

E 433

.C182

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005023580

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEWIS D. CAMPBELL, OF OHIO,

IN

REPLY TO MR. STEPHENS, OF GEORGIA,

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 28, 1855.

WASHINGTON:
PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.
1855.

FREE LABOR AGAINST SLAVE LABOR.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union—

Mr. CAMPBELL said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now past ten o'clock in the evening of one of the expiring days of the Thirty-Third Congress. I rejoice, as the country rejoices, that we so nearly approach the hour of its dissolution. The history of this Congress, I fear, sir, will prove to the future that we have done more of evil than of good. I look back in vain upon the pages of its Journals for proof that we have done much that is either calculated to promote the great interests of our own nation, or the cause of humanity at large. It is not my purpose now to review our acts in detail. It is enough to say that when this Congress and the present Administration came into power under a pledge to economy, it found our National Treasury full to overflowing. If measures enough have not already passed to drain it, means will be provided before next Sabbath morning, not only to draw from the sub-Treasury vaults the last dollar of the people, but such, sir, I predict, as will compel the Executive to call upon the incoming reform Congress to issue Treasury notes to enable it to raise the means necessary to carry on the Government.

Again, sir, when we were first convened, that sectional strife which had so often disturbed the national harmony and endangered the perpetuity of the Union had happily subsided, and the whole country rested upon the assurance that it had secured its long-desired repose. Sir, I cannot, without deep emotion, again call attention to the condition of public sentiment produced by that reckless act of this party, which, regardless of plighted faith, and defiant of popular will, repealed the Missouri compromise. We came here full of hopes of future harmony—we separate with hearts full of fear that the storm which the uncalled-for Nebraska act has occasioned will not be allayed without serious results to the great interests of our common country. If it brings woe to our people, let this Administration and its party be held responsible, because in every branch of the Government they have held unlimited power.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to reply to the last speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] upon the repeal of the Missouri compromise. There are some remarkable incidents connected with the controversy between us which call upon me to do so. That controversy originated in the consideration of the bill proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MACE] to exclude slavery from Kansas and Nebraska. When I entered this Hall on the 14th day of December, the gentleman from Georgia had the floor, and was discussing its merits. I had no expectation of embarking in the discussion until, when near the close of his speech, he undertook to prove, in substance, that the labor of a slave in Georgia was more successful than the labor of a freeman in Ohio. Sir, this proposition, in such a crisis as this, involved a principle worthy the consideration of any statesman in any civilized land upon the face of the earth.

But there were other considerations which prompted me to meet the gentleman in controverting so startling an assumption. I had left behind me in my native Buckeye-land, where the foot of slavery never made its imprint, brothers, kindred, true and trusty friends, laboring freemen in every branch of industry. I should have been recreant to my duty here, false to every impulse of my nature, and treacherous to the great cause of human freedom, to have permitted the gentleman's comparison and statistics to remain unanswered. I obtained the floor after he had spoken his hour without any interruption from me, and proceeded to reply. I yielded to him in my hour, thirty-three times, as appears by the record revised by himself, and I afterwards submitted the reporter's notes to him for revision, and such additions as he chose to make explanatory of his views. Under this state of facts, I had reason to believe the controversy was closed. But a month afterwards, the gentleman again took the floor and delivered a premeditated and elaborately prepared assault upon my reply, charging among other matters, that I had sized his argument to my capacity to reply to it! Sir, it is a matter of indifference to me as

to how *high* an estimate the gentleman may place upon his "argument," or how *low* he may scale my "capacity" to meet him; this House and the country will give to each of us our just level. When I arose to correct one of his statements, with haughty mien, he replied to me that my interruption had no pertinence, and then, again, he said "Be brief, sir, I have no time to spare." May I not, under such circumstances, suggest that the gentleman discovered that he could not "size" his courtesy in debate by the extent of the task he sought to perform, in assuming that slave labor was superior to free labor!

Again, sir, the honorable gentleman would seem to demand for his statistics and arguments great force, for he told us he was "never wrong." I cannot set up for myself such infallibility! I am often wrong; but in this contest I feel a consciousness that the right is with me, and until I am satisfied of my error, neither contemptuous contortions of countenance, violent gesticulations, nor high-toned announcement can move me one hair's breadth from my position.

Again, sir, the honorable gentleman seems to assume for himself a very elevated position, and to assign to me a very humble one. In alluding to our controversy of December 14th, he compares me to the "wild boy of the forest, with bow and arrow, attempting to shoot into the moon!" Without questioning the gentleman's good taste, I submit to the stigma of the "wild boy of the forest." There is quite as much truth as poetry in it, for bears were very plenty

"Around the hut where I was born,"

and, in boyhood, it was occasionally my lot to traverse the forest paths in night's dark hours, when the wolf howled behind me. And, Mr. Chairman, I shall not controvert the claim which the gentleman's figure sets up—that he is the veritable man in the moon! I stood at my desk when the gentleman delivered his speech, as I am here now,

"With bended bow, and quiver full of arrows,"

ready to "shoot at folly as it flies," whether to the green cheese of the moon, or to the sweet potatoes of Georgia!

The honorable gentleman is adroit in his effort to escape the consequences of the issues he had the temerity to present to this House. I shall bring him back to them in due time, after disposing of the outside matters he has introduced. I quoted him as saying "*the South asks nothing*," and he charges me, therefore, with "putting words in his mouth which he did not utter!" It is due that I should give the gentleman the benefit of his language as published in his first speech as revised by himself. He said:

"But when did we ever come up and ask any aid from the Government of the United States? The constant prayer of the South to you has been to stay your hands. *All that we ask of you is, keep your hands out of our pockets. That is all that the South asks, and we do not get even that.*"

Now, sir, may I not ask whether the gentleman's complaint, about "putting words in his mouth," has not for its foundation a mere quibble? The substance of his charge is, that the free States have been *robbing* the South. In what manner has this alleged plunder been perpetrated through the General Government? Let us briefly examine.

Have we robbed you through our tariff laws? In 1816, Mr. Calhoun was the advocate of a protective tariff. The free States never demanded protec-

tion until, under the system proposed by the South, they had been induced to invest, in permanent manufactories, buildings, and machinery, their capital. Then they claimed that, in good faith, the system should be continued. In 1824-'28 the system was advocated by southern statesmen, such as Jackson, Benton, Eaton, Richard M. Johnson, and others. Besides, sir, every branch of southern industry has been as fully protected by all our tariff laws as those of the free States. There is no injustice in this branch of Federal legislation. If there is, I challenge the gentleman to show it.

Have we robbed you through our improvement laws? I assert, without the fear of contradiction from any source, that in all the bills that have ever passed Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors, the slave States have received a much greater amount from the National Treasury, according to their Federal representation, than the free States. Such was the case last session. It is so now. In the future, you will not complain if, in this branch of legislation, we say, "*keep your hands out of our pockets!*"

Have we robbed you in expenditures for acquiring additional territory? On a former occasion I asserted that the free States had never asked for the acquisition of new territories, and attributed to southern demands all the acquisitions since the organization of the Government, to wit: Louisiana, Florida, Texas, California, Utah, and New Mexico, and the Mesilla valley. These annexations, the result of southern influence, including the war with Mexico, (the fruit of annexation,) cost the Federal Government *more than two hundred millions of dollars*, and furnished a legitimate item in reply to the charge of robbery.

The gentleman goes into an elaborate calculation to prove that a portion of this territory is in northern latitudes. The truth of this proposition does not affect my point. The acquisitions are all the result of southern demands upon the Federal Government, the purpose being to strengthen the *political power of slavery*, which has always been successful. The repeal of the Missouri compromise, and the admission of slavery into Kansas and Nebraska, consummate this policy of the slave States; because our national history shows that no free State has ever yet been formed from territory from which slavery had not been positively excluded by law.

Have we robbed you through the postal arrangements of the General Government? Look, sir, into the last page of the President's message and accompanying documents upon our desks. We have here the figures of an annual robbery. The figures stand thus:

Slave States, cost of mail transportation.....	\$2,087,225
Slave States, postages, &c., paid.....	1,487,984
Deficit	\$599,241
Free States, postages, &c., paid.....	\$4,393,950
Free States, cost of mail transportation, &c.....	2,381,877
Overpaid.....	\$2,011,179

The free States pay more than \$2,000,000 above the cost of their mails, whilst your slave States (Georgia being a leading defaulter) are annually nearly \$600,000 behind. Our people are taxed for the letters you receive, and the day is not far

off when they will say to you, through the solemn forms of law, "keep your hands out of our pockets!"

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's last speech discloses a purpose to evade the issues of our first controversy. I am, therefore, induced to follow him briefly in his filibustering wanderings to Cuba. He wants to annex that rich Island. Inasmuch as Spain will not sell it, he seems to propose that our people should become land pirates, and take it through the process of throat cutting. In reference to our objections to his ideas of acquisition, he says: "I see none but an obstinate, fixed, and blind dogmatical nonsense!" And in another part of his speech he says:

"My record may stand as it is made up. I have no desire to change or modify it in the least; not even to cross a t or dot an i. *By it, as it stands, I am willing to abide while living, and by it to abide when dead.* It was not made for a day, or for an election, but for all time to come."

Mr. Chairman, the honorable gentleman has called attention to his record, with all the solemn forms of a "last will and testament!" I had occasion, on the 14th of December, to look into his record, and will now take up other parts of it, with a view to ascertain whether he had not as well add a codicil, by way of explanation. He seems to regard my argument as deficient in power compared to his own. I choose, therefore, to reply to his late demonstration in favor of taking Cuba whilst Spain refuses to sell it, by the forcible remarks which his record shows he made in this Hall on a former and similar occasion. I read from the Congressional Globe, volume 19, page 163. During our war with Mexico, an obstacle to a treaty of peace was presented in the refusal of Mexico to dispose of her territory. On the 2d of February, 1848, the honorable gentleman gave utterance to the following noble sentiments. He seems now to repudiate them. I have a right to appropriate them to my present purpose, and to adopt them as my own. By doing so, I have assurance that I quote authority that will command from the honorable gentleman more attention than the offspring of my own intellect.

"The *sine qua non* for peace in the instructions to Mr. Trist, was to take New Mexico and California, and pay \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. No man can be mistaken. The reason that peace was not made, was because Mexico was unwilling to sell a portion of her country; and the avowed object in now continuing it, is to compel and force her to make the surrender, or to take the whole of it.

"Sir, I take this earliest opportunity of saying that I shall never tax my constituents for any such object. If they wish to contribute their substance to sustain a policy so odious and detestable, so entirely at war with the most sacred principles upon which their own Government is founded, they must send some other person here to lay the taxes. I never shall do it.

"The President assumes, if I understand his position, that the honor and interest of this country require us to make this demand of Mexico. Sir, I wholly dissent from any such doctrine. *The honor of this country does not and cannot require us to force and compel the people of any other to sell theirs.* I have, I trust, as high a regard for the national honor as any man. It is the brightest gem in the chaplet of a nation's glory; and there is nothing of which I am prouder than the high character for honor which this country has acquired throughout the civilized world—that code of honor which was established by Washington and the men of the Revolution, and which rests upon truth, justice, and honesty, which is the offspring of virtue and integrity, and which is seen in the length and breadth of our land, in all the evidences of art, and civilization, and moral advancement, and everything that tends to elevate, dignify, and ennoble man.

"This is the honor of my admiration, and it is made of sterner, purer, nobler stuff than that aggressive and degrading, yea, odious principle now avowed, of waging

war against a neighboring people to compel them to sell their country. Who is here so base as to be willing, under any circumstances, to sell his country? For myself, I can only say, if the last funeral pile of liberty were lighted, I would mount it and expire in its flames before I would be coerced by any power, however great and strong, to sell or surrender the land of my home, the place of my nativity, and the graves of my sires! Sir, the principle is not only dishonorable, but infamous. As the Representative upon this floor of a high minded and honorable constituency, I repeat, that the principle of waging war against a neighboring people to compel them to sell their country, is not only dishonorable, but disgraceful and infamous. What! shall it be said that American honor aros at nothing higher than land, than the ground on which we tread? Do we look no higher in our aspirations for honor, than do the soulless brutes? Shall we disgrace the similitude of our Maker, and disgrace the very name of man? Tell it not to the world. Let not such an aspersion and reproach rest upon our name. I have heard of nations whose honor could be satisfied with gold, that glittering dust which is so precious in the eyes of some; but never did I expect to live to see the day when the Executive of this country should announce that our honor was such a loathsome, heastly thing, that it could not be satisfied with any achievements in arms, however brilliant and glorious, but must tread on earth, gross, vile dirt; and require even a prostrate foe to be robbed of mountain rocks and desert plains. I have no such notions of honor; and I have quite as little opinion of that policy which would spend fifty or a hundred millions of dollars in compelling the Mexicans to take fifteen or twenty millions for New Mexico and California, on the score of public interest."

Mr. Chairman, further back in the gentleman's "record," which is to "stand as it is made up," I find wholesome suggestions from him, pertinent to his present proposition to take Cuba. In vol. 16, page 950, of the Congressional Globe, his record shows that he said to the American people, from his desk in this Hall:

"We can only properly enlarge by voluntary accessions, and should only attempt to act upon our neighbors by setting them a good example."

Again, he repudiates filibustering for other nations' territories:

"Fields of blood and carnage may make men brave and heroic, but seldom tend to make nations either good, virtuous, or great."

Still further back in the pages of the gentleman's "record," by which he abides, "dead or alive," he spoke well on the proposition of annexing Texas. On the 25th January, 1845, (Congressional Globe, vol. 14, page 190,) he is reported as follows:

"Much as he regarded the luster of the 'lone star,' (and he would let it gleam on,) he admired the brilliant galaxy of the present Confederacy of our glorious old twenty six States, as they now existed, more. And rather than that star, shooting from its orbit and coming to ours, should produce contention, he should say let it gleam on alone, and remain where it was."

It will be remembered that during the pendency of the Mexican war the question was raised here, whether we should exact from Mexico any of her territory as a condition of peace. On the 22d of January, 1847, (Cong Globe, vol. 17, p. 240,) he offered in this House the following resolution:

"Be it therefore resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the present war with Mexico is not waged with a view to conquest, or the dismemberment of that Republic by the acquisition of any portion of her territory."

And prior to this resolve (June 16, 1846, Cong. Globe, vol. 15, p. 982) he denounced acquisitions of territory:

"As to the objects of the war, he inquired what it was the intention of the Administration to do? Was it to pursue the conquest of Mexico? Was it that our soldiers might revel in the halls of the Montezumas? Was it that we might acquire the Californias and all the mining districts?"

well as the capital of Mexico itself? If so, he was opposed to it. He declared himself, in advance, in favor of peace so soon as peace could be honorably obtained."

The gentleman's pertinacity against acquisitions of territory was most remarkable. His was the firmness of the "noblest Roman of them all." On the 12th of February, 1847, (Cong. Globe, vol. 17, p. 401,) he said, in reference to conquests and the war with Mexico:

"If there were any other object, it was for the direct and settled purpose of conquest; and that he believed to have been its main object. He declared himself opposed to the conquest and dismemberment of Mexico, either for the expenses of the war or for the satisfaction or indemnity of our citizens."

He wants Cuba now. He would have our Government violate or abrogate our solemn treaty with Spain, and turn out its reckless adventurers and speculators to aid the "oppressed Cubans!" Mr. Chairman, there never lived a greater tyrant than Santa Anna. Our war with his Government closed with the treaty by which we acquired the rich mines of California and the vast Territories of Utah and New Mexico. How ran the current of the gentleman's sympathies for the "oppressed" of tyranny then? What were his views of an extension of our domain? On the 19th of February, 1849, (Cong. Globe, vol. 20, p. 557,) the following resolution was submitted to this House by one of its members from my own State, [Mr. Schenck:]

"That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and instructed to enter forthwith into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Mexico for the surrender to said Republic of all the territories known as New Mexico and Upper California, or so much thereof as lies west of the Rio Grande, of any title thereto which was acquired by the United States under the fifth article of the treaty between the United States and Mexico, made and concluded at Guadalupe Hidalgo, on the 2d day of February, A. D. 1848," &c.

The vote stood as follows:

"YEAS—Messrs. Ashmun, Cranston, Crowl, Fisher, Giddings, Henry, Horace Mann, Palfrey, Schenck, Stephens, and Toombs—11."

But, sir, I must leave the gentleman voting with his "Abolition" friends, and pass from this branch of his "record." Necessity does not require further explorations. I said, on the 14th December, when I interrogated him on the constitutionality of the Wilmot proviso, that I had confidence in him as a constitutional lawyer. I repeat it now, in connection with the question of our power to annex territories. On the 25th January, 1845, (Cong. Globe, vol. 14, page 190,) Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, thus defines his position:

"He denied that the Constitution gives to Congress any power, either expressed or implied, to acquire foreign territory; or to the treaty making power the right to acquire territory for the purpose of extending the Union. He affirmed that the power given to Congress to admit new States was limited to the then territory of the Union."

Now, sir, I dismiss the points of the gentleman's last speech, and I leave the "record" which he has given us for all time and eternity, too. I cannot learn from it in what way we can annex Cuba, if he acquires it, either by purchase or by filibustering, without violating the Constitution both he and I have sworn to support. Glancing thus hastily over its pages to learn wisdom on the great points of our power to annex territories, and then to exclude slavery from them, one might very naturally say:

"Man's a strange animal, and makes use
Of his own nature, and the various arts,
And likes particularly to produce
Some new experiments to show his parts!"

He presented an argument, in favor of taking Cuba, to the people of Ohio, which it is proper I should notice in leaving the subject. He suggests that we are now required to pay heavy duties at Havana, under the laws of Spain, on Ohio produce, which would not be required if the island were annexed. I wish to say to the gentleman, that whatever may be the code of national or individual morals in Georgia, in Ohio we regard *American faith* as higher than the profits on flour, and *principle* dearer to us than the value of pork! The Ohio farmer will not consent to cut the throat, or shoot out the brains of a Spanish subject in Cuba, on the gentleman's promise that he shall make two shillings more of profit on his pig!

Mr. Chairman, I propose now to go back to the original issues which the gentleman presented in his first speech. They involved: 1, the *constitutionality*; 2, the *expediency* of excluding slavery from our national Territories by an act of Congress. I have no desire to discuss self-evident propositions, or those that are admitted by my adversary. Slavery is the antagonist of liberty. In the abstract, it is admitted to be a *wrong*, hence remarks on this point are needless. Upon the question of the power of Congress over Territories, under the Constitution, there has been ground for dispute; but on the 14th of December the gentleman certainly united in my repudiation of the doctrine that we should give to the people of a Territory unlimited sovereignty. He denounced what is termed "squatter sovereignty," thereby making an issue with those who aided him to pass the Nebraska bill, and not with me. On these points I pass him over to those who went for that bill on the ground that it secured to the people of the Territories the right of self-government, and the privilege of "regulating all their affairs in their own way."

I held that Congress had constitutional power to exclude slavery, and sought to fortify myself by the action of our great statesmen, as well as the opinion of the gentleman. To be sure, sir, he was rather *twisted* in the course of my cross-examination, and said that he had never expressed an opinion on this point, either here or before his constituents. I resorted, then, to that "record," and proved that he had exercised the power, and voted—in the Texas resolutions—to deprive the people of a Territory of the right to hold slaves, and to withhold from them the privilege of tolerating slavery under any State constitution they might adopt. My high estimate of the gentleman's integrity and ability forbade me from supposing that he had willfully violated the Constitution he had sworn to support; and I assumed that he agreed with me that Congress had power to legislate for the exclusion of slavery from Territories. He did not dispute the assumption. Sir, I shall hold him to the point I established. He is a distinguished leader among southern members. His admissions have not been denied on this floor by southern members. Two months have elapsed, and no southern newspaper that I have seen has denied their correctness. I have, therefore, the right now to assume—and shall assume—that the South, and especially members from the State of Georgia, unite with me, as the gentleman did, in acknowledging the constitutional right of Congress to exclude slavery from all the Territories of the Federal Government.

Mr. BAILEY, of Georgia. I have seen the liberality of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CAMPBELL] in extending, on being interrupted, the privilege to explain and to answer. He knows well enough that on the floor I have never sought to intrude on the time or attention of any one; but from reference having been made to Georgia, I ask him to allow me the privilege of speaking briefly on this subject.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have much to say and but little time. If the gentleman repudiates the positions of his colleague, he can say so in a word, and place himself right on the record.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to say that I not only repudiate that position of my colleague, [Mr. STEPHENS,] but a great many other positions of his.

[Mr. BAILEY proceeded to define his position at length, stating that he believed the people of Georgia also repudiated the positions of his colleague, [Mr. STEPHENS.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. On this branch of the subject I have no longer any controversy with the gentleman's colleague, [Mr. STEPHENS.] We seem to have come together on the great question which underlies the whole difficulty, *the constitutional power of Congress to exclude slavery from Territories*. He joins me, too, in denouncing the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty," as asserted by the friends of the Nebraska bill. If the gentleman [Mr. BAILEY] joins issue with us, I transfer his colleague [Mr. STEPHENS] to him. They may have their contest before the people of Georgia.

Mr. SEWARD, of Georgia. I ask the gentleman to allow me a moment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you indorse the positions of your colleague, [Mr. STEPHENS:]

Mr. SEWARD. No sir; I do not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then I turn him over to you also. Fight it out in Georgia. I carry on no controversy with your colleague further than we may disagree.

Mr. SEWARD here expressed his regret that his colleague [Mr. STEPHENS] had not defined his position more promptly, and proceeded to define his own position, closing with the remark that in a particular contingency in reference to the right of slavery in Territories, &c., he was willing to see this Government rent asunder.

Mr. CAMPBELL. All these threats of dissolving the Union since the repeal of the Missouri compromise have become, in the free States, "stale, flat, and unprofitable!" They do not frighten anybody. Much as our people may have loved the Union, they have pretty generally made up their minds for the future, if this Union is to be perpetuated, it shall not be for the purpose of extending slavery into free Territories. Southern gentlemen may stick a pin there!

I have no design to interfere in any contest these honorable gentlemen from Georgia may get up among themselves. They may "regulate their domestic institution in their own way," and I will look on with entire complacency. The honorable gentleman to whom I reply, [Mr. STEPHENS,] has substantially indorsed my positions as to the constitutional power of Congress to exclude slavery from Territories. I have proved by his "record" that we have no power to sustain his proposition to annex Cuba, as he now proposes, without viola-

ting the Constitution we have solemnly sworn to support.

Mr. WRIGHT, of Mississippi. If the gentleman denies the power of Congress to annex Cuba, I ask him to explain his resolution of last session for the annexation of the Canadas, &c.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman from Mississippi cannot involve me in an inconsistency. My record, here and at home, is straightforward for the promotion of freedom, without proposing to violate the Constitution, or the rights of the South. The resolution to which he alludes, submitted by me at the last session, simply authorized negotiations to be opened, to ascertain on what terms we might acquire the British Provinces in North America, in an honest and peaceful way. It merely presented the inquiry, "What do you ask for them?" without committing Congress to an agreement to pay the price that might be demanded, or to annexation. It was a resolution of inquiry merely. Besides, Mr. Chairman, I thought that, inasmuch as the slave States had so often found power under the Constitution to annex the Territories of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, California, Utah, New Mexico, and the Messilla valley—wading us through rivers of blood, and expending millions upon millions from the National Treasury to accomplish their purposes—and are even now willing to have a war with Spain for the acquisition of Cuba, to increase the slave power of the Union, we, of the free States, might venture to make an honest, quiet, and peaceful inquiry as to the terms upon which we might extend our area of freedom northward. Mr. Jefferson declared the acquisition of Louisiana to be an act beyond the powers of the Constitution. The gentleman from Georgia agreed with him, as I have shown. The acquisition of Louisiana was justified only on that principle known as the "higher law" of national necessity. Every acquisition since that finds no other authority than in the principles of that "higher law." My position is, that if the Constitution justifies acquisitions southward for slavery, it justifies them northward for freedom! If the slave States act upon a principle of "higher law" than the Constitution, the free States (being equal copartners in the firm known as "The Union") have a right to adopt it as the rule of their action. And, Mr. Chairman, I intend to assert that right. The Constitution was formed with an implied understanding that no additional territory was to be annexed, and no new slave States admitted into this Union. The spirit of the instrument has oftentimes been violated by the friends of slavery; their "strict construction" arguments are only advanced when they fear the onward march of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen apply the taunt of "Abolitionist" on this floor, and seek to effect their purposes by engendering prejudices. For my own part, I have to say that I have always hitherto been a Whig. Now, that the Whig party seems to have been numbered with the "things that were and are not," and the faithless Democracy has gone down below the point to which it is supposed the arm of resurrection can reach, I shall prefer to have my position known, now and hereafter, by the principles I may avow. I shall hold myself independent of every political organization which would interfere with the progress of justice, or put in jeopardy the great cause of American liberty

or national honor. On this troublesome question of slavery I fortify my position by the opinions of southern statesmen—of Georgia politicians—

Mr. BAILEY, of Georgia. Name them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Your patriots of 1776, of the day that tried men's souls—the first colonists of Georgia—those who fought for our liberties. And, recently, your colleague, [Mr. STEPHENS,] who seems to have played the part of the flying Parthian, throwing his arrow at his antagonist, then trusting to the fleetness of his horse for safety. But the gentleman has left his record behind him. On the 25th of January, 1845, he is thus reported:

"As a southern man and Georgian, he protested against the correspondence of the Secretary of State on this subject. The institution of slavery was a domestic one, and the Secretary of State sought to make it a national one. He objected to calling on this Government to strengthen the institution of slavery."

Your institution of slavery is local. We deny the right of the free States, or of the General Government, to abolish or interfere with it, in the States where it is tolerated, and we deny your right to authorize its extension or its support through the power of the Federal Government, either by direct or indirect means. The Constitution confers no power on this subject, except for the reclamation of your fugitive slaves, and I regard any law to carry out that power, which denies the right of jury trial, not only as unjust, but practically inefficient.

[At this point a running discussion took place between Mr. BAILEY, of Georgia, and Mr. CAMPBELL, in reference to trial by jury in the case of fugitive slaves.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. I come now, Mr. Chairman, to the consideration of the only point presented by the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. STEPHENS,] in his first speech, on which we appear to be at issue. That is, the expediency of extending slavery, the comparative merits of free and slave labor, and the relative prosperity of free and slave States. The responsibility of such a comparison does not rest upon me, and I remind the House that the gentleman invited the investigation in his first speech, and followed it up vigorously in his last. I pursue it in no sectional or unkind spirit, but solely with a view to present fairly such facts as should direct us in legislation for the establishment of institutions in our unsettled Territories.

It may be well, sir, to ascertain, before we provide for the increase of slave States or promote the interest of slave labor, the number of American citizens who have a substantial interest in slavery.

The census shows the number of whites in the slave States to be 6,222,418.

Number of slaveholders.....347,525
Number owning less than five slaves.....174,503

Number owning five and more slaves.....173,022

It is a fact worthy of attention, that whilst the whole country is constantly being disturbed by this institution, there are, of the 20,000,000, only 173,000 who own five slaves or more. In the slave States alone, the number of persons who do not own a single slave is 5,874,893; whilst the number of slaveholders is only 347,525. These figures prove either that a large majority of the people of the slave States are opposed to holding

slaves on a principle, or agree with me, that even there free labor would be more profitable. The correctness of this conclusion can only be questioned on the ground that the mass are too poor to own even one slave—an assertion which I am not disposed to make.

There are twenty millions of our people, therefore, interested in free labor, and only one third of a million who have property in slaves. Is it wise, is it just, that this interest of the few, which conflicts with the interests of the great mass, as well as the genius of our Government, should be promoted by national legislation? The gentleman assailed the statistical facts which I presented on a former occasion. I shall not now confine my tables to the census returns from Georgia and Ohio. With a purpose to test more fully the merits of free and slave labor, I have carefully compiled tables, drawing the line between the free and slave States. In presenting the results, I refer to the pages of the Compendium of the Census, from which my figures have been taken.

MANUFACTURE, MINING AND MECHANIC ARTS, (page 179.)

	Capital invested.	Raw material.	Hands employed.	Product.
Free States	\$430,240,051	\$465,844,092	950,573	\$842,285,058
Slave States	95,029,879	86,190,639	160,627	165,423,027
	\$335,210,172	\$379,653,453	789,946	\$676,862,031

The excess of profit in the free States, it will be seen, is nearly SEVEN HUNDRED MILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

In connection with our manufacturing establishments much is said about northern slavery. True, sir, we have made slaves of our rivers and our mountain cascades. The Connecticut, and the Merrimack, the Miamis, and all the tributaries of the Mississippi, the mountain streamlets, are made to work in supplying the wants of man. Even now Niagara's cataract, with more power than is contained in the bones and sinews of all the Africans on earth, is being enchained and reduced to servitude by northern energy, for the benefit of man.

Closely allied to the mechanical interest is the invention of labor-saving implements, &c. By reference to the list of patents granted, I find issued to the free States.....13,944
issued to the slave States.....2,396

NUMBER OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL, AND PER CENT. OF WHITE POPULATION, (Page 144.)

	Number of pupils.	Percentage.
Free States.....	3,017,954	22.02
Slave States.....	970,396	15.46

	Number of Schools.	Ratio for every one thousand whites.
Free States.....	62,433	4,683
Slave States.....	18,507	2,972

LIBRARIES, OTHER THAN PRIVATE, INCLUDING SCHOOL, COLLEGE, AND CHURCH, (page 159.)

	Number.	Volumes.
Free States.....	14,893	3,847,617
Slave States.....	713	654,194

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS, (page 156.)

	Number.	Annual circulation.
Free States.....	1,800	331,523,331
Slave States.....	704	81,038,033
Difference.....	1,096	250,485,298

RATIO OF ILLITERATE TO NATIVE WHITE POPULATION, (page 152.)			
Slave States.....	8.37 per cent.		
Free States.....	2.40 per cent.		
RATIO OF ILLITERATE AMONG FOREIGNERS, (page 152.)			
Free States.....	9.69 per cent.		
Slave States.....	6.37 per cent.		
COMPARATIVE RATIO OF ILLITERATE AMONG NATIVES AND FOREIGNERS, OVER TWENTY YEARS, (page 152.)			
	<i>Native.</i> <i>Foreign.</i>		
Slave States.....	17.23 per cent. 10.62 per cent.		
Free States.....	4.42 per cent. 15.15 per cent.		
PER CENT. RATIO OF WHITE ILLITERATE TO TOTAL WHITE POPULATION, (page 152.)			
<i>Slave States.</i>	<i>Free States.</i>	<i>Georgia.</i>	<i>Ohio.</i>
8.27	3.36	8.99	3.12

It is worthy of remark that the State from which the gentleman comes, who institutes these inquiries, is ahead of the average of slave States in "illiterate" persons, whilst Ohio, the State he selected for comparison, is below the average of the free States.

CRIME—PRISON STATISTICS.

The gentleman goes into the statistics of crime, and claims a successful comparison. The result of his statistics might be answered by the well known fact that offenses are more promptly and severely punished in the free States than in the South. But there are other facts worthy of presentation, connected with the statistics of crime, in the present state of public feeling, in regard to foreign emigration. The census tables prove remarkable facts. The tables of illiterate show that the foreign emigrants of the South are more intelligent than those of the North, and yet the percentage of crime among the foreigners in slave States is double that in the free States. The ratio of white persons imprisoned out of every ten thousand, in the free States, (page 166,) is:

Foreign-born.....	5,868
Native born.....	1,991

I have the official reports of the board of Governors of the alms-house of the city of New York, for the last year, which furnish important disclosures. I quote the following figures:

	<i>American.</i>	<i>Foreign.</i>
City prison, received 1853.....	6,303	22,229
Work house 1853.....	382	1,286
Penitentiary, Blackwell's Island, received from January 1, 1854, to December 9, 1854.....	833	2,720
Total.....	7,518	26,235

The inference the gentleman would seem to draw that crime is more frequent under a system of free labor than of slave labor, is simply preposterous, "blind dogmatic nonsense!" Much of the crime in the North is perpetrated by convicts sent to our shores from foreign countries. In proof of this, I submit the following extract from the New York Times of December 24:

"Yesterday morning a highly important arrest of twelve convicts, sent to the United States at the expense of the Belgian Government, was effected by Sergeant Bell of the Mayor's office, and officers Newman and Frende.

"During the past two years a large number of English felons have arrived here from Botany Bay, whom the authorities of the Old World liberated from confinement, and paid their passage to this port to get rid of them. In the course of the past summer, about fifty of these notorious

thieves were captured and returned." * * * "Their crimes ranged from petty larcenies to robberies on the highway."

The United States consul at Antwerp recently wrote to Collector Redfield, of the city of New York, as follows:

"It has been discussed in the Legislature of Belgium whether it would not be better to send to the United States all criminals at Government expense, rather than to maintain them at home."

I present these facts for the two-fold purpose of meeting the gentleman's criminal statistics, and of calling the attention of our people to the outrages which foreign Governments are perpetrating in turning loose their cut-throats upon our shores.

PAUPERS.

The census tables show the following results:

	<i>Native.</i>	<i>Foreign.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
Slave States.....	16,111	4,849	21,960
Free States.....	59,014	63,679	113,793

More than three fourths of the paupers in the slave States are native-born; in the free States nearly three fifths are foreign-born. The same general facts I have mentioned in reference to foreign criminals sent to northern cities apply to the pauper statistics.

During the year 1853, there were admitted into two institutions of New York city, (Bellevue hospital and the alms-house,) as stated in the report before me:

Foreigners.....	5,797
Americans.....	1,236

During the same time the city authorities furnished relief to the "out-door poor:"

Foreigners.....	30,341
Americans.....	5,950

In this connection I submit a statement of pauperism in 1850, in several of the free States:

	<i>Foreign.</i>	<i>Native.</i>
Massachusetts.....	9,247	6,530
New York.....	40,689	19,273
Pennsylvania.....	5,625	5,293
Rhode Island.....	1,415	1,115
Total.....	51,976	32,111

GEORGIA AND OHIO.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has again pressed upon us his comparison of Georgia and Ohio prosperity, and assails the tables I presented, showing the value of agricultural products of the two States on the basis of New York city prices. He protests against Ohio hay at sixteen dollars per ton, yet I have the Cincinnati prices current, published a few days after he delivered his last speech, showing that it was then selling in that city at seventeen dollars per ton. He is startled, and becomes nervous over the fact, that Ohio hay alone amounts to more than the cotton of Georgia. He complains, too, that I put down his Georgia sweet potatoes at fifty cents per bushel, and claims them to be worth two dollars in New York. His Georgia sweet potatoes are a perishable product, and during the short period they might form an article of commerce, and enter into the exports of Georgia, or into the general consumption of the State, they are not worth more in New York than the rate I affirmed in my former table.

But, sir, I have prepared another table, including every product returned by the census, taking the

prices current of New York of the 25th January, which I have preserved to fix the *value*, which the census does not furnish. To accommodate him I have rated his sweet potatoes at two dollars per bushel, although that figure presents the absurdity of giving Georgia nearly as much credit for her sweet potatoes as for her great staple of cotton. I leave Ohio hay at sixteen dollars, (less than the Cincinnati price, whence it is shipped to southern ports in large quantities.) Whatever sneers the gentleman may have for Ohio hay, and powerful as may be his eloquence in portraying Georgia's success in *corn-shucks*, it is nevertheless unquestionably true that the quantity of hay produced in Ohio, as returned by the census, estimated at Cincinnati prices, is six millions of dollars ahead of the cotton crop of Georgia estimated at New York city prices! If the census tables are erroneous as to the quantity of products, it is not my fault, for it was the gentleman who commenced this comparison and referred me to these tables. As to his offset of "corn blades," I have only to say, that common sense ought to prove to any mind that Ohio, with fifty millions of bushels of Indian corn, must produce nearly twice the quantity of "shucks," "blades," and "fodder," of Georgia, with her thirty millions of bushels. I have no time to spend on the insignificant question of Georgia corn blades. I presume the gentleman will next set up the superiority of Georgia thunder! I cannot forbear quoting, for the amusement of western farmers, the gentleman's description of the Georgia system of agriculture. He says:

"We grow an immense amount of grass in Georgia; but we do not save it! We put our labor in saving corn blades and shucks!"

This is Georgia progress! She permits the "immense quantities of grass" to go to waste, because she is too busy in gathering shucks! In Ohio, one laborer, with a patent mower, will cut down and save hay which will furnish as much sustenance to stock as one hundred slaves in Georgia could save in gathering shucks. But, sir, I have inquired into this Georgia grass business! A southern planter, on this floor, (whose name I promised not to give,) gave me an account of the manner in which "immense quantities of grass" are produced. He went home from Congress, and one of his head darkies escorted him out to the corn-fields. The grass was higher than the corn, and he charged the boy with having neglected the crop. Sambo readily replied, "Not much corn, massa; but mighty nice crop of grass!" Georgia, doubtless, produces the "immense quantities of grass" in like manner.

I submit, as an appendix, the table of agricultural products of the two States. I take the New York prices as the basis, for the reason that it is the head of the market of this country, and quite as accessible for the transportation of the surplus products of Ohio as those of Georgia. The gentleman may quote Smith and McCullough till doom's-day, and still fail of success in proving that the prosperity of any community ought to be measured by the amount of its products if consumed within its own limits. In comparing the success of two States, the only just rule is to take a common market whither the *surplus* products of the labor of *both* are exported and sold. The gentleman makes nothing by parading the figures which

I hastily gave him some years ago, which merely presented the *then* supposed rates of Ohio produce upon our farms. My table for both Georgia and Ohio products is predicated upon the current prices in the city of New York, as reported a few days after the gentleman's last speech, and I credit Georgia \$14,000,000 for sweet potatoes, not a bushel of which ever enter that market—a product which either rots upon her soil, or is eaten up by her negroes. Still, the agricultural products of Ohio, including live-stock, stand ahead of Georgia nearly one hundred millions of dollars!

LIVE-STOCK.

The gentleman says the comparison of live-stock is "still more favorable to Georgia." I propose to penetrate this point a little deeper than the gentleman has probed it. Live-stock, by the census tables, stands thus:

	Ohio.	Georgia.
Horses and mules.....	466,810	208,710
Cattle.....	1,318,947	1,997,528
Swine.....	1,964,770	2,168,617
Sheep.....	3,942,929	560,435
	<u>7,733,456</u>	<u>4,035,290</u>

Singular as it may appear, the census justifies the gentleman in boasting that his State has a greater number of hogs than Ohio! What sort of hogs are they, and what do you do with them? Thousands of fatted hogs and bullocks are taken weekly into the New York market from Ohio, but who ever heard of such an animal there from Georgia? If one were introduced there, Barnum would have him in his museum in less than twenty-four hours! I would like to know of the gentleman to what market out of the State Georgia sends her fat beeves and hogs? If she exports, why is it that Ohio pork is often sent to Georgia? I have before me a report of the trade and commerce of Cincinnati for the past year, made to the Chamber of Commerce, by which it is shown that the value of exports from that city alone of pork in barrels, and other products of the hog, amounted to upwards of \$9,000,000.

Again, sir, many of the identical horses and mules which make up the gentleman's "favorable table" are the product of Ohio, driven to and sold in Georgia. Will the gentleman claim that horses and mules are raised in Georgia and exported? If he does, I ask where are they sent?

The number of hogs in Ohio has fallen off since the census of 1840. The reason is easily explained. We have a greater number of sheep than Georgia has of horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and swine! The hog produces no wool! Our farmers have reduced their stock of swine and increased their herds of sheep. The annual product of wool is immense. It amounts to \$3,500,000—\$500,000 more than the entire product of Georgia in wool, and in woolen, cotton, and iron manufactures! I present this fact to demonstrate that the value of live-stock depends upon the product, and not upon the quantity in numbers. This rule will apply more forcibly to neat cattle. In numbers, Georgia appears to have nearly as many cattle as Ohio. The great question is, where are the profits? Take the articles of butter and cheese, products from the dairies. The value of Ohio's products in these two little items is.....\$8,971,333 Of Georgia's only..... 932,908

Showing that Georgia, with more than three fourths the number of cattle held in Ohio, produces less than one ninth part of the butter and cheese of that State. The product of Ohio, in butter and cheese alone, is four times as great as the entire product of Georgia in the manufactures of wool, cotton, and iron, which the gentleman has paraded. And, sir, it is greater than the entire product of Georgia in manufactures, mining, and mechanic arts, as exhibited in table page 179.

MANUFACTURES, ETC.

The gentleman complains of my former table under this head, and seemingly charges me with misrepresentation. By reference to the table, (page 179,) he would have observed, under the caption of "products of manufactures, mining, and the mechanic arts," the figures precisely as I gave them, and he would have observed, too, the per cent. profit of the two States in these important branches of industry. I stand by the table so objectionable to him, and reinsert it here, referring him to page 179:

MANUFACTURES, ETC.

	Capital invested.	Raw material.	Annual product.	Per cent. profit.
Ohio.....	\$29,019,538	\$34,677,937	\$62,647,259	49.97
Georgia.....	5,460,483	3,404,917	7,086,525	36.06
Ohio ahead..	\$23,559,055	\$31,273,020	\$55,560,734	13.91

It shows the net profit under free labor to be thirty-three per cent. greater than under slave labor. I wish him to mark that; and I challenge him to show a single erroneous figure. It embraces all establishments in both States in which there was an annual product of \$500. I submit to every fair mind, whether the gentleman has treated the table fairly, and whether he has not attempted to bolster up his sickly cause by charging misrepresentation upon my speech, at the same time he was sending forth, through his own, garbled or detached portions of the returns.

The gentleman has invited me, by his imputations, to an exposition of his conclusions, which, he says, are "never wrong." Now, sir, how has he attempted to prove that Georgia's labor in manufactures is more profitable than that of Ohio? Instead of taking the table on page 179, which includes every branch in both States, he turns over to page 180, and takes the isolated interests of manufactures of wool and cotton. He adopts his "sliding scale" again; sliding in those figures which make for him, and sliding out those which are against him. In cotton and wool, he finds Georgia profits ahead of Ohio; there he stops, and slides out everything else; at the same time, charging error to my figures, which included every branch, whether in favor of or against free labor. By a different combination of figures, under his sliding scale, he might have made his case much stronger. In regard to manufactures, he says:

"I have not looked into the manufacture of iron, to see how the result would stand, because Georgia has very little capital invested in that business, and Ohio has certainly not enough to make it a matter of great importance."

Now, sir, it is a remarkable fact that he "did not look into the manufacture of iron." By opening the Compendium of the Census, you will observe the cotton and wool tables, which he examined thoroughly, on the one side, and those of iron on the other—(pages 180, 181.)

I will give the footings of the table of iron manufactures:

	Establishments.	Capital invested.	Raw material.	Product.
Ohio.....	224	\$2,731,150	\$2,022,885	\$4,153,049
Georgia.....	10	70,200	41,936	115,884
Ohio ahead...	214	\$2,660,950	\$1,980,949	\$4,037,165
Deduct entire product of woolen and cotton manufactures of Georgia.....				2,227,794
Leaves.....				\$1,809,371

The product of iron manufactures in Ohio almost doubles the entire product of all the manufactures of wool, cotton, and iron in Georgia. It is not surprising, therefore, that it was inconvenient for the gentleman "to see how the result would stand!" How he regarded it proper to parade cotton and woolen manufactures as consequential, and then assert in this House, with the tables before his eye as to iron, that "Ohio has certainly not enough to make it a matter of great importance there," passes my comprehension. It may accord with the gentleman's ideas of statesmanship to consider a grave question in such a manner; but, using his own language, "I nail his tables to the counter as base coin!"

WHISKY.

Mr. Chairman, in my former tables I took no account of distilleries. This branch of manufactures is not everywhere regarded as creditable. I introduce the "institution" now because the gentleman has alluded to it, and wish to say that, although we make it extensively, there is not much of it drank in Ohio. We send heavy exports to Georgia. Large quantities, I am told, are sent to the Yankees, down East, who color it with log-wood, put it in bottles, labeled handsomely, call it "London Dock," "Old Otard," &c., &c., and find a ready market for it in Georgia and the South at two dollars per bottle. The gentleman could not procure data upon which to make his calculations. I submit a table, because the exports from distilleries and breweries in Ohio, form a very heavy item. I have estimated the grain consumed at the market prices in Ohio and in Georgia, and the ale and whisky at the prices in New York, as adopted in the table of agricultural products. The following is the result:

	Establishments.	Capital employed.	Raw material.	Product.
Ohio.....	58	1,262,974	3,386,542	5,521,500
Georgia.....	8	9,230	22,650	21,180
	50	1,253,744	3,363,892	\$5,497,420

The excess of Ohio's product, in this branch of manufactures, over Georgia, is more than double the entire product of Georgia in the manufactures of wool, cotton, and iron.

The annual product of Ohio, in butter, cheese, and whisky, is.....	11,468,752
Annual product of Georgia, in all branches of manufactures, mining, and mechanic arts, see page 179, is.....	7,086,525
Ohio, butter, cheese, and whisky, ahead.....	\$4,382,227

Mr. Chairman, I have not felt the necessity of

introducing this whisky argument, but it struck me as the proper material with which to "wash out" the gentleman's figures. Besides, sir, it is an "institution," a "peculiar institution!" We have the same right so to dignify it that the people of the South have to call slavery an institution! Whisky, like slavery, is *peculiar*, too. It would be difficult to determine which of these institutions has done most to produce human wo. I have read arguments delivered from the sacred desk to show that slavery is a divine institution! If I had time I might quote as strong proofs from holy writ to show that whisky, too, is a divine institution. It is written, Zachariah ix, 17:

"How great is His goodness, and how great is His beauty. Corn shall make the young men cheerful, and new wine the maids."

My crude opinion on the divinity of these two peculiar institutions is, that they are the inventions of man instigated by the devil!

Having presented a just comparison of the manufacturing interests of Georgia and Ohio, I will exhibit a single county in my State. Ohio contains eighty-seven counties:

The annual product of Hamilton county, Ohio, (page 295.) in *manufactures alone*, and having only two Representatives on this floor, is.....\$20,790,743
 Whole annual product in *manufactures, mining and mechanic arts*, in the slave States of Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, and Texas, (page 179,) having twenty five Representatives in this House, and twelve Senators..... 16,930,810

One county in Ohio ahead of six slave States.. \$3,859,933

Having *greased out* the gentleman's "never wrong" figures with the butte of Ohio, *washed out* the grease spot with our whisky, and beaten with a surplus of nearly *four millions*, the entire product, in *manufactures, mining and mechanic arts*, of six of his sovereign States with *slave labor*, by the product, in *manufactures, of a single county* in Ohio with *free labor*, I bid adieu to his tables on this point.

CHURCHES.

The table, page 138, shows:

Ohio has churches to every 100 square miles.....9.86
 Georgia has churches to every 100 square miles.....3.21
 Ohio ahead three to one.

Table on page 136-7, shows churches having accommodations for the following numbers:

Ohio.....1,457,769, ratio to population.....75.160
 Georgia.. 633,992, ratio to population, (part slave,) 69.100

The table, page 139, shows the average value of churches:

Ohio.....\$1,4-8 00
 Georgia..... 713 01
 \$775 00

Ohio ahead in church comforts more than two to one.

Mr. DeBow's note (same page) says, "the New England and Middle States, and the Territories and California, have nearly the same average value to their churches, which is nearly FOUR TIMES THAT OF OTHER SECTIONS."

One of the happiest days in man's life is that on which he leads to the altar and weds the object of his tenderest affections. Another of his happy days, naturally succeeding this, is that on which

he receives into his arms his first-born! I cannot say that the gentleman will appreciate this suggestion; but I present the following table from the census to show, that according to this test, the people of Ohio enjoy a higher degree of happiness than those of Georgia.

MARRIAGES AND BIRTHS IN 1850.

	Married.	Born.
Ohio.....	22,328	56,884
Georgia.....	4,977	15,239
Ohio ahead in marriages and babies!...	17,351	41,645

The father has days of deep anxiety—none more so than when he watches the developments of his infant to ascertain whether its organs are perfect. Can it see?

PROPORTION OF BLIND WHITE POPULATION—1850.

Ohio.....	1 to 3,163.
Georgia.....	1 to 2,328.

Georgia ahead in blindness!

Then again, even though the child be blind, the more deeply interesting inquiry follows: Has it sense? The returns in the census show the following:

PROPORTION OF IDIOT WHITE POPULATION—1850.

Ohio.....	1 to 1,455.
Georgia.....	1 to 1,013.

Georgia decidedly ahead in fools!

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to discuss the physical causes which produce these wonderful results. I leave it to others to inquire whether the difference in the character of the labor of the two sections has not an agency in producing these consequences.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that this whole question as to the superiority of slave labor, started by the gentleman, is really settled against him by a sensible consideration of the figures quoted by him in his first speech, from the census. I will present the table:

AREA OF THE STATES OF OHIO AND GEORGIA, ETC.

	Total acres.	Acres improved.	Value.	Acres unimproved.
Ohio...18,917,493	9,851,493	\$358,758,603	*8,146,000	
Georgia 23,821,379	6,378,479	95,753,445	16,442,900	
	5,803,886	3,473,014	\$263,005,158	*8,246,900

It appears that more than two thirds of the territory of Georgia, an old State, is *unimproved*—more than half of Ohio, a young State, is *improved*. Why is this? Georgia, more than a century settled, has only eight Representatives on this floor, with the advantage of a representation based on her property in slaves. Ohio, half a century settled, has, without a slavery representation, twenty-one members!

Ohio farms are valued at..... \$36 41 per acre.
 Georgia farms are valued at..... 15 01 per acre.

What occasions this vast difference? If Georgia agriculture, under slave labor, is as profitable as Ohio agriculture, under free labor, why does not capital seek investments in Georgia lands and elevate their value? If slavery produces a prosperity in Georgia excelling that of Ohio, why are your lands worth, in the market of the world, less than one half the value of those in Ohio?

The gentleman tells us, and attempts to prove, that the Georgia farmers, manufacturers, and

mechanics make a greater profit upon their investments than those of Ohio. If that be true, let him explain why it is that Ohio lands are worth one hundred and fifty per cent. more than those of his State. He may talk about the "wild boy of the forest shooting at the moon," but the country will look upon his tales as mere "moonshine," and as "spurious in their elements and composition," until he explains the cause of the difference in the value of the soil. Capital always runs in that channel which gives it most profit. The soil of Ohio produces, under free labor, to its farmers and artisans who own it, a greater profit, at thirty-six dollars per acre, than that of Georgia does at fifteen dollars. The value of the soil is a just criterion by which to compare the two systems. Free labor stands at *thirty-six*—slave labor at *fifteen*!

Mr. Chairman, this issue which the gentleman has now so boldly presented, with a view to keeping open the door for the admission of slavery into free Territories, is by no means a new one. The time was—aye, the good olden time—when the patriots of the South took a correct view of the proposition. I have only time to quote a few passages from the record. As early as 1774, the patriots of Virginia everywhere resolved *against slave labor*, giving the most forcible reasons for their opposition. In Culpeper county they assembled 7th July, 1774. Henry Pendleton was moderator. (American Archives, 1st vol., 4th series, p. 523.) They unanimously

"Resolved, That the importing slaves and convict servants is injurious to this Colony, as it obstructs the population of it with freemen and useful manufacturers; and that we will not buy any such slaves or convict servants hereafter to be imported."

The keen faculties and philanthropic spirit of these patriots enabled them to foresee, and guard against, those fatal causes which would reduce Georgia soil, with slavery upon it, to fifteen dollars per acre, whilst that of the then unbroken wilderness, inhabited only by savages and wild beasts, would be brought up to *thirty dollars*, if the foot of the slave should not be allowed to make its imprint there.

Again, to bring the matter nearer to the gentleman's home: General Oglethorpe was the first Governor of Georgia. He crossed the briny ocean to join the infant Colonies of America in laying deep and strong the foundations of American liberty. I quote his letter from the life of Granville Sharp, page 157:

CRANHAM HALL, October 13, 1776.

My friends and I settled the Colony of Georgia, and by charter were established trustees to make laws, &c. We determined not to suffer slavery there, (which is against the Gospel as well as the fundamental law of England,) to be authorized under our authority; we refused, as trustees, to make a law permitting such a horrid crime. The Government, finding the trustees resolved firmly not to concur with what they thought unjust, took away the charter, by which no law could be passed without our consent.

The cruel custom of a private man being supported in exercising more power over the man he affirms to have bought as a slave, than the magistrate has over him, the master, is a solecism in politics. Thus, I think, was taken from the Romans. The horrid cruelty which that proud nation showed in all they did, gave such power to masters of slaves that they confused even the State.

I am exceedingly glad that you have entered the list in opposition to these horrors. It is a proper time to bring these abominable abuses under consideration, and if those who have the power of legislation will be admonished, and

correct them, it may save them and us from justly merited destruction. Your most obedient, &c., &c.
J. OGLETHORPE.

Would it not now be well for Georgiana (who alone have the power over their institution of slavery) to take the advice of the old patriarch who established their Colony, and bring "these abominable abuses under consideration?"

Again, sir, (see American Archives,) the Provincial Congress of Georgia, on the 4th day of July, 1775, resolved unanimously:

"That we will neither import or purchase any slave imported from Africa or elsewhere after this day."

For the same reasons, the Provincial Congress of Georgia, held at Darien on the 12th January, 1775, resolved to manumit their slaves!

I commend to the gentleman from Georgia the study of the early history of his State, as well as the *example*—which the record shows—her pure patriots have left for him, for me, and the world.

A word or two, sir, in connection with this matter, as to Virginia. A meeting was held in your city, on the bank of the Potomac, (Alexandria,) in July, 1774, (see American Archives, p. 600.) The report shows that "George Washington, Esquire," presided. A resolution similar to that which I have quoted from Culpeper was passed unanimously.

But slavery was not driven from the Old Dominion. Now mark the result of the prediction of the men of '74, that it would "obstruct the population of it with freemen and useful manufacturers."

A few days ago a meeting was held in that same city of Alexandria, in full view of this Capitol. One of Virginia's most talented and gifted sons addressed the multitude. His days had been spent within her borders, and he stands high in the estimation of her people. Recently he had traversed the State, as a candidate for their highest honors. He was fresh from her mountain scenes, her plains, her fields, her cities, her harbors, and her great rivers. Henry A. Wise uttered, at Alexandria, in the hearing of many Senators and Representatives, the following beautiful but sad description of Virginia:

"You have the line of the Alleghany, that beautiful blue ridge which stands placed there by the Almighty not to obstruct the way of the people to market, but placed there in the very bounty of Providence to milk the clouds, to make the sweet springs which are sources of your rivers. [Great applause.] And at the head of every stream is the waterfall murmuring the very music of your power. [Applause.] And yet commerce has long ago spread her sails and sailed away from you; you have not, as yet, dug more than coal enough to warm yourselves at your own hearths; you have set no toll hammer of Vulture to strike blows worthy of gold in the iron foundries. You have not yet spun more than coarse cotton enough, in the way of manufacture, to clothe your own slaves. You have had, no commerce, no mining, no manufactures. You have relied alone on the single power of agriculture; and such agriculture! [Great laughter.] Your sedge patches outshine the sun. Your attention to your only source of wealth has scared the very bosom of mother earth. [Laughter.] Instead of having to feed cattle on a thousand hills, you have to chase the stumptailed steer through the sedge patches to procure a tough beefsteak. [Laughter.]

I have heard from a Virginian, Mr. Chairman, the rich story of the manner in which the "stump-tailed steer" was pursued, and finally captured by those in quest of a "tough beefsteak." The "big niggers and the little niggers, the big dogs and the little dogs, (from Towser down to Pen,) were all summoned to the chase." The steer fled over hill and vale, and finally took refuge in a sedge-patch.

As a dernier resort, they set fire to the sedge-patch and captured him. I am officially informed that after he was butchered, his net weight was precisely *forty-eight pounds!* And, sir, I am honored with a promise of a "hind-quarter" of the next steer of that sort that is taken.

The distinguished Virginia orator proceeds thus in portraying *Virginia progress and prosperity:*

"And yet, while your trust has been in the hands of the old negroes of the plantation—while the master knows as little as his slave about the science, the applied science of agriculture, white commerce, and manufactures, and mining have been hardly known, and agriculture has been neglected—notwithstanding all that, and notwithstanding the effect of this has been that you have parted with as much population as you have regained; notwithstanding all this, I say, old Virginia still has a million and a half of population left within her limits. She still has her iron, her coal, her gypsum, her salt, her copper. She still has her harbors and rivers, and her water power, and every source of wealth which thinking men, active men, enterprising men, need apply to." * * * "Her head is in the dust. With all this plenitude of power, she has been dwarfed in the Union; but by her gods! I say that she has the power now, the energy, the resources—may I say the men? to be put upon the line of progress to the eminence of prosperity—to pass New York yet, faster in the Union than ever New York has passed her. [Cheers.] You have been called the "Old Dominion." Let us, as Virginians, I implore you, this night resolve that a new era shall dawn, and that henceforth she shall be called the New Dominion. [Cheering.]"

May God grant it, Mr. Chairman! Let Virginia wake up from her lethargy, shake off the chains which weigh down her energies, and join in that onward march of progress which will bring prosperity to her, glory and renown to our common country, and blessings to the whole human family.

Again, he is reported as having said at another place:

"You all own plenty of land, but it is poverty added to poverty. Poor land added to poor land, and nothing added to nothing gives nothing. [Renewed laughter.] While the owner is talking politics at Richmond, or in Congress, or spending the summer at the White Springs, the lands grow poorer and poorer, and this soon brings land, negroes and all, under the hammer. You have the owners skinning the negroes, and the negroes skinning the land, until all grow poor."

I will not be regarded, I trust, as indorsing the truth of this over-wrought picture of desolation. I do not know that it is just—in fact, I do not believe it is just. I certainly should not have ventured anywhere to have uttered it; but I use it as a reply from a southern statesman, to the claim of the gentleman from Georgia for the superiority of slave labor and the blessings of slavery. It comes from the Democratic candidate for the gubernatorial chair of Virginia, and must be regarded, in the South at least, as high authority. I make these quotations, from southern statesmen of the olden times and of the present, in justification of my own position in reference to slavery, and the effects of slave labor. I trust, hereafter, no southern man, will charge me with being a "Free-Soiler," dealing unjustly by the South.

Mr. Chairman, why was the Missouri compromise repealed? I repeat, that the responsibility must rest on the heads of those who are guilty of the act. No one will share more largely in that responsibility than the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. STEPHENS.] His voice and his influence on this floor passed that bill. He was the master-spirit in the great movement, and his intolerance towards the minority during the contest is known to the country. He need not lay the flattering

unction to his soul that in the late elections the question was not considered by the people. The "*vox populi*" has been sent forth from mountain top and valley; from palace and from log-cabin; and it will, ere long, be reverberated in this Hall, in tones not to be misunderstood either by the gentleman or the party in power, with whom he acts, in the language of the maxim: "*Cessa regnare si non vis judicare!*" "Cease to rule if you will not do justice."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to be amazed at my temerity, in entering the lists of debate with him. I have no apologies to make. He seems, too, to compare me to the "wild boy of the forest!" When I was, in truth, a "wild boy of the forest," I remember to have read a story of one who exhibited a disposition somewhat similar to that which the gentleman has displayed on this floor, in pressing the extension of slavery. I think he will find it regularly reported in the Book of Samuel! The Philistines were led on against the armies of Israel by one who seemed amazed that any warrior should have the temerity to meet him:

"The staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam, and his spear's head weighed six hundred shekels of iron: and one bearing a shield went before him.

"And he had a helmet of brass upon his head, and he was armed with a coat of mail, and the weight of the coat was five thousand shekels of brass."

In short, Mr. Chairman, the old Philistine had brass all over him.

"And he stood and cried to the armies of Israel:" * *

"Choose you a man for you, and let him come down to me.

"When Saul, and all Israel, heard these words of the Philistine, they were dismayed, and greatly afraid."

But, Mr. Chairman, the record goes on to state, that there came up a "wild boy from the forest," who had taken the lion by the beard, and smote and slew him, and delivered the lamb from his mouth. He came with simple sling and stone, and went to battle upon his confidence in the justice of his cause. The brass of the Philistine did not save him, because there was a soft place in his head!

"And David put his hand into his bag, and drew thence a stone, and slung it, and smote the Philistine in the forehead; and the stone sunk into his forehead, and he fell upon his face, to the earth!"

Thus, Mr. Chairman, fell Goliath of Gath!

I see the statement made in the papers, Mr. Chairman, that the manner of the gentleman from Georgia, in his discussion on this subject, bore a strong resemblance to that remarkable man, John Randolph, of Roanoke. This may be true. I am willing the compliment should be conferred upon him; but, sir, I have to say, that were the real "old Roanoke" to rise up from his grave, and with his cutting sarcasm, shrill voice, and bony finger, attempt to deter me from my humble defense of freedom, I would simply quote the fact, that when he was preparing his accounts for eternity, one of his last acts on earth was to give freedom to his slaves, and furnish them homes in Ohio!

Mr. Chairman, this controversy is closed, at least for the present. I leave it as I entered it—with no personal feeling of unkindness towards the gentleman from Georgia, or any other member on this floor. I am firmly, resolutely determined in the future, as I have been in the past, to oppose the extension of slavery; but I seek no conspicuous position in any struggle. A few more short days, and we separate—many of us to meet no

more on this side of Jordan. Before another Congress convenes, my mortal remains may sleep under the shade of my native buckeye, and I desire we should part in peace. If life is spared me, however, I shall return to these scenes of strife, in obedience to the decree of the people. I shall come to respect the feelings and opinions of others, yet determined to defend my own principles, and the rights of my constituents, under all circumstances, and at all hazards! And, sir, I believe there will be many others from the wild-wood of the free forests, each of whom will come here with his "five smooth stones gathered from the brook," ready to defend the right. Should I stand alone, believing that my position on this subject is founded upon the immutable principles of God's justice, I shall not be dismayed when the wild storm may rage in these Halls. Planting myself firmly upon the principles of liberty and truth and national honor, as proclaimed by the founders of the Republic, if the Philistines gather around in battle array, I will draw my feeble blade, and bid defiance in the language of the gallant Fitz James, when surrounded by the clan of Rodrick:

"Come one, come all—this rock shall fly
From its firm base, as soon as I!"

APPENDIX.

PRODUCTS OF AGRICULTURE.—(Quantities taken from Census Prices from the New York Prices Current, January 25, 1855.)

GEORGIA.

Value of live stock, (returned in dollars).....	\$25,728,416
Value of animals slaughtered, do.....	6,339,762
Wheat..... 1,088,534 bushels at \$2 35..	2,449,201
Rye..... 53,750 " at 1 35..	72,562
Oats..... 3,820,044 " at 60..	2,292,026
Indian corn.... 30,080,099 " at 1 00..	30,080,019
Potatoes, Irish.. 227,379 " at 2 00..	454,758
Potatoes, sweet, 6,986,428 " at 2 00..	13,972,856
Barley..... 11,501 " at 1 15..	13,226
Buckwheat.... 250 " at 1 50..	375
Hay..... 23,449 tons at 16 00..	375,184
Hops..... 261 pounds at 30..	78
Clover seed.... 132 bushels at 6 00..	792
Other grass seed 428 " at 4 00..	1,712
Butter..... 4,640,559 pounds at 20..	928,111
Cheese..... 46,976 " at 10..	4,697
Peas and beans, 1,142,011 bushels at 1 50..	1,713,016
Value of produce of market gardens, (as returned in dollars).....	76,500
Value of orchard products, do.....	92,776
Beeswax and honey..... 732,514 pounds at 25..	133,128
Home manufactures.....	1,838,968
Flaxseed..... 622 bushels at \$1 75..	1,088
Flax..... 5,387 pounds at 10..	538
Hemp, dew-rotted and water-rotted..... 10 tons at 175 00..	1,750

Sugar, maple.... 50 pounds at 6..	3
Sugar, cane.... 816,000 " at 6..	49,560
Molasses..... 216,215 gallons at 25..	54,054
Cotton, ginned. 199,636,400 pounds at 9..	17,966,376
Rice..... 38,950,691 " at 31..	1,167,529
Tobacco..... 423,924 " at 10..	42,392
Wool..... 990,019 " at 35..	346,506
Silk cocoons.... 813	
Wine..... 795 gallons at 1 00..	795
Family goods, value of, (returned in dollars).....	1,167,630
	\$107,467,393

OHIO.

Value of live-stock, (returned in dollars).....	\$41,121,741
Value of animals slaughtered, do.....	7,139,243
Wheat..... 11,487,351 bushels, at \$2 25..	32,596,351
Rye..... 425,918 " at 1 30..	574,099
Oats..... 13,472,742 " at 60..	8,083,645
Indian corn.... 58,078,695 " at 1 00..	58,078,695
Potatoes, Irish.. 5,057,769 " at 2 00..	10,115,538
Potatoes, sweet. 187,901 " at 2 00..	375,802
Barley..... 354,358 " at 1 15..	407,511
Buckwheat..... 638,960 " at 1 50..	957,990
Hay..... 1,413,142 tons, at 16 00 (Cincinnati price)	23,000,272
Hops..... 63,731 pounds, at 30..	19,119
Clover seed..... 103,197 bushels, at \$8 00..	825,576
Other grass seeds 37,310 " at 4 00..	149,210
Butter..... 31,448,579 pounds, at 20..	6,289,715
Cheese..... 20,819,542 " at 10..	2,081,954
Peas and beans. 60,168 bushels, at 1 50..	90,252
Value of produce of market gardens, (as returned in dollars).....	211,004
Value of orchard products, as returned in dollars).....	695,921
Beeswax and honey, 804,275 pounds, at 25..	201,068
Home manufactures, (value returned in dollars)	551,193
Flaxseed..... 188,880 bushels, at \$1 75..	330,410
Flax..... 446,932 pounds, at 10..	44,693
Hemp, dew-rotted and water-rotted..... 150 tons, at 175 00..	26,250
Sugar, maple.... 4,568,399 pounds, at 6..	275,299
Sugar-cane..... none.	
Molasses..... 197,308 gallons, at 25..	49,327
Cotton, ginned.. none.	
Rice..... none.	
Tobacco..... 10,454,449 pounds, at 10..	1,045,444
Wool..... 10,196,371 " at 35..	3,568,729
Silk cocoons.... 1,552	
Wine..... 48,207 gallons, at 1 00..	48,207
Family goods, value of, (returned in dollars).....	1,853,937
	\$201,800,398
Georgia products.....	107,667,393
Ohio ahead of Georgia.....	\$97,133,015







