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DEBATE ON THE MISSOURI BILL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MR. CORNISH’S SPEECH.

Mr. Corrinal commenced by saying, that it was with great reluctance he entered on the subject before the House, but that he had done so from a sense of the responsibility of his position, and from a conviction that the subject was too important to be left unconsidered.

The proposition of the委组织部 was that the people of Missouri should be permitted to establish a separate state, with a separate government, and with a separate constitution. The question was, whether this proposition should be granted, or whether it should be rejected.

Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be granted. He said, that the people of Missouri were a distinct people, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large property, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large influence, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large power, and that they had a right to be regarded as such.

Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be rejected. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a distinct people, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large property, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large influence, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large power, and that they had no right to be regarded as such.
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Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be rejected. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a distinct people, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large property, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large influence, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large power, and that they had no right to be regarded as such.

Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be granted. He said, that the people of Missouri were a distinct people, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large property, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large influence, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large power, and that they had a right to be regarded as such.

Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be rejected. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a distinct people, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large property, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large influence, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large power, and that they had no right to be regarded as such.

Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be granted. He said, that the people of Missouri were a distinct people, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large property, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large influence, and that they had a right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were a people of large power, and that they had a right to be regarded as such.

Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be rejected. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a distinct people, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large property, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large influence, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large power, and that they had no right to be regarded as such.
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Mr. Corrinal then proceeded to state the reasons why he was of opinion that the proposition should be rejected. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a distinct people, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large property, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large influence, and that they had no right to be regarded as such. He said, that the people of Missouri were not a people of large power, and that they had no right to be regarded as such.
THE STEAM SHIP PENNANT.

To all those who doubted the ability of steam ships to navigate the Bering Sea, we are pleased to announce the success of the "Pennant." The vessel, under the command of Captain John A. Murray, set sail from Seattle on May 15, 1855, for the Islands of the Bering Sea, and arrived at its destination on June 25, 1855, after a voyage of 25 days. The "Pennant" is the first steam ship to navigate the Bering Sea, and has demonstrated that steam ships are capable of making the journey safely and efficiently.

The vessel was built by the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, and is the largest ship ever to navigate the Bering Sea. It is equipped with the latest technology, including a steam engine, a steam boiler, and a steam turbine. The ship is also equipped with a wireless telegraph, allowing it to communicate with other ships and land-based stations.

The "Pennant" is owned by the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, and is operated by the company's experienced crew. The ship is equipped with the latest safety features, including lifeboats, life rafts, and emergency equipment.

The voyage was not without its difficulties. The ship encountered rough seas, icebergs, and ice floes, but the crew managed to navigate through them safely. The "Pennant" is now en route back to Seattle, where it will be greeted by cheering crowds.

The success of the "Pennant" voyage demonstrates the potential of steam ships to navigate the Bering Sea. The Pacific Steam Navigation Company plans to continue its operations in the area, and is looking forward to future voyages.
WASHINGTON.

Tuesday, June 30.

A Register has passed the two Houses of the General Court (Legislature) of the State of Massachusetts, disapproving the recommendation of the President for the recall of three楸 vice-presidential electors, and therefore the three vice-presidential electors have now finished their term. It may be, therefore, that some further action will be taken by the President to recall the three vice-presidential electors, and another vote will be taken by the House of Representatives on the same subject. The above is reported in a press on Tuesday last, and contains a recommendation that the President should take further action in this case, which is highly important to the country.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

To the Editors.

Gentlemen:—I have no objection to the publication of your paper the other day, but I think it is not proper to publish the following statement:

"The President of the United States, Mr. Madison, has forwarded to Congress a message in which he recommends the recall of three of the vice-presidential electors of Massachusetts, on the ground that they have not fulfilled their duties. The Secretary of the Treasury has been instructed to send a message to the President, stating that the recall of these electors is not necessary, and that the President's action is a violation of the Constitution."

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

THOMAS JEFFERSON.
SCOTLAND AND CANADA.

The Hon. William Duff, M.P., for Perth, in a speech made in the House of Commons, March 23, 1823.

Mr. Speaker, - We have lately heard much of the great alterations that have taken place in the British colonies in North America. It is a subject that has been much talked of, and it is one that occupies the attention of the people of this country. The changes that have been made in the colonies have been for the better, and we are now witnessing the fruits of those changes.

The colonies have been made more free, and the people have been given more rights. The land has been opened up, and the settlers have been given more land. The colonies have been made more independent, and the people have been given more power to govern themselves.

The changes that have been made in the colonies have been for the better, and we are now witnessing the fruits of those changes. The colonies have been made more free, and the people have been given more rights. The land has been opened up, and the settlers have been given more land. The colonies have been made more independent, and the people have been given more power to govern themselves.

In conclusion, I would say that the changes that have been made in the colonies are for the better, and we are now witnessing the fruits of those changes. The colonies have been made more free, and the people have been given more rights. The land has been opened up, and the settlers have been given more land. The colonies have been made more independent, and the people have been given more power to govern themselves.