







Clark 419.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

Copy of 4127

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. WINTER DAVIS, OF MARYLAND,

ON

THE PRESIDENT'S COLONIZATION AND COMPENSATION SCHEME.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEB. 25, 1864.

The House having resumed the consideration of the bill to establish a Bureau of Freedmen's Affairs, Mr. DAVIS said:

Mr. SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN: The bill which is now under consideration involves a subject forced on us by the events of the war, and which must be determined one way or the other—the disposition of the freed negroes in the rebel States. The range of debate has naturally been very wide upon a bill of this character; and topics not, perhaps, at first sight very directly related to it have been dragged into the discussion.

The votes of the gentlemen from the loyal slave States cast a new light on the mind of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Brooks] respecting the fate of the negro race on this continent. But while he justly appreciated the great and decisive weight of that vote upon the speakership of this House, he took occasion to discredit the moral power of that vote by impeaching the election of the Representatives who cast it. He thinks they speak words not authorized by the people. He said:

"I know that the people of Maryland and of Delaware, if they had been allowed to vote, intended no such decree"—

That is, of emancipation—

"And I know that it is said those two States are better represented by the honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] than by their Representatives here."

If this were merely meant as a compliment to my distinguished friend from Ohio I would be among the first to admit that any district of Maryland, as well as any in New York, would be better represented by him than by any gentleman representing either State—even the gentleman from New York. But when it comes in the shape of an imputation upon the validity and moral force of the election, it questions the legitimacy of the Administration majority in this House, and must not pass unanswered. When the gentleman from New York says "*it is said* those two States are better represented by the honorable gentleman from Ohio than by those who represent them here," no person who cares to have any respect for his knowledge of the public affairs of the day has so said. And when the honorable gentleman says that "*he knows* the people of Maryland and Delaware, had they been allowed to vote, intended no such decree," I desire to say that the honorable gentleman from New York does not know any such thing, and knows no fact that makes the error excusable.

"Had they been allowed to vote!" Who hindered them from voting? Where were they stopped from voting? "The people of Maryland!" If the gentleman means to say that because *the people of Maryland* determined that *the traitors* of Maryland, who disavowed their allegiance to the Government, should not tarnish the ballot-box by their votes, we differ about the terms but not about the facts. We *did* mean *they* should not vote, and we so meant because by the laws of Maryland such men are not entitled to vote. They who disavow, deny, and disown their allegiance to the United States, and declare and avow they are not citizens of the United States, have no right to vote;

and so the judges of election held, almost from one end of Maryland to the other. If that is not good election law, this House can say so; the General Assembly of Maryland can say so; and if both be silent the law is confessed.

If the gentleman referred to the complaints which are made of the interference of the military in the election, I desire to say that that complaint comes from nobody but heated partisans who howl because they are beaten. Even they confined the complaint to one single congressional district out of five, and to four out of eight counties in that congressional district; and therefore, conceding everything that is complained of, and everything that is inferred from the complaint, we have an undisputed election in four fifths of the State, which the gentlemen who make the complaint do not dispute. No one questions the election of the honorable member from the fifth congressional district, [Mr. HARRIS,] where the divided Union vote was overborne by the united secession vote, and where the aggregate vote of the district fell only a little below the normal vote of the district before the rebellion attracted many of its young men to the rebel ranks. My honorable friend in my eye from the second congressional district [Mr. WEBSTER] could find no competitor to meet him before the people. The distinguished gentleman, the senior of the delegation, [Mr. THOMAS,] from the fourth congressional district, is here for the second time an unopposed candidate. And I am here because my political opponents did not care to take the responsibilities of a canvass, although aided and urged to oppose me by a distinguished adviser of the President up to within a week of the election. So that of all the State of Maryland, whose election is here impeached, in three fifths of it there was no contest whatever; in one fifth there was a contest in which our opponents had so free an election that they have their Representative on this floor; and in the other fifth the contest is only impeached in four of the eight counties; and if the whole vote which was not cast in that district be added to the aggregate vote of our opponents, the emancipationists will still have a majority of thirteen or fourteen thousand in the State. And yet, in the face of such facts, a gentleman, who is entitled to be regarded as an intelligent observer of public affairs, rises here and says that *he knows* that if the people of Maryland had been *permitted to vote* they would not have allowed the emancipation candidate for comptroller to carry the State by twenty thousand majority!

In Delaware the case is still more absurd; for after an animated canvass the opponent of the Representative from that State withdrew on the eve of the election; and yet the vote for the gentleman from Delaware was the *largest* ever cast in that State for any candidate, and a majority of the whole vote of the State.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of Maryland is overwhelmingly Union, but not overwhelmingly for emancipation. There is a majority in the Senate opposed to it, and there is a majority in the House who were not in favor of it when they came to Annapolis; because, though elected by emancipation constituencies they were nominated before their constituents had developed their views upon the subject. But this election which the gentleman from New York wishes to impeach carried with it such moral power that its enemies in the Senate and its lukewarm and doubtful friends in the House of Delegates are dragged backward over their prejudices and compelled to pass just such a bill as we dictated to them, and it stands now the law of the State of Maryland by the votes of a majority of both Houses of the Legislature. They confessed that moral power which the honorable gentleman ignorantly denies.

"Slavery is dead," says the honorable gentleman. "Slavery is dead," is echoed by some on this side of the House. "Slavery is dead," is echoed from the too sanguine people of the country. He may be a very sick man, Mr. Speaker, but I assure gentlemen of this House and the country that he is not dead; and if he is not done to death he will be your master again. That is my opinion, and I think my friend from Kentucky in my eye [Mr. MALLORY] agrees with me.

Slavery is not dead in Maryland. We have to carry a majority of the convention on the old slavery apportionment, where one fourth of the population ties the body; and whether the hostile influence that presides near the President's ear will allow Maryland to become a free State, or will fail her in her hour of need, remains yet to be seen. Up to this day Maryland is under no obligations to the President of the United States for the great strides that the cause of emancipation has made there. A convention of the loyal men, the emancipationists of Maryland, on the 22d of this month, while declaring themselves in favor of immediate and unconditional emancipation, and while ex-

pressing their confidence in the President and their appreciation of his services, added this significant admonition, worthy of the State and of the people that uttered it:

“Resolved, That this convention is in favor of the entire and immediate abolition of slavery in this State and in the States in rebellion, and is opposed to any reorganization of State governments in those States which do not recognize the immediate and final abolishment of slavery as a condition precedent. That this convention express their sympathy with the radical emancipationists in Missouri, and in Arkansas, Tennessee, and Louisiana, and regret that influences in the Cabinet have, in Maryland and those States, depressed the efforts of the radical friends of the Administration and of emancipation, and given prominence to those who are the unwilling advocates of emancipation.”

I trust that that admonition will have its weight, and that these sinister influences will cease to be the controlling element near the presidential ear in this grave crisis of emancipation in Maryland; and I desire that the country shall understand that, being under small obligations to the President for what has been done in Maryland up to this time, the people of Maryland thought it wise while expressing their confidence in the President to put that significant resolution before him for his serious consideration, so as to show that their devotion is not personal, but to principle; that their interest is in the cause and not in a man, and that while they will support the man as long as the man supports the cause, if the cause fail by any failure elsewhere, there may be a revision of their judgment respecting the person.

But “slavery is dead in the *rebel States*.” No, sir. No, sir. Far from it. If our honorable friends on the other side elect their President in the coming fall, slavery is as alive as it was the day that the first gun blazed against Sumter. If we lose the majority in the next Congress, slavery is as powerful as it ever was. We are, it is true, in the condition in which we cannot stand still. We must go backward or we must go forward. My face, sir, is to the future. I wish so to look at it, and so to say, to the men of my day and generation, what I think about the great measures which now touch the salvation of the country, that, whether I be on the winning or on the losing side, whether the nation triumph or fail, whenever anybody shall by accident hereafter rake about among the ashes of the past and find my name, he will find at least that I did not fear to say to *friend* and foe what the times demand; and it may be that it will be well if it were heeded.

Slavery is not dead by the proclamation. What lawyer attributes to it the least legal effect in breaking the bonds of the slave? Executed by the bayonets, legally valid to the extent of the duration of the war, under the law of 1862 which authorizes the President to use the people of African descent as he may see fit for the suppression of the rebellion, it is undoubtedly valid to the extent of turning them loose from their masters during the rebellion. So long as the military power is engaged in suppressing resistance, they are free from their masters. Re-establish the old governments, allow the dominant aristocracy to repossess the State power in its original plenitude, how long will they be free? What courts will give them their rights? What provision is there to protect them? Where is the writ of *habeas corpus*? How are the courts of the United States to be open to them? Who shall close the courts of the States against the master? Does the master resort to the court against the slave? No; he seizes him by the neck. The law of last Congress freeing a few slaves provides that that act may be pleaded in defense. But when is the slave sued by his master? When is the time to plead in any such process? Gentlemen legislate without a knowledge of the country or of the people they are legislating for. Their laws are on the statute-book, and the opinions of the dominant faction conspire to perpetuate the master's rights and the slave's wrongs. Nothing but the resolute declaration of the United States that it shall be a condition precedent that slavery shall be prohibited in their constitutions, and that the United States shall give judicial guarantees to the negroes, freedom in fact, and that the United States shall be kept under the the control of men of such political views and purposes that the law will be executed as a constitutional law and imposed on reluctant people—nothing else can accomplish the death of slavery.

Supposing that to be done, Mr. Speaker, what then? This bill relates to the other grave social problem of the destiny of the negro race when their bond is broken. Now many of them are thrown on our hands. We have to take care of them. To that extent the bill is right, and I shall vote for it for that

purpose. How well it will answer, how far it must be modified after the national cause shall triumph, remains to be seen. Let the things of the future be cared for by the future. But it is necessary now to determine our policy respecting the negroes when freed; to form some definite ideas as to what shall be the future of the negro race; in other words, what dispositions we will make of them when we have broken the master's yoke, when Maryland shall have broken it hereafter, when Missouri shall have finally broken it, when West Virginia shall have finally broken it, and when slavery in all the rebel States shall have been destroyed and broken up in fact.

There are on that subject two, and only two, theories. The President says, "Colonize and pay for them." The people say, "Leave them where they are." In favor of colonization, and compensation to all loyal persons in the rebel States, we have the declaration of the President of the United States, which naturally carries with it great weight. He has formally proposed it for the consideration of the people as his preferred policy. It is for that reason that it is the more important to look at it directly in the face, and to deal with it, subject to the conditions which it involves, if it be adopted as the policy of the nation. It has been discussed and commented on by a distinguished gentleman, a member of his Cabinet, supposed, on that and other subjects, more accurately to represent his opinion than any other person. (The P. M. G.) These comments throw a flood of light on the views which prevail in high quarters on the practical execution of the scheme of colonization and the industrial and social reasons which prompt or justify it. These comments have been published broadcast over the country as comments upon the emancipation policy of the President of the United States. Those comments have never been disavowed. They are entitled to our grave and respectful consideration, both from the high position and character of the gentleman from whom they emanate, and his peculiar relations to the President, and the concurrence of view between him and the President asserted and not disavowed. Those comments are in the form of an attack upon the "radical abolitionists;" but, while that is the form, the substance is a vindication of the colonization policy of the President, a demonstration of its necessity to the success of the emancipation policy proclaimed by the President, and the "radical abolitionists" are all who differ from the President and his commentator! I am one of them.

What are the grounds? First of all it is said that the "radical abolitionists" wish to change the Constitution of the United States and all of our laws, to elevate to an equality this race, which is wholly untrue; and in the next place that unequal races cannot live together on terms of equality and peace, and, therefore that it is necessary to prevent the massacre of the negro that he should be expatriated. Mr. Speaker, what is the foundation of this view? The negro must be colonized if he be free, or a war of races will exterminate him! What justifies this alternative? Will gentlemen tell me where in the history of the world they find the fact upon which they base that astounding generalization? Civilized people have overborne savages, men of one religion have borne down men of a different religion, ambition has overturned one nation by another; but where in the history of the world is there any case of a nation going to work to exterminate a large portion of its people of another race living in the midst of it, of the same religion, civilized in the same manner, conforming to its laws, subject to its will, willing to work for its wages, not ambitious, and not disturbing the public peace, because they are of a different race? Where is the instance in the history of the world of the subjugation and massacre of a different race under these circumstances? In earlier times great masses of people poured from Central Asia over Europe. They were of a different race from the inhabitants of the Roman empire, in any ethnological sense in which the word can be used. I do not know that they enslaved the whole mass of the people of the Roman empire. My impression is that the conquered civilized the conqueror, and that it did not end in the social war such as is contemplated here; but the descendants of both form now the people of Europe.

The distinguished commentator on the colonization views of the President refers to the Moors of Spain. In an ethnological sense they were far from kin in point of race to the Spaniards. But race was not the ground of war; it was religion; and every decree which undertook to expel them gave them the alternative of baptism or exile. The Spaniards wanted them to stay, and Ferdinand and Isabella would have been glad if they had remained to decorate the southern portion of their empire, the perpetual glory of their missionary zeal.

Then we are referred to San Domingo. That is exactly what gentlemen on

the other side of the House are preparing for us in the future. There was no revolt of slaves against their masters, there was no war of one race against another, unwilling to live in peace and industry; but the French Assembly, having freed the slaves of San Domingo, undertook to reduce them to slavery again. They revolted against the authority which attempted to reduce them to slavery, and under Toussaint L'Ouverture, whose military genius Thiers thinks it worth while to commend, defeated both France and England in their attempt to reduce and hold the island.

These are the examples of wars of race! But why do they pass over the peaceful example of emancipation of Jamaica and the French colonies, where the circumstances would be more analogous? Why do they not invoke the great example of Mexico and South America? The Indian of those countries is as far removed from the Spaniard as our Indians from us, and as we are from the negro. The Spaniard gained and wielded the empire over them, but neither is exterminated; the two races are not blended, neither is reduced to slavery, and in Mexico both unite against the common foe. Race has nothing to do with the question. The Indian and Spaniard live together because both are civilized and both are Christian and both are interested in the same laws and government and industry.

I wait patiently till the gentlemen adduce their historic facts upon which to rest their theory of the necessary contest of races to reply to them. I have dealt only with those they have furnished.

The honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. Brooks] arraigned the harsh, hard-hearted conduct of Massachusetts toward the Indians. The war of Massachusetts on the Indians was that of a civilized and Christian people against a people of different religion, and which refused every form of American civilization. The same differences of religious and social organization prevents the toleration of a Mormon people in any of our States hitherto. He might have found an example nearer at home. The only example upon the American continent of a war on the peace and quiet of the negro is the riots in New York city last summer, when Seymour's *friends*, the Paldees, undertook to show their Democratic mercy to the wretched negro. I agree that it is possible that such a class of population as that might be tempted to oppress the negro, but no class of American population would condescend to do it. There was more of Democratic hostility to the Government than Celtic hostility to the negro. An argument without a fact is not likely to carry conviction; but the gentleman from New York did not venture to use the only one pertinent to his purpose, which bad men had prepared at his very threshold.

Then what are you going to do with them? The President and the commentator say, go to kindred races and congenial climes. Where? To Texas? That is abandoned. To Central America for the purpose of making a connection between the great oceans? That was respectfully declined. To South America? I have not heard that the President has been successful there in finding a kindred race willing to receive them. Back to Africa? Won't you ask as a matter of kindness to transplant the Irish back to Ireland, to a kindred race and congenial bogs? Who inhabit Mexico? Who inhabit Central America? Who inhabit South America? I take it the Indian of this Peninsula is further removed from the negro of the African peninsula than we are who come more directly from the common stock of central Asia. Then to transplant them there would be putting a greater diversity of races together to come into collision. Or will they love each other, though alien in race, because of their color? Is skin deep the depth of their philosophy?

In the imagination of the commentator Cuba is the central empire of the negro; and strange as it appears, while one party of colonizationists are talking of transplanting the negro to the coast of Africa, the commentator on the President's policy grows enthusiastic over the vision of the negroes settled in the American tropics inviting their brethren from Africa to this western world—a new Canaan for that outcast and rescued race? What becomes of the Spaniard and his rights? What becomes of the rights of the white population? What becomes of the aristocratic Spaniard who has been crushing generation after generation in Cuba to enhance his wealth? How is he to receive the African in spite of the diversity of race? Is the Spaniard nearer in blood because Spain is nearer geographically to Africa? The theory of the incompatibility of different races has no foundation in history. The moment you come to state it in words, and ask what it means, all the theory, all the philosophy, and all the facts break down, and there is the end of it. Its very advocates discard it in their dreams.

But we are ourselves interested a little in this question of exportation of the negro. The President proposes to pay loyal owners for loss of slaves by the acts of the United States. That is part of his scheme of settlement. But who will submit to additional millions of taxation for slaves freed by the United States? Such a debt would equal the war debt; it would prostrate the resources of the country for generations: it would inflict the scourge of perpetual debt on a land destroyed by civil war, and made a desert by the deportation of its laboring population. The free men of the free States will not mortgage the labor of their sons and daughters for such a purpose; and the loyal men of the South must, and will, find their indemnity in the increased value of their lands, if they are not deprived of their labor.

But if the schemes of colonization be persisted in, who will pay the cost? Who will pay for the transportation? Who will supply the depleted labor of the country? Who is going to pay the increased price of bread to the poor mechanic? Who is going to pay the increased price of cotton? Who is going to fill up the enormous vacuum of labor swept away by this insane and unchristian philanthropy? What is the negro to do in the mean time? You cannot take them away to-morrow or in a generation. The schemers propose to build canals and fortifications, connect the Mississippi with the lakes—for a generation! Under whose supervision, at whose expense, by what new forms of socialism will you sweep a whole region of country of three or four million people, and concentrate them upon the banks of the Mississippi to eat bread and dig ditches, while the cotton fields are unplanted, and men and women starving? When you undertake to colonize the negro you will meet the master, who says, "Do not leave me to starvation." The master will offer the negro more to stay than the Government will offer him to go. Two generations cannot fill up his place; and if we can stand his presence two generations perhaps Christian philosophy will enable our descendants to reconcile themselves to the permanence of what has been found tolerable so long.

Why should they consent to go to barbarous countries? Why should they love the people of Ashantee? Would the King of Dahomy protect them from the cannibals of Africa? They prefer to stay where they are. You cannot offer them as good homes; you cannot offer them as good wages; you cannot give them as good treatment; you cannot give them as good churches, nor as good houses and food and clothing for their children. Why should they consent to go?

Now deal with the problem under the conditions which exist. The folly of our ancestors and the wisdom of the Almighty, in its inscrutable purposes, having allowed them to come here and planted them here, they have a right to remain here, and they will remain here to the latest syllable of recorded time. And whether they become our equals or our superiors, whether they blend or remain a distinct people, your posterity will know, for their eyes will behold them as ours do now. These are things which we cannot control. Laws do not make, laws cannot unmake them. If God has made them our equals, then they will work out the problem which he has sent them to work out; and if God has stamped upon them an ineradicable inferiority, you cannot make one hair white or black or add a cubit to their stature. Let us leave such questions for gentlemen of the school of Wendall Phillips to talk of, but I earnestly pray gentlemen in high positions, in view of the excited and feverish state of the public mind, in dealing with this delicate topic of the welfare of millions of whites and blacks, not to add to the inherent difficulties of the problem, prejudices drawn from fancies not facts which we may never be called upon to deal with, and which can only exasperate the very feeling which we ought to allay, and instigate the very collision we all deprecate.

Sir, I am a Marylander, not a "northern fanatic." My father was a slaveholder. I was myself for years a slaveholder. I have lived nearly all my life in Maryland. I know the temper of her people. I have lived for years in Virginia. I know the temper of her people; I know the relations of the white and black population in those States, and I am going to state some facts to the House nearer home than those cited by the dreamers.

In Maryland we have more free negroes than any other State in the Union. Virginia stands next. She has some fifty thousand among five hundred thousand slaves, and we have eighty-three thousand among eighty-seven thousand slaves. One eighth of our population is free negro. In 1859, just before the rebellion, there was what was called in Maryland a "slaveholders' convention"—a phenomenon under the sun—fit precursor of the slave confederacy! No-

body could be admitted who did not own slaves; and their purpose was, as their resolutions indicated when introduced, to put an end to free negroism in Maryland for the advantage of the white population. There was one man in that assembly who was not crazy, and that man was an old Whig whom I honored and whom my friend from Kentucky Mr. [MALLORY] knew and honored. His name was James Alfred Pearce, always a statesman, always a gentleman, however wandering into errors in his last days. He was placed upon the committee to which this subject was referred, and being a gentleman and a large slaveholder, and knowing something about political economy, and the effect of tampering with the laws of industry, he embodied his sane views in a report to that convention, a part of which I will read for the benefit of the House :

“The existence of so large a number of free blacks in the midst of a slaveholding State is believed to be of itself an evil, and this evil is readily perceived to be greater when it is considered that a portion of them are idle, vicious, and unproductive. This, however, is not the case with the majority of them, and their removal would, as the committee believe, be far greater than all the evils the people of Maryland ever suffered from them. In the city of Baltimore it is estimated that there are more than twenty-five thousand of them, employed chiefly as domestic servants or laborers in various departments of industry. In many of the rural districts of the State, where labor is by no means abundant, they furnish a large supply of agricultural labor, and it is unquestionable that quite a large portion of our soil could not be tilled without their aid.”

How much of South Carolina or Mississippi could be tilled without their aid ?

“In some districts they supply almost all the labor demanded by the farmers. Their removal from the State would deduct nearly fifty per cent. from the household and agricultural labor furnished by people of this color, and indispensable to the people of the State; would produce great discomfort and inconvenience to the great body of householders; would break up the business and destroy the property of large numbers of land-owners and land-renters—a class whose interests are entitled to as much consideration as those of any other portion of our citizens; would be harsh and oppressive to those people themselves; would violate public sentiment, which is generally not only just, but kindly, and would probably lead to other evils which the committee forbear to mention. We are satisfied that such a measure could not receive the legislative sanction, and would not be tolerated by the great body of the people of Maryland, even with that sanction.”

That is from James Alfred Pearce, a slaveholder. Even the secession Legislature of Maryland then about to meet, had it passed that law, James A. Pearce tells them the people of Maryland would not tolerate them in doing it. I beg you, gentlemen, observe the strength of the language :

“The committee, therefore, cannot recommend their expulsion from the State. Still more unwilling should they be to favor any measure which looked to their being deprived of the right to freedom which they have acquired by the indulgence of our laws and the tenderness of their masters, whether wise or unwise, or which they have inherited as a birthright.”

Then, sir, in Maryland a free negro has some rights.

The policy of the report prevailed in this convention of slaveholders, and the iniquitous purpose was not by them pressed on the Legislature.

Some of the people in that convention were in the Legislature, and a Mr. Jacobs was one of them. He introduced a law to hire the free negroes out to the highest bidders; and if they should be disobedient after being hired out, then they were to be sold as slaves for life. The bill could not be passed. It was objected to by county after county. It was only allowed to become a law with reference to four or five counties—St. Mary's, Charles, Somerset, Worcester, Baltimore county, and perhaps one or two others; and it was not allowed to be operative till approved by the people of the counties respectively. The friends of the infamous scheme went before the people at the presidential election in those counties; for the Legislature would not allow the law even to apply to those counties unless a majority of the people willed it. In Howard, one of the slaveholding counties, they got just 55 votes for it, and against it 1,397. In Baltimore county they got 681 votes for, and 5,364 against it. In Kent county they got 74 votes for, and 1,502 votes against it. It passed in no county except in one, and there by an accident. That is the judgment of the people of Mary-

land on the relations of the laboring free colored people living among them, essential to their industry, a part of their social system, filling well their place in life, without whom their interests cannot be protected, and which we neither will expel ourselves, nor encourage to go, nor allow other people to expel.

If gentlemen want to know still further how Maryland regards the free negro population, I desire to say that the emancipation movement of Maryland is indebted very much to the commencement of negro enlistments in Maryland for the same economic reason. Colonel Birney was sent there with general orders to enlist negroes. He was not instructed to take slaves. He commenced the enlistment of free negroes. Gentlemen found at once that that was a discrimination between the loyal people who do not own slaves and the disloyal people who do own slaves; and my friend Judge Bond wrote to the Secretary of War remonstrating against the inequality of taking from the Union men their labor and leaving with the secessionist his labor. He pointed out the law of 1862, authorizing the enlisting of one as well as of the other. The Secretary of War agreed with him. Birney acted under the implied if not the express authority of the Secretary of War, and commenced to levy from the slave population, in order that the Union men might have the free colored population to hire. So the beginning of slave enlistments was a question of political economy which the President and his commentator propose to solve in one way, but which the people of Maryland mean to solve in another way.

But it was also apparent that every slave enlisted was a poor white man's substitute. It was that more than anything else that brought directly before the people of Maryland at the last election the burdens they were suffering from the existence of slavery; and that aided more than did the bayonets to which the gentleman from New York refers, more than all proclamations, more than any other argument urged, in bringing on our side the people of the slaveholding counties of Maryland, who had voted at the beck of the slaveholders for generations. They said, "if we are to have a draft, and if our rich neighbor's plantation is to be cultivated while we are dragged off to fill the quota of the State, we think that an injustice. We are for slave enlistments and in favor of relieving the white people from the disproportionate burdens of the draft." It was that, sir, and no proclamation; it was that view, carried home by my honorable friend who represents the first congressional district, [Mr. CRESWELL,] urged upon every hustling, in every fence-corner, that dragged out men in homespun to cast their first independent vote, and my honorable friend from the first district is the representative of that independent vote.

Such was the telling power of the enlistment of slaves that my colleague got in the county of Worcester, one of the great slaveholding counties, several hundred more votes than his predecessor, Mr. Crisfield, a most able gentleman, got when he was candidate of the United Union party.

If we are to be treated, Mr. Speaker, to speculations on equality, and prejudices of race, and matters of that kind, to bewilder and mislead the public judgment upon this grave and important topic, allow me to beseech gentlemen to recollect that we people in America are not the only ones who have prejudices, and that negroes are not the only proscribed race in the world; that other nations have been as unjust and as inclined to oppress, and that we in some regions of the world, would fare no better than negroes do here. How long has it been since "Dog of a Christian" was the most polite word to us in the Moslem's mouth? How long has it been since a Brahmin would condescend to sit at table with the most aristocratic Englishman? How long has it been since the nobles of Europe refused to mingle their blood with the blood of the *villain*, or the peasant of continental Europe? Have we forgot the first example—that the Hebrew was an *abomination to the Egyptian-African*?

These are arguments to prejudice, and not to the merits. They are intended to mislead, not to enlighten. I beg gentlemen on the other side, whatever their views or purposes may be, let us combine, whatever the result, that the least damage may be done to the public service. Let us decide the question, not upon suggestions of prejudice, not on questions of hostility to race, but on the great politico-economic argument, if I may use the expression. Those forces which must determine it will determine it peacefully if we are wise, or in blood if we are unwise. Those, and those alone, in my judgment, are the alternatives.





