

E 423

.S63

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0000502402A





SPEECH

OF

HON. E. K. SMART, OF MAINE,

IN

DEFENCE OF THE NORTH AGAINST THE CHARGE OF AGGRESSION
UPON THE SOUTH.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 23, 1852.

25/10



WASHINGTON:
PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.
1852.

E423

.S63

S P E E C H .

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the Homestead Bill—

Mr. SMART said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have obtained the floor for the purpose of defending the North against certain charges of aggression, recently made by gentlemen in both wings of the Capitol. Sir, I dislike to speak at any time of sections of the Union, by way of contrast or comparison, but I believe an intelligent understanding of the relations which have hitherto existed between the North and the South, will, at the present time, have a tendency to insure justice and cement the union of our country. I am, sir, a Northern Representative; but "I ask nothing that is not clearly right," and, as a Northern man, I will "submit to nothing that is wrong." What, sir, is the best method of preserving the Union, so far as the action of the North is concerned? It is to insist on our rights, and with equal alacrity to concede, at once, all that belongs to our Southern friends. This I intend to do.

The gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. JACKSON,] who introduced a resolution, not long since, requiring a pledge of non-agitation on certain subjects, did not, I presume, mean to preclude a Northern Representative from defending his constituents from unjust imputations. Be that as it may, I shall not acknowledge, in this respect, the "binding efficacy" of his resolutions. In his late speech, he used the following language:

"If that people who sent me here be disunionists, the inference is irresistible, that I also have forgotten my duty to my country and am a disunionist. If there be any man upon this floor who has drawn that inference, I feel it to be my duty, from a regard to myself, from a regard to my posterity, and from my respect to my countrymen and this House, to disown the fact, and to say here, as I do, before my country and my God, that never, WITH ALL THE CAUSES WHICH, IN MY JUDGMENT, THE SOUTHERN PEOPLE HAVE FOR DISSATISFACTION IN A LONG COURSE OF TWENTY YEARS' LEGISLATION, have I felt the first desire to see this Union dissolved."

This, as I understand it, is a plainly implied reflection upon the North, and doubtless has reference to the subject of slavery. It should not pass without a reply.

The gentleman speaks of legislation, not non-legislation. In reply to him, I pass over the acts of the last Congress, because they appear to be supported by a majority of the Southern people; and I pass over the establishment of a Government in Oregon, because the South have always affirmed that they had no desire to propagate slavery in that hyperborean region. I also pass over the formation of Territorial Governments in Territories where slavery had been excluded by the ordinance of '87 and the Missouri compro-

mise, because a re-enactment of what was already the law in relation to slavery in these Territories injured nobody; and, passing over these, I assert, that no slave-holding right has been infringed by Congressional legislation during the period designated by the gentleman. With the exception of certain acts of the last Congress, and acts in relation to the Territories, I find only the following legislation upon slavery for the last twenty years:

Act of 1834. E. Brooke may remove two slaves into the District of Columbia.

Act of 1841. John Carter may bring his slave into the District of Columbia.

Act of 1843. Balance of indemnities, to be paid to persons or companies for slaves lost at Nassau, Bahamas.

Act of 1844. Slaves of persons residing within the reputed limits of Arkansas, but found to be within the limits of Texas, may be brought back.

In addition to this, I believe claims for slaves have been allowed within the time named by the gentleman from Georgia. This is the sum of the legislation during the period mentioned by the gentleman. Now that I am speaking upon the subject of slavery, I have a few words to say in reference to the escape of slaves.

The census has been cited to show how many slaves have escaped to the North. Here is what was said by a distinguished Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. RHETT,] a few weeks ago:

"I see that, according to the census returns for the year ending the 30th of June, 1850, upwards of one thousand fugitive slaves escaped to the North from the South. That amounts to \$800,000 worth of property at the market value of slaves."

Now, sir, the census does not demonstrate that a solitary slave has escaped to the North. It only purports to show how many have been lost. Many have probably escaped to neighboring swamps; and it would not be strange if large numbers have been taken and carried away, for sale, by persons residing in the South. With the exception of the border slaveholding States, I do not believe that many slaves escape from the South to the North. The census pretty conclusively establishes the fact, that the number alleged to have escaped to the free States is greatly exaggerated.

It shows that in the New England States, there has been a small decrease in the number of its colored population. The following table of colored persons will be found interesting:

	1850.	1840.	1830.	1820.	1790.
Maine.....	1,313	1,355	1,177	929	-
N. Hampshire...	477	537	607	783	788
Vermont.....	710	630	881	918	871
Massachusetts..	8,773	8,668	7,049	6,740	6,001
Rhode Island....	3,543	3,238	3,578	3,502	4,355
Connecticut....	7,415	8,105	8,072	8,008	5,572
	<u>22,231</u>	<u>22,633</u>	<u>21,364</u>	<u>20,881</u>	<u>16,987</u>

In the State of New York the decrease during the past ten years has been 2,583 in the colored population. In none of the free States has there been any increase of consequence, except in Pennsylvania and Ohio. The entire increase in the Middle States is much less than that reported in 1840.

Now, making due allowance for births in the last ten years, and for emigration of free persons of color from slave to free States, it does not appear that large numbers of slaves have gone to those States. They are not there. Have they gone to Canada? They are not even there, to the extent generally stated. It is said one thousand slaves escaped for the year ending June, 1850. This, it will be recollected, was prior to the passage of the fugitive slave act. Without inquiring further whether they did or not escape to the free States, and without going into the question of responsibility in the matter of their escape or recapture, I ask what was the loss incurred during the year our Southern friends suffered the most? Why, sir, it amounted, after all, to only about one thirtieth of one per cent, on the whole number of slaves in the United States; and supposing the slave property in the South to be worth \$1,500,000,000, it amounted to about one eighteenth of one cent, or one half mill on a dollar! It would seem that this property, as a whole, has been held by a more reliable tenure than bank stock or shipping, or almost any other property you can mention. Considering the nature of the property, I think it is as secure as can reasonably be expected. The feeling got up upon this subject by certain Northern "Union patriots," reminds me of a story of a client who had not a very good cause of action. His lawyer, however, presented the case with great eloquence and power. The client watched his advocate, during the argument, with great attention, and at last burst into a flood of tears, saying that he had no idea before how badly he had been treated. So it is in this case. Till Mr. Webster made his demonstration, Southern gentlemen, I think, had not felt themselves badly aggrieved in this particular matter.

But at all events the people of the North are now charged with having committed the most flagrant aggressions upon our Southern friends. I will read some of the specifications:

"It has been said by Southern men, 'that the South knows the Federal Government only by its exactions and oppressions, and that she has never received benefits and advantages from its power or influence.'"

And again:

"I wish to show to this Senate that in all the operations of this Government, there is but one story throughout—the North lives—the South suffers."

"This Government openly says to us, we will govern you as we please; we will plunder you by tariff; rob you of your territories, assail your institutions, and if you attempt to escape our power by secession, we will put you to the sword."

"Let us now go back to the fiscal operations of this Government. If I mistake not, they will exhibit one consistent course of aggrandizement on the part of the North at the expense of the South."

"If I mistake not, from the very foundation of this Government to this day, the operation of it in its financial and pecuniary relations, has had but one uniform tendency; and that has been to aggrandize the North at the expense of the South. If I mistake not, the course of usurpations submitted to has led to their legitimate sequences in the measures of aggression which have been denominated the con-

promise. To test the truth of this position, I propose now to go back and trace the financial operations of the Government for many years past."—*Speech of Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, December 15th and 16th, 1851.*

"The honest truth is that in our secret hearts we all know that justice has not been done us, and we have little hope that it will be in future. We have submitted to one wrong; will we submit to another?"

"I used in my speech at home, after my return from Congress, the Cromwellian expression, which ever since has so much annoyed the peculiar guardians of the Union. 'Pray to God and keep your powder dry.' And it was as if I had said, 'Hope for the best, but be prepared for the worst.' The true meaning of this expression will be understood, when I state, that on that occasion, as now, I said appearances in my judgment are delusive. We have suffered much at the hands of the North, and we have not seen the end. We are destined to suffer much more."—*Speech of Hon. A. G. Brown, of Mississippi, March 30th, 1852.*

We are told by our Southern friends of exactions and oppressions, wrongs and aggressions; of their being governed by their bitter enemies, and always excluded from the benefits and advantages of the Government. These are the complaints; and I doubt not they will be solemnly repeated on Monday next, at the anti-secession Convention in South Carolina. But I hope to be able to show that they are unfounded. In justice to a portion of our Southern friends I will say, that they do not make these very grave charges against us. If any of the gentlemen who do make the charges, put them forth as a sufficient cause for a dissolution of this Government, they should see to it that they are not fallacious. When our fathers signed the Declaration of Independence, the great facts it contained were true. Nor was this all. They demonstrated to the world a magnitude of injustice on the part of Great Britain, which abundantly justified them in the course they pursued. The complaints I have read cover the whole history of the Government. They have only known the Government by its exactions and oppressions. If Northern men were to acquiesce in the justice of these complaints, by admitting them to be well founded, or by remaining silent under them, I should fear for the safety of the Union. The immortal Jefferson said, in his first Inaugural:

"If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, WHERE REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT."

If, sir, we are left free to combat the errors of those who would dissolve the Union, all will be well. We must be permitted to look over the books, and to take an account of stock. The different sections of the Union entered into a partnership more than three-fourths of a century ago. Some of the partners, it seems, have become dissatisfied with the dividends they have received. Such being the case, I think it would be an act of wisdom for the complaining partners to review the profits they have realized from the concern, and to determine whether these profits have not been ample and abundant, and whether there is any serious justification for complaints against the Northern members of the firm. I purpose, sir, to take a glance at the accounts, and to speak of some of the benefits which have inured to our Southern brethren, in virtue of our great Confederacy. I will endeavor to give some facts in answer to the complaints of Southern gentlemen, of oppression, and of being governed by the North.

As there is no limitation as to the period covered by these complaints, I will refer, for a few moments, to a time anterior to the formation of the Consultation.

I do not mean to rely, in my defense, upon the deliberations and transactions of the North and South during the period to which I refer. Public men at that time were poor individually and collectively, and could not bestow local or personal favors to any extent. It was enough that they gave to posterity the general benefit of the freest and best Government in the world. While I do not rely for my answer to the charges of Northern aggression upon the period of our history anterior to the formation of the Constitution, I expect, by a reference to it, and by other facts in our subsequent history, to show that the South have obtained, by the magnanimity of the North, or by the political tactics of Southern politicians, not less, but often more than their share of the benefits and advantages of the Government. In passing to the subjects I purpose to notice, some allusion to our early history is drawn from me by the recollection of a declaration made by Mr. Calhoun a short time previous to his decease.

That eminent man, in his last great speech in the Senate, (read by Mr. MASON, of Virginia,) spoke of Washington as the "illustrious Southerner;" and subsequently (March 13th, 1850) he said, in his place in the Senate:

"I reminded the Senate and the world, and rightly reminded them, that Washington was an illustrious Southerner." * * "We have a right to claim him as an illustrious Southerner—for he was a Southern man, a Southern planter; and we do not intend he shall be taken out of our hands."

Now, sir, I repudiate entirely such distinction for the memory of George Washington. He is remembered as an illustrious American, and as the property of every section of the Union; and in the opinion of the world, the best man the world could furnish to conduct the revolutionary war to its glorious termination. This was apparent soon after, if not at the time of his appointment, as Commander-in-Chief. If, indeed, he might at that time be regarded as a "Southerner," for the reason that he resided at the South, and was known personally to few of the people of the North, I claim for Northern men that they were magnanimous to him and to the South. By whom was he made Commander-in-Chief of the armies of the Revolution? To use the phraseology I have quoted, it was done by "illustrious Northerners." The motion was first made for the appointment of Washington, by John Adams, "the Colossus on the floor of Congress" in favor of the Declaration of Independence. By whom, I ask, Mr. Chairman, was that motion seconded? By none other than Samuel Adams, of Massachusetts, a man worthy to be placed in the category with Hampden.

Northern men by this act superseded their own military commanders for the sake of the cause. Their strongest reason for doing so was, to unite the South in the war. I mean no disparagement of the patriotism of the Southern colonies. A large portion of their citizens were early in the fight, and among the last to remain on every field. But the North had, at the commencement of the war, a stronger spirit of resistance. The Pilgrims had been the children of oppression, because they were dissenters from the established Church. They

flled for refuge from the intolerance of their country. The persecutions of Britain had pursued them to the then inhospitable shores of America.

"Wild was the day; the wintry sea
Moaned sadly on New England's strand,
When first the thoughtful and the free,
Our fathers, trod the desert land."

The settlement of New England was the result of persecution—that of Virginia was a matter of choice. In 1609 a charter was granted to Virginia, and the grantees were incorporated by the name of "The Treasurer and company of ADVENTURERS and Planters of the city of London for the first Colony of Virginia." The early settlers of Virginia were generally of the established Church, and were, in some degree, the favored colonists. They were less annoyed by the acts of the British Government, and had fewer grievances to redress. Their leading spirits had made common cause with the North; but with a view to unite the Southern colonists fully in the war, the North resolved, with great magnanimity, to take the Commander-in-Chief from the most important Southern colony. The military men of the North were passed by in favor of one who, in consequence of that act, became, not an "illustrious Southerner," but an illustrious American. They were passed by in favor of one who for twenty years had not drawn a sword or mixed in public affairs. The superseded generals were brave and true men. There may be those who would detract from their merit and magnify their faults. To such I would reply, in the language of a British historian, "Were the defects of the heroes of New England far greater, and their virtues far less, they would yet throw into the shade of merited oblivion the character of their defamers, either of the past or the present age." Sir, I am not much given to poetry, but I can feel what a New England poet has written:

"Oh! never may a son of thine,

Hear, unmoved, the taunt of scorn
Breathed o'er the brave New England horn;
Or mark the stranger's jaguar hand
Disturb the ashes of thy dead,
The buried glory of a land
Whose soil with noble blood is red,
And sanctified in every part,
Nor feel resentment like a brand
Unsheathing from his fiery heart!"

Indeed, it was objected to the commanders of New England that they had been too decided for independence; and, therefore, the appointment of one of their number would be impolitic! As I would be careful not to misstate history, I ask attention to the following authorities for what I have said:

"Among the Southern colonies, Virginia, for numbers, wealth, and influence, stood preeminent. To attack so respectable a colony to the aid of Massachusetts, by selecting a Commander-in-Chief from that quarter, was not less warranted by the great military genius of one of her sons than dictated by sound policy."—*Rumsey*, vol. 1, p. 216.

"It was questionable, however, in what light an attempt to supersede General Ward would be viewed. This difficulty, however, was overcome by the MAGNANIMITY of the New England delegation. John Adams proposed the adoption of the provincial troops as a continental army, and at the close of his remarks he expressed his intention to propose a member of Congress from Virginia.

"All persons understood it to be Washington." *Lossing*, page 164.

"There were officers in the country older in years than Colonel Washington, who had acquired a reputation in the last war, and whose services would be necessary. To pass

over such as should be thought by themselves or friends to have higher claims on the score of former rank and standing, a point in which military men are always so sensitive, might be a hazardous experiment.

" Besides, the troops already in the field were wholly from the New England provinces, and it was uncertain how far they would be reconciled to a commander from the South, with whom no one among them had a personal acquaintance, and would not be supposed to understand their habits, feelings, and prepossessions. General Ward, who had hitherto been at the head of the Army, by the appointment of Massachusetts, was cheerfully acquiesced in by the other New England colonies, was an officer of experience and ability, and it was questionable in what light an attempt to supersede him might be viewed. It should be said, to the credit of the New England delegates, that they were among the foremost to propose, and the most zealous to promote the appointment of Colonel Washington. As the contest had begun in Massachusetts, the inhabitants of which had been the chief sufferers, and as the existing army was mostly raised there, it would not have been thought an extravagant assumption, had that colony aspired to the honor of furnishing a Commander-in-Chief.—*Sparks's writings of Washington*, vol. 1, p. 140.

" General Washington was placed on all those committees whose duty it was to make arrangements for defense; and when it became necessary to appoint a Commander-in-Chief, his military character, the solidity of his judgment, the steady firmness of his temper, the dignity of his person and deportment, the confidence inspired by his patriotism and integrity, and the independence of his circumstances, combined with that policy which actuated New England, and indeed a wish to engage the Southern colonies in the war, to designate him, in the opinion of all, as the person to whom his country should be confided.—*Marshall's Life of Washington*, vol. 11, p. 236.

" But we were embarrassed with more than one difficulty; not only the party in favor of the petition to the King, and the party who were jealous of independence, but a third party, which was a Southern party against a Northern party, and a jealousy against a New England army under the command of a New England general. Whether jealousy was sincere, or whether it was pride and haughty ambition of furnishing a Southern general to command a Northern army I cannot say.

" Several gentlemen declared themselves against the appointment of Mr. Washington, not on account of any personal objections against him, but because the army were all from New England, had a general of their own, appeared to be satisfied with him, and had proved themselves able to impress the British army in Boston, which was all they expected to desire at that time.

" Mr. Pendleton, of Virginia, and Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, were very explicit in declaring this opinion. Mr. Cushing and several others more faintly expressed their opposition, and their fears of discontent in the army and in New England. Mr. Paine expressed a great opinion of General Ward, and a strong friendship for him, having been his classmate at college, or at least his cotemporary; but gave no opinion on that question. This subject was postponed to a future day; in the meantime, pains were taken out of doors to obtain a unanimity, and the voices were generally so clear in favor of Washington, that the dissentient members were persuaded to withdraw their opposition.—*Works of John Adams*, vol. 11, p. 416.

Let me not be misunderstood. The concession was, indeed, as fortunate as it was generous. Washington, I repeat, the world has decided, proved to be a better man for the crisis than the world could furnish. It is true, also, that the North had grievances to be redressed, and views to accomplish in his appointment. But what I wish to assert is, that " illustrious Northerners," nevertheless, performed an act of great magnanimity at that period, in bringing forward George Washington. This no one can deny.

I hope, sir, it is understood that I do not make any complaints for the North in this discussion. If they have grievances, I am not now about to state them. I mean, before I sit down, to make out, if I can, a defence against the charge of injustice to our Southern friend. As I am speaking for this purpose, I may notice a smaller incident. General Washington, in 1777, was unanimously

elected President of the Federal Convention, upon the nomination of Mr. Morris, of Pennsylvania, a Northern man. I find a note in the Madison papers, upon the subject, which I take the liberty to read:

" The nomination came with particular grace from Pennsylvania, as Doctor Franklin alone could have been thought of as a competitor. The Doctor was himself to have made the nomination of General Washington; but the state of the weather and his health confined him to his house."

Now, sir, if Northern gentlemen had been disposed to overlook the great claims of Washington, they might have done so by the selection of a native of New England, whom Jefferson declared to be, " at the age of eighty years the ornament of human nature," and who was worthy to preside over any deliberative body in the world.

" The name of Benjamin Franklin will be immortal in the records of freedom and philosophy. We hope they (the people of America) will learn with interest the funeral homage which we have rendered to the Nestor of America."

Thus wrote the President of the National Assembly of France, in 1790.

I make, Mr. Chairman, no merit of this matter. But I say, we were not unjust to the man whom the great Carolinian designated as the " illustrious Southerner."

In connection with these revolutionary incidents, I will remark here that I have heard complaints recently by a distinguished Senator, in the other end of the Capitol, that large sums of money have been received by the North in revolutionary pensions. This is not a new alleged grievance. More than twenty years ago, the talented Hayne invested this " grievance" with sufficient dignity to be introduced into one of his eloquent speeches in the United States Senate. To this I have a short answer. The laws granting pensions apply to all sections of the country equally; and if the North have received a greater amount in pensions than the South, they furnished more men for the war.

The following statement of troops (continental and militia) furnished by the respective States, during the revolutionary war, from 1775 to 1783, inclusive, is from the collection of the New Hampshire Historical Society:

By the North.		By the South.	
New Hampshire.....	14,580	Delaware.....	2,693
Massachusetts.....	83,162	Maryland.....	18,039
Rhode Island.....	10,192	Virginia.....	32,288
Connecticut.....	39,831	North Carolina.....	7,263
New York.....	21,635	South Carolina.....	6,317
New Jersey.....	16,781	Georgia.....	2,679
Pennsylvania.....	32,965		
Total.....	219,155	Total.....	69,379
	69,379		
	149,776		

It appears, by this statement, that the North furnished, during the war of the Revolution, 149,776 more soldiers than the South. These figures, Mr. Chairman, will, I think, explain any inequality as to the amount of pensions allowed to the different sections of the country.

Mr. MEADE. I wish to correct the gentleman as to a matter of history. The gentleman does not mean to say that all those persons from the North were actually engaged in the war. The State of Massachusetts, and other States, made all their militia soldiers, soldiers of the revolutionary war. That accounts for the difference.

Mr. SMART. I understand all that, and I said continentals and militia. The difference is not, I

think the gentleman will find, accounted for in that way. The North, it is well known, furnished by far the largest number of active soldiers who served in the field. But I ask gentlemen, respectfully, not to interrupt me. I say to you, "hear me for my cause, and be *silent* that you may hear;" and, by the way, I have a better cause than Brutus had. [Laughter.]

I now come to a consideration of some of the more important acts of Government under the Constitution. I purpose to notice some of the important provisions of the Constitution, and the manner in which those provisions have been carried out. We find the power given to Congress to establish the seat of Government. I had not the pleasure of being in the last Congress—and I have no doubt it was a pleasure—but I recollect of reading a speech of the gentleman over the way, [Mr. CLINGMAN,] in which he said, "I tell gentlemen that this is our slave-holding territory." But the gentleman did not tell us that the Federal Government, established its seat here, when it was nearly an unbroken wilderness! and that the splendid wealth and cultivated appearance of this city is to be ascribed to Northern votes, and, to a great extent, to Northern treasure. At the time of General Washington's inauguration, the temporary seat of Government was located in the city of New York. But at the first session of the first Congress, the subject of a removal, and permanent establishment of the seat of Government was agitated; and at the second session, a bill actually passed, transferring the seat of Government, after 1800, to some place on the Potomac, between the mouth of the Eastern Branch and Connogochegue, and it was transferred accordingly. The Northern States had a majority of four in the Senate, upon the passage of the bill, and yet it was carried by two majority. They also had a majority of five in the House, and yet were defeated by a majority of three. Messrs. Elmer, of New Jersey, Langdon, of New Hampshire, and Morris and McClay, of Pennsylvania, of the Senate, voted for the Southern location; and Messrs. Sinickson, of New Jersey, and Clymer, Fitzsimmon, Hartley, Heister, Muhlenburg, Scott, and Wynkoop, of Pennsylvania, of the House, voted for the same location. It is worthy of notice, that at the first session of the first Congress, both Houses voted for a "Northern position" for the seat of Government, and still the North were defeated.

The House of Representatives, September 7, 1789, passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the permanent seat of Government of the United States ought to be at some convenient place on the banks of the river Susquehanna, in the State of Pennsylvania, and that until the necessary buildings be erected, the seat of Government ought to continue in New York."

An additional resolution was passed, authorizing the appointment of commissioners to carry out the spirit of this resolution. On the 25th of September, 1789, the resolution of the House was stricken out by the Senate, and the following amendment inserted:

"And be it further enacted, That the President of the United States be authorized to appoint three commissioners, who are under his direction, to locate a district, not exceeding ten miles square, in the said countries, [in Pennsylvania,] and including therein the said Northern Liberties and town of Germantown, and to purchase such quantity of land within the same, as may be necessary, and to accept grants of land for the use of the United States, and to erect thereon, within four years, suitable buildings for the accommodation of the Congress, and the officers of the United States."

On the 26th of September, this amendment was sent to the House. It was now apparent that the House would adopt the amendment of the Senate; but Mr. Madison, who was warmly and ably the advocate of the "Southern location," on the 28th of September offered an unimportant amendment, and the Northern men were entrapped into its adoption. This carried the bill back to the Senate for action upon this additional amendment. It was immediately returned to the Senate, and postponed to the next session. This gave the friends of a "Southern location" what they desired, to wit, time to gain over additional strength. They afterwards obtained the entire vote of Pennsylvania, in both Houses, which State got in return, the trifling equivalent of the temporary location of the seat of Government till the year 1800. If the seat of Government could be established in a Southern position, certain Southern members were willing to give to the North an additional equivalent; they were ripe for "compromise." And what was the equivalent? I answer, the assumption of the State debts. There were not wanting men who thought the North gained as much as the South by this "compromise." But how miserably fallacious was this equivalent.

These debts were contracted for services and supplies in the war of the Revolution, and the obligation to pay them rested equally on the Southern as upon the Northern men. Nor is this all. This very assumption gave to the South \$11,200,000, and to the North, only \$10,300,000. This, and the seat of Government at Philadelphia for ten years, make up the equivalent to the North for trucking off the capital to the South, to remain forever. Another idea was also kept up, that the nation was to incur no cost for the erection of public buildings, &c. This proved to be equally fallacious. Here was no aggression of the North, certainly; but a mastery, by the aid of political tactics, on the part of the South.

I have looked into the discussion upon the subject, and I must say that some of the speeches are as fresh and natural as if made but yesterday. Men, eminent for their patriotism and character, brandished in debate the same weapons we often witness in this and the other Hall. I am incapable, Mr. Chairman, of intending any disrespect to the memory of those who have passed away; and the instances I give, are offered as illustrations merely of the language of certain *localities* towards other *localities*. I take the liberty to read a few extracts.

Mr. Lee, of Virginia, (in the House of Representatives, September 3d, 1789,) "Asked whether 'this Government was intended for a temporary, or a lasting one? Whether it was to be a fleeing vision, or continue for ages? He hoped the result would proclaim that the Government was calculated for perpetuity. If that was done, the Government would be removed to the Potomac; if not, we should stop short of it. He said he was averse to sound alarms, or to introduce terrors into the House; but if they were well founded, he thought it his duty.

The same gentleman (in the House of Representatives, July 6th, 1790,) observed that—

"While the present position continued to be the seat of Government, the agriculture of the States east is invigorated, while that to the south is languishing and expiring. He then showed the FATAL TENDENCY to this preponderating encouragement to those parts of the country, already

considered as the strongest parts of the Union, and from the natural operation of the principles he inferred that the interest of the Southern States must be eventually swallowed up. The decision of the Senate (in favor of the South) affords a most favorable opportunity to manifest that magnanimity of soul which shall embrace, upon an extensive, liberal system, the best interests of the great whole. He then drew an ALARMING PICTURE of the consequences to be apprehended from DISTINCTION, ambition, and rivalry. He then gave a pleasing sketch of the happy effect to be derived from a national, generous, and equal attention to Southern and Northern interests. Will gentlemen, said he, blast this prospect by rejecting this bill? I trust they will not."

These speeches were delivered more than sixty years ago. But, sir, the language of this eminent man sounds as fresh and natural as a speech of yesterday. He hoped the result would proclaim that the Government was calculated for perpetuity. If that was done, the Government would be removed to the Potomac. He then showed the fatal tendency of giving preponderating encouragement to the North; therefore he said the preponderating encouragement of the capital must go South. Then comes the fearful apprehension that the South will be swallowed up; then an alarming picture of the consequences of disunion; then a pleasing sketch of happy effects to be derived from an equal attention to Southern and Northern interests; then an appeal to Northern gentlemen not to blast this beautiful state of things by rejecting this bill—yes, by rejecting this bill. This is the grand finale. It seems that the attention to Southern and Northern interests was to give the South the seat of Government, in view of "alarming pictures," and of impending terrors. This was the spirit of the language addressed to Northern gentlemen then, and the same in spirit is addressed to them now.

These speeches, it is true, did not have a great effect, for the South got but few more votes than appear to have been stipulated for. There was indeed rivalry of feeling between Pennsylvania and New York, which powerfully contributed to the defeat of a northern location. The South were in a similar danger of dividing between Baltimore and the Potomac; but that able statesman, Mr. Madison, saw the danger and sounded the note of alarm. He made an appeal, which appears to have called the Southern members together like the blast of a trumpet. He said:

"We have it now in our power to procure a Southern position. The opportunity may not again speedily present itself. He knew the various and jealous interests that exist on this subject. We should hazard nothing. If the Potomac is struck out, are you sure of getting Baltimore? May no other places be proposed? Instead of Baltimore, is it not probable we may have Susquehanna inserted, perhaps the Delaware.

"Make any amendments, sir, and the bill will go back to the Senate. Are we sure that it will come back into our possession again?

"By amending we give up a certainty for an uncertainty. In my opinion, we shall not wisely if we accept the bill as it now stands; and I beg leave to press it on gentlemen, not to consent to any alteration lest it be wholly defeated, and the prospect of obtaining a Southern position vanish forever."

Thus we see, sir, the South controlled the decision. They controlled it without much regard to the arguments on the other side. Upon this subject one Southern gentleman [Mr. Bourke of South Carolina] said, in the House of Representatives, July 6, 1790:

"It is unjust to the people of this city (New York) to remove from this place until the expense they have incurred is repaid them. It is a breach of honesty and of justice. It is injustice to the State—to the whole nation. He entered into a consideration of their sacrifices and ser-

vices. He thought it a very extraordinary measure, indeed."

Mr. Gerry, of Massachusetts, said:

"When the Constitution was adopted, Congress determined that the first meeting should be in New York; and, from this determination, it became necessary that accommodations should be provided.

"Had not New York done this, they would have been charged with parsimony, or disaffection, or with both. It would have been said that this city, having been a British garrison, was careless and indifferent in respect to the Government.

"These considerations and their attachment to the Constitution produced the elegant building in which the sessions of Congress have been held; in addition to this, they have incurred other heavy expenses to beautify and render more convenient the seat of Government. These expenses the city has incurred to do honor to the new Government, and they have not been reimbursed."

Such is the history of this transaction.

Having thus described the manner in which the seat of Government was established in this District, I hasten to consider the advantages and benefits derived by a Southern community in consequence of its permanent location. During the discussion upon this subject, to which I have alluded, Mr. Madison said:

"The seat of Government is of great importance, if you consider the diffusion of wealth that proceeds from this source. I presume the expenditures which will take place when the Government will be established, by those immediately concerned in its administration, and by others who may resort to it, will not be less than \$500,000 a year."

If, sir, Mr. Madison had been correct in this prediction, there would have been expended among our Southern friends, for the benefit of this city and the agriculturists in this neighborhood, upwards of \$25,000,000; but he did not approach the reality. I now go to show the amount expended in this District since the permanent establishment of the seat of Government.

Why, sir, here is a great and thriving city grown up upon Government patronage, and the agriculturists of Virginia and Maryland are constantly deriving large revenues from the expenditures of Government in this locality. I have a statement of the money expended for local objects in the District of Columbia from 1790 to 1849-'50, prepared by Townsend Haines, Esq., Register of the Treasury, in compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives of July 26, 1850. The total amount thus expended, as appears by this statement, is put down at \$10,090,387 23.

The civil list of expenditures, about three fourths of which are expended in the city, from 1791 to and including 1832, amounts to \$37,158,047 00
From 1832 to and including 1850 to 46,019,302 00

Total.....\$83,177,349 00

Three fourths of this sum is..... 62,383,012 00

Add the amount expended in the

District for local objects, as already stated..... 10,090,387 23

And you have a total of.....\$72,473,399 23

It is proper to state that the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for several years included in the civil list the expenses of foreign intercourse. The amount for those years I have therefore estimated.

If, then, we take into account the expenditures of the foreign legations and others who resort to

the capital, the immense amounts lavished in printing contracts, &c., I think it will not be extravagant to say that one hundred millions of dollars have been expended in this city in consequence of the establishment of the seat of Government here, on the banks of the Potomac. The figures I have given are sufficient to justify me in this declaration. These are some of the "benefits and advantages" that our Southern friends have received from the Government. Instead of half a million, as predicted by Mr. Madison, there have been expended in this District about two millions per annum, without serious molestation by the "uncomplaining North;" for no serious attempt has ever been made to remove the seat of Government. I will not now add more under this head. I proceed to my next point.

The Federal Government has power, under the Constitution, to bestow office and emoluments upon the citizen. What share have the South had in the administration of Government, and in the execution of the laws? Have they, in this respect, been the victims of Northern domination and oppression? From what sections have the Chief Magistrates of the nation been taken? At the close of Mr. Fillmore's term the presidential chair will have been filled—

From the South.....49 years.

From the North.....15 "

Let it be remembered that, from the first formation of the Government, to the present moment, the North have had a decided preponderance of numerical strength; and yet they have forborne, with few exceptions, to use that strength for the elevation of their sons to the first place in the nation. There have been sixteen elections of President; and how many times do you suppose, sir, a majority of the North have voted for a man of Southern birth? They have done so eleven times. And how many times have a majority of the South voted for a native of the North? Let me answer, But once;—only once in sixty-four years. In the sixteen Presidential elections, 3,456 electoral votes have been cast; 790 votes have been given by the North for Northern candidates; 1,190 by the South for Southern candidates, and 321 by the South for Northern candidates.

The South have stood with their serried ranks for their own men, generally asking, and seldom yielding; and now some of their citizens are complaining of "Northern domination and aggression." Men sometimes complain to obtain more than their rights. Sir, I am reluctant to bring myself to believe that our Southern friends are actuated by a similar policy.

Several of the important places have been filled as follows, up to March 4th, 1849:

	<i>From the North.</i>	<i>From the South.</i>
Presidents.....	12 years.	48 years.
Chief Justices.....	11 "	48 "
Secretaries of State.....	20 "	40 "
Attorneys General.....	20 "	39 "
Speakers of the House.....	23 "	37 "

With about one half the white population, the slaveholding States have had, if I am not in error, a majority of the Cabinet, of the members of the Judiciary, of the Foreign Legations, and of the officers of the Army and Navy. They have now the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Commanding General of the Army, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and a

majority of the Cabinet officers. There have been from the South twenty-one Presidents *pro tempore* of the Senate, and from the North thirteen. These are the facts, and this is the answer to the charge of Northern aggression, that is forever sounding in our ears. I ask attention to these facts, and ask gentlemen to remember that there are 13,000,000 of white people at the North, and only about 6,000,000 at the South. I have alluded, sir, to the first places under the Government. I have not mentioned second and subordinate offices. Now, I ask, what justification can there be for the complaints of a distinguished Senator, made in the late convention, of Southern-Rights Association, held at Charleston? Hear him:

"The Southern States can no longer be the nurse of great statesmen. The ambition of the eagle's flight will be no longer seen—we may have crows and ducklings who will be ready to be satisfied with the crumbs and garbage of office. There are those who will be willing to make an easy transition to degradation by being candidates for the secondary and subordinate offices. Suppose there were a provision in the Constitution that no man from the South Atlantic States should be eligible to the Presidency; it would not change the present state of things. Such a clause might as well be in the Constitution for all practical purposes.

The young men of the South, throwing off the ties of trained politicians, should look to their own destiny. They need look to no Federal preferments that are worthy of their ambition. Third and fourth places they might attain, when they would be entitled to the first if they were in their rightful position."

These extracts were cut from the newspapers, and I suppose them to be correct.

This able and ardent champion of what I regard as factitious grievances, modestly claims that the rightful positions of the young men of the South, are the "first positions" under the Government. But, sir, I cannot understand how they have any exclusive right to be first on the list of important places. They have a right to an equality of condition under the Government, and nothing more. But admitting what seems to be the modest claim of the distinguished Senator, and the facts show that their names have remained on the first pages of the Blue Book, first, last, and all the time.

Why, sir, they have not only had the "first places," but their "crows and ducklings" have been well cared for. Here is a list taken from official tables:

"From these tables it appears that of fifty one principal officers of Government, heads of Departments, bureaus, chief clerks, &c., there were 24 born in free States, and 25 in slave States, nine of the former being born in Pennsylvania, and eleven of the latter in Virginia. Two are foreigners, namely, the Commissioner of the Patent Office, and one of the Assistant Postmaster Generals.

"Of 1,698 clerks and other officers, (not including custom-houses,) 1,442 were natives of the United States, 136 foreigners, and 120 whose place of birth was unknown. Of the 1,442 Americans, 632 were born in free States, and 810 in slave States; 275 were born in Virginia, which is 79 more than from any other State. Maryland has 196; Pennsylvania 177; New York 144; District of Columbia 128; Massachusetts 83; Kentucky 47; North Carolina 44; Maine 42; New Jersey 41; Connecticut 39, &c.

"Of the 136 foreigners, 34 were born in Ireland; 31 in England; 21 in Germany; 8 in France; 7 in Scotland; 3 in Spain; 2 in Canada; 1 in Wales, and 29 in other foreign countries.

"In the table showing the number appointed from each State, we have excluded the custom-houses, as those employed in them are always appointed from the States in which they are located. This table shows that of 1,698 persons, 621 were appointed from the free, and 930 from the slave States, the difference in favor of the latter being 299. Of these, 1,177 were employed in the city of Washington, 369 being from free, and 729 from slave States, showing that in that city there are 360 more Government officers from slaveholding States, than from the free. The

number employed in Washington city appointed from each State, is as follows: From Maine 20, New Hampshire 10, Vermont 10, Massachusetts 20, Rhode Island 5, Connecticut 13, New York 81, New Jersey 15, Pennsylvania 100, Ohio 30, Indiana 15, Illinois 12, Michigan 8, Iowa 4, Wisconsin 5, California 1; total from free States 631. Appointed from Delaware 6, Maryland 96, District of Columbia 226, Virginia 163, North Carolina 25, South Carolina 10, Georgia 16, Alabama 12, Mississippi 11, Louisiana 8, Texas 3, Florida 6, Kentucky 16, Tennessee 18, Missouri 19, Arkansas 3; total from slave States 729. Not reported 79."

Let me say here that the idea of filing a list of the offices in the local custom-houses at the State, as a "set off" to these places is simply ridiculous.

The people of the South are entitled to fill their own local offices, and the citizens of the North are entitled to discharge the duties of the offices in their section, but the offices "at large" should be filled from all sections in proportion to population. If the experience of the past is worth anything, it certainly affords no ground for gloomy apprehensions on the part of Southern gentlemen, and no reason for a dissolution of the Union. But I go further. If the North should hereafter claim their share of consideration in these matters—and I hope they will have spirit enough to do that—Southern gentlemen cannot complain, unless they can show that they have a divine right to the "first places." Any right, founded on any superior capacity or intelligence, I trust they will not urge upon us at the present day. It will be observed that the distinguished gentleman, to whom I have referred, considers a participation in the Government of the country, by the occupation of high official stations, as an important matter. So do I. To take the Government from the King of Great Britain, and to give it to our own citizens, was one important design of our glorious Revolution. But the design was to give it to the whole country, and not to the South or North exclusively. The "first places" in all governments, among all people, civilized and uncivilized, have been deemed objects worthy of the most ardent aspirations, and of the most tremendous struggles. It may be in accordance with human nature for one section to desire them all, but having obtained nearly all, it is certainly not reputable to pour out murmuring accusations. Without adding more upon this point, I beg the indulgence of the House while I call attention to the power—

TO LAY AND COLLECT TAXES, DUTIES, IMPOSTS, AND EXCISES.

Taxation has ever been regarded with jealousy by the Anglo-Saxon. Charles I., it has been said, lost his head by the levy of a twopenny tax of ship-money. I propose to look into the manner in which the power of taxation has been wielded in this nation.

First, of direct taxation. At the time of the formation of the Constitution, a contest arose between the North and the South, as to the basis of representation. The North contended that the Government should be one of free people exclusively, and that the representation in Congress should be based wholly upon free population. The South, however, succeeded in obtaining a "compromise," by which three fifths of the slaves are added to the whole number of free persons in the several slaveholding States as the "representative population." As an equivalent for this concession of the North, the South consented to prescribe, in the Constitution, that direct taxes, when

laid, should be apportioned among the States in the same manner as representatives. The equivalent, however, has proved to the North wholly fallacious. But four comparatively inconsiderable taxes have been laid since the adoption of the Constitution. "The slaveholding States," in the language of another, "have enjoyed the benefits of this compromise, without feeling any of its burdens."

The slave basis of representation is equal to some twenty-four Congressional constituencies, and how much has been received by the Government in direct taxes? McGregor, in his Progress of America, puts down the whole amount at \$12,000,000. Not only has there been little resort to direct taxation, but when resorted to the South have had comparatively few slaves for which to be taxed. In 1798, the period of the first direct tax, the slaves enumerated, for purposes of taxation, amounted to only 393,219. But when the subject comes up again the South will find the North for direct taxation, and itself against it, whatever has been said upon the subject to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. CARTTER, (in his seat.) That is true.

Mr. SMART. It is proper that I should allude to another fact, immediately connected with this subject. In 1836, an act of Congress was passed depositing the surplus revenue with the States; and about \$27,000,000 were actually distributed to the several States, in proportion to their respective representations in the Senate and House of Representatives. This was money in the Treasury of the United States, and was distributed according to representation, while we were collecting revenue, not according to representation, but upon a basis, in fact, much more favorable to the South than to the North. The money was collected by one rule, and distributed by another. The distribution to the South was undoubtedly greater than their contributions. They received, by this act of Government, more money, in virtue of their slave basis of representation, than they ever paid in direct taxes. It will be seen, therefore, that, under the compromise of "taxation and representation," they have never sacrificed a dollar; that they have obtained the advantage of slave representation without any equivalent. For some thirty-five years, no serious effort has been made by the North to resort to this constitutional mode of taxation. During all this time the slaves to be enumerated, for the purpose of taxation, have numbered from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000. Here, sir, is a clearly constitutional right which might be made to fall heavily upon the South, and no resort to it for the last thirty-five years. Does this look like Northern aggression? Rhetoric and oratory may give to the winds the complaint of aggression, but facts are far more important for a thinking people. Thus much for direct taxation.

A word of indirect taxation. The expense of collection of duties upon imports and tonnage in the North, has been exhibited as an instance of Northern oppression! This view of the subject has been taken without any regard to the amount of revenue collected in the free States. Let us see how the matter stands. I hold in my hand a statement showing the total amount of revenue derived from customs, and the expenses of collection, from 1791 to 1850, as appears by McGregor's Progress of America, and from a statement kindly furnished

me by the Secretary of the Treasury. I respectfully ask for it the attention of the House:

Whole amount of revenue.....	\$1,169,999,965
Expense of collection.....	54,257,320
Amount of revenue in free States.....	932,222,911
Amount of revenue in slave States.....	237,076,354
Expense of collection in free States.....	36,894,926
Expense of collection in slave States.....	17,362,393

It will be seen by these figures that the South have collected only about one fourth of the whole duties on imports and tonnage. In fine, sir, the expense of collecting one hundred dollars in the South has been nearly double that of collecting the same sum in the North. These facts, when thus presented, without any sophistry, really furnish our Southern friends, they being judges, with no just cause of complaint.

But to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, is one of the most important acts of sovereignty. If the power of taxation has been abused, and generally wielded against the interests and wishes of our Southern friends, I admit it may be a just cause of complaint on their part. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, for me to go into the effects of all the tariff acts upon all sections of the Union. I do not propose to do that. But there are some facts going to show that in this matter the North have not committed substantial aggressions against the South. I know, sir, it is believed by many in the South, that they have been always injured in the exercise of the power of taxation; and, I dare say, it is supposed by many that a majority of the South have scarcely ever voted for the revenue laws under which we have lived; but if it be found, upon investigation, that a majority of the Southern members of this House have voted for a majority of all the tariff acts passed since 1789, I think they are estopped from presenting a bill of indictment against the Government or the North in this matter.

In the House Journal may be found the yeas and nays upon twenty-one tariff acts, and of these a majority of the Southern members have voted for twelve, and against only nine. I hold in my hand the votes of Southern members upon these acts. They are as follows:

		Yeas.	Nays.
Tariff of August 10, 1790.....	22	3	
“ March 3, 1791.....	7	16	
“ May 2, 1792.....	11	15	
“ March 3, 1797.....	27	11	
“ July 8, 1797.....	14	31	
“ March 26, 1804.....	47	00	
“ March 27, 1804.....	27	20	
“ July 1, 1812.....	41	15	
“ July 29, 1813.....	44	21	
“ April 27, 1816.....	25	38	
“ April 20, 1818.....	19	33	
“ May 22, 1824.....	19	70	
“ May 19, 1828.....	17	62	
“ May 24, 1828.....	44	24	
“ May 29, 1830.....	65	12	
“ July 14, 1832.....	54	31	
“ 1833.....	84	4	
“ 1842.....	17	73	
“ 1846.....	62	22	

Such is the vote given in the Journals of the House; and I am confident an investigation of the Journals, will show that no tariff, distasteful to the South, has remained long on the statute book. It is a little striking, sir, that the first tariff, upon which sufficient interest was felt to take the yeas and nays, and the last tariff—the one now on the statute book—received an overwhelming majority of the Southern vote. It is easy to talk of Northern aggression; but here are facts, and I commend

gentlemen to a critical examination of them. Since 1833, a period of about nineteen years, we have lived under a tariff, voted for by the South, with the exception of some four years.

But I am aware it is often affirmed by our Southern friends, that they pay more than their just proportion of the revenues of the country. Since 1833, the tariff acts being, to a great extent, the work of the South, with the exception of four years, have not, I am bound to believe, contained unjust discriminations against that section. The statements generally made, of the benefit of the tariff to the North, of the amount of money that it throws into their hands, at the expense of the South, I know are, in a great degree, fallacious, and had I time, I could demonstrate it to any one. Our tariff system is a tax on consumption. Our people are taxed mainly according to their necessities, according to what they may need to eat, drink, or wear. Such being the fact, I think it can be demonstrated that the North bears even more than their share of the burdens of taxation, in proportion to their ability to acquire. Let me give an illustration.

In 1850, the receipts from customs amounted to about \$40,000,000. Maine and South Carolina, if assessed with a direct tax, agreeably to the Constitution, in a revenue of \$40,000,000, would pay about \$1,000,000. Now, let us assume for a moment that the slaves of South Carolina consume no articles paying duty. The white population of that State being a fair average of that of all the other States, would consume enough to pay of the \$40,000,000 revenue, \$560,000, and Maine would pay, upon the same principle, \$1,160,000! I have assumed that the slaves consume no articles paying duty.

This is not true, I confess; but it is not very far from the fact, as I will endeavor to demonstrate. In the Patent Office Report for 1849, is an account of the management of one of the best plantations in South Carolina. There are upon this plantation two hundred and fifty-four slaves, upon which the following cash expenses were incurred in one year:

Two hundred pairs of shoes \$175, annual supply	
of hats \$100.....	\$275 00
Bill of cotton and woolen cloth.....	810 00
One hundred cotton comforters in lieu of bed blankets.....	125 00
One hundred oil-cloth capotes.....	87 00
Twenty small woolen blankets for infants.....	25 00
Calico dress and handkerchief for each woman and girl.....	82 00
Christmas presents in lieu of negro crop.....	175 00
Fifty sacks of salt.....	80 00
Four hundred gallons of molasses.....	100 00
Total.....	\$1,959 00

The above articles are given as the whole consumption of two hundred and fifty-four slaves, exclusive of what is produced on the plantation. I leave gentlemen to examine these items at their leisure, and to ascertain the amount of duties actually paid upon them. I will not pursue this matter further; but I think it is evident from this illustration, that if our system of taxation is an aggression, it will be found like the aggression of winter, somewhat more searching and rigorous as you go North. I come now to the power—

TO ESTABLISH POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS.
Let us see if there are Southern grievances upon

this point. I find, by examination, that there is one post office in the North, to eleven hundred free population; and one in the South, to about eight hundred free population. Such are the accommodations furnished. And who pays the bills for this branch of the public service? Why, sir, the men, women, and children of the North pay an immense sum for transporting the mails for the benefit of our complaining friends of the South. I ask attention to the following tables, which I have condensed from a statement politely furnished me by the Post Office Department.

Statement showing the cost of transportation in each free State and Territory, for ten years, from 1st July, 1841, to 30th of June, 1851; also the amount of net revenue for the same time:

	Cost of Trans.	Net Revenue.
Maine.....	\$518,693 00	\$684,205 42
New Hampshire....	345,555 00	446,332 87
Vermont.....	398,643 00	421,671 76
Massachusetts.....	1,236,433 00	2,598,010 64
Rhode Island.....	102,182 00	308,125 64
Connecticut.....	531,559 00	781,572 21
New York.....	3,061,489 00	6,745,701 24
New Jersey.....	581,660 00	479,214 59
Pennsylvania.....	1,681,953 00	3,187,982 61
Ohio.....	1,781,936 00	2,007,657 15
Michigan.....	509,885 00	430,597 47
Indiana.....	690,994 00	543,486 90
Illinois.....	1,239,345 00	659,909 17
Iowa.....	128,578 00	126,332 08
Wisconsin.....	199,664 00	209,114 44
Minnesota Territory.	1,578 00	3,936 18
	\$13,039,187 00	\$19,723,940 37
		13,039,187 00
Net revenue.....		\$6,684,753 37

Statement, showing the cost of transportation of the United States mails in each slave State, for ten years, from 1st July, 1841, to 30th June, 1851; also the net revenue from the Post Office during the same period, in said States:

	Cost of Trans.	Net Revenue.
Delaware.....	\$89,812 00	\$101,632 69
Maryland.....	1,366,596 00	1,067,798 48
Virginia.....	1,842,927 00	1,236,293 13
North Carolina.....	1,600,270 00	409,518 10
South Carolina.....	1,154,147 00	693,263 97
Georgia.....	1,514,537 00	812,576 70
Florida.....	374,135 00	128,132 90
Missouri.....	697,538 00	586,105 42
Kentucky.....	1,157,431 00	699,297 05
Tennessee.....	798,936 00	515,932 84
Alabama.....	1,832,226 00	711,422 02
Mississippi.....	868,445 00	462,357 99
Louisiana.....	529,103 00	965,403 01
Arkansas.....	556,252 00	120,066 29
Texas.....	311,336 00	88,015 45
	\$14,716,761 00	\$8,601,026 09
	8,601,026 09	
Deficit.....	\$6,115,734 91	

It will be seen by this statement, that in a period of ten years, \$6,000,000 have been paid by the citizens of the North—by the men, women, and children of that section of our country, to transport the Southern mails. From this data I leave gentlemen to calculate the amount paid during the last sixty years. But, sir, I have not time to dwell upon this point.

ACQUISITION OF TERRITORY.

I ask the attention of gentlemen to the action of the Government under the power to acquire and relinquish territory. This power is not expressly granted by the Constitution; but we have on sev-

eral occasions exercised the right of making territorial acquisitions and relinquishments. These acquisitions have been highly favorable to Southern domination and prosperity. In 1802 we purchased the Territory of Louisiana, and paid for the same the sum of \$15,000,000. In 1819 we purchased Florida, and advanced in cash \$5,000,000. In 1842, from three to five millions of acres of Northern territory were surrendered to Great Britain by the treaty establishing the Northeastern boundary. In 1815 we annexed Texas to the United States. In 1847 we surrendered our claim to about one half of Oregon, extending five degrees on the Pacific. Here are three great acquisitions, and two grand relinquishments. The acquisitions were all slave territory, and relinquishments free territory. So far, all the acquisitions were for the use of the South, and all the relinquishments at the expense of the North. For these acquisitions our Government paid from the common Treasury of the nation—

To France.....	\$15,000,000
To Spain.....	5,000,000
To Texas.....	10,000,000
Total.....	\$30,000,000

It is true that a part of the Louisiana purchase is now free, but by far the larger part of this is waste territory, and of no value. To give a just idea of the benefits derived by the free and slaveholding States relatively, in consequence of our acquisitions, I ask gentlemen to consider the value of real and personal property, according to the late census, in the States acquired from foreign countries. I hold in my hand an authentic statement, which I will read:

Free States.	Slave States.
California.....	\$22,131,914
Iowa.....	21,436,138
Total.....	\$43,568,052
Louisiana.....	\$227,029,092
Texas.....	51,114,488
Florida.....	22,033,637
Missouri.....	99,129,712
Arkansas.....	36,368,765
Total.....	\$435,675,694

I ask honorable members, who seem to grudge even California, to look at this statement, and then decide for themselves, who have realized the benefit of foreign acquisitions under this Government. But I have not done. Much complaint has been made by some of our Southern friends, at the disposition of our "Mexican acquisition." But how is this? Texas is a slaveholding State. California is free. Utah and New Mexico are open to slavery. This, I believe, is not denied by any one. Henry Clay has stated such to be the fact, and so, I think, Senator Downs has very recently affirmed.

Our whole acquisition of Mexican territory amounts to 831,000 square miles, and is appropriated as follows:

Territory open to Slavery.	Not open to Slavery.
Texas.....	237,321 square miles.
New Mexico.....	249,774 "
Utah.....	187,923 "
Total.....	675,018

California..... 188,982 square miles.

It is not an answer to this statement to say that Utah and New Mexico will remain free. According to the provisions of their territorial government, they are to be admitted with slavery, if adjacent States will have it so; for, from their con-

tiguous position, they have the power to settle it. Four fifths of this acquisition is, in truth, open to slavery propagandism. Even California was not made free by Northern votes, against the votes of the South. She made herself free. But this is not all. The Missouri compromise line has been altered to give territory to the State of Missouri. Hear Colonel Benton, upon the annexation of the Platte country. In a speech delivered in the United States Senate, he uses the following language:

"By that act of annexation a part of the Missouri compromise line, one hundred miles of it on a straight line, was abolished and a new line substituted, nearly three hundred miles long on its two sides, cutting deep into free soil, and converting it into slave soil. The six beautiful counties of the Platte country were gained to Missouri by this operation—gained to a slave State, and carved out of free territory, made free by the compromise of 1820, and all by the help of Northern votes."

Sir, if complaints are to be made in the premises, Southern gentlemen are the last persons to prefer them.

It may be proper in this connection to say a word in relation to the Northwest Territory. We are often told by Southern gentlemen that Virginia gave up this Territory for the exclusive use of the North. In reply to this, I ask gentlemen to recollect that Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York claimed the same Territory, and those States, together with Virginia, ceded their rights to this tract of country. It may be said further, that even if Virginia had the best claim, her cession was a voluntary act of her own, and not a Northern aggression. But has the South been deprived of the use of this tract of country in consequence of the cession? Not at all. The sons of the South have enjoyed it in common with those of the North. There are at this moment, I am confident, as many citizens from the South as from the North upon this Territory, in proportion to the population of each section of the Union.

I am now naturally brought to quote again from the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory of the United States."

Under this provision it is contended that we are authorized to make regulations concerning the public lands. How have we exercised this authority? Has any injustice been done to the Southern States in the action of the Government, or in the conduct of the North upon this matter? How does the case stand? The lands have been held, among other purposes, as a source of revenue to the Government.

The receipts for public lands have been as follows:

Free States.		Slave States.	
Ohio.....	\$20,853,694 33	Missouri.....	\$13,674,258 62
Indiana.....	21,870,255 57	Alabama.....	17,722,124 74
Illinois.....	30,491,177 17	Mississippi....	13,353,247 49
Michigan....	11,704,657 76	Louisiana.....	4,405,389 31
Iowa.....	3,402,878 88	Arkansas.....	4,071,121 73
Wisconsin...	6,213,321 13	Florida.....	1,294,893 52
Total.....	\$84,565,934 84	Total.....	\$54,521,035 41
	54,521,035 41		
	\$30,044,899 43		

Showing that there have been received for the sale of public lands from the free States, \$30,044,899 43 more than from the slave States, up to the 30th of September, 1851. I obtain this information from a statement furnished me by the Commissioner of

the General Land Office. Thus much for the revenue from the sales of public lands, and the men who have furnished that revenue. Sir, I shrink from nothing in this investigation; and I now ask the attention of the House to an abstract from a statement furnished by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, showing the donations, grants, and reservations of land to the several States for all purposes whatever; up to 30th September, 1851:

Free States.		Slave States.	
Ohio.....	11,152,523	Missouri.....	3,310,694
Indiana.....	3,566,667	Alabama.....	4,453,233
Illinois.....	3,515,341	Mississippi....	3,895,465
Michigan.....	6,310,317	Louisiana.....	10,218,534
Iowa.....	1,997,445	Arkansas.....	6,438,357
Wisconsin....	3,318,476	Florida.....	2,096,564
California....	500,000		
Total.....	30,360,729	Total.....	30,412,850
			30,360,729
			52,121

By which it appears that the slave States have received 52,121 acres more than the free States. The donation for the Illinois and Mobile Central Railroad is not included in this calculation, it being of a character of the Cumberland road, for the benefit of several slaveholding and non-slaveholding States.

These donations, grants, and reservations have been made to six slaveholding and six free States. If there is any propriety in making them, they should be made according to population. This proposition is, I think, apparent. If one State has 500,000 children to be taught in schools and colleges, and another has 1,000,000, lands should be given to each State, if given for educational purposes, in the same ratio. So, if they are given for any other purpose. I ask, then, the attention of gentlemen to the population of States to which lands have been given. It is as follows:

Free States.		Slave States.	
Ohio.....	1,930,408	Missouri.....	682,013
Indiana.....	988,416	Alabama.....	771,671
Illinois.....	851,470	Mississippi....	606,555
Michigan.....	397,654	Louisiana.....	511,974
Wisconsin...	305,191	Arkansas.....	209,659
Iowa.....	192,214	Florida.....	87,401
Total.....	4,715,353	Total.....	2,869,283

Here is a population, in round numbers, of 4,700,000 in six free States, and 2,800,000 in the same number of slaveholding States.

The six slaveholding States have one half as much population as the six free States, and have received, not one half, but more of the public domain. If, indeed, a citizen in a free State is equal to a citizen in a slaveholding State, then the land States of the South have little reason to complain. But what of the future? I ask a moment's attention to the donations of land, prepared in the United States Senate at the present session:

Free States.		Slave States.	
Michigan....	341,760 acres.	Missouri.....	890,889 acres.
Wisconsin....	599,040 "	Arkansas....	1,873,920 "
Iowa.....	3,107,417 "	Alabama....	1,295,760 "
Ohio.....	302,195 "	Florida....	5,882,880 "
Illinois.....	35,000 "	Louisiana..	13,508,250 "
Total.....	4,385,412 "	Total.....	23,361,699 "

This is the programme of legislation for the present session. Let gentlemen study these figures, and remember that even Northern men can

be found to talk of aggressive legislation upon the South!

So much for donations, grants, and reservations of lands.

But I have not yet explained the whole connection of the Government with land matters. Our Government has been a land purchaser from the aborigines of the country. It is pertinent to this discussion to make a brief examination of the extinguishment of Indian titles. To whom have the benefits and advantages of this Government accrued in the extinguishment of Indian titles?

The number of acres of land purchased from the Indians since the establishment of the Federal Government, according to a statement kindly furnished me by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, amounts to 481,644,448 acres. The Indian title has been extinguished, by purchase, to 293,889,091 acres of Southern territory, and to 187,759,351 acres of Northern territory. The excess of Southern territory, to which the Indian title has been extinguished, is 106,125,746 acres. At \$1 25 per acre, the excess of land in the South thus disincumbered, would amount to \$132,657,182. Its extent is more than twice as large as all New England. I do not, however, profess that this statement is precisely accurate; as in two or three instances Indian tribes were located in what is now partly the slaveholding, and partly the non-slaveholding section of the Union. I think the statement is, if anything, most favorable to our Southern friends.

But I have not time to say more relative to the purchase of lands from the Indians. Before I conclude, I shall allude to other expenses immediately connected with this subject, and in consequence of which the whole Southern country was freed from the presence of hostile Indians.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES NORTH AND SOUTH.

But I must pass along. There are many matters of less importance which illustrate the unfortunate character of this charge of aggression. Among the grants of power we are authorized to coin money. Now, there are three establishments for this purpose at the South—one in North Carolina, one in Georgia, and one in Louisiana, and but one at the North, in Philadelphia. It will be recollected, that Congress has been petitioned year after year for a branch at New York, and the petitioners have been denied their reasonable request. The Southern establishments have been brought into existence by Northern votes—and if this may be called a Northern aggression, I may as well say that the business men of New York and New England would be very glad to be visited with a Southern aggression of a similar character. It cannot be said that the business of coining will not be done as cheaply at the North. Upon that point I will not detain gentlemen long. I will briefly refer to the mint operations for 1851. An official document sent into Congress from the Treasury Department shows the mint operations of the United States, during the year 1851, to have been as follows:

General Recapitulation.

	No. of Pieces.	Value.
Philadelphia.....	21,985,736	\$52,639,878 43
New Orleans.....	3,557,000	10,122,600 00
Charlotte, N. Carolina..	165,366	224,454 00
Dahlonga.....	83,856	351,592 00
Total.....	28,791,958	\$63,488,524 43

The expense of coinage at Philadelphia is forty-two hundredths per cent.; at New Orleans one and eight hundredths per cent.; at Charlotte three and fifty-five hundredths per cent.; and at Dahlonga three and thirteen hundredths per cent.

It is impossible to comment in detail upon all the acts of Government in a single speech. Nor is it necessary to this defense; for I have Southern testimony of a very comprehensive character. I will read:

“In many instances of the highest importance and greatest moment, the policy of the United States has been in favor of the South, and under the control of the South.”

“I remember to have heard Mr. Calhoun say, not many years before his death, that the South always had, and always would control the Government when united. This is abundantly shown in our past history.

“Since the formation of the Federal Government, the Southern States have given to the Union, nine Presidents out of thirteen; and have had a very large proportion of all the Federal offices. Three fourths of this time the South have been in power, and have had the control of the Government.—*Extracts from Speech of Hon. B. F. Perry, House of Representatives, South Carolina, December 11th, 1850.*

But I do not ask honorable members to rely on general assertions concerning the more important operations of Government. I have some additional facts and figures. I am able to show the total expenditure, in each section, for internal improvements by the General Government from 1791 to 1837.

These facts are taken from the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury of January 17th, 1835, and March 16th, 1838.

By this data the expenditures have been:

In the slave States.....	\$5,614,113 60
In the free States.....	4,292,593 23
Excess in the slaves States.....	\$1,321,520 37

The sums expended in the District of Columbia are included, amounting to about \$500,000—but I have excluded from the statement the expenditures for the improvement of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, and for the Cumberland road—these thoroughfares leading through both sections of the country. I am not able to give the amount expended from 1837 till the present time; but these figures will, I think, demonstrate that the impression has been very erroneous as to the sums expended in each section of the Union for internal improvements.

As intimately connected with this subject, I have a statement showing the total expenditures for light-houses from 1791 to 1837, as derived from the reports already referred to. I have condensed that statement, and will make the following exhibit:

Total amount expended for light-houses from 1791 to 1837.....	\$5,203,083 05
In the free States.....	2,511,265 39
In the slave States.....	2,691,817 66

The appropriations made for light-houses since 1837, are as follows:

In the free States and Territories.....	\$864,127
In the slave States and Territories.....	794,262

Add these appropriations to the expenditures already stated, and we have this result:

Expenditures and appropriations in free States.....	\$3,375,392
Expenditures and appropriations in slave States.....	3,486,079
Excess in slave States.....	\$110,687

I have little more than time to state the facts, which I wish gentlemen of this House to consider, and I pass to another point which I think should not be over-looked. This nation, from its common Treasury, has made immense expenditures for the peculiar benefit of our Southern brethren; to protect them and relieve them of the Indian race. Who, sir, does not realize that the means to carry on the Indian wars, and to keep up commerce with the Indian tribes, in the South and Southwest, came from the common Treasury of the nation? Now I ask gentlemen who say this Government has only oppressed them, to listen to the language of the distinguished individual of South Carolina, whom I have already quoted. What does he say? Hear him:

"There are the Indian wars on the southern frontier, for the protection of the Southern people, at a cost to the Federal Government of near \$200,000,000. This is surely feeling the power and influence of the Union, not by its exactions and oppressions, but by its care, protection, and liberality. These Indian wars are not only waged for the protection of the South, but have resulted in the entire removal of the Indians from the Southern States, at a very heavy expense to the Federal Government.

And who is the honorable B. F. Perry? In January, 1851, the Washington Union, Thomas Ritchie, editor, held the following language concerning him:

"We have been taught to appreciate his character. He was formerly the editor of the Greenville Mountaineer, and displayed great talents in his arduous vocation.

"During the nullification storm of 1832-'33 he was a Union man. He is now a prominent member of the bar, and a distinguished delegate in the House of Representatives of that State, (South Carolina.) Even the breath of suspicion has never tarnished his escutcheon. He is a man of high honor, firmness, and talents."

Such is the testimony as to the character of the witness I have called to the stand. But let us look at the action of the Government a little further, under the provision of the Constitution to provide for the common defense. I find important information in a report of General J. G. Totten, Chief Engineer, on the subject of the national defenses. From that report I obtain the following statement:

Fortifications upon the Coast and Northern Frontier.

FREE STATES.			
	Estimated cost.	Amount expended.	Cost of Armament.
Northern Frontier....	1,153,537	612,650	331,068
Class A.....	2,598,810	2,131,214	1,372,007
" B.....	4,367,108	4,217,108	1,282,621
" C.....	630,442	130,442	125,663
	<u>\$8,749,897</u>	<u>\$7,091,414</u>	<u>\$3,010,359</u>
SLAVE STATES.			
Class A.....	1,673,328	1,452,598	447,119
" B.....	9,341,358	8,955,851	1,050,283
" C.....	8,300,580	3,772,386	1,238,688
	<u>\$19,215,266</u>	<u>\$14,180,775</u>	<u>\$2,736,090</u>

The classes A, B, and C, embrace the old works repaired, the new works completed, or nearly completed, and the works now under construction.

It will be seen that the total estimated cost of these works amounts to \$33,661,512; and that two thirds of the cost of these fortifications are in the slaveholding States. This statement embraces the defenses not only on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, but upon the great Lakes.

To give a more just view of this application of the funds of the nation for purposes of coast de-

fense, I will make an exhibit of the extent of the American coast. I have made a statement from information kindly furnished me by Professor Bache and Major Stevens, of the Coast Survey Office. I ask attention to it.

The shore line of the United States of America, including bays, sounds, &c., is as follows:

Free States and Territories.	Statute miles.
Maine.....	1,355
New Hampshire.....	18
Massachusetts.....	887
Rhode Island.....	230
Connecticut.....	235
New York.....	59
New Jersey.....	510
California.....	1,110
Oregon.....	1,171
United States shore line of the great Lakes as follows:	
Lake Superior.....	855
Lake Michigan.....	1,100
Lake Huron.....	420
Lake Erie.....	350
Lake Ontario.....	200
Total.....	<u>8,492</u>

Slave States.	Statute miles.
Delaware.....	230
Maryland.....	730
Virginia.....	247
North Carolina.....	845
South Carolina.....	205
Georgia.....	250
Florida.....	1,913
Alabama.....	210
Mississippi.....	155
Louisiana.....	1,247
Texas.....	940
Total.....	<u>7,032</u>

By the facts here presented it will be seen that the shore line of the slaveholding States is more than one thousand miles less than that of the free States and Territories; and yet they in the slaveholding States have received two thirds of the national expenditures for purposes of coast defense.

There are many other matters upon which I might dwell. I have not noticed all the expenditures of Government, nor is it possible for me to do so on the present occasion. It is fair to state that in the construction of naval vessels, &c., the larger amount has been expended at the North; but with very good reasons. The cost of construction at the North has been much less. This is no aggression, but the exercise of a wise economy. Put this and whatever other items of a similar character that may appear upon the record down to the Northern account, and still, I affirm, that, taking into consideration the expenditures of every description, they are very far from furnishing our Southern friends any decent reason for complaint.

Before concluding, I must briefly allude to one other cause of uneasiness. It has been said that the people of the North make money out of the commerce of the country. This is put down among the list of grievances. But are the North to blame for that? The question is briefly answered by a writer in De Bow's Commercial Review, a work of high authority and standing at the South. Hear him:

"The ships of the North come to our shores laden with rich stores from all quarters of the globe—silks and teas of China, coffee from Brazil, the manufactures of England, France, the spice of Sumatra, the gold of California. For almost every article of necessity and luxury we use from foreign countries we are indebted to Northern enterprise, to which we annually pay a large tribute, the immense

profits of which might accrue to ourselves had we the enterprise and energy to enter the field. Will any man of sense pretend to say that there is any action of the General Government to prevent a merchant of Charleston, Savannah, or New Orleans, from fitting out ships for the whaling business, importing teas from Canton, or coffee from Brazil? Are the duties on foreign goods any higher in Charleston than in New York?

Sir, the case is well put, and I have only to add that, for the "tribute" they pay, they receive from the North a valuable consideration, in the services described in this extract. And if they do not think so, they have the same right enjoyed by the citizens of my own State, to become carriers for themselves and the world, to enter into both foreign and coastwise trade. And the remark will apply with equal force to every branch of business known to civilization.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks I have submitted have been prompted by my regard for the Union, and by a respect for the principles of equity and justice. I have often thought that a fair and candid investigation of the benefits and advantages of this Government, enjoyed by the South, would disarm the spirit of disunion; that our Southern friends, by an examination of the facts, would be induced to demand less of the North. It seems to me, too, that the Northern volunteers in behalf of Southern grievances, by looking into the action of the Government, instead of acquiescing in the charge of aggression, will see that we have rights—fair, just rights, which we have seldom asserted. They have made, in some instances, concessions that I am frank to say I would not have yielded, because a submission to unreasonable demands never makes for peace. If the people of the North desire a perpetuation of the Union they should ask what is right. They should ask, it is true, nothing more. They should, I repeat, submit to nothing wrong. They should not consent to be put under bonds to keep the peace, or to keep any law, because, doubtless, without any intention of those who wish to impose the bonds to do so, it puts those who consent to be bound, wrongfully on the record as criminals by their own confession! No man is called upon to get bonds that he will not violate a law, unless he is suspected of criminal intentions. As a member of the Democratic party, I hope no such bond will be demanded at the Baltimore Convention. I hope there will be no interpolation of new obligations into the Baltimore platform. It is, however, fair to warn our Democratic friends at the North that they have been notified that they must be "bound to keep the peace." Are these the terms to offer to the proud spirit of freemen? Will they be submitted to? We shall see. The Democracy of Maine have repudiated all such offensive tests. In their late legislative State Convention they adopted the old Baltimore resolutions without ad-

ditions or interpolations. Such is the overwhelming voice of the Democracy of the State I have the honor in part to represent, sustained, as it is, with unparalleled unanimity by our Democratic press. "Bonds to keep the peace," indeed! Without intending disrespect to any one, I must be allowed to remark that these are terms fit only for slaves. Neither should the people of the North on any occasion quietly submit to unjust attacks from men in their own ranks, or from those who understand little of their character or intentions.

It is often the case, that extreme men charge the North with aggression, and the idea is caught up by a certain class of men from the free States, who stand ready to do swift and willing injustice to their own section. Sir, Northern politicians, who, to advance their own political fortunes, brand the North with injustice to the Southern people, and thus create, at the South, causeless dissatisfaction, do not, in my judgment, exhibit a very sincere patriotism. They are the swift witnesses, who come voluntarily to the stand to blacken, by their testimony, the land of their birth. They will do more: they will advocate unworthy concessions, and, if successful in their work, the young men of the North may finally become impressed that they have no rights to be defended; that they are not the equals of those residing in other sections of the country; that they are not as great or good. But I trust they are not to succeed in dwarfing the position of our young men, or in creating a servile spirit that dares not defend our interests and honor when assailed. I trust the time is not near at hand when an American citizen will not dare to utter his honest opinions. Such a spirit of political bondage, fastened upon the minds of men, would wither the land like the blight of mildew. It would be a species of bondage that would turn the fairest country on earth into a moral desert. With such a condition of things fixed upon us, it would be no longer delightful to look upon the green fields and the busy towns of our country. "Even the croaking of frogs in the 'uncultivated fen, or the howling of wild beasts 'on the mountain-top, where liberty dwells, would 'be preferable to the nightingale's song in the 'vales of slavery, or the melting notes of Corelli 'in cities clanking their chains!" What is thus characterized is not more galling than the intolerant spirit which would stifle the thoughts and crush the voice of freemen!

One word more, and I have done. The North have faults, though not grievous ones, I think; but that we have been visited with unjust denunciation and intolerance by some, and often betrayed by others, must be apparent to all. As it has not been the object of these remarks to make complaints, I only state this now as due to the truth of history.





WERT
BOOKBINDING
Grantsville, Pa
Jan - Feb. 1989
We're Quality Bound

