their own amendments to the Constitution and not to interfere with, but rather to favor their adoption, whatever they may be.'

'What is the inference from all this? Inasmuch as all our troubles arise from the attempt on the part of Congress to prohibit slavery without the sanction of an express provision of the Constitution, and the counter attempt on the part of Congress to protect slavery without an express provision of the Constitution authorizing it, therefore such an amendment must be made as will settle the slavery question by an express provision and he will not oppose the amendment. Hence we are authorized to infer that if the people do originate such amendments to the Constitution as will settle the slavery question — even if the settlement be repugnant to the principles of the Republican party, in violation of the Chicago platform, and against the right of Congress to prohibit slavery in the Territories, Mr. Lincoln and his administration will not oppose, but favor it.

'What more can be asked? If the people, when they come to amend the Constitution, shall determine that

Congress shall have no power upon the subject of slavery anywhere, except to surrender fugitive slaves and to prohibit the African slave trade, Mr. Lincoln will not oppose it. If the people shall say that it shall be the duty of Congress to protect slavery everywhere in the Territories, Mr. Lincoln is pledged not to oppose that. If the people shall say in their amendment that Congress shall have the power to prohibit slavery in the Territories, Mr. Lincoln is pledged not to oppose that. If, on the contrary, the people shall say that they are in favor of the Crittenden proposition dividing the territory by a geographical line on the principle of an equitable partition, Mr. Lincoln says he will not oppose that. He is in favor of such amendments as will settle the question forever, by an express provision of the Constitution, and he leaves the people and their representatives to devise what those amendments shall be, and he will accept them cheerfully, and not throw any obstructions in the way of their adoption.

'Taking these two propositions together, I find much cause for hope, for encouragement, in this inaugural. First, his policy will be peaceful and not aggressive; he will do no act that tends to collision, but will modify his course always with the view and the hope of a peaceful solution; and, second, inasmuch as the difficulties arise out of the absence of an express provision on the slavery question, he will favor such measures as will enable the people to settle that question by an express provision in the Constitution.

'Now, sir, far be it from me to intimate that the President, in these recommendations, has not been faithful to the principles of his party, as well as to the honor and safety of his country. Whatever departure from party platforms he has made in these recommendations should be regarded as an evidence of patriotism, and not an act of infidelity. In my opinion, if I have understood the inaugural aright, he has sunk the partisan in the patriot, and he is entitled to the thanks of all conservative men to that extent. I do not wish it to be inferred from anything that I have said or have omitted to say, that I have any political sympathy with his administration, or that I expect that any contingency can happen in which I may be identified with it. I expect to oppose his administration with all my energy on those great principles which have separated parties in former times; but on this one question, that of preserving the Union by a peaceful solution of our present difficulties — that of preventing any future difficulties by such an amendment of the Constitution as will settle the question by an express provision — if I understand his true intent and meaning, I am with him.

'Mr. President, if the result shall prove that, I have put a wrong construction on the inaugural, I shall deplore the consequences which a belligerent and aggressive policy may inflict upon our beloved country, without being responsible in any degree for the disasters and calamities which may follow. I believe I have placed upon it its true interpretation. I know I have put the patriotic construction on it. I believe the action of the President will justify that construction. I will never relinquish that belief and hope until he shall have done such acts as render it impossible to preserve the peace of the country and the unity of the States. Sir, this Union cannot be preserved by war. It cannot be cemented by blood. It can only be preserved by peaceful means. And when our present troubles shall have been settled, future difficulties can only be prevented by constitutional amendments which will put an end to all controversy by express provision. These remedies and preventatives have been clearly marked out by the President in his inaugural. All I ask is that his Administration shall adhere to them and carry them out in good faith. Let this be done, and all who join in the good work will deserve and they will receive the applause and approbation of a grateful country. No partisan advantage can be taken, no political capital should be made, out of a generous act of noble patriotism. While I expect to oppose the Administration upon all the political issues of the day, I trust I shall never hesitate to do justice to those who, by their devotion to the Constitution and the Union, show that they love their country more than their party.'

Stephen A. Douglas Publications

A survey of our collateral material reveals that the Foundation has forty-two printed publications of Senator Stephen A. Douglas' addresses, speeches, remarks and letters. This check list does not contain the publications issued in 1858 and 1860 relative to the Lincoln-Douglas debates. Another file, not included in this compilation, might be labeled "Publications About Douglas."

A catalogue of the Foundation's collection follows:

Speech/of/Hon. Stephen A. Douglass, of Illinois,/on/The Annexation of Texas:/Delivered/In The House of Representatives, January 6, 1845 (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 8¼, 7 pp.

Speech/of/Hon. S. A. Douglas, of Illinois/on/The War With Mexico,/and/The Boundary of The Rio Grande./Delivered/In The Senate of The United States, Tuesday, February 1, 1848/Washington:/Printed At The Congressional Globe Office/1848 (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9, 15 pp.

Speech/of/Mr. Douglas, of Illinois,/On The/Territorial Question./Delivered In Senate of The United States, March 13 and 14, 1850/Washington: Printed By John T. Towers./1850. (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9, 31 pp.

Speech/of/Hon. Stephen A. Douglas,/On The/"Measures of Adjustment,"/Delivered In The City Hall, October 23, 1850. (Caption Title).

Pamphlet 5½ x 8¼, 16 pp., Gideon & Co., printers.

Address/Of The/Hon. Stephen A. Douglas,/At The/Annual Fair/Of The/New York State Agricultural Society,/Held At Rochester, September, 1851./Albany: C. Van Benthuysen, printer, 407 Broadway./1851 (Title Page).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9½, 41 pp.

Welcome To Kossuth./Remarks/Of/Hon. Stephen A. Douglas,/On The/Joint Resolution Welcoming Governor Kossuth./Delivered/In The Senate Of The United States, December 11, 1851./Washington: Printed At The Congressional Globe Office./1851 (Cover Page).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9, 7 pp.

Remarks/Of/Mr. Douglas, of Illinois,/Upon/The Resolution Declaring The Compromise/Measures To Be A Definitive Adjust-ment Of All Questions Grow-ing Out Of Domestic/Slavery/Delivered In The Senate Of The United States, December 23, 1851/Washington:/Printed By Jno. T. Towers/1851 (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 5½ x 8½, 15 pp.

Speeches/of/Mr. Douglas, of Illinois,/At The/Democratic Festival, At Jackson Hall,/January 8, 1852./And At/The Congressional Banquet To Kossuth, January 7, 1852/(Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9, 8 pp.

Speech/of/Hon. Stephen A. Douglas,/of Illinois,/Delivered in Richmond, Virginia, July 9, 1852. (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 8½, 8 pp.

In a speech before the Springfield Scott Club Lincoln replied to Douglas' Richmond Speech. August 14, 26, 1852.

Oration/Of The/Hon. Stephen A. Douglas,/On The/Inauguration Of The Jackson Statue,/At The/City of Washington,/January 8, 1853/Washington:/Printed by Lemuel Towers./1853 (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 8¼, 16 pp.

(Sp)eech/of/Mr. Douglas, of Illinois,/on/The Monroe Doctrine./Delivered In The Senate Of The United States, February 14, 1853 (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9, 8 pp.

River And Harbor Improvements./Letter/of/Senator Douglas/To/Governor Matteson, of Illinois (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9, 8 pp.

January 2, 1854.

The/Nebraska/Question/Comprising/Speeches In The United States Senate/By/Mr. Douglas (And Seven Others)/Together With/The History Of The Missouri Compromise/Daniel Webster's Memorial In Regard to

it — History of/The Annexation of Texas — The Organization of/Oregon Territory — And The Compromises of 1850/Redfield/110 and 112 Nassau Street, New York/1854 (Cover Title).

Book, 6¼ x 9¼, 119 pp.

Pages 35 to 36 contain Mr. Douglas' Report In The United States Senate, January 4, 1854. Pages 37 to 47 contain Douglas' Senate speech of January 30, 1854.

Speech/of/Hon. S. A. Douglas, of Illinois,/In The Senate, January 30, 1854,/On The/Nebraska Territory./Washington: Printed At The Sentinel Office./1854 (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 5½ x 8½, 14 pp.

Letter/of/Senator Douglas,/In Reply/To The Editor/Of The/State Capitol Reporter,/Concord, N. H./ Washington:/Printed At The Sentinel Office:/1854 (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 6 x 9½, 7 pp.

February 16, 1854.

Speech/of/Hon. S. A. Douglas, of Illinois,/In The United States Senate/March 3, 1854/on/Nebraska and Kansas/Washington: Printed At The Sentinel Office/1854/(Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 6 x 9½, 30 pp.

Letter/of/Senator Douglas,/Vindicating/His Character And His Position On The Nebraska/Bill Against The Assaults Contained In/The Proceedings of/A Public Meeting/Composed of/Twenty-five Clergymen of Chicago./ Washington: Printed At The Sentinel Office/1854 (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 8¼, 14 pp.

Letter of Douglas is dated April 6, 1854.

Nebraska And Kansas/Speech/of/Senator Douglas,/In The Senate, May 8, 1854/in vindication of his character and of his position on the Nebraska-Kansas bill. (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5½ x 8½, 8 pp.

Speech/of/Senator Douglas,/At the Democratic Celebration of the Anniversary of/American Freedom, in Independence Square, Philadelphia, July 4, 1854 (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5½ x 8½, 7 pp.

Speech/of/Senator Douglas,/at/a Public Dinner/given him/by his personal and political friends, at Chicago,/ November 9, 1854./Washington:/Printed at the Congressional Globe Office./1855. (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 5½ x 7¾, 15 pp.

Execution of United States Laws/Speeches/of/Hon. S. A. Douglas, of Illinois,/Delivered/In The Senate Of The United States, February 23, 1855/on/The Bill reported from the Committee of the Judiciary to protect Officers and Other/Persons Acting Under the Authority of the United States (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5½ x 8½, 8 pp.

34th Congress/1st Session/Senate/Rep. Com./No. 34/ In The Senate Of The United States/(. . .)/Mr. Douglas Made the following/Report./The Committee on Territories . . . (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5½ x 8¼, 61 pp.

March 12, 1856.

Speech/of/Hon. S. A. Douglas, of Illinois,/on Kansas Territorial Affairs./Delivered In The Senate Of The United States, March 20, 1856/Washington:/Printed At The Union Office./1856 (Cover Title).

Pamphlet, 6 x 8¼, 29 pp.

34 Congress/1st Session/Senate/Rep. Com./No. 198/ In The Senate Of The United States./June 30, 1856 . . . /Mr. Douglas made the following/Report./To accompany Bill S. 356/The Committee on Territories . . . (Caption Title).

Pamphlet, 5¼ x 9, 10 pp.

(To Be Continued In February Issue)