

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. D. C. ATKINS, OF TENNESSEE,

ON THE

POSITION AND TENDENCY OF PARTIES.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 24, 1859.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—Mr. ATKINS said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It may not be altogether unprofitable at this particular juncture to review briefly some of the leading events of the history of parties, and to analyze some of their peculiar characteristics. The time seems auspicious.

The American Statesman who would progress safely in the science of political government, is not unlike the mariner who explores an unknown sea. Even in the midst of the most placid waters, under the most auspicious sky, and with the most prosperous gales, he should cast anchor and take his reckoning of both wind and current.

WHITHER ARE WE TENDING? is a question often propounded in political circles. It is generally asked by politicians whose little barks have been shipwrecked upon the shoal of expediency; for the man who pursues principle, although he may for a time sink beneath the wave of popular sentiment, will surely rise again. Right principles never lead to wrong results. I have no solicitude whatever to know whither we are tending, so far as the great national party, with which I stand identified, is concerned. Its past history is to my mind a sufficient guarantee of what its future will be. But whither are the Opposition parties tending, for there are several factions of them?

The history of American politics presents two distinguishing and leading facts. One is, that there have never been but two political parties in this country formidably contending for the mastery at the same time. The other is, that the Democratic party has always been one of these, while the Opposition party has changed its name and principles to suit the temper of the times. The one is a party of expediency, while the other is a party of principle; the one advocates the interests of the few at the expense of the many; the other advocates the greatest good to the greatest number; the one sustains the interests of favored classes, the other sustains the interests and rights of the people. The one is founded in high Federal aristocracy; the other is the offspring of Democracy; the one is styled the "people's party," while the other is the party of the people. The grounds of difference between these two parties were plainly defined by the respective administrations of the elder Adams and Thomas Jefferson; a difference so broad and deep that it struck to

the very basis of government itself. It is refreshing in these days of political degeneracy to return to the original fountains of political lore, like pilgrims to the Holy Land. Our views of Federalism and Democracy become more vivid and distinct the nearer we approach the primitive days of the Republic.

The Adams or Federal party favored a strong consolidated and central Government; a Government or nation of *people*, viewing the States in the light of dependencies or provinces; while the Jeffersonian or Democratic party regarded the central Government as a *Union* of free, sovereign, and independent States, as a limited sovereignty, as a commissioned agent, with no powers only those expressly delegated and nominated in the Federal Constitution. The one adhered to a strict construction of that instrument, the work of great, good, and patriotic men; the other would construe it latitudinously—finding a grant of power to engraft upon the policy of the country almost any measure which expediency might suggest, or ambition demand, although in clear violation of its letter and spirit, and often of doubtful utility.

Of these I might mention various instances, long since exploded, and against which the fiat of the American people has been unmistakably pronounced. The shades even of a United States Bank and distribution, and their kindred brood of political heresies, do not now enter within the walls of this Capitol. But I will forbear to exhume these buried memories over which the mantle of oblivion has been long since thrown by the hand of the nation, further than they may serve to illustrate the argument I am about to submit.

As a Representative of a southern constituency, with a heart whose every pulsation beats jealously for the honor of my beloved section, in the Union, or out of it, should I live to see that evil hour, there is one truth of which I am most earnestly convicted, and that is, that the South "owes the Iliad of all her woes" to this libertinous-litudinous construction of the Constitution. And I declare here to-day, if this Union is ever dissolved—if that "bright particular star" shall disappear from its central position, and go darkling through chaos, no more to light the nations of the earth in their march to civilization and constitutional liberty, the historian must date its decline to this unfortunate and fatal principle.

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to show that the Democratic party has administered this Government successfully and prosperously, and in strict accordance with the Constitution. And that the inequality that has, from time to time, crept into the Federal legislation of the country has been effected by the Opposition party during the occasional intervals when it was in power, and when the Democracy failed to have a working majority—that inequality being always unjust and oppressive to the South. In other words, that the Democratic party has always come boldly up to the maintenance of southern rights and southern honor. True, in almost every contest in which the equality of the southern States with their northern sisters has been brought in question, a small portion of the northern Democracy have hung fire, and, in some few instances, taken shelter in the camp of the enemy—but still the records of the country testify that the great body of it has been firm and true to the integrity of the Constitution, while the Opposition, I care not by what name they are designated, are the unyielding enemies of our constitutional rights and equality. I allude to the northern wing of the Opposition—the southern wing of the late Whig party was largely in the minority—and though it had the good of the country in view, yet it was so weak and powerless it fell an easy victim to the corruptions of its more powerful northern allies. And though for some time they presented the strange anomaly of acting together, yet the two parts were vitally repugnant to each other—the lesser was borne along by the greater body through the prejudice and influence of the party

name and party machinery, until southern Whigs could go no further, without dishonoring their section and degrading themselves. In that long list are found the names of some of the purest patriots—the wisest statesmen—and the most exalted intellects of the land.

The same is true of the American party, which is only another form of opposition to the Democracy, with this difference—that there is a wing of it in the South which boldly proclaims its purpose to affiliate and unite with the Black Republican party in the overthrow of the Democratic party, and are no doubt daily laying their plans, and making their treaties of amity and union. But I will treat of this hereafter.

What has been the effect of Democratic policy upon the history of this Republic, whether commercially, politically, or socially? How have the rights of the South fared under Democratic Administrations? And what has been the policy of the Opposition in reference to the same great interests?

It has always been a cardinal principle of the Democratic party to oppose all monopolies and class legislation; not only because they are wrong in principle, but because they invariably operate unequally upon the people. For this service the South should be peculiarly grateful, as the discrimination is always against that section. What southern statesman does not know that the North has always had the advantage of the South in the laws and treaties regulating the commerce of the United States with foreign nations? What natural law of commerce, or in other words, what rule of justice compels southern merchants to buy ships of northern ship-builders, instead of purchasing in the cheapest market, although it be a foreign one? What natural law of commerce compels our cotton to go by New York before it can be shipped for Liverpool, submitting to the most onerous coasting freights, when it would be nearer its port of destination at Charleston or Savannah, if it were not forced to take that circuitous route? Why do our northern merchants, and northern ports, reap almost the entire benefit from the tonnage of the United States?

The House will remember how the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURLINGAME) was exercised a few days since for fear that this monopoly, which, by our navigation laws, is secured to New England merchants' would be restricted. The gentleman admitted that "ships could be built thirty per cent. cheaper in the British Provinces than in the United States, and he contended that every interest demanded protection in this respect; for, if the building of ships stopped, the tonnage of the country would sink, and it was a law that when the tonnage of the country fell, freights went up." Here is a monopoly of thirty per cent. that the South and West have to pay to New England commerce by way of protection. Just think of it, the southern and western people, under the operation of our navigation laws, are denied the privilege of buying or employing foreign bottoms, but are forced to pay tribute to New England cupidity. It is the worst form of protection. No wonder that southern commerce languishes under such odious discriminations! No wonder that New England's rock-bound coast has become an Arcadia, when southern labor and capital are forced by law to be expended in enriching and adorning it.

Millions have been paid our northern seamen in the shape of Government bounty for catching codfish. Money actually taken out of the pockets of all the people, and especially the South, to pay a certain class of men to catch fish and sell them to us. I am glad to find that a Democratic Senate has passed a bill repealing the law, and I trust that the House will concur in that judgment, in wiping from the statute-book an act that imposes an unjust tax upon the southern people, for which they do not receive even the cold thanks of the beneficiaries, but rather their curses. The partiality in Federal legislation for the North, is evinced again, in the immense sums of money that are lavished upon

northern rivers and harbors it is seen again in the large and munificent land grants that have been voted by Congress upon northern railroads—it is seen in the disproportionately large number of custom-houses, court-houses, and other public buildings—the North has nearly three, while the South has one; and half of them exist only on the statute-book, having no “local habitation.” At the origin of the Government, the South had two ports that surpassed New York as commercial marts, but by a regular system of favoritism, New York has been made the great commercial emporium of this country. Look at the immense outlays of public money in erecting her public buildings—the untold millions spent upon her harbor and shipping—her immense army of office-holders who must necessarily live upon the Federal treasury—the princely and extravagant donations made in establishing her ocean mail lines—all tending to make that city the great heart of the trade and commerce of this country, not only with foreign nations, but even among the States, one with another.

If Tennessee would purchase a State bond of Georgia, the first step is to ascertain its value in New York. Why do nearly all of our European importations first land at this great centre, thence to radiate all over the nation? Have we not skillful navigators, and experienced merchants? Look to the statute-book, and you will find the true cause in your laws upon commerce and navigation. The same is true of all your splendid schemes of internal improvement. The North has got nearly the lion’s share.

But, sir, I ask to be indulged just here, in calling your attention to another marked and striking instance of the inequality of Federal legislation in favor of the North; the more grievous and burdensome on account of its universality, affecting every branch of industrial pursuit for the benefit of one—the manufacturing. I allude to the effect of a protective tariff upon the people at large, and upon the South especially. Does any sane man, no matter of what latitude, at this late day, deny that every kind of a tariff is a *tax*? Does anybody deny that this tax is collected from the hard earnings of the great mass of the people under the specious name of revenue, by which the favored few are protected and enriched, who need no protection? And will any one deny that any sort of a tariff affording incidental protection, does not operate unequally and oppressively upon the South and West, the producing sections, for the benefit of the North and East? If he does, I would advise him to go back to the political primer, and learn anew political economy. Of course, the higher the tariff, the more burdensome to the people of the South, who pay largely over their share of the duty. Of all the Machiavelian schemes to pamper the lordly aristocrats of the North and East, at the expense of their toiling millions who are not operatives, and to grind to dust the interests of the South and West, I must say it is to be found in the operations of a protective tariff. But I do not mention this subject with the view of entering into an argument upon its details, further than to show its injustice to the South, and for the additional purpose of reminding the country that the Democratic party has always opposed this, and all kindred measures of class legislation, such as bankrupt laws, United States Banks, &c., &c., as subversive of that principle of equality, without which liberty is imperfect.

But I have said that the South pays largely over its proportionate share of the revenues collected by duties upon imports. Where is the proof? In the first place, the South has only about two-thirds the population of the North; or, in other words, the North has fifty per cent. more population than the South. The North has eighteen millions, while the South has only twelve millions, including slaves.

The Report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that the United States, in 1857, exported, in round numbers, “\$279,000,000, excluding gold and foreign

merchandise, re-exported. Of this amount, the sum of \$158,000,000 was the clear product of the South—articles that can only be raised in the South. We have \$80,000,000 worth of exports, the productions of the forest, provisions, &c. Suppose that one-third of them are of Southern products there is for the South: \$185,000,000, while the North has only about \$95,000,000 of exports." The total amount of imports for the same period is \$333,000,000, which is more than half paid for by Southern exports. When we take into consideration the excess of population in the North, and the excess (nearly one hundred per cent.) of exports from the South, and that the North has grown rich off of the South, in being the factor of the South—exchanging its products for foreign importations, we must conclude that the fault lies in our system of imposts, and that it operates most unequally upon the South—making its people the tax-payers, and those of the North the tax-gatherers.

According to population, the South should pay sixty-six cents to one dollar for the North—whereas, as our exports pay for our imports, the South pays as 185 to 95, nearly one hundred per cent. Add the excess of Northern population, and we have for the South to pay in the ratio of 218 to 95 for the North. It is a safe calculation to say, that the South pays two-thirds of the revenue that supports this Government, while more than three-fourths of it is expended upon the North. Is there justice or uniformity in this? The Constitution says that "all duties, imposts, and excises, shall be uniform throughout the United States." As before observed, the North has managed to become the factor of the South, and, in exchanging its products for foreign importations, heavy reductions are made upon them by way of commissions, &c., when the foreign importation in turn, under the operation of the tariff, is made to pay a heavy duty upon its arrival at the custom-house, when it is bought by the merchant, and from him by the Southern planter; or, to express it differently, is returned to the planter, with still another per cent. Thus it is, that Southern labor and capital, under the operation of Federal legislation, are made to contribute largely over their share to the maintenance of the Government: and, at the same time, enriches the commercial men and manufacturers of the North, exacting tithes where none are due, to fill the coffers of a bloated aristocracy. And yet a crusade is preached from the hustings and the pulpit, in almost every town and hamlet in the North, against the slave labor of the South, not knowing, in the phrenzy of their fanaticism, that they are smiting the hand that feeds them.

Notwithstanding the liberal policy of the Democratic party towards each State and section of this Confederacy, applying as it well could the principle of equal and exact justice to all, it has, nevertheless, in its attempts to do justice to the Southern States, been met at every step with the most relentless and determined opposition by a party in the North, whatever other principles it may have entertained, and by whatever other name it may have been recognized, is deeply imbued with the sentiment of anti slavery. It has resisted the commercial progress and the territorial expansion of the South from the origin of the Government.

The liberal mind would have supposed that this bitter enmity should have been spared the South, having been the principle actor in the Revolution—having baptized its fields with the best blood of its sons, and consecrated them to the genius of American liberty; and having consented to ordain a constitution and enter a Union of confederated States, each sovereign and independent over its own internal affairs, consisting of both free and slave. But so bold and reckless has abolitionism become, after having warred upon slavery in every possible form, having almost completed its serpentine work of encircling the South, it boldly rears its hydra-head, and with its hissing tongue it tells the

South that it intends to storm its very citadel. SEWARD, the great Representative man of Northern Abolitionism, proclaims upon the floor of the Senate that the battle has been fought and won, and that henceforth the southern States will hold the relation of conquered provinces to our northern sister States, or neighbors; that the slave States must be abolitionized, and that our tobacco, cotton, rice, and sugar-fields must be tilled exclusively by free labor. What, emancipate our slaves? Of course, turn them loose among us. I will not contemplate so horrid and revolting a picture; and yet such are the designs of abolitionism.

Twenty years hence, or sooner, there will be the constitutional number of free States required to amend the Federal Constitution, when the solid bulwarks of the Supreme Court are to be undermined and reconstructed upon an abolition basis, and the institutions of the South will be at the fanatical mercy of abolitionism. This view preceeds upon the idea that no more slave States are to be admitted, abolitionism swears it; the heavens may fall, but another slave State will never be admitted into this Union, if abolitionism can prevent it. Has not the door of the Union been slammed in the very face of the slave constitution of Kansas—and, strange to say, southern men rejoice at it! The original twelve slave States, with a magnanimity that challenges our admiration, did not insist upon uniformity of laws and institutions, but were content that Massachusetts should regulate her own internal affairs to suit herself. To have acted otherwise would have been false to their high character, and to the gallant heroes who fell upon the memorable field of Bunker Hill, and to the brave spirits who met the advanced guard of the British army upon the plains of Lexington and Concord. And yet this great high-priest has spoken at Rochester, and the oracle is caught up throughout all Abolitiondom, that slave labor and free labor are incompatible in this Confederacy of States, and that the Democratic party, being the "*natural ally of slavery, must be overcome.*" Sir, who of the many reckless, defeated, and disappointed politicians of the South are ready to assist in breaking down this Democratic party, that SEWARD says is the natural ally of slavery, and thus enable these Free-Soil traitors to tear down the temples of the South, and desecrate her altars with their unhallowed hands? But, for fear I may do the distinguished Senator from New York injustice, I quote from his speech, made at Rochester, some time in the autumn of 1858. He is represented, in his own party newspapers, in speaking of the collision between the system of free labor in the North and slave labor in the South, to have said:

"Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. *It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation.* Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina, and the sugar plantations of Louisiana, will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free States, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises when made, vain and ephemeral.

In order to break down the Democratic party at the North, abolition orators describe it before the people as a party identified with the slave power, and that the ulterior object is to plant slavery in the free States. Such was the idea in Mr. SEWARD's speech. The Senator has been greatly imposed upon as to the future aims of the southern people. No such desire exists in any

slave State. Nor do I understand it to be the mission of the Democratic party to go about planting slavery, or preventing its being planted by the people wherever a majority of them may desire to do so. I understand it, however, to be the true principles of that party, to interpose no restrictions upon the rights of the people of a State, upon that subject, one way or the other. Nor does the Democratic party deny the right of the people of a Territory, when they come to ordain a State Constitution, to exercise complete sovereignty over that and all other domestic questions.

Slave labor and free labor are opposing forces, says Mr. SEWARD. Let us look at this question for a moment. Republicans say that slavery sits like a vampire upon the energies of the South, and retards her progress. They do not believe it when they say it; for opposition to slavery with them has become a trade—a profession; they get office by it; as was well said a short time since by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. JENKINS,) “they get their bread by it.” The northern masses are made to believe that slavery is the Pandora’s box of all their ills. New England operatives will yet learn that without cotton they are without bread. If the South will withhold her cotton from New England manufactures, public sentiment may be revolutionized. Without cotton, the product of slave labor, the manufacturing thousands of the North, the lords of the loom, would be utterly prostrated in business.

I will not speak of the social condition of the laboring classes in the North—it is deplorable enough; but I will speak of the society and institutions of the South, where this much abused system of slave labor is established. Where will you go to find society more refined and at the same time more simple and republican? All white men in the South are upon the same platform of social and political equality—the only distinctions recognized are those of merit, intellect, and an honest name—the highest honor is in the grasp of the poorest man. The tendency of slave labor is to elevate the poor man in a social point of view. White men in the South do not perform menial service.

Mr. KELLOGG. I understand the gentleman to say that this cry of anti-slavery is a political trade in the North. I ask him if it is not that by which gentlemen in the South get office also?

Mr. ATKINS. If there are any such gentlemen in the South I do not know any of them. They do not live in my region of country, I can assure the gentleman. Can the gentleman say as much for his region?

Mr. KELLOGG. Oh, yes, truly I can.

Mr. ATKINS. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KELLOGG) has just referred to the non-slaveholders of the South, and, if I understand him correctly, has advanced the idea that they constitute an element of opposition to slavery. Sir, he does not know them; they would spurn all intimations of the gentleman of their want of devotion and loyalty to southern rights and southern institutions. No slaveholder would defend the honor and equality of the South and the institution of slavery itself, if menaced, sooner than would that portion of our southern citizens. They are true and patriotic, and thoroughly imbued with a sense of southern equality.

Had I the time, I would be glad to discuss, at some length, the relative nature of labor and capital in the South and in the North. They operate adversely in the North, while in the South they are identified. In the North it is the interest of capitalists that the price of labor should be low—the lower the price the greater amount of it can be had for a given sum of money. In the North, capital is not permanently invested in labor, but only for a limited space of time—while in the South capital seeks a permanent investment, and in a word, a man’s capital thus invested is *labor*. Hence, it is to the interest of

a man owning slaves, that the price of labor should be high, because that makes the price of his products correspondingly high; hence they are identified. So with his non-slaveholding neighbor; his capital consists in his labor, and it is to his interest, of course, that labor should command remunerative prices. But I might refer to some statistics which place this view of the subject beyond doubt; they amount to demonstration; suffice it the difference in the wages of nearly all the mechanical tradesmen ranges from 25 to 50 per cent. higher in the South than they do in the North, which establishes the fact that slave labor is an auxiliary to free labor.

It does not necessarily imply that all free labor is white labor, for, according to this theory, the labor of free negroes is free labor. Hence, SEWARD, and be it remembered he is the great Mogul of his party, would have our negroes freed and placed upon the same basis with our white citizens. Just in this connection I desire to refer to the speech of the able and distinguished Republican member from Maine, (Mr. WASHBURN,) delivered in the House on the 10th inst. You remember, sir, how boldly he proclaimed the tenets of the Black Republican creed, and in what unmeasured terms he denounced the "slave-struck Democracy," as he called them. In a word, the whole drift and scope of the gentleman's argument was to prove that all men, whether white or black, are equal. He quotes these celebrated words from the Declaration of Independence, that have rendered the name of Jefferson immortal.

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, DERIVING THEIR JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED."

Can any man suppose that Jefferson had reference to negroes, when he was the owner of a large number at the time that he penned the sentiment, and died holding them in slavery? To suppose that he did is to maintain an absurdity.

He then denounces the Lecompton Constitution because it recognizes the "right of property in a slave." In his indignation, he pays his respects to the application of Oregon, free Oregon, for admission as a State into the Union, simply because its Constitution does not recognize free negroes, who are citizens of other States, the "right to maintain suits at law." He desires them to be recognized as citizens of course.

Speaking of the demands of the Democratic party, he quotes from the President's message the following:

"The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that all American citizens have an equal right to take into the Territories whatever is held as property under the laws of any of the States, and to hold such property there UNDER THE GUARDIANSHIP OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, so long as the territorial condition shall remain. This is now a well-established position."

The gentleman then says:

"It requires the acceptance of this 'position' by the Democratic party as one not to be denied, or even brought in question. It insists that the inhuman and impious declaration of the slave-holding judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, that those who bear 'God's image cut in ebony' have 'no rights which white men are bound to respect,' and may be treated as outlaws and hunted as wolves, shall be received as a sacred and indubitable verity.

"It demands the admission of Oregon into the Union as a State, with a constitution which denies to colored persons, although they may be citizens of sovereign States under the constitutions thereof, the right to maintain suits at law for the vindication of any right, or the redress of any wrong.

"It counsels its allies of the straight Whig school to renounce all the cherished ideas and oft-repeated declaration of the Whig party, and, by unavoidable implication, to stamp as weak or hypocritical the great chieftains of that once powerful organization—Clay, Webster, and others, whose names will stand conspicuous and eternal in the firma-

ment of their country's history, and, wallowing in the mire of an inconceivable degradation, as northern Whig journals has recently asserted, that—

“The declaration that all men are endowed with an inalienable right to liberty, and that this right is self-evident, is contradicted by natural reason, by natural religion, and by the sacred Scriptures, and leads not only to infidelity, but also to anarchy and atheism.”

The principle embodied in the above quotation from the President's message, I take to be orthodox with all good Democrats, North and South. Slaves are property, and under the “*guardianship* of the Federal Constitution” the owner can hold them in the territories with or without legislation, whether “friendly or unfriendly.” The Supreme Court has substantially so decided.

The gentleman styles the present Democratic organization as a slave oligarchy, as the sham Democracy, and most feelingly holds up the Black Republican party as the true Democratic party. Quite Democratic. So abstractly Democratic is he, that he can see no difference between a white man and a black African; at least such is his theory.

Sir, the doctrine of the political equality of the white man and the negro implies social equality—amalgamation. And this doctrine of equalizing labor—making it all free labor—in other words, abolishing slavery, are only different terms to express the same idea of negro citizenship—equality. Sir, do they want negro judges, jurors, legislators? If Maine, or any other State, chooses to degrade themselves by the adoption of any such Black Republican ideas, let them do it; but I beg that they will not attempt to obtrude them upon other communities.

The following sentiment, artfully woven into the gentleman's speech, too plainly tells what his entire party is eventually looking to. The gentleman should endeavor to inform himself better as to the purposes and aims of this “Lecompton Democracy.” He knows, or ought to know, before he asserts it, that neither the Democracy, nor the entire southern people, expect to plant slavery in a solitary free State of this Union, as before observed. Knowing, as he must, that no such propagandism is anticipated or intended by the southern people, his language, “prepare for its gradual removal,” was intended to have a peculiar significance.

The South is already aware that the day is regarded as not far distant when the North will have the requisite number of free States to amend the Constitution and “prepare for its (slavery) gradual removal.” When that day comes, if it comes in your day and mine, it will be one full of retribution to you as well as calamity to us. The South will not shrink from it.

But the gentleman pleads most eloquently that his party shall not be disintegrated—that it shall not lower its piratical flag—that it shall not resolve itself into a mere do-nothing Know-Nothing Opposition party to the Democracy. He seems to have some fears that the Northern anti-Lecompton Democrats and Americans will demand terms of coalition that will dilute the savory principles of Republicanism as he expounds them. In speaking of those who may hereafter constitute the Republican party, or its successor, should it fail to come up to the demands of Abolitionism, he says:

“And I do not believe that it will be constituted hereafter of those only who are now within its ranks, but that it will embrace, also, all Americans and anti-Lecompton Democrats who did not mean to submit to the subjugation of freedom, or the overthrow of our political institutions. Upon these over-shadowing issues, there can be but two opinions or parties, and those who are not with the slave-holders' party must be with that of their opponents.”

Again he says:

“And, sir, I venture to predict that within ten years from this time, it will have the support of a large majority of the people of the slave States.”

How hopeful is this champion of the Republican party! His faith can remove mountains. He must feel that he has the nucleus of a party there now. Will he be so kind as to tell us who so treacherous to the South as to embrace Black Republicanism? But he has great horror of the South's extending her institutions into any other Territories, and appeals to all North and South, who are opposed to this "slavery propaganda," to unite in making bitter and relentless war upon the Democratic party, because, as he says, it favors southern expansion. Sir, if these things be in "the green tree, what will be in the dry?"

I am proud to acknowledge, that under the Democratic principle of State-rights and popular sovereignty, the South may grow and expand. Under the benign influence of this party, with a genial climate that rivals the sunny climes of Italy or France, with a soil rich and productive as the fabulous fertility of the Nile, and with a population whose spirit and energy "could conquer a world," the South may yet achieve a still nobler destiny. What would our power, as a nation, be to-day, if it had not been for this principle of expansion, so dear to the great Democratic heart?

When we come to glance at the map of our territorial acquisitions, the injustice and inequality to which the South would have been subjected, and from which it was partially saved by the policy of the Democratic party, is startling. In order to comprehend more fully the enormity of northern selfishness, see the Old Dominion—the mother of great ideas and great deeds, in the prodigality of her munificence, and in the virgin purity of her patriotism, with a magnanimity to which the history of the world furnishes no parallel, cede to the North the Northwest Territory, an empire of itself, comprising the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. For this munificent donation—a free will offering to these people—they send to this Congress some Representatives who affect to scorn what they are pleased to denigrate the slave oligarchy of Virginia. Well may this venerated old mother exclaim,

"How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is
To have a thankless child!"

And, yet, when the wise statesmanship and forecast of Jefferson seized upon the lucky moment to wrest the Louisiana purchase from the grasp of Napoleon, this same northern party denounced him as a propagandist and a usurper. There was a splendid acquisition, the richest in soil, the most splendid in production, the most delightful in climate, and the most fruitful in resources of any land beneath the sun; with the noblest rivers, embracing the great Father of Waters, upon whose bosom navies might proudly float Who so insane—who so struck with judicial blindness as to regret the free navigation of the Mississippi river, without which the South must ever have been a blighted province, shorn of her commerce?

The advantages of that territory can scarcely be computed. Every farmer who lives within the great valley of that noble river, has cause to bless the American progress of the Democratic party, without which, that immense empire would have been to-day a French colony. It was the Democratic party that gave you Florida with its health-giving breeze. And when the lone star of Texas, coruscating with the glories of San Jacinto, veered from the orbit of her nationality, and settled amid the American galaxy, this same anti-slavery party of the North, had their hearts not quailed them, would have quenched it in blood, and blotted it from the firmament of States. Annexation was opposed by the old Whig party in the South; but only as a party move, which resulted most disastrously to its prospects and future. But the national Democracy inscribed the honored name of Texas upon their banners, and bore her triumphantly into the Union. Who, now, but an Abolitionist, will gainsay the wisdom of that policy? There she lies upon our southwestern border, like

a huge giantess slumbering in her strength, who, if the blood-hounds of fanaticism approach too nearly, will arouse to the most determined and desperate resistance. We can no more do without Texas, than the moon can do without the lustre of the stars that smile in her face as—

“She walks in beauty through the night.”

Where is the enlightened statesman who will admit that the Mexican territorial acquisitions—the crowning glory of that most successful and brilliant administration of the model President, were inexpedient and unwise. Since the mines of California and New Mexico have been opened up to American enterprise and industry, every department of human pursuit throughout our whole country has been quickened, and the whole commercial world strides along upon a more extended scale. California gold is silently producing revolutions in the commercial and financial world that contradicts all calculations of the political economist, and upsets the best established theories of the wisest statesmen. Sceptics may doubt and sneer, but they are confounded at the amazing results it has produced in the progress of human thought and action. Energies have been aroused, and latent efforts put forth, which had lain dormant throughout the long night of ages past. In the whirl of prosperity and sudden fortune which has broke upon us, men can scarcely believe their senses. In a word—Democracy has acquired every foot of territory that has been added to the nation, and has taken every step in the march of American progress, while the opposition parties have resisted and opposed our expansion, preferring rather American repression.

That mission is not yet fulfilled; the dim vista that separates the present from the future, but hardly conceals from the view still grander and nobler results.

The time may not have arrived when we ought to acquire other territory, but it will come. Destiny forces it upon us—*what is to be will be*, and human power cannot prevent it. You can no more repress the energies of this people than you can check the headlong cataract, or turn the course of the mighty river. Cuba, rough diamond in the Spanish crown, will some day dazzle the eye, bright, polished, and sparkling in the diadem of American States. English diplomacy, nor French bluster, can wrest from the American people this gem of the ocean wave, colored as it is, with the blood of the lamented Crittenden. It is ours, geographically, commercially, naturally, and the very sovereignty of America, sooner or later, requires its annexation.

There is not an interest in this country that would not be beneficially affected by the acquisition of this Island; but more especially would it contribute to the interests of the people inhabiting the valley of the Mississippi river. Every description of produce now raised in that fertile valley would be enhanced in value, by finding a market in Cuba; while the great staple of that Island, sugar, under American culture and by free-trade, would be supplied to us at greatly reduced rates. The people of the United States would save annually millions in the simple article of sugar. But the Island becomes doubly important to this country in view of our hundreds of millions of commerce between the Atlantic and Pacific shores that pass beneath the Spanish guns. A people so near our own shores, and long weighed down by the iron yoke of Spanish despotism, awed into submission to the most tyrannical laws by a hiring soldiery, it is not unnatural that they should seek deliverance from a government, which, instead of affording them protection, operates as an engine of oppression. American prosperity and Cuban independence alike suggests the necessity of early action.

European diplomacy is endeavoring to entangle us with our Southern neighbors, but American progress must cut the Gordian knot of Mexican misrule, and

Central American despotism, and rebuke the unwarrantable intervention of the English Queen and the French Emperor. These countries must and will be *Americanized*; in spite of the intrigues of foreign despots, by the moral power of our great example; if not, by the terrible vengeance of the sword. To such an alternative we may have to come; I would prefer not, but sooner than see those transits closed by the armaments of the Anglo-French alliance, to intercept our commerce and our free passage to the Pacific shores, and thus laugh to scorn our boasted American principle of the Monroe doctrine, I would counsel and appeal to the arbitrament of the sword, the last argument of nations. Sir, I am not of that school of politicians that would repress the application of the great principle of liberty and justice to classes or to States. I have no fears that those eternal principles will become diluted by expansion. I am not alarmed for fear this country will break into on account of its great magnitude—that very magnitude presupposes remoteness of parts and diversity of interests, and those parts and interests will naturally beget a jealousy towards the more central and powerful that cannot fail to preserve in beautiful proportion the entire whole. The isolated position of California and Oregon, far off on the Pacific shores, renders them ever watchful and jealous of the Atlantic States and those lying to the North, and demonstrate to-day, by their sound conservative national Democracy, their sympathy for the weaker section of the Union, and the rights of the States.

But to return in chronological order. When, in 1850, the South meekly asked an equal participation in the Mexican territorial acquisitions, purchased by the common blood and treasure of the country, there was in the path of American progress, a monster more terrible than European guns—the infernal spirit of anti-slavery, who stood up in all his effrontery and opposed her just and constitutional demand, and thrust in her face Wilmot provisos. But the Democracy, with true constitutional devotion, denounced all such unjust discriminations against any portion of this Confederacy, and proclaimed the principle of non-interference and popular sovereignty. It is true that, to the genius and statesmanship of the illustrious Sage of Ashland, more than any other man, is the honor of that triumph due; but, it must be remembered, that he had then been set aside by the Whig party for the availability of General Taylor, and that the great Kentuckian was without a party, and had to rely upon the willing support of the Democratic party.

And, again, in 1854, who but the Democratic party stood up for the same great principle in the Kansas and Nebraska act? The great body of the Whigs in the South, who love principle more than they did party, gave the measure their hearty support. Again, when Kansas, with a legally made constitution, knocks at the door of the Union and asks that she be allowed a seat in this great sisterhood of States, she is indignantly refused by every Abolitionist and Black Republican, because she has recognized domestic slavery in her constitution. The South, in this instance, as in 1854, furnishes a corporal's guard who vote and act with the anti-slavery party. But no Southern Democrat, I am proud to say, is found upon that list; but, to a man with more than half the Southern Americans, support the measure. And where stands the Northern Democracy in this test of their fealty to the constitutional rights of the South? Of the northern Democrats in the Senate, only three voted against it; while in the House, from the North, only twelve Democrats are found to finally record their vote with the Opposition.

Thus you see, after all the hue and cry of the division in the ranks of the Democracy, there were but a very few who stood out finally. But it is urged that the policy of the Administration upon this issue has been condemned in the recent elections in the North. The Democracy, in the last

Northern elections, for the first time, had to contend against the complete fusion of the Black Republican and Know-Nothing parties. And even against that unholy alliance our strength, as shown by the popular vote in each of the three great States, New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio, is larger than it ever was before. Showing, conclusively, that the policy of the Administration has been approved by the honest masses of the party. But where is the man of any other party in the North who stood by the South in this contest? Echo answers, where? But how has the policy of the Administration been received in the States South where elections have taken place? The popular majorities have been largely increased. In Missouri, where an effort has been made to introduce the emancipation question along with anti-Lecompton, the Administration party has been sustained by the uprising of the people by unprecedented majorities. Democrats and Americans have united and swept anti-Lecompton and emancipation from the soil of Missouri.

But some Americans of the South complain that the South has lost Kansas, as a slave State, and that squatter sovereignty has been substituted for popular sovereignty. At the same time that these partizans make these complaints, they sustain most enthusiastically the very men who voted against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; the very men who voted to keep Kansas free territory, and who opposed her admission as a slave State. Beautiful consistency! Complaining because Kansas is not a slave State, and yet hurrah for the very men who, by their votes, would not give her even a chance to be a slave State; and denounce those who did give her the opportunity to have slavery! These same consistent patriots affect to be wonderfully horrified at the doctrine of squatter sovereignty. They cry out squatter sovereignty, and at the same time denounce the Administration which is opposed to that odious doctrine. They are down on squatter sovereignty, but they are ready to excuse any body (but a Democrat) for entertaining the heresy. They denounce squatter sovereignty, but sustained Millard Fillmore, who sustained Congressional intervention. They cry out squatter sovereignty, and at the same time sustain their leaders, who voted and acted with Free-Soilers in the territorial organization act of Kansas and Nebraska, and who were in open harlotry with the Abolitionists against the admission of Kansas, because she had slavery.

Nor can they say that they are ignorant of the Black Republican tendency of this party. Have not some of the South American journals recently boldly declared their willingness to fuse with the Black Republicans? And is it not understood in this city, that efforts, unceasing efforts, are constantly made to bring about a harmonious coalition? Do not the journals of Congress tell the tale too plainly, that there is a party in the South *acting*, not talking only, but *acting* with the Black Republicans, with the view to overthrow the Democracy? And was not this Northern American party politely bowed out of the late New York State Black Republican Convention, after it had become demoralized by a proposition to fuse, and after it had lowered its flag and subscribed to the anti-slavery plank of Seward's platform? I say bowed out, for they were indignantly refused a voice in the nomination of the ticket. Did not the Senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD,) during the great debate of the last session, congratulate his party, that their prospects were brightening, and that even in the South a party was forming, upon whose aid he could confidently rely? To whom had he reference? Of course to those who think and vote with him upon those great issues of Southern rights. As a member from Tennessee, it was with deep mortification and regret that I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURLINGAME) eulogize a Tennessee Senator, (Mr. BELL,) knowing, as every one does, the inveterate hatred which the Massachusetts Representative bears the institutions of my State.

The *Richmond Whig*, a leading anti-Lecompton American journal, having argued that the slavery question is settled, says:

"There is now, therefore, no reason under Heaven why the opposition, North and South, East and West, may not unite in support of the same policy, and the same candidates, in 1850. And we go for such union, with all our heart and soul."

The *Louisville Journal* has been for a year or two advocating the election of Black Republicans over sound and national Democrats.

"In view of the existing state of things, the necessity for a reconstruction of parties is apparent," say some of the American papers of the South. The signs of the times very clearly indicate that the discordant elements of the Opposition are going through another smelting process, of which Black Republicanism, Northern Know-Nothingism, and Anti-Lecompton Southern Americanism constitute the component parts. And the honest masses will soon be called upon by the professed patriots of this new organization, to unite with them in putting down the time-honored Democratic party, that has stood the shocks and changes that have swept over this country from the days of Jefferson down to the present moment. What is to be the name of this new party is, perhaps, the most difficult and perplexing question connected with its parturition—a party traveling about in search of a name, like Japhet for a father. But, judging from those who have kindly offered their services to stand at the baptismal font as god-fathers for the foundling, it is very evident that the South will find as little sympathy from it as from the bitterest of her sectional foes. The same pen with which Horace Greely and James Watson Webb invite William H. Seward and Henry Wilson to a Black Republican jubilee, over the defeat of the Kansas-Lecompton constitution, indites, in terms of warm commendation, letters of invitation to distinguished South American Senators.

For the want of a better platform, opposition to the Kansas policy of the Administration, and support of the Crittenden-Montgomery substitute, has been suggested as the basis of union; hoping, in the course of time and the progress of events, that they may be able to insert other planks, if the American leaders dare risk, going further in that direction before their Southern constituency. That portion of the American party whose patriotism rises above the love of party, and who have stood firmly by the Democracy from the beginning of this Kansas episode, seeing the irreconcilable divisions that exist between themselves and the northern wing of that party, and those of the leaders South, who shout in its train, and who, through the pride of ambition and hatred to Democracy, would bargain away our dearest interests, have no alternative left them but either to disfranchise themselves, or to act at once with the Democratic party in resisting the storm of anti-slavery that threatens to desolate the South in 1860. You will either have to vote for the Democratic candidate or Black Republican candidate in the next Presidential election. "Choose ye between them." Will they longer blindly follow in the lead of such supplants at the footstool of abolitionism? From every mountain and valley—from every city and hamlet—the indignant and patriotic shout comes up—no never!

"It is a base abandonment of reason to resign your right of thought."

The American party is totally denationalized. Its northern end is abolitionized, and while the southern wing of it is disintegrated. With this deplorable picture staring in the face the honest men of that now defeated and disbanded party, they must decide to what flag they shall rally; they must either march in the ranks of that party which "carries the flag, and keeps step to the music of the Constitution and the Union," or they must range themselves under the black banner of sectionalism and abolitionism, upon which is written, "eternal

hatred to the South." Are you ready to be tied hand and foot, and handed over to the embittered foes of your section? If you would not, I charge you, by the rights and honor of your beloved South—by the sovereignty of fifteen States—by the Constitution your fathers made and transmitted you—by the glorious memories that cluster thickly around the Union itself, to beware of the coils that are now set to entrap you, and make you the unconscious instruments of an unholy ambition.

Let us be united in the South. The union of the South will encourage our northern friends to stand by us in the future, as they have in the past. Instead of denouncing the northern Democracy, and preferring Black Republicanism, thereby weakening our means of defence, and strengthening our enemies, it is the duty of every southern patriot to rebuke and silence all opposition to the northern Democracy. They have fallen like grass before the scythe in defence of our rights; and can we expect them to continue to offer themselves in the breach if we will not defend ourselves? But, with the South united, we will have friends enough in the North to meet the fierce onsets of abolitionism in 1860, and once more roll back the tide of battle upon their discomfited and flying legions. Let the motto be written upon your banner, "The union of the South for the sake of the South and for the sake of the Union."

And though the Democratic party is beleaguered upon the one hand in the North, as evidenced in the late elections by a fusion of Republicans and Americans with a party of strong sympathizers in the South, of which Tennessee and Kentucky furnish the chief exponents and leading spirits, while on the other hand stand opposed to it, the extremists of the South, who are threatening to form new political associations and "*Leagues*," doubtless with the view of finally precipitating a dissolution of the Union—I must be allowed to express my entire confidence that the national Democracy, aided by the conservative men, who will naturally gather about it, and finally enter into it, and be a part of it, will triumph—gloriously triumph—over all these jarring factions, and once again safely guide the ship of State through the tempestuous billows that would seem to threaten her destruction. It has been the fate of this great party to meet with reverses always just after a Presidential triumph, and the weak and timid and dissatisfied spirits, for a time, seem to abandon its fortunes. But there is a recuperative power and energy in the Democratic masses, and when once again they begin to get in motion, as they always do when any great crisis arise, their success is certain and overwhelming.

Sir, may we not hope that the good genius that has so long watched over and protected and preserved to the country the Democratic party, may still point out the forbidden paths and continue to direct us in the way of truth. Let no new and fatal doctrine be engrafted upon our creed. Let us steer clear of gigantic schemes to deplete the Treasury and bankrupt the nation, by building Pacific railroads, and thus set up a monopoly in this country, to a company whose children's children would suck the life-blood of the Republic. Let us avoid high protective tariffs that eat up the substance of agriculture, and destroy all incentives to honest industry. Let us return, as well as the growth and expansion and necessarily complicated machinery of our great country will allow, to the utmost simplicity and economy consistent with the public weal in the administration of the Government. Let us guard with a watchless vigil every avenue leading to or from this great political fabric, that no rude hand shall enter and strike a fatal blow that will despoil any of its fair proportions. Let us perform the high trusts committed to our hands, with a scrupulous regard for the letter of our instructions, and return our commissions unsullied to the people from whence they emanated.

One other word, and I conclude. Sir, the South has a solemn duty to perform;

the duty of rebuking the spirit of lawless aggression and disregard for law which we see manifested in the recent importation of Africans to our shores. Were I to-day in favor of repealing all laws preventing the African slave trade, I would nevertheless be opposed to subjecting the South to the approval of a violation of our laws and treaties by giving countenance to smuggling in cargoes of wild Africans. I am aware, sir, that Abolitionism would be delighted to make up an issue with the Democracy upon this question. But that wish will not be gratified. Much as I hate and loathe this Abolition party, let it come in whatever shape or form it may, whether it comes like the daring robber, or noiselessly like the cunning and stealthy approach of the thief, I declare here to-day, as a southern man, my unqualified opposition, as a matter of expediency, to the re-opening of the African slave-trade, could it be done legally. Not that I have any sickly sentiments of Black Republican negrophilism that would suggest its immorality; not that I think it shocking to humanity and outraging to the moral sense of Christendom; for I believe slavery is a moral, social, and political blessing, and has done more, and will yet do more, under Providence, to enlighten, civilize, and Christianize the world, than any human institution beneath the sun. No, not that I would not as soon purchase a slave from the King of Dahomey as from a Virginia planter; but I would deplore it on account of the effect it would have upon the South itself.

If the African slave-trade be reopened, northern cupidity will land them by the thousand upon our southern coasts; soon the South will be overrun with wild savages; our present docile, contented, happy, and christian slaves, will either lapse into barbarism or be forced to flee their homes, to which they are now so much attached. Of course it is visionary to suppose that this trade will be opened by any act of Congress repealing the laws interdicting it; but the duty which the South has to perform, if she would maintain her high position in the eye of the world and in her own estimation, is to promptly frown down all efforts that are being made, in contravention of law, to that end. Viewed politically, the South can never hope to regain her lost equilibrium in the councils of the nation—the sceptre of power has departed forever. Why, then, make an impracticable demand, as some few of our southern citizens are doing? Sir, the South plants herself proudly and fairly upon her constitutional rights; and if she falls, she will fall in defence of right, of truth, and her own spotless honor, and not by the error of her own aggressions. The Democratic party controls the politics of the southern States, and it will set its face against all violations of law, let them come from any of our people, North or South. Respect for law is the first duty of a free people; disrobe it of its sanctity, anarchy prevails, and liberty itself is endangered.