

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY  
WILLIAM PRICH, JR.  
(PRINTER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.)  
31, SOUTH GAY-STREET,  
NEAR THE CUSTOM HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Daily paper 87 and Country paper 5 per ann.  
All advertisements appear in both papers.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1866

### The Cordial Preventive.

(WELL WORTH ATTENTION.)

It is pleasing to observe, in these enlightened times, the increasing liberality of the physical profession. Few medical practitioners but experience among their patients the superlative efficiency of Dr. SOLOMON'S CORDIAL BALM OF GILKAD—which is sold only in this city at the store of WARNER & HANNA.

It often saves those whom the whole faculty give over; and cures after every physician of eminence can do no more. This medicine, therefore, is now as frequently and regularly prescribed as any in the Materia Medica, in all complaints which it professes to subdue; and is likely to be soon so immediately and universally used in every case of debility, consumption, or relaxation of the solids, by the whole medical world, as entirely to supersede the application of every other remedy.

Masters of vessels, seafaring men, heads of seminaries and private families supplied with a warranted cordial preventing yellow fever, bilious fever, and fever and ague; it will be found a specific in the cure of the latter. From its restorative virtues it should be resorted to in relaxed, weak or decayed constitutions, in coughs, colds, astmas, consumptions and nervous disorders, from whatever cause they may proceed. By its use will be removed all diseases of the first passages, accompanied with or proceeding from inactivity to the stomach and bowels, acidity, indigestion, vitiated bile, worms, putrid sores and jaundice. It will be found capable of penetrating into every part of the body and of gently stimulating the whole system; removing the most obstinate disorders dependent on or connected with scrofula or king's evil, indolent tumors, obstructions of the liver, spleen, kidneys, and mesenteric glands—add to these all disorders of the skin, scaly eruptions, tetter, ring worms, leprosy, blotches, foul ulcers, &c. It would be impossible to enumerate the various complaints to which this excellent cordial is applicable: in a word recourse should be had to it in all complaints of infants as well as of grown persons, and it may be justly esteemed an universal restorative, in all decays, from age, intemperance or disease. In the use of it no peculiar restraint is required, and for the satisfaction of the public the proprietor avers that no metallic principle whatever is admitted into its composition. A number of respectable references to persons residing in New York, and certificates of its harmless and amazing restorative virtues, accompanies each bottle, with full directions for its use, the work of an eminent physician. As, also an obligation signed by the proprietor, engaging to return all such sums of money as may be received for this cordial, for every instance wherein its failure as a preventive is fairly established. Price 20¢ per bottle.

The following cases from a number of others are submitted to the consideration of the public:

MRS. WELLS, 47, Ferry-street, in the 83d year of her age was for some time confined to her bed, and her relations in daily expectation of her death. She was quite deaf, and would frequently exclaim in great distress, "O! how sick I am!" At the request of her friends for something to comfort her, I sent her a bottle of the CORDIAL PREVENTIVE, and to the no small surprise of all who saw her, in three or four days after its use, she was able to get from her bed, was restored to her hearing, can ever since sit up from six to eight hours every day, and read with ease frequently; she enjoys a wonderful state of health, and thinks her understanding as strong to-day as it was 40 years ago.

The following certificate is from her son—I certify the statement to be correct.

RICHD. CUNNINGHAM.  
Clarissa Coles, two years old, and daughter of Mr. Willet Coles, 45, Ferry-street, labored under a distressing illness for some months; she was brought very low, and apparently near death, but was completely restored by a single bottle of the Cordial, and is now a healthy thriving child.

I certify the above statement to be correct.  
WILLET COLES.

SIR,  
I am happy to state to you for the benefit of the public, that Mrs. Longworth having made trial of your Cordial Preventive, has received considerable benefit from its use. Your humble servant,  
DAVID LONGWORTH.

Mary Delano, four years old, and daughter to captain Paul Delano, was seized with a sudden illness, accompanied by a considerable fever, was completely relieved by four tea spoonfuls of the Cordial Preventive.

I certify the above statement to be correct.  
ANNE DELANO.

The citizens of this city (BALTIMORE) can well attest the extraordinary benefits they have received from this wonderful Medicine.—Some speak in such terms of it, as to assert that they will never be a day without it in their houses; others that were they to want it they could not live.—All this can be well attested. Grocers, Tavern-keepers, and the like, are informed that it is a delicious substitute for Bitters, or any other spirituous dram taken in the morning; and to those who may doubt this assertion, a week's trial is only necessary to prove the important truth! Oh! blessed Health, thou art above all gold and treasure.

N. B. The Guide to Health and Anti-Impe- tines, with all the best London Patent Medicines sold by  
WARNER & HANNA.  
February 26 2041

IMPERIAL TFA,  
JUST received for Sale by A. McCULLOH,  
81, Market-street,  
Thirteen quarter-cents of superior quality.

And  
A small invoice of Silk HOSIERY, hand- some assorted, and entitled to deputation.  
February 27 2041

HENRY THAPNALL begs leave to in- form his friends, and the voters of the city and county of Baltimore, generally, that he still continues to offer himself a candidate for the office of Sheriff; and he again respectfully solicits their friendship—and suffrage at the ensuing election.  
February 12.

## Congress.

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

THURSDAY, February 13.  
BRITISH AGGRESSIONS.

Debate on the second resolution reported by a select committee, as already given.

[CONTINUED.]

Mr. Worthington.—On further consideration of the resolution now before the Senate I confess I feel more opposed to it, and do believe, on the whole it will be best not to pass it in its present form. The resolution must mean something, or it must mean nothing. It must intend to convey to the President, the opinions and advice of this body, or not to convey it. Now, sir, if it is intended to convey to the President the opinions and advice of the Senate, which is certainly my understanding of it, I beg gentlemen to reflect a little before they adopt it. The advice of this senate I trust will never be given to the President without having the desired effect, and let me add, sir, that from the intimate connection which exist between this and the executive branch of the government, I must believe that the President would not feel himself justified, nor would he be willing to take so much responsibility on himself as entirely to reject it. Sir, I could not justify him if he did. We are equally responsible with him in our executive capacity, and can we for a moment believe that he would act contrary to the decided opinion of the Senate, who can at all times control or defeat him by rejecting a treaty made contrary to their advice and opinions? What, sir, is the object of the resolution?

Resolved, That the President of the U. States, be requested to demand and insist upon the restoration of the property of their citizens, captured and condemned on the pretext of its being employed in a trade with the enemies of Great Britain, prohibited in time of peace; and upon the indemnification of such American citizens, for their losses and damages sustained by those captures and condemnations; and to enter into such arrangements with the British government, on this and all other differences subsisting between the two nations, (and particularly respecting the impressment of American seamen,) as may be consistent with the honor and interests of the United States, and manifest their earnest desire to obtain for themselves and their citizens by amicable negotiation, that justice to which they are entitled.

We request the President "to demand and insist upon the restoration of the property of their citizens, captured and condemned on the pretext of its being employed in a trade with the enemies of G. B. prohibited in time of peace; and upon the indemnification of such American citizens, for their losses and damages sustained by these captures and condemnations;" and afterwards "to enter into such arrangements with the British government, on this and all other differences subsisting between the two nations, (and particularly respecting the impressment of American seamen,)" as may be consistent with the honor and interests of the United States, and manifest their earnest desire to obtain for themselves and their citizens by amicable negotiation, that justice to which they are entitled."

To my mind, sir, the resolution seems to be at war with itself. It is not, Mr. President, the bold ground taken by the first part of the resolution to which I object. It is not, sir, that I am opposed to demanding or insisting on our rights; but it is because I fear the resolution taken together will embarrass the executive in negotiating a treaty to settle our differences. A gentleman from Maryland has told us, and we know the fact is so, that there are several subjects on which negotiation is necessary. At present we know we have no commercial treaty with G. B. If, sir, this subject is intended to be embraced, (and I so understand it) by the resolution, and if it is the opinion of the Senate it should, let us be more explicit. We have such a treaty with Holland, Spain and France, and I confess I see no good reason why we should not have one with G. B. if it can be made on terms which will promote the mutual interests of the two nations. Indeed, I cannot imagine how we are to get along without continual jarrings, and probably ultimately war, with all its concomitant evils, unless we know the ground on which we are placed. Whilst I should deplore an event of this kind, yet, if under all the circumstances, the honor and interests of my country made it necessary, I hope I shall be found among those who would firmly resent the insults and vindicate the injuries of any nation on earth.—With so wide a field for negotiation, with so many important objects to accomplish, I submit it to the good sense of the Senate, whether it will be proper to tie up the hands of the executive in the manner contemplated by the resolution. If the resolution passes, the President must in every event "demand and insist upon the restoration of the property of our citizens, captured and condemned on the pretext of its being employed in a trade with the enemies of Great Britain, prohibited in time of peace; and upon the indemnification of such American citizens, for their losses and damages sustained by these captures and condemnations;" This must be made the basis on which all further proceedings are to be founded. "I do not wish to be understood as being willing to give up the property which has been unjustly taken from our citizens without an

equivalent may be obtained in many ways. If the resolution is adhered to by the executive a restitution of the property must be insisted on. Request the President to demand and insist, and he must take this ground, and this only, if we pass this resolution.—Although in my opinion this resolution was not intended to censure the Executive, yet, it would seem to bear that construction. But on this ground I will not object to it. It is notorious to every gentleman of the Senate that the President has been, and is now prosecuting a negotiation on the subjects which seem to be the particular objects of this resolution, viz. the condemnation of our vessels and the impressment of American seamen. It would therefore seem improper on this ground to pass the resolution in its present form. I know, sir, that what has been so often and so properly repeated is all important on the subject, that is, that we should be united in what we do. With this view and with the hope that the same committee can offer to the Senate a resolution varied in its form from the one before us, and embracing the wishes of at least a great majority, and I hope the whole Senate, I move that the resolution be recommitted.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. President—the motion before the Senate is to recommit the resolution to a special committee. Gentlemen in favor of the resolution as it stands, have called upon us to point out the alterations we wish to make in it as a cause of commitment; I will do so by stating my objections to it in its present shape. The first resolution on the paper which I hold in my hand, and which met with a unanimous vote of the Senate two days past, contains a mere declaration of their opinion on an abstract principle; to this resolution I fully and freely assent, although I did not vote for it, being that day unwell and absent. But this second resolution, if it is to have any effect at all, is meant to convey an instruction to the President of the U. S. It contains a request to him, not only, that he will endeavor to obtain an adjustment of our differences by treaty, but that prior to this he will "demand and insist upon the restoration of the property of our citizens captured and condemned on the pretext of its being employed in a trade with the enemies of G. Britain, prohibited in time of peace; and upon the indemnification of such American citizens for their losses and damages sustained by these captures and condemnations;" that he will enter into arrangements, &c. This, Mr. President, is the part of the resolution I object to. It is going too far. It is circumscribing the powers of the President, and tying him down to a particular point. It is making that the *sine qua non*, the basis on which alone he is to treat; at least it is doing this so far as an opinion of the Senate, expressed in this way, can do it. It really looks to me, as if on this particular point of restitution we were afraid to trust our chief magistrate. I presume there is not a member who hears me, who does not fully believe the captures and condemnations alluded to in the resolution were unjust, that they are an infringement of our rights; and that we are entitled to restitution. But let it be remembered that these condemnations are the solemn decisions of a court of very high authority in Great Britain. A court that, it is well known, acts under the councils (if not the controul) of the cabinet—may we not then reasonably suppose that the British government are as fully assured (in their own minds) that these condemnations are just and warranted, under the law of nations, as we are that they are unjust and unwarranted; and that they will be as unwilling to acknowledge in the face of the whole world that they have been wantonly robbing us of our property, as we will be to acknowledge that we have paid so much without a cause. It has been well observed by an honorable member from Tennessee, that in forming commercial treaties of this kind, there will be various points to consider: and it may not be necessary to contend for strict justice in every punctilio—arrangements or treaties, when there are existing differences to settle, must always be a bargain of compromise and forbearance; in one point we may give a little that we may obtain an equivalent in another. So it may turn out in settling our disputes with G. Britain. Why then are we not satisfied with expressing our opinion on the great principle of right; and leave it altogether with our chief magistrate to enter into and point out the details.

It is asserted by the advocates of the resolution as it now stands, that the part objected to, has been virtually agreed to in the first resolution; and that the latter part of the second resolution so qualifies the first as to prevent it from operating as an instruction or restriction on the President. To this I answer that the same principle, so far as it relates to the United States or to the British government, is certainly contained in the first resolution, and therefore unnecessary to be thus expressed in the second; and if it is not intended to operate as an instruction to the President, why is it so anxiously retained in the resolution? I can see no other reason for this, unless it is intended as a declaration of the Senate, a solemn pledge to be used on some future occasion, by the merchants, whose property has been thus condemned, to shew that we are bound to obtain restitution for them from the British government, or to compensate them ourselves. How far this may be right is not now for me to say. It is a subject not now before the Senate, and I think it too soon to make

the declaration. Nor do I like to see such a measure as it were; unnoticed, because obscured by the brighter blaze of more important objects. In support of the words "demand and insist," an extract has been read from a letter of the President himself to his minister abroad, in which he uses the same words. But is there no difference between the President's acting officially, giving instructions to his ministers where it is necessary and proper he should enter into the details; and our merely expressing an abstract opinion upon a great principle before it officially comes before us. The President in using these words does it with the strictest propriety; and I trust when he instructs a minister agreeably to the request contained in this resolution, that he will make use of language equally strong.—He shall meet with my hearty approbation, nor is there any length in my power that I will not cheerfully go to support him.—Yet still I am unwilling to tie him down to a particular point, or to express an opinion in detail upon the subject of a treaty, which if made must finally be laid before the Senate for their approbation. Let it be remembered that in the first resolution we have solemnly pledged ourselves to a principle of right; we are so far bound as the representatives of the nation to defend this right to our citizens; or to obtain an equivalent. This ought to satisfy all.—In this second resolution we request the President to obtain for us the free exercise of this right by treaty. Let us then confide to him the broad field of negotiation; let us not cramp him. Our rights are secure in the hands of the constituted authorities; should he fail or succeed, we all know the consequence; the next and last alternative is war; to this we all stand solemnly pledged, and when it comes to this, I must there will be no difference of opinion. Peace is the first wish of our hearts; it is the soul of our government. But the man who would not prefer war to oppression, to dishonor and infamy, is not an American. One word more, Mr. President, and I have done—it has been concluded that a unanimity of sentiment and vote is desirable on this subject. If then gentlemen are in earnest when they say those exceptional words, mean no more than what is contained in the first resolution; and convey no special instruction to the President, can they not change them for others equally strong as to the principle, and that will meet the approbation of all—why not strike them out and in lieu of them request the President to enter into arrangements agreeably to or in conformity to the first resolution; some such alteration as this would certainly retain the whole idea avowed by the advocates of the present resolution, and as the special direction and restriction would be left out, it would meet with my concurrence.—To obtain some such alteration in words that will be agreeable to all is the object I have in voting for the commitment, and as one day cannot materially affect us, I hope we will be indulged.

The motion to commit the resolution was lost by a small majority.  
(To be continued.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, Feb. 24.

Mr. Gregg from the committee on public lands reported on the petitions of Roger Enos and Robert H. Stone.—The report in both cases is unfavorable to the petitioners.

The House took into consideration the bill, received from the Senate, to prohibit commercial intercourse with the island of St. Domingo.

A motion was made by Mr. Nicholson so to amend the bill as to require bonds to be given with sureties, [The bill from the Senate only required a bond to be given by the masters and owners,] to prevent all trade to the ports of that island which are not in the possession of the French.

Mr. Nicholson supported this amendment.

Mr. J. Clay opposed it.

Mr. Jackson spoke in favor of it.

Mr. Nicholson, for the purpose of allowing further time to examine the provisions of the bill, moved its postponement till to-morrow.

Messrs. Eppes, Bidwell, Bealinger & Alston opposed; and Messrs. Nicholson, Leib, J. Clay, and Crowninshield supported the motion, which prevailed.—Ayes 57—Noes 53.

Mr. Leib, from the committee appointed to enquire into the expediency of altering the mode of keeping the Journal of the House, made a report, which was referred to a committee of the whole House to-morrow.

Mr. Crowninshield, from the committee of Commerce and Manufactures reported a new bill, to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, which was referred to a committee of the whole House on Thursday.

Mr. J. Randolph moved that the House should resolve itself into a committee of the whole on the state of the union upon the resolution amendatory of the Constitution of the United States as to the tenure of the judicial office.

Mr. Masters moved to postpone the consideration of it.

Mr. Speaker said this motion was not in order.

The question was taken on going into a committee, and carried—Ayes 65.

Mr. Gregg took the chair.

The resolution having been read, Mr. Randolph moved that the committee should concur in it, which motion was disagreed to—Ayes 51—Noes 55.

The committee rose and reported their disagreement to the resolution.

The House having agreed to consider the report, Mr. Clark moved a postponement till the 3d Monday of March.

Mr. J. Randolph opposed this motion, and expressed a hope that a postponement for a shorter time would be agreed to.

Messrs. Gregg and Smilie opposed the postponement.

Mr. Masters moved an indefinite postponement.

Mr. Findley and Mr. J. Randolph opposed; and Mr. Conrad supported this motion, which was lost. The Yea and Nays being called were Yeas 42—Nays 61.

Mr. Clark withdrew his motion of postponement till the 3d Monday of March, and moved that the resolution should be made the order for next Monday in which the House concurred.—Ayes 67.

Mr. J. Randolph, after some preliminary remarks, offered the following resolutions, which were referred to a committee of the whole House on Tuesday week.

Whereas it is provided by the sixth section of the 1st art. of the constitution of the United States, that no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a member of either house of congress during his continuance in office:

THEREFORE,  
1st. Resolved, That a contractor under the government of the United States, is an officer within the purview and meaning of the constitution, and, as such, is incapable of holding a seat in this house.

2d. Resolved, That the union of a plurality of offices in the person of a single individual, but more especially of the military with a civil authority, is repugnant to the spirit of the constitution of the United States, and tends to the introducing of an arbitrary government.

3d. Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law, to render any officer, in the army or navy of the United States, incapable of holding any office under the U. States.

The House having considered the bill to amend the Library act, ordered it to a third reading to-morrow.

TUESDAY, Feb. 25.

The House resumed the consideration of the bill to prohibit commercial intercourse with certain parts of the island of St. Domingo.

Mr. Nicholson's motion to require sureties, after considerable debate, was disagreed to.

A debate then ensued on the passage of the bill.—Messrs. Nicholson, J. Clay, Eppes, Early, and Smilie supported, and Messrs. J. C. Smith, Quincy, Dana, Ely and Crowninshield opposed it.

When the question was taken by Yeas or Nays, and the bill passed.—Yeas 43—Nays 26.

Report of the committee appointed on the 13th December last, to whom were referred the report of a select committee on the letter of Wm. H. Harrison, on the 17th February, 1864, in relation to the legislative council and the representatives of the Indian territory, and several petitions of sundry inhabitants of a territory.

REPORT.

The committee to whom were referred the report of a select committee, made on 17th February, 1864, on a letter of Wm. Henry Harrison, president of a convention held at Vincennes in the Indiana territory, touching the consent of the people of the said territory to a suspension of the 6th art. of compact between the United States and the said people; also on a memorial and petition of the inhabitants of the said territory; also on the petition of the legislative council and a committee of representatives of the said territory; together with the petition of certain purchasers of land, settled and intending to settle on that part of the Indiana territory west of Ohio, and east of the boundary line running from the mouth of Kentucky river; and on two memorials from the inhabitants of Randolph and St. Clair counties.

REPORT.—

That having attentively considered the facts stated in the said petitions and memorials, they are of opinion that a qualified suspension for a limited time, of the 6th article of compact between the original states and the people and states west of the river Ohio, would be beneficial to the people of the Indiana territory. The suspension of this article is an object almost universally desired in that territory. It appears to your committee to be a question entirely different from that between slavery and freedom, inasmuch as it would merely occasion the removal of persons, already slaves, from one part of the country to another. The good effects of this suspension, in the present instance, would be to accelerate the population of that territory, hitherto retarded by the operation of that article of compact; as slave holders, emigrating into the western country, might then indulge any preference which they might feel for a settlement in the Indiana territory, instead of seeking, as they are now compelled to do, settlements in other states or countries permitting the introduction of the slaves. The condition of the slaves themselves would be much ameliorated by it; as it is evident, from experience, that the more they are separated and diffused, the more care and attention are bestowed on them by their masters; each proprietor having it in his power to increase their comforts and conveniences in proportion to the smallness of their numbers. The dangers too (if any are to be apprehended) from too large a black population existing in any one section of country, would certainly be very much diminished, if not entirely removed. But whether dangers are to be feared from this source or not, it is certainly an obvious dictate of sound policy to guard against them, as far as possible. If this danger does exist, or there is any cause to apprehend it, and our western brethren are not only willing but desirous to aid us in taking precautions against it would it not be wise to accept their assistance? We should benefit ourselves without injuring them, as their population must always so far exceed any black population which can ever exist in that country, as to render the idea of danger, from that source, chimerical.

Your committee consider the regulation contained in the ordinance for the government of the territory of the United States, which requires a freehold of fifty acres of land, as a qualification for an elector of the general assembly, as limiting too much the elective franchise. Some restriction, however, being necessary, your committee conceive that a residence continued long enough to evince a determination to become a permanent inhabitant, should entitle a person to the rights of suffrage. This probationary period need not extend beyond twelve months.

The petition of certain settlers in the Indiana territory, praying to be annexed to the state of