

DEFENCE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY WILSON,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

ON THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, DECEMBER 19, 1856.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.

1857.

ple of the ..

1

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1911

SPEECH OF MR. WILSON.

The Senate having under consideration the motion of Mr. Rusk to refer so much of the President's Message as relates to foreign affairs to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILSON said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: In the memorable debate of 1830 on Foote's resolution, Mr. Webster, in that magnificent speech, which won for him the proud title of the ablest defender of the Constitution, spoke of the Ordinance of 1787 as a measure of great foresight and wisdom, which had laid the interdict against personal servitude over the region northwest of the Ohio while it was yet a wilderness, deeper than all local laws or local constitutions. "We are accustomed," said he, "to praise the lawgivers of antiquity; we help to perpetuate the fame of Solon and Lycurgus; but I doubt whether one single law of any lawgiver, ancient or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked, and lasting character, than the Ordinance of 1787." This tribute to the crowning work of the old Congress of the Confederation brought upon him and upon his section of the Union the accusation of making an onset upon the South; of interfering with their domestic institutions; of endangering the relation of master and slave. General Hayne, his distinguished opponent, who fought then the first great battle of nullification under the eye of his great leader, Mr. Calhoun, who then presided over the Senate, brought these accusations into the Senate, and hurled them against Mr. Webster, and against the people of the North. Mr. Webster met these accusations, these unjust reproaches, with a prompt and emphatic denial. After expressing his surprise that these charges should be brought into the Senate, he said:

"I know full well that it is and has been the settled policy of some persons in the South, for years, to represent the people of the North as disposed to interfere with them in their own exclusive and peculiar concerns. When it became necessary, or was thought so by some political persons, to find an unvarying ground for the exclusion of Northern men from confidence and from lead in the affairs of the Republic, then, and

not till then, the cry was raised, and the feeling industriously excited, that the influence of Northern men in the public councils would endanger the relation of master and slave. This is a delicate and sensitive point in Southern feeling; and of late years it has always been touched, and generally with effect, whenever the object has been to unite the South against Northern men or Northern measures. This feeling, always carefully kept alive, and maintained at too intense a heat to admit discrimination or reflection, is a lever of great power in our political machine. It moves vast bodies, and gives to them one and the same direction. But it is without adequate cause, and the suspicion which exists is wholly groundless. There is not, and never has been, a disposition in the North to interfere with these interests of the South. Such interference has never been supposed to be within the power of the Government; nor has it been in any way attempted. The Slavery of the South has always been regarded as a matter of domestic policy, left with the States themselves, and with which the Federal Government had nothing to do."

The motive, Mr. President, for these unjust accusations "of some persons in the South" against the people of the North, is here clearly stated by Mr. Webster. That motive has continued to animate this class of persons to this day. It is even now stronger than when it prompted the arraignment of Mr. Webster for his eulogium upon the Ordinance of 1787. The "sensitive point in Southern feeling" has been "carefully kept alive" up to this hour, "and maintained at too intense a heat to admit discrimination or reflection." Nor were there wanting in 1830 Northern men to echo the words, and join in the cry against the people of the North. If Mr. Webster, for a simple and beautiful tribute to the beneficent effects of the Ordinance of 1787, was arraigned on this floor in 1830 by one of the most accomplished statesmen of the South; if there were then found Northern men ready to echo his words, surely the men who now vote to apply the principle of that great

Ordinance to the vast territorial possessions of the Republic cannot hope to escape the misrepresentation, censure, and reproach, of Southern men, who see in the expansion of Freedom the signs of their waning power, or of that class of Northern men who

—"in the dust are groping
For the largess, base and small,
Which the hand of power is scattering;
Crumbs which from its table fall."

But, sir, I can stand, we can stand here to-day and say, as the great New England orator then said, that their accusations and suspicions are wholly groundless—that no attempt has ever been made, since Washington took the oath of office on the 30th of April, 1789, to this hour, to interfere with the legal and constitutional rights of the people of the Southern States in their domestic concerns.

On the 4th of November last, more than one million three hundred thousand men, intelligent, patriotic, liberty-loving, law-abiding citizens of New England, the great Central States, and of the Northwest, holding with our Republican fathers that all men are created equal, and have an inalienable right to liberty; that the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established to secure that inalienable right everywhere under its exclusive authority; denying "the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States, while the present Constitution shall be maintained," pronounced through the ballot-box that "the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, Polygamy and Slavery." Believing, with Franklin, that "Slavery is an atrocious debasement of human nature"—with Adams, that "consenting to Slavery is a sacrilegious breach of trust"—with Jefferson, that "one hour of American Slavery is fraught with more misery than ages of that which we rose in rebellion to oppose"—with Madison, that "Slavery is a dreadful calamity," that "imbecility is ever attendant upon a country filled with slaves"—with Monroe, that "Slavery has preyed upon the vitals of the community in all the States where it has existed"—with Montesquieu, that "even the very earth, which teems with profusion under the cultivating hand of the free-born laborer, shrinks into barrenness from the contaminating sweat of a slave"—they pronounced their purpose to be to save Kansas, now in peril, and all the Territories of the Republic, for the free laboring men of the North and the South, their children, and their children's children, forever.

Accepting the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States as their political charts—avowing their purposes to be to maintain the Constitution, the Federal Union, and the rights of the States—proclaiming everywhere their purpose not to make war upon the South, not to interfere with the legal and

constitutional rights of the people of any of the States—they gave their votes with the profoundest conviction that they were discharging the duties sanctioned by humanity, patriotism, and religion. Youth with its high hopes and aspirations—manhood in the vigor and maturity of its powers—age with its rich and ripe experiences, inspired with the spirit of Washington, when he announced to Robert Morris that his "suffrage should not be wanting" to effect "the abolition of Slavery" in his native Virginia "in the only proper and effectual mode in which it could be accomplished—that is, by legislative authority"—severed the ties which had bound them to other organizations, and united to prohibit Slavery everywhere outside the slave States, where it exists under the exclusive authority of Congress. This is the offence of these one million three hundred thousand sons of the free North, upon whom the unkenelled hounds of the slave propagandists have been unleashed.

Sir, the President of the United States, in this his last will and testament, has arraigned these one million three hundred thousand intelligent and patriotic freemen of the country. His accusations have gone forth over the land. Steam and sail, wind and wave, are bearing these accusations all over the Christian and civilized world. Wherever our country is known, these accusations made by the Chief Magistrate of the Republic will meet the eye or reach the ear of men. I indulge the hope, however, that the Republicans of the Old World who have been and now are branded as factionists, disorganizers, levellers, enemies of churches and hierarchies, will remember that the Republicans of the New World, who battle for the liberty of man against the dominion of man, are doomed, like themselves, to share the contumely and reproaches of power.

Assuming, Mr. President, that his policy has been sanctioned by the election, the President proceeds to accuse more than one million three hundred thousand American citizens of an attempt to organize a sectional party, and usurp the Government of the country. He proceeds to arraign more than one million three hundred thousand citizens of the free North, and to charge them with forming associations of individuals "who, pretending to seek only to prevent the spread of Slavery into the present or future inchoate States, are really inflamed with a desire to change the domestic institutions of existing States"—with seeking "an object which they well know to be a revolutionary one"—with entering "a path which leads nowhere, unless it be to civil war and disunion"—with being "perfectly aware that the only path to the accomplishment" of the change they seek "is through burning cities and ravaged fields and slaughtered populations"—with endeavoring "to prepare the people of the United States for civil war by doing everything in their power to deprive the Constitution and the laws of moral authority, and to undermine the fabric of the Union by appeals to passion and sectional prejudice, by indoctrinating its people with reciprocal hatred, and by educating them to stand face to face as enemies."

Sir, I deny each—every one—ay, all of these charges. There is not the semblance of truth in them. If the serpent that stole into Eden, that beguiled our first mother, which the angels

“Found
Squat like a toad close at the ear of Eve,”

had glided into the Executive Mansion, that serpent could not have hissed into the President's ear words more skillfully adapted to express the precise and exact opposite of truth. Sir, these accusations against as intelligent and patriotic men as ever rallied around the standard of Freedom, are untruthful and malignant, showing that the shafts hurled in the conflict through which we have just passed, rankle in his bosom.

Senators express their surprise that we on this side of the Chamber should utter the indignation which men who have any spirit, any sense of honor, should feel at these malignant and false charges of the Chief Magistrate of the Republic. Sir, he has undertaken to arraign us before the world, as making pretensions to one line of policy, when we intended to act up to another. He has charged us with engaging in revolutionary movements. He has charged us with having entered on a line of policy that has no possible outlet but civil war and disunion. He has charged us with thus acting, in the full knowledge that our path leads over ravaged fields, burning cities, and slaughtered populations. He has charged us with undermining the Constitution and laws of our country; with arraying the people of one section against the others, learning them to stand face to face as enemies. Sir, we should meet the scorn and contempt of all honorable men, if we did not utter the feelings which these unjust, untruthful, and malignant aspersions upon the people whose representatives we are, excite in our bosoms. To us, to the people he has so bitterly assailed, these expressions of the President's personal opinion are of very little importance. We know his weight of metal, and the limited range of his vision. The *New Hampshire Patriot*, the *Boston Post*, and the *Washington Union*, are little calculated to convey to the Executive that exact, full, and accurate information, which would entitle his personal opinions to much consideration. These charges, however, derive some little importance from his high position.

There is one member of his Cabinet, whose hand some think they see in the message, who knows full well the character of this production—I mean the learned Attorney General. His vast acquisitions and tireless industry, his early associations and correspondence with the Abolitionists of New England, all teach him that these accusations against the people of the North are without any foundation. For years he was in correspondence with the leading Abolitionists of the North. I remember, sir, the public letter penned in his night-dress, dictated by the poet Whittier, which he wrote to secure Abolition votes. I remember too, sir, that when Wise made the insolent threat that they would introduce Slavery into the North, he indignantly answered, that before they could introduce Slavery into the North, her cities and villages would be levelled

in the dust, so that squadrons of cavalry could gallop over them unimpeded, as the steeds sweep over the boundless prairies of the West. He should have restrained the pen which libels more than one hundred thousand sons of his native State, whose only offence is that they have resolved that Slavery shall never be introduced “into the North.” Sir, these aspersions of the Executive upon Northern men will recoil upon his own head. He will go out of power with the stern condemnation of hundreds of thousands who were instrumental in elevating him to that lofty position from which he has hurled his envenomed shafts.

The first charge is, that associations have been formed of persons pretending to seek the restriction of Slavery in the Territories, but who desire to interfere with Slavery in the States. This does not apply to the Garrison Abolitionists—they do not pretend to act in favor of the restriction of Slavery in the Territories; the Gerrit Smith Abolitionists do not make that pretension. These words apply to the Republican party of the United States—a party that has given a larger vote in the free North, by nearly one hundred and fifty thousand, than any party ever gave there before—a vote within a few thousands as large as Taylor received in 1848, or Scott in 1852, in the whole Union.

But the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PUGH] undertook to break this charge, the other day, by telling us, on this side of the Chamber, that if our positions were as we stated them to be, the President could not have intended this attack upon us; that he meant it for the little organization of Abolitionists in the North. I was surprised that the Senator should have invented such an excuse for the Chief Magistrate. I tell the Senator, and I tell other Senators, that this excuse will not do. The President intended to arraign the electors who voted for Fremont; his words do not apply to the Garrison Abolitionists, or to that class of radical Abolitionists who supported Gerrit Smith for the Presidency.

Sir, Senators who have undertaken to sustain or rather to apologize for this extraordinary course of the President, have condemned the discussion of the Slavery question during the past few years. I commend to Senators who censure the people for these discussions, the words of JAMES MADISON, that—

“Everything which tends to increase danger, which involves national expense or safety, becomes of concern to every part of the Union, and is a proper subject for the consideration of those charged with the general administration of the Government.”

Surely Senators cannot be surprised at the discussion of questions so vast as those which grow out of the slavery of nearly four millions of men in America. American Slavery, our connections with it, and our relations to it, and the obligations these connections and relations impose upon us as men, as citizens of the States and the United States, make up the overshadowing issues of the age in which we live. Philanthropists who have sounded the depths and shoals of humanity; scholars who have laid under contribution the

domain of matter and of mind, of philosophic inquiry and historical research; statesmen, who are impressing their genius upon the institutions of their country and their age—all are now illustrating, by their genius, learning, and eloquence, the vast and complicated issues involved in the great problems we, of this age, in America, are working out. The transcendent magnitude of the interests involved in the existence and expansion of the system of human bondage in America is arresting the attention of the people, and stirring the country to its profoundest depths.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. JONES] quoted a remark of mine, to the effect that this agitation of the Slavery question would never cease while the soil of the Republic should be trod by the foot of a slave. That sentiment I repeat here to-day. I believe it. GOD is the great agitator. While his throne stands, agitation will go on until the foot of a slave shall not press the soil of the eastern or western continent.

Would that Senator suppress all aspirations for human Liberty? I commend to the Senator the words of Henry Clay, whom he followed so devotedly while living, by whose bedside he stood when dying, and whose memory he cherishes and reveres. Of those who would repress all generous effort for Freedom in America, Henry Clay said:

"They must blow out the moral lights around us, and extinguish that greatest torch of all which America presents to a benighted world, pointing the way to their rights, liberties, and happiness. And when they achieve all these purposes, their work will be incomplete. They must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate the light of reason and the love of Liberty. Then, and not till then, when universal darkness and despair prevail, can you perpetuate Slavery, and repress all sympathies and all humane and benevolent efforts among freemen, in behalf of the unhappy portion of our race doomed to bondage."

I commend, Mr. President, these words of the great American statesman to Senators who would silence every noble pulsation of the human heart which beats for the liberty of the poor unfortunate men now held in perpetual bondage.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BROWN] told us the other day that Garrison had said, if he had a million of votes, he would give them all for Fremont. Sir, the impression has gone out to the country, that Garrison voted for Fremont. The Senator's remark will deceive those who have already been deceived, and mislead those who have already been misled. Garrison had but one vote to give, but he did not give even that for Fremont. Garrison, speaking for himself and his associates, did say:

"The best wishes of every enlightened friend of Freedom must be on the side of Fremont; so that, if there were no moral barrier to our voting, and we had a million of votes to bestow, we should cast them all for the Republican candidate. Justly open to censure as the Republican party is, on other ground—its fidelity to the United States Constitution, in regard to its Pro-Slavery compromises—it is deserving of commenda-

tion for endeavoring to baffle the designs of the Slave Power in regard to our vast Territorial possessions at the West."

Sir, this is what Garrison said; and I call upon the Senator to place this matter right before the people whose ear he has. Garrison said, in explanation of this position:

"We have uniformly expressed our preference for Fremont as against Buchanan or Fillmore, and this is the universal feeling of the ultra Abolitionists; not because Fremont is an Abolitionist, not because his party gives any countenance whatever to our disunion views, or to 'ultraism' in any shape; but because he and they are right in resisting the extension of Slavery, and in that act necessarily have our sympathies and good wishes, however culpable they may be, and are, in other respects; just as we approved of Mr. Webster's course when he declared: 'The freemen of the North have a deep interest in keeping labor free, exclusively free, in the new Territories.' * * * I shall consent to no extension of the area of Slavery upon this continent, nor to any increase of slave representation in the other House of Congress.' This is Fremontism, in whole and in part—nothing more—nothing less."

The Senator also made the charge here, that the New York *Tribune* had appealed to the Garrison Abolitionists, and to the supporters of Gerrit Smith, to support the Republican party; promising that in due time the Republican party would go with them in attacking Slavery in the States. To this declaration of the Senator, the *Tribune* gives this complete denial:

"The *Tribune* made no appeal whatever to the Garrison and Gerrit Smith Abolitionists to come over to the Fremont party, nor anything of the sort. It never promised to unite in urging the use of Federal authority or power to overthrow Slavery in the States."

I call the attention of the Senators who make it a practice here before the people to class us with the Garrison Abolitionists, and with the supporters of Gerrit Smith, to the precise and exact difference between us. The Garrison Abolitionists do not vote at all. They will neither vote nor hold office. They take no political part or lot in the Government of the country. They are not only committed against the extension of Slavery, but they are committed against Slavery in the slave States. Believing, with Brissot, that "Slavery in all its forms, in all its degrees, is a violation of divine law, and a degradation of human nature;" and believing the Constitution to be what some honorable Senators on this floor represent it to be, an instrument that recognises what Madison said he would not embody in it, "the idea that there can be property in man," they are in favor of dissolving the present Union, and overthrowing the Federal Constitution. I dissent, the Republican party dissents, from their construction of the Constitution of the United States. We dissent altogether from their disunion sentiments—we do not concur with them in abstaining from the exercise of the elective franchise. I have ever avowed that disagreement at home—I avow it here. But

while I disagree with them altogether, I will do them the justice to say here, that they have for years devoted their lives and their property, and incurred costumely and reproaches, for the cause of the bondmen of America; and here or elsewhere, while I express my total disagreement with them, I will say that they are men of self-sacrificing devotion, and men of great ability, who have studied the Slavery question in all its aspects, collected volumes of statistics bearing upon it in all its relations—men at whose feet the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIGLER] and other Senators who so glibly pronounce them fanatics, might sit and learn something of Slavery in America.

There is a class of men calling themselves Radical Abolitionists. They believe the Constitution of the United States is an Anti-Slavery Constitution. They believe that the Supreme Court which sits under us has the constitutional power to proclaim the emancipation of every slave in America, as Lord Mansfield in England and the Supreme Court in Massachusetts declared Slavery illegal in England and Massachusetts. They believe the Declaration of Independence to be, in the words of John Hancock, "the ground and foundation of future government" in America. They believe the declaration that all men are created equal, underlies the foundation of our political institutions. They believe that the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established to secure not only in the Territories, not only under the exclusive control of Congress, but in all the States, the inalienable rights of every human being. That is their position.

The Republican party, Mr. President, differs with this party, as it differs with the Garrison Abolitionists, in regard to the Constitution of the United States. When the members of the first Congress assembled, in 1774, at Philadelphia, when they formed that first union of the American Colonies, when they proscribed the slave trade, when they made the articles of the Association that bound together as one people the inhabitants of these thirteen colonies, they assumed no power over Slavery in the States. When the Articles of the Confederation were made in 1778, no power was then specifically granted to Congress over the local affairs of the States. When the Constitution was framed, the men who framed it did not intend to give Congress the power to abolish Slavery in the slaveholding States. Opening the Constitution of our country, we find no power specifically granted to Congress to abolish Slavery in these States. Sir, the Republicans, like the Garrison Abolitionists and the Radical Abolitionists, are opposed to Slavery. We believe, with Burke, that "Slavery is a state so degrading to the feelings and capacities of human nature that it ought not to be suffered to exist." We believe, with Henry Clay, that "Slavery is a curse—a curse to the master—a wrong, a grievous wrong, to the slave; that it is all wrong, and no possible contingency can make it right." We believe, with President Pierce, that everything connected with Slavery is "odious;" and, in the expressive language of the framer of your Cincinnati platform, "we are in favor of

Freedom and free soil wherever man lives throughout God's heritage."

Since I took my seat in the Senate, early in February, 1855, I have travelled more than thirty thousand miles in fourteen of the free States; I have seen hundreds of thousands of American citizens in counsel; I have listened to many of the ablest men of the country; I have counselled with them; and I never yet heard one word uttered, claiming power in Congress, or proposing to usurp power in Congress, to abolish Slavery in the slaveholding States. The venerable Senator from Michigan [Mr. Cass] mistakes in the idea that many persons voted under the conviction that they were voting for the abolition of servitude in the States. The Republican party was brought into being because the people saw there was an attempt making to reverse the action of the Government for sixty years, and to revolutionize the whole policy of the Government in regard to the Territories. The people of the whole country were summoned to meet in June in Philadelphia, to organize a movement on the basis of the inhibition of Slavery in the Territories by Congressional action. The Republican party was then organized; and it announced to be its sentiments, principles, and purposes:

The maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Federal Constitution;

The Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, shall be preserved;

It is a self-evident truth, that all men are endowed with the inalienable right to liberty; and the primary object and ulterior design of our Federal Government was to secure this right to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction;

No person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;

That it is our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing Slavery in any Territory of the United States by positive legislation prohibiting its existence.

We believe in the sublime doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, and have an inalienable right to liberty. We believe that doctrine to be embodied in the Constitution, that without due process of law no person can be deprived of liberty. We do not believe, with Mr. Calhoun, the Declaration of Independence to be a "rhetorical flourish." We do not believe it to be what Mr. Pettit pronounced it, "a self-evident lie." We do not believe it to be "an eloquent and passionate manifesto of a revolutionary war"—mere "glittering and sounding generalities of natural right." We believe it to be a living truth, from the pages of the New Testament, expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Constitution of the United States. We believe the maintenance of that truth everywhere, under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, to be the constitutional and imperative duty of Congress.

Then we declare, "That the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, shall be preserved." Sir, we went

before the country with this declaration, that the Federal Constitution, the Constitution as it is, should be preserved; and yet the President has arraigned us before the civilized world, and charged us with an attempt to undermine the Constitution and laws of our country, and doing so for revolutionary purposes—purposes that will bathe the fields of the country in blood, involve cities in conflagration, and carry death throughout the land!

Senators have declared on this floor that we have not disclaimed the right to interfere with Slavery in the States. I understood the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PUGH] to say that we had not made that disclaimer. I say to that Senator—I say to all, that it was intended by this expression, "The rights of the States shall be preserved," to cover that and all other questions of State rights. Sir, the Republican party of 1856, like the Republican party of 1800, is the party of State rights. We believe the security of Liberty in America depends upon the preservation of our town authorities, of our county authorities, of our State rights; and, if State rights are broken down, if the Government is centralized—and it is tending in that direction—we believe the liberty of the country will be in peril. These doctrines we have avowed everywhere, before the people and in the public press. We vindicate the rights of the States—the right of the Southern States, if they choose to hold men in Slavery, and the right of Massachusetts, Vermont, Michigan, and Wisconsin, to protect, by their own legislation, the liberty of every man that treads their soil, until his liberty has been forfeited by due process of law.

Then we are charged in the message with having entered upon a path which has no possible outlet but disunion. When the Republican party was organized, the avowal was made that the Union must be maintained. The declaration of Mr. Webster, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable;" the declaration of Andrew Jackson, "The Union must be preserved," were borne throughout the canvass on all our banners. In the public press, and before the people everywhere, the doctrine was maintained that we were for the Union; and if any men, North or South, laid their hands upon it, they should die, if we had the power, traitor deaths, and leave traitor names in the history of the Republic.

This charge of disunion, made against the Republican party by the President, comes with an ill grace from the chief of a party which has in its ranks every political disunionist of the United States. The Senator from Georgia, [Mr. TOOMBS,] not now here, declared, "If Fremont were elected the Union would be dissolved, and ought to be." The Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. SIDELL,] the organizer of Mr. Buchanan's wing of the Democratic party, and its acknowledged leader during the canvass, avowed the same sentiments. Governor Wise, whose indecent assaults upon Colonel Fremont and his mother shocked the feelings of every gentleman in America, threatened to dissolve the Union; he was ready to organize the militia of Virginia, to place them

upon a war footing, and they were ready, he said, to "hew their bright way" through all opposing legions. We are now told by the *Richmond Enquirer*, that Wise, who made the tour to Raleigh, who called upon the grand juries and courts to indict Botts for defending the Union in his dominions, that he only made these threats to preserve the Union. The *Richmond Enquirer* of the 6th of October last declared, that if Fremont were elected, it would be the duty of the South to dissolve the Union, and form a Southern confederacy; and we were told, further South, that if Fremont were elected, it would be their duty "to march on Washington, and take possession of the archives and Treasury of the United States," forgetting that the treasures of the Treasury were at Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, "in the enemy's country"—the North.

The President charges us with engaging in a sectional movement, which he tells us has been rebuked. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] gave as a reason why the Republican movement was sectional, that both its candidates were from the North. Has the Senator from South Carolina forgotten that his own State, in 1796, set the example of that species of sectionalism, by voting for Pinckney and Jefferson, when it should have voted for Adams and Pinckney? Has he forgotten that in 1812 the Federal party supported De Witt Clinton, of New York, and Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania, both of them from the free States? Has he forgotten that in 1828, Jackson and Calhoun, both Southern men, were supported on one side, and Adams and Rash, both Northern men, on the other? Has he forgotten that in 1836 the Whig party generally supported General Harrison for the Presidency, and Mr. Granger, of New York, for the Vice Presidency, both free-State men? Why this charge about sectionalism, because both of the candidates happened to be from the North? Why may not the West complain, if both of the candidates happen to be from the Atlantic coast? Our early statesmen thought that if a division should ever happen, it would not be between the South and the North, but between the East and West. I tell the Senator from South Carolina, that we had candidates from the North because we had no men from the South for either of those offices who would, however much they might have agreed with us, venture to assume our position.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow me to make one remark?

Mr. WILSON. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. The proposition which I made was perhaps made hastily, without having looked at the true historical statement of facts. My proposition was, that the issue had never been made between the non-slaveholding and slaveholding States, by the nomination of candidates, until this time. I may have used the expression, that the President and Vice President heretofore, and I think it is true except in one instance, have been, one from the North, and one from the South. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts, that it is a curious piece of history, that South Carolina never voted for one of her sons for the Presidency, and Massachusetts has voted for

three of hers. They were worthy. Mr. Webster was worthy; Mr. John Adams was worthy; and Mr. John Quincy Adams was worthy. I think we could enumerate men in our own State equally worthy, but they were not nominated. My proposition was, that this issue had never been presented before.

Mr. WILSON. I want to correct the Senator from South Carolina in a matter of history. In 1796, the Federal candidate for the Presidency was John Adams, and for Vice President, Thomas Pinckney. South Carolina was then in Federal hands. There was an intrigue gotten up in the country to defeat Mr. Adams, and make Mr. Pinckney President, and South Carolina played her part in the intrigue, by voting for Jefferson and Pinckney.

We should rejoice to have found a Southern man of talent, of character and position before the country, who would have taken our platform of principles and accepted our nomination for either President or Vice President. More than one Southern man of high character was consulted in regard to our movement. I will tell the Senator the reason why Southern statesmen did not venture to assume our position and accept of the nomination. They had no faith in our movement, no faith in its power, no faith in the fidelity to Freedom of the people of the North. I remember the words of one Southern statesman who was consulted in relation to this movement. A few weeks before the close of the last session, in conversation with Mr. Clayton, he said: "You Northern people never stand by us when we stand by you. Whenever any Southern statesman has undertaken to stand by the rights of the North, your people have forsaken him, and he has been borne down." When we prove that we will stand by Southern men who will stand by true national principles, when we establish that character for ourselves in the North, then we shall have Southern men who will stand on a true, broad, and national platform, that comprehends the whole country, including the North. If nominations were to be now made, I believe we could find more than one Southern man ready to stand upon the Philadelphia platform, and to accept our nomination for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] claims that the South has a constitutional right to the expansion of Slavery, as a political element, into the Territories. He assured the Senate that he cared nothing about the distinctions we make between the Garrison Abolitionists, the Radical Abolitionists, and the Republicans; that he held opposition to the extension of Slavery in the Territories to be a war upon Slavery in the States, because they had a constitutional right to the expansion of Slavery as a political element. In 1848, the Senator from Virginia, who tells us that it is a matter of profound indifference to him and the people of his State whether we claim the power to abolish Slavery in the States or prohibit it in the Territories, voted to prohibit it in three hundred thousand square miles of our Territory. In 1848, this Senator voted to extend to the Pacific ocean the Missouri Compromise, approved the

6th of March, 1820. He voted for this proposition:

"That the eighth section of the Missouri Compromise act, approved March 6th, 1820, be and the same is hereby declared to extend to the Pacific ocean; and the said eighth section, together with the Compromise therein effected, is hereby revived and declared to be in full force and binding for the future organization of the Territories of the United States, in the same sense and with the same understanding with which it was originally adopted."

The Senator from Virginia, who voted to prohibit Slavery to the Pacific ocean, in Utah, in a portion of New Mexico, and in the larger portion of California, now comes into the Senate, and when we propose in 1856 to do what he voted for in 1848, he tells us that these distinctions are matters of indifference to him and to his State. When we propose to exercise now the power he exercised then, he is ready to stand up to the doctrine of his letter of last autumn; he is ready for the perpetual and eternal separation of these States! Let me inform the Senator from Virginia, that the one million three hundred thousand men of the North who voted for the sacred doctrine embraced in the Ordinance of 1787, will not be deterred from maintaining their principles by any threat of the dissolution of the Union. Our answer to him is in the words of Daniel Webster:

"Our opposition to the further extension of local slavery in this country, or to the increase of slave representation in Congress, is general and universal. It has no reference to limits of latitude or points of the compass. We shall oppose all such extension and all such increase, in all places, at all times, under all circumstances, even against all inducements, against all supposed limitation of great interests, against all combinations, against all compromises."

Threats of dissolution have no terror for us. Perhaps they were intended for the latitude of Wheatland. The future will disclose whether they have any effect in that latitude.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. RUSK] told us the other day that we cared for the negro, and he cared for the white man. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIGLER] has expressed the same idea. We claim the Territories of the United States for the free laboring men of the country, North and South. The extension of Slavery into Kansas, into the other Territories, is the exclusion of the free laboring men of the country from those Territories. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. ADAMS] referred to the census to show that some seven hundred thousand Northern men had gone into the slave States. If the Senator from Mississippi had read through the very page from which he made the quotation, he would have discovered that the statement is not correct. By that very page he would have discovered that, in 1850, less than two hundred thousand Northern-born men were in all the slave States. In 1850, more than two millions of the natives of the free States had removed from their own States into other States—less than two hundred thousand of that number had gone

into the slave States. More than two millions of immigrants from abroad were in the United States in 1850. One million eight hundred thousand of them were in the free States; three hundred and seventy-eight thousand in the slave States. Ninety per cent. of all the emigration from the free States goes to other free States; eighty-five per cent. of all the foreign immigration goes to the free States. While only two hundred thousand free-State men had passed into the slaveholding States in 1850, more than six hundred thousand natives of slave States had removed into free States. In 1850, five hundred and fifty-six thousand men, born in the South, were residents of the five States of the Northwest, saved to Freedom by the Ordinance of 1787. Virginia has sent sixty thousand more emigrants into the free States of the Northwest—States covered by the Ordinance of 1787—than all the free States have sent into the slaveholding portions of the Louisiana purchase, Florida, and Texas. I would remind the Senator from Pennsylvania, [Mr. BIGLER,] that his own State has sent more than three hundred thousand of her sons into the free West—only fifteen thousand to these slave Territories. The laboring men of the South, whose battles we are fighting, seek homes in the free States; and let me remind Senators that to this class of men in southern Indiana and Illinois they are indebted for the votes of those States.

Sir, the free laboring men of the North never did go into the slaveholding States, and they never will. Establish Slavery in Kansas, and you exclude the entire population of the free States from that Territory, with the exception of a few teachers, professional men, and merchants. The farmers, the mechanics, the laboring men of the North, never put themselves on a degrading equality with slaves. In 1850, while five hundred and fifty-six thousand Southern men had passed into the five Northwestern States, less than ninety thousand Northern men of all the free States had passed into Florida, Texas, and the whole Louisiana purchase, which was dedicated to Slavery. I tell the Senator from Texas, that the great reason why we maintain the doctrine of the prohibition of Slavery in all the Territories of the United States is, that we want to preserve those Territories to the free laboring men.

I commend to the consideration of Senators who would open the Territories to Slavery, these words of the Hon. C. J. FAULKNER, of Virginia, concerning the effects of Slavery upon the condition of the farmer, mechanic, and laboring man:

"It banishes free white labor—it exterminates the mechanic, the artisan, the manufacturer. It deprives them of occupation. It deprives them of bread. It converts the energy of a community into indolence—its power into imbecility—its efficiency into weakness." * * * "Must the country languish, droop, die, that the slaveholder may flourish? Shall all interests be subservient to one? all rights subordinate to those of the slaveholder? Has not the mechanic, have not the middle classes, their

'rights—rights incompatible with the existence of Slavery?'

Sir, the Senator from Texas spoke sneeringly of "bleeding Kansas." Throughout the canvass, our efforts in favor of making Kansas a free State, and protecting the legal rights of the people, were sneered at, as "shrieks for Freedom," and for "bleeding Kansas." I remember that on the evening when the news came to New York, that Pennsylvania was carried, in October, the Empire Club came out with cannon, banners, and transparencies. The Five Points, where the waves of Abolition fanaticism have never reached, the inhabitants of that locality, like the people of the lower Egypt of the West, stood fifty to one by the Democracy; the Five Points and the 6th ward were out—and upon a transparency, borne through the streets of the great commercial capital of the western world, was the picture of three scourged black men; and on that transparency were the words, "Bleeding Kansas!" I thought then that it was a degradation which had reached the profoundest depths of humiliation; but even that degradation has been surpassed here in the national capital. In that procession which passed along these avenues but a few evenings before we came here—a procession formed under the immediate eyes of the chiefs of the Executive Departments of the Government, and filled with their retainers, led by Government officials—was borne upon a transparency the words, "Sumner and Kansas—let them bleed!"

The Senator from Texas may sneer, and others may sneer, at "Bleeding Kansas;" but I tell him one thing—that, the next day at ten o'clock after the Presidential election, there was an assemblage of men, continuing through two days, in the city of Boston, from several States, and from "Bleeding Kansas"—men, some of whom you guarded through the summer months for treason—assembled together to take measures to save Kansas; and I assure that Senator, and others who may think this struggle for Kansas is ended with the election, that more money has been contributed since that election than during any three months of the whole controversy. Thousands of garments have been sent to protect that suffering people. We have resolved—and we mean to keep that resolution—that if by any lawful effort, any personal sacrifice, Kansas can be saved to Freedom, it shall be saved in spite of your present Administration, or anything that your incoming Administration can do.

I listened the other day with surprise and pain to the allusion made by the venerable Senator from Michigan [Mr. CASS] to my colleague, [Mr. SUMNER,] whose forced absence from this body for the last seven months must have touched the sensibilities of every honorable man in America. Sir, he is not here to speak for himself. If he were here, his physical condition is such that he could not speak for himself with safety; but he will come here again, if God in his providence shall restore him to health, by the almost unanimous voice of his native State, to whose cherished sentiments and opinions he has been true. He may not come until the seat which now knows the venerable Senator from Michigan shall know

him no more. The venerable Senator retires from this body by the inexorable decree of the people of his adopted State. I know my colleague well enough, however, to know that he is too magnanimous to hurl a shaft at the absent.

But the Senator takes objection to this figure of speech: "The rape of a virgin Territory, compelling it to the hateful embrace of Slavery." The Senator calls this an "unpatriotic metaphor," showing a "purient imagination." I would remind the Senator, that to the pure all things are pure. If this metaphor was not fit to be made, surely it was unfit to be repeated, and subjected to that Senator's criticism. But is not the figure true? Was not Kansas a virgin Territory? Was it not free? And has it not been polluted by Slavery? Were not the sacred words, "Slavery shall be, and is, forever prohibited," written upon every foot of its green sods? Every breeze that swept over it bore to the world the words, "Liberty for all." You took this Territory—you took it; and have you not compelled it to the hateful embrace of Slavery? Slavery is there—carried there by an invasion. That invasion has placed it there, and your Administration has sustained it; and the Senator from Michigan and other Senators have supported the Administration in its policy of coercion. Sir, the soil of Kansas has been bathed in the blood of brave men, for the sole offence of loving Liberty.

But we are charged by the President with inculcating a spirit which would lead the people of the North and South to stand face to face as enemies. Sir, I repel that charge as utterly and wholly false. There is no such feeling in the Northern States towards the people of the South. But a few months ago, the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. Toombs,] whose views upon this question of Slavery are known to be extremely ultra, went to the city of Boston, and lectured before one of the most intelligent audiences that ever assembled in that section of our country. He was received by all with that courtesy and that kindness of feeling, which every Southern man who visits that section receives, and to which they bear testimony. Mr. Benton is in the North now, lecturing in favor of the Union—"carrying coals to Newcastle." He is everywhere sought after, everywhere listened to, everywhere treated kindly, although he holds views in regard to Slavery that not one man in ten thousand in that section approves.

Can we utter, in the South, the words which the fathers of the South taught us? Could the Senator from New York, [Mr. Fish,] whose father fought at Yorktown, go to that field, and utter the sentiments which were upon the lips of all the great men of Virginia when Cornwallis surrendered? Could the Senators from New Hampshire stand on that spot once baptized by the blood of Alexander Scammell, and there utter the sentiments of Henry, or of Jefferson, or of Mason? Could one of us go down to Mount Vernon, which Slavery has converted into a sort of jungle, and there repeat the words of Washington, that

"No man desires more earnestly than I do to see Slavery abolished; there is only one proper

way to do it, and that is by legislative action, and for that my vote shall never be wanting."

Could we go to Monticello—could we stand by the graves of Jefferson, of Madison, of Henry, of the great men of Virginia, and utter the sublime thoughts which they uttered for the liberty of the bondmen? Could we stand by the grave of Henry Clay, and declare, as he declared, Slavery to be "a curse," "a wrong," a "grievous wrong to the slave, that no contingency could make right?"

In the slaveholding States, free speech and a free press are known only in theory. A slaveholding, Slavery-extending Democracy has established a relentless despotism. We invited you of the South to meet us in national convention, to restore the Government to the policy of the fathers. Mr. Underwood, of Virginia, did go to Philadelphia. He united with us in our declaration of principles; he united with us in the nomination of John C. Fremont; and for this offence he was banished from Virginia. He returned a few days since, and was notified that if he remained, he must run the risk of being dealt with by an indignant community. He has left there, and I believe is now here in the city of Washington. When the Fremont flag was raised in Norfolk, the civil authorities took it down. Mr. Stannard, a merchant of Norfolk, a native of Connecticut, went up to the ballot-box, and quietly handed in his vote for Fremont. It was handed back to him. They would not receive it. He was driven from the polls, and compelled to hide himself for days, until he could find an opportunity to escape from the State to preserve his life.

During the canvass, Professor Hedrick, of North Carolina, was denounced by the Southern press for intending to vote for Fremont. He came out in a moderate, carefully-written letter, declaring his belief that it would be for the interests of North Carolina to keep her slaves at home, to develop her own resources, and that Kansas should be a free State. For that offence, the professors of the North Carolina University came together, and disavowed any sympathy with him. The trustees assembled and removed him. The mob assembled and insulted him. He left, or rather was driven from, his native State. He held a little appointment as a scientific man connected with the publication of your Nautical Almanac, worth \$500 a year—an appointment given him by Mr. Secretary Graham. He went to Cambridge, where the Nautical Almanac is made up; but he has been removed from his position in the Government service as a computer, for the crime of having declared, in his own native State, that he believed the interests of North Carolina required that Kansas should be free. Let it go abroad over the world, that a native of North Carolina, a scholar, a man of scientific attainments, has been removed from his professorship—banished from his State, for such an offence; and that this Administration has removed him from the little office, worth \$500, as a computer on the Nautical Almanac for the same reason. Let it go abroad over the world. Let the scientific men and the literary men of the Old World un-

derstand that we have a party in power, in republican America, which lays its iron hand on a man, even from the slaveholding States, who breathes the word "Liberty." That act is a black and damning disgrace to this country; and there is not an American, at home or abroad, who carries a manly heart in his bosom, that does not look upon it as a degradation to his country. Sir, the tyrants of the Old World will scoff at it; and the friends of Liberty who turn their eyes hopefully to us will hang their heads in very shame, for the infamy your Administration has brought upon the Republic.

Mr. PUGH. I would like to ask the Senator a question, with his permission. Will he explain to us how it happened that a professor was removed from the Cambridge Law School, in Massachusetts, simply for acting as a commissioner under an act of Congress, and was also attempted to be removed from his judgeship under the State laws, by resolution of both branches of the Legislature, and his removal only prevented by the veto of the Governor? It struck me that they are parallel cases.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps that Senator sees a parallel; I see none. In the one case, it was a professor acting, you say, under the law of Congress called the Fugitive Slave Law. We believe that law to be unconstitutional, inhuman, and unchristian. He was not compelled to act upon it, for he was under no necessity of holding that office. We did not choose that a man who executed that law as he executed it, should teach law to the young men of the country. One professor uttered a word for Liberty, and your Administration crushed him; the other performed a deed for Slavery, and we of Massachusetts condemned him.

Sir, I have said that you have no freedom of speech at the South. Senators have denounced us as sectional, because we have no votes in the South. That reminds me of the Dutch judge in old Democratic Berks, who kicked the defendant out of doors, locked the door, and then entered a judgment for default. [Laughter.] Your native sons stand on electoral tickets, or vote our principles, at the peril of life. Then, when you are able with your iron despotism to crush out all there who would go with us, you turn round and tell us we are getting up a sectional party. I assure you, there are tens of thousands of men in the South whose sympathies are with us, but they have no opportunity so to vote. In the city of St. Louis, nearly three thousand Germans, to show their devotion to Liberty, went to the ballot-boxes, when they could get up no State ticket for Fremont, and voted for Millard Fillmore, the Know Nothing candidate, with the word "Protest" printed on their ballots—an act which illustrates your despotism, and shows that these men, who were true to Liberty in the Old World, will not be false to their cherished convictions in the New. Mr. Moses C. Church—a son of your State, Mr. President. [Mr. SUMNER in the chair]—was driven from Georgia for writing home to his father these words:

"The working men, non-slaveholding mechanics, and others, who are dependent upon their

'daily labor for their support, feel sorely the competition of non-paid labor; and they do not hesitate to say they would vote for Fremont if they had a chance. As voters, they are three to one of the slaveholders, and they are fast finding out their strength."

Even here, in the National Capitol, that vacant seat [pointing to Mr. SUMNER'S chair] is an evidence that freedom of speech is not always tolerated—not always safe.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, [Mr. BRELLER,] not now present, charged upon us the offence of being opposed to Slavery *per se*. Well, sir, we are opposed to Slavery *per se*. But is it to be charged upon us that we mean to usurp power which we have not, and do not claim, because we are opposed to Slavery *per se*? Mr. Buchanan declared, more than thirty years ago, that he "believed Slavery to be a 'great political, a great moral evil,' and he thanked God that his lot was cast in a State where it did not exist." Does the Senator from Pennsylvania call that warring against Slavery *per se*? The Senator voted in the Senate of Pennsylvania, in 1847, in favor of the Wilmot Proviso. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] regards the assertion of that doctrine as a war upon the slave States—upon Slavery *per se*. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania now concur in that opinion?

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. CASS] the other day gave us another disquisition upon his doctrine of squatter sovereignty. While he occupied the floor of the Senate in giving us additional notes and comments upon his Nicholson letter, and in illustrating the beauties of his theory—while he was upon the floor, claiming that the people of the Territories, in their Territorial capacity, have the right to exclude Slavery, a distinguished Representative from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREY MARSHALL] was bringing up the Democratic party to the confessional in regard to this doctrine. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] was summoned to the House, to explain to his colleagues a casual remark which he had made during the speech of the Senator from Maine, [Mr. FESSENDEN.] The delegation from Virginia proclaimed on the floor of the House their unanimous disagreement with the doctrines the Senator from Michigan was then avowing, and announced, by authority, that the Senator from Virginia had been misunderstood. After the close of that speech, the Senator from Virginia came in here, and asked two minutes for explanation, and then avowed his doctrine to be, that Congress had no right, under the Constitution, to legislate in regard to Slavery in the Territories; that the people of the Territories derived their powers from Congress, and therefore had no right to legislate at all. That was a beautiful illustration of this doctrine of squatter sovereignty, which has been preached all over the North, and by which the people have been cheated, deceived, and deluded. Sir, the people of Kansas have found, that while your motto is, "All by the people," your practice is, "Nothing for the people."

The Senator from South Carolina told us, some days ago, that in the Revolution, when the Gov-

eriment was first framed, they were all patriots—they did not quarrel over these sectional questions. The Senator from Texas, I think, held the same language, that we of this degenerate age were raising these sectional questions. I would ask these Senators, Who forced these issues upon us? In 1774, when the Old Congress met and framed the Articles of Association, the second article was a prohibition of the slave trade, which had been forced upon the Colonies by the policy of the British Government. That prohibition of the slave trade was sustained by the North and by the South; even South Carolina endorsed it. In 1787, when your Constitution was framed, we of the North were not responsible for the existence of a slave anywhere under the authority of Congress. Most of the Northern States had taken measures in favor of, or tending to, emancipation in their States. When the Constitution was framed, there was not a man in America who believed that the idea of property in man, to use the words of Mr. Madison, was embodied in that Constitution. When Washington entered upon his duties as President, there was no action of the National Government which made the people of Massachusetts, or of any State, responsible for Slavery anywhere outside of their own jurisdiction. Were men proscribed then who held the views that we on this side of the Chamber now hold? No, sir; the men who promulgated the Declaration of Independence, who carried us through the Revolution, who framed the Constitution of the United States, and who held the first offices, were all men opposed to Slavery. Washington was President. He had declared that no man in America was more in favor of the abolition of Slavery than himself, and his vote should never be wanting to effect that object. John Adams had declared that consenting to Slavery was a sacrilegious breach of trust. Thomas Jefferson had proclaimed, over and over again, his views in favor of emancipation, that "the abolition of Slavery was the first object of desire."

Alex. Hamilton was removed from the Presidency of an Abolition Society in New York, to the head of the United States Treasury. John Jay was taken from an Abolition Society in New York, and made Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; yet he had proclaimed to the world that our "prayers to Heaven would be impious" until we abolished Slavery. Iredell, of North Carolina, had declared, that when the abolition of Slavery took place, it would be an act pleasing to all generous minds, and he was made a Judge of the Supreme Court. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, in the Convention for the adoption of the Federal Constitution, had avowed the doctrine, that the new States were to be under the authority of Congress, and that Slavery would never go there. He, too, was placed on the bench of the Supreme Court. Gouverneur Morris, who was sent abroad to represent this country, declared Slavery to be a nefarious institution. Madison, Sherman, Ellsworth, Gerry, Patrick Henry—all the great men of the country, North and South, with the exception of a few fire-eaters in South Carolina and Georgia—held the doctrine

then that Slavery was a local institution, existing only by the force of local law; that the National Government had no connection with it; and that it was an institution which would pass away before our higher civilization and our purer Christianity. All we ask of you is, to carry us back and place us where we stood when we made the Constitution and inaugurated the Government. Then we were not responsible for the existence of Slavery anywhere on earth outside of our own Commonwealths.

What have you done? You accepted the grants of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, over Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, on condition that you should not emancipate the bondmen which had been carried into portions of those Territories, thereby making us of the free States responsible for the political power at least of Slavery in those three great States. Then you located the National Capitol here on the banks of the Potomac, and continued the laws of Virginia and Maryland, under which the slave trade and Slavery flourished beneath the protecting folds of the National flag. Sir, within sight of the starry banner of the Union, which now floats over our heads, hundreds of men, for whom Christ died, are held in perpetual bondage, for which we of the North are responsible in the forum of the nations. The permanent interests of the country required the purchase of Louisiana. You purchased it. You took with it forty thousand slaves. You did not make them free. You made the people of Massachusetts and the North responsible for their future slavery, and the slavery of their posterity. Then you purchased Florida, with her slaves. You did not set them free. You linked us with Slavery in that Territory. You made us responsible for its future existence there. Then you annexed the Senator's own State of Texas; and the leading motive why it was forced into the Union at that time, at the risk of a war with Mexico, was to strengthen the cause of Slavery. Mr. Calhoun, the master-spirit in that annexation, avowed this substantially in his letter to Mr. King, then our Minister at Paris. You annexed Texas with her slaves, and you have made us responsible for Slavery there.

In 1807, when you abolished the African slave trade, you passed a law protecting the coastwise slave trade; and from 1807, almost fifty years ago, the slave trade has been carried on upon the rivers and waters of the United States, under the protection of the National flag. You made us responsible for that traffic, the trophies of which, to use the expressive language of John Randolph, "are the manacle, the handcuff, and the blood-stained cowhide."

When we established the Constitution, when we inaugurated the Government, we reaffirmed the Ordinance of 1787 over every foot of our Territory; we stood as a nation before the world not responsible for Slavery; we had not its guilt or its shame upon us. By sixty years of legislation you have connected and associated us with that system, until you have arrived at this point when you claim it as your right to carry Slavery, under the Constitution, into all the Territories of the

