

E 381
.S76

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005084829







71, 42.
D.C.L. - Dup.
SPEECH

OF

MR. SPRAGUE,

July
OF MAINE:

DELIVERED IN

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

FEBRUARY 3d, 1830,

IN THE DEBATE WHICH AROSE

UPON

MR. FOOT'S RESOLUTION

RELATIVE TO THE

PUBLIC LANDS.

WASHINGTON :

PRINTED BY PETER FORCE, CORNER OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE
AND ELEVENTH STREET.

.....

1830.

E381
576

In Exchange
Dartmouth College.

DEC 9 1916

SPEECH OF MR. SPRAGUE, OF MAINE.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

February, 3, 1830.

Mr. FOOT'S Resolution concerning the further survey and sale of the Public Lands being under consideration—

Mr. SPRAGUE said, it was with reluctance that he entered into this extraordinary debate. The gentleman who had just resumed his seat (Mr. BENTON) had most gratuitously given to it an unpleasant sectional character. Some portion of his remarks related merely to measures of a party, in opposition to the administration of Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison. Had he confined himself to those acts, I should not have felt myself constrained to participate in the discussion, because I was from the first politically opposed to them, and have never changed my sentiments. I mention this, that the position which I occupy may be distinctly understood. Animadversions upon party measures affect no particular geographical division of the country, but only the individuals who sustained them, wherever they may reside. But the gentleman has assailed all the Northern States, and particularly those of New England; accusing them of narrow views, and of systematic hostility, and injustice toward the West; while, on the other hand, he has lauded the South as her generous, liberal, and magnanimous friend. Such assertions, in order to gain any credence, must be supported by proof; of this, the gentleman, seems to have been aware, and has accordingly attempted to sustain them by a recurrence to historical facts. I shall endeavor concisely to remark upon such as appear to be of importance enough to deserve attention, and which have been stated with sufficient distinctness to render them susceptible of being followed.

He has gone back to the days of the Old Confederation, and the records of the Continental Congress, and dwelt upon certain proceedings, in 1786, relative to the defence of what was then the Western District of Virginia—now the State of Kentucky. A proposition was made to send two companies of federal troops to the Rapids of the Ohio. It is to be recollected that we had just then emerged from the war of the Revolution; that tremendous struggle in which we had strained every nerve to agony, and had sunk down to a state of exhaustion—destitute of money—without revenue, and without credit. To send two companies to the then distant wilderness on the Ohio, was a severer burden upon the public finances, than to send thousands now to the mouth of the Columbia. Upon this proposition, the votes of New England were equally divided. During its pendency, on the 21st of June, a motion was made by Mr. Lee, a delegate from Virginia, to add two companies more, making four in all, *for her defence*, which was supported by that State alone, all the delegates from the other States, excepting one from Georgia, answering in the negative.

It was upon his stating this vote, that the gentleman exclaimed, in tones of delight and exultation—MAGNANIMOUS VIRGINIA—Ay!

She is a great and magnanimous State. I would not detract aught from her merits. New England seeks not to prostrate the fabric of others' fame, in order to erect her own from its fragments; she is rich enough in her own splendid materials. But the gentleman has not been fortunate in selecting this vote, given *for her own exclusive benefit* against all the other States, as an illustration of her disinterestedness and liberality. To attribute in this instance so great merit to her, is an implication of demerit in all the others, which I leave to be repelled by their older and abler representatives around me.

On the 29th of June, eight days only after the almost unanimous refusal of Congress to send more than the two companies to the defence of Virginia, a committee consisting of two members from that State, and one from Massachusetts, made a report in favor of authorizing the Commander of those two companies, to march into the Indian country and make war. or treat for peace, as he should see fit; and, also to call, at his pleasure, upon the Governor of Virginia, for one thousand militia. This report being under debate, a motion was made to postpone it for the present, in order to take up another proposition, which, after reciting that there was not sufficient evidence of Indian depredations "to justify carrying war into their country," recommended the adoption, "*without delay,*" of "such measures as shall effectually secure peace to the Indians, and safety to the citizens inhabiting the frontiers of the United States." This motion, the Senator from Missouri pronounced "cold-blooded, cruel and inhuman—equalled only by the National Assembly of the French Revolution; which, when their fellow citizens were falling around them by the daggers of assassins, passed to the orders of the day." It was made by Mr Pettit of Pennsylvania, and there were more votes for it out of New England than from within it.

But if the gentleman's sensibilities were so much outraged by the idea of passing over that report in favor of war and bloodshed, even for a moment, in order to take up a substitute of peace and security, what will he say, how will he bear the shock, when he finds that a motion was made—not by a delegate from New England, nor even from the North of the Potomac; but from the South, from Georgia, to postpone the whole for six days; and that there were no less than fifteen voices in the affirmative, and two thirds of them from without the limits of New England! Nay, more, that this very report, which it was so monstrous and horrible to hesitate even for a moment in adopting, was upon the final question, absolutely rejected, and that too, not by a bare majority of the Congress, but by a vote of two to one—six States to three; and of the six, two only being from the North East! And of the individual delegates, seventeen voted in the affirmative, and nine only in the negative; Mr. Houston, of Georgia, being excused at his own request!

I have been accustomed, sir, from my earliest recollections, to cherish the memory of those who composed the Continental Congress with reverence and gratitude. I have supposed that the very existence of this great, prosperous and happy Republic, demonstrated the elevation of their intellectual and moral character, their wisdom, purity and beneficence;—that their monuments were every where but over their

graves. Is all this illusion? Is their epitaph still to be written? And shall we now inscribe upon their tomb—*here lie the members of the Continental Congress of 1786—those cold blooded, cruel, inhuman monsters, who are to be paralleled in all history only by the fiends of the French Revolution, who washed their hands in the blood of their brethren!!*

There are some exaggerations, too extravagant even for the figures of rhetoric or the fictions of poetry.

My own section of country might be well content to appear sombre and unlovely to that vision which can present the revered patriots of the Revolution in colors so dark, and with features so distorted.

The next topic of crimination against our forefathers, was a clause originally inserted in the ordinance for ascertaining the mode of disposing of lands in the western country, when it was reported by a Committee, in 1785, and which prohibited the sale, by the public officer, of a second township, *by sections*, until after all the first should have been disposed of. It arose from an evident solicitude for the security of the frontier settlers, and a desire to keep them in some measure compact, that they might be competent to their own protection, instead of scattering over immense forests beyond the reach of timely succour. This is well known to have been the policy of Washington. It is not a little singular that the gentleman should have made this a theme of reiterated and vehement condemnation, when he had just before complained so loudly of an alleged indifference to the safety of the new settlements. He insists that a majority of the committee lived north of the Potomac, and that their object was to stint the growth of the West. He did not tell us who composed it. [Mr. BENTON explained by reading the names of a committee consisting of one from each State, A. D. 1785.] Mr. S. proceeded. The committee, which the gentleman had just named was not that which originally reported the ordinance, but one to whom it was subsequently referred, and who do not appear to have made any amendments or alterations. It was, I believe, first reported in May, 1784, by a committee consisting of Mr. Jefferson, of Virginia, Williamson, of North Carolina, Reed, of South Carolina, Howell, of Rhode Island, and Gerry, of Massachusetts; and its paternity is thus transferred to the south side of the Potomac. It was not finally acted upon during that session; and at the commencement of the next session, in November, 1785, all the unfinished business of the preceding was taken up, and this appears to have been subsequently referred to the large committee which the gentleman has mentioned. But the justice and charity with which sinister motives are attributed to the North, is further illustrated by the fact, that upon the motion of Mr. McHenry to strike out this obnoxious clause, every member, with the single exception of Mr. Howell, of Rhode Island, answered in the affirmative; and yet it is insisted that the North, who had the whole perfectly in their power, were wickedly intent upon it as a means to cramp the growth of the West; and were defeated only by those of a more magnanimous region.

By the same ordinance, one third part of all the mines of gold, silver, copper and lead, were in all sales to be reserved to the Government. Upon a motion to strike out this reservation, and thus leave the whole to the purchasers, Massachusetts was divided, Rhode Island divided, and all the other States and all the other delegates, excepting Mr. Mon-

roe answered in the negative. This instance of comparative liberality seems to have wholly escaped the gentleman's observation.

Strange as it may seem, it has in this Debate, been made matter of loud and bitter complaint, that the United States have sold the Public Lands for money—have coined the soil into gold and silver, as it was expressed. The right and the obligation of the Government to do this, have been so unanswerably established by the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Webster,) that I shall not discuss it. It would be useless, indeed, for me to follow where is seen the giant's track. I shall endeavour, throughout, to avoid the ground which he has occupied. I will only now add, that however illiberal some persons may now consider the selling, instead of giving away this common property of the nation, it is not a mere Yankee notion, nor even confined to the wrong side Mason's and Dixon's line ; but has, from the first been insisted upon by of the statesmen of the more congenial South. In February, 1786, a committee of Congress, consisting of Messrs. Pinckney, of South Carolina, McKean, of South Carolina, Monroe, of Virginia, King, of Massachusetts, and Pettit, of Pennsylvania, held the following language : We “ contemplate with great satisfaction the prospect of extinguishing a part of the “ domestic debt, by the sales of the Western lands, but a considerable time “ must elapse,” &c. And in the Virginia Convention in 1788, Mr. Harrison said, “the *back lands* and imposts will be sufficient for all the exigencies of Government.” Mr. Grayson spoke of the “ domestic debt being “ diminished by the sale of Western lands;” and Mr. Madison, speaking of the Mississippi, said, “ a material consideration was, that the cession of “ that river would diminish the value of the Western country, which “ was a *common fund for the United States*, and would consequently tend “ to impoverish *their public treasury*. *These, Sir, were rational grounds.*” And in 1786, the Virginia delegation in Congress, with reference to the same subject, say—“The States who have ceded it, and the Confederacy at large, look up to the *western lands as a substantial fund* for “ for the discharge of the public debt.”

The navigation of the Mississippi occupied a large space in the gentleman's contrast of sectional liberality and illiberality. It is indeed, a subject of importance, and vastly more worthy of attention than most of those upon which he has expatiated.

The specification of charge is, that in the year 1786, Mr. Jay, then Secretary of Foreign Affairs, proposed the making of a treaty with Gardoqui, the Spanish Minister, by which the navigation of that river should be relinquished to Spain for twenty-five or thirty years, in consideration of certain commercial stipulations for mutual interchange of commodities, by which all the productions of this country, with the exception of tobacco, were to be received into the Spanish dominions. This proposition was supported by the States of the North ; and the gentleman charitably supposes, from a desire to deprive their fellow citizens of the West of that great highway, so essential to their prosperity.

It is to be recollected that Spain, being then in possession of Louisiana and the Floridas, most positively and peremptorily denied that we had any right to participate in the use of that river. Prostrated as our strength and finances then were, the country was not in a condition to enforce our claim by arms. Thus situated, it was apparent that we

could have no immediate enjoyment of the waters of the Mississippi, and it was believed that the best mode of securing the future permanent possession of them, was to lease it for a while to the Spanish government for a valuable consideration : and that by assenting to such an arrangement, and holding it by our permission, Spain would unequivocally acknowledge our right, which would revert to us, accompanied by the possession, at the expiration of the stipulated term. And it was thought, moreover, that it would be dishonorable to the country to suffer a foreign nation to withhold it from us in a hostile attitude. It was also apprehended that Great Britain would unite with Spain in resisting our claim, and excluding us forever from the enjoyment of our right.

These facts rest upon no doubtful authority ; they are supported by the disinterested testimony of high-minded and honorable men, actors in the scenes which they describe, and who, in 1788, were willing to do that justice to their associates which is now attempted to be withdrawn.

General Lee, in the Virginia Convention, made the following statement :

“ I feel myself called on by the honorable gentleman, to come forward and tell the truth about the transaction respecting the Mississippi.” “ There are men of integrity and truth here, who were also then in Congress. I call on them to put me right, with respect to those transactions. As far as I could gather from what was then passing, I believe *there was not a gentleman in that Congress who had an idea of surrendering the navigation of that river.* They thought of the *best mode of securing it.* Some thought one way, and some another way. I was one of those men who thought the mode which has been alluded to, the best to secure it. I shall never deny that it was my opinion. I was one peculiarly interested. I had a fortune in that country, purchased, not by paper money, but by gold, to the amount of 8,000 pounds. But private interest could not have influenced me. The public welfare was my criterion. In my opinion I united private interest to public interest—not of the whole people of Virginia, but of the United States. I thought I was promoting the real interests of the people.”

Mr. Madison said—

“ There were seven States who thought it right to give up the navigation of the Mississippi for twenty-five years, for several reasons, which have been mentioned.—As far as I can recollect, *it was nearly as my honorable friend said; but they had no idea of absolutely alienating it.* I think one material consideration which governed them, was, that there were grounds of serious negotiation between Great Britain and Spain, which might bring on a coalition between those nations, which might enable them to bind us on different sides, permanently withhold that navigation from us, and injure us in other respects materially. The temporary cession, it was supposed, would fix the permanent right in our favor, and prevent that dangerous coalition.”

For these transactions, as affecting the interests of the region beyond the Alleghanies, the gentleman has cast unmeasured opprobrium upon the North, and bestowed a corresponding eulogium upon the South, particularly Virginia. With what justice or candor may be seen, not only from what has just been stated, but from the facts which I shall hereafter adduce, and to which he has made no allusion.

That a majority of the delegates from Virginia were opposed to the contemplated treaty, is unquestionably true ; but, is there not reason to believe that this was occasioned, in some degree at least, by the circumstance that her great staple, tobacco, was not provided for ; especially when we find that one of her most eminent citizens (Mr. MONROE) disapproved of it, merely for its commercial regulations.

But the delegation from that State, in the same year, 1786, themselves proposed to enter into *permanent stipulations* with Spain, by which we should *relinquish forever, all right of transporting any articles up the Mississippi, from its mouth*; and *New Orleans* should be made an entrepot, at which our produce, carried down the river, *should be landed, and pay duties to the Spanish Crown*; and a Consul of the United States there should be responsible for every violation of these engagements! Now, Sir, compare these renunciations and sacrifices, to *endure through all time*, with the mere temporary relinquishment, for twenty-five or thirty years, and let the candid and intelligent declare which would have been most wise, and have best secured the true and permanent interests and safety of the Western country.

But the comparison ends not here. There was a time when the *Southern States, and Virginia with the rest, were disposed to make an absolute and perfect surrender of all right to the waters of the Mississippi, but the Northern and Eastern States opposed it*. It was at the period of their greatest distress, and for the purpose of obtaining succour from Spain. For this, we have the high authority of Mr. Madison himself, who says—

“It was soon perceived, after the commencement of the war with Britain, that among the various objects that would affect the happiness of the people of America, the navigation of the Mississippi was one. Throughout the whole history of foreign negotiation, great stress was laid on its preservation. In the time of our greatest distresses, and particularly when the Southern States were the scene of war, the Southern States cast their eyes around to be relieved from their misfortunes. It was supposed that assistance might be obtained for *the relinquishment of that navigation*. It was thought that for so substantial a consideration, Spain might be induced to afford decisive succour. *It was opposed by the Northern and Eastern States. They were sensible that it might be dangerous to surrender this important right, particularly to the inhabitants of the Western country. But so it was, that the Southern States were for it, and the Eastern States opposed it.*”

And Mr. Monroe, after speaking of the constant efforts of Virginia to preserve this navigation, says—

“There was a time, it is true, when even this State in some measure abandoned the object by authorizing this cession to the Court of Spain.”

It is not my purpose to censure those who advocated that surrender. They felt themselves constrained by the necessities of the war. But the Northern States, more unyielding in their purpose, never despaired of the Republic; they sent their own sons to fight the battles of their distant brethren, and freely furnished, from within themselves, that succour which others were willing to purchase from foreign hands, at so great a price—and now they are, even here, rewarded with contumely and reproach!

Such is the effect of partial or distorted views of distant events; of resting upon insulated parts of remote transactions; of seizing and following the mere shreds of history, which lead to error and injustice, instead of light and truth.

By the terms of the treaty proposed by Mr. Jay, and which have been so much reprobated, Spain was to receive *all* the productions of the United States, with the exception of a single article; and yet the gentleman has, some how, fallen into the error of asserting that the privilege was confined to *fish and oil*—which he several times repeated, adding, in a particular tone, “*id est, from New England.*” Sir, what-

ever the manner in which that gentleman may choose to allude to the fruits of their labor, it is not in his power to depreciate the merits or importance of our hardy fishermen—of that class of men who, with John Manly, in 1775, first unfurled the American banner upon the ocean, and first caused the proud cross of St. George to bow to it in submission.

Yet even the fisheries—the right which Heaven gave, wherever the winds would waft or the waves would bear us, which were deemed so highly of, that Mr. Grayson denominated them the cornfields of the East; even these were so far abandoned that the Congress refused to make their preservation a *sine qua non* of a treaty, but authorized peace to be concluded without any stipulations for their security. Thanks to the wisdom and firmness of the Commissioners who saved us from that calamity.

In January, 1803, President Jefferson nominated Robert R. Livingston and James Monroe co-ministers to the French Republic, for the purpose of obtaining from the First Consul an extension of our rights on the Mississippi. Upon the question of confirmation, by the Senate, of the nomination of Mr. Monroe, there were fifteen affirmatives and twelve negatives. And this opposition is made food for accusation against the States of the Northeast, as evincing hostility to the objects of the mission and the interests to be effected by it. Yet, Sir, without the affirmative votes which were given from those States, Mr. Monroe's nomination could not have been confirmed: for if you subtract the three votes which their Senators gave in favor, and place them in opposition to the confirmation, there would have been but 12 for and 15 against it. But on the same page of the Journal, and in the sentence next preceding the statement of the question of Mr. Monroe's appointment, we find that the nomination of Mr. Livingston was confirmed without a division. The *mission and its purposes* were thus unanimously approved. The votes against Mr. Monroe must have arisen from the conviction that the expense of a second minister was unnecessary; and when we consider the ability of Chancellor Livingston, and the subsequent history of the negotiation, that opinion may not appear to have been wholly unfounded. On the same page, too, we find that Mr. Monroe was immediately, without a division, confirmed as Minister to Spain, in conjunction with Mr. Pinckney, the object of that mission being also avowedly to secure and extend our rights to the Mississippi. It is strange, indeed, that these facts should have escaped the gentleman's scrutiny.

When the Louisiana treaty was presented to the Senate, in October, 1803, there were twenty-seven votes in favor of its ratification, and seven only against it; and this, too, is made a topic of crimination against those on our side of the Potomac. Yet, of those yeas, one half were by Senators North of that river, and four of them from New England; and, as it required two thirds to ratify, these four had it in their power to have rejected the treaty. Is this evidence of Northern hostility to the West? Mr. Jefferson, in 1805, attributed the little opposition which did exist, to higher and purer motives—to a “ candid apprehension that the enlargement of our territory would endanger the

Union." And we shall presently see that there may have been other reasons also in accordance with his own opinions.

The gentleman inveighed vehemently against the North, for its alleged opposition to the admission of Louisiana into the Union, the evidence of which was, that when the bill for that purpose was before the Senate, an amendment was proposed by Mr. Dana, providing that it should not take effect until the consent of each State should have been obtained. Yet this proposition was defeated by Northern Senators : if they had voted in the affirmative, it would have prevailed by a vote of eighteen to ten. The whole amendment of Mr. Dana consisted of two alternative propositions, providing that the act should not take effect until the consent of each State should have been obtained, or *the Constitution have been so amended as to authorize Congress to pass the act.* A division of the question being required, a distinct vote was taken on the first proposition ; which alone seems to have been selected for special animadversion. I marvel much that the gentleman's vision should have been confined to one half of the amendment, especially when he was in search of motives, and they would have been clearly disclosed by a glance at the other half. Doubts were entertained of the constitutional power of Congress to admit Louisiana. And were not those doubts entitled to respect ? Is it not known that Mr. Jefferson himself, to whose opinions the gentleman bows with such profound reverence, repeatedly declared in his letters to Mr. Dunbar and others, that Congress had no such power ; and, if I mistake not, Mr. Madison, in March, 1803, then Secretary of State, framed his instructions to Messrs. Livingston and Monroe upon the basis of this constitutional disability. He was so particular as to give a formula of some of the articles to be inserted in the proposed treaty, for the acquisition of Louisiana, one of which is prescribed in these words :

" To incorporate the inhabitants of the newly ceded territory with the citizens of the United States, on an equal footing, being a provision *which cannot now be made,* it is to be *expected,* from the character and policy of the United States, that such incorporation will take place *without unnecessary delay.* In the mean time they shall be secure in their persons and property, and in the free enjoyment of their religion."

Here, Sir, our negotiators were unequivocally warned not only to make no agreement for the admission of the inhabitants of the ceded territory into the Union, but to declare that such a stipulation *could not then be made.* By what was it *prohibited* except the limits of the Constitution ? And what was the *necessary delay,* but to obtain the requisite authority by amendment ? On the 12th of August, 1803, after the formation of the treaty, and before its ratification, Mr. Jefferson holds the following strong and explicit language, in a letter to Mr. Breckenridge :—

" This treaty must, of course, be laid before both Houses, because both have important functions to exercise respecting it. They, I presume, will see their duty to their country in ratifying and paying for it, so as to secure a good which would otherwise probably be never again in their power. But I suppose they must then appeal to the nation for an additional article to the Constitution approving and confirming an act which the nation had not previously authorized. *The Constitution has made no provision for our holding foreign territory, STILL LESS FOR INCORPORATING FOREIGN NATIONS INTO OUR UNION. The Executive, in seizing the fugitive occurrence which so much advances the good of the country, have done an act against the Constitution.*"

It is not my intention to enter into the argument or even to express an opinion upon the subject, but merely to show that it is not strange that seven Senators, or even a committee of the Legislature of Massachusetts should have doubted the existence of a constitutional power, which President Jefferson so peremptorily denied.

The Missouri question has been invoked upon this occasion. It is not a correct representation to say that the North were opposed to the admission of that State; they proffered her their cordial embrace. But they wished to exclude involuntary servitude from her limits; and, believing it, as they did, most sincerely and conscientiously, to be a great moral and political evil, they were actuated by no feelings of unkindness; but the purest motives of justice and benevolence, in endeavouring to secure what to them seemed a great blessing to her citizens. That it was a disinterested effort, is attested by the Senator from South Carolina, who declares it to be for their interest that slavery should exist at the South.

As to the admission of Mississippi, the preparatory act authorizing the formation of her constitution passed without a division through the various stages in the Senate, until it came to the question of engrossment, to which there were eleven negatives. Those gentlemen might have thought the application premature. But I shall not stop to enquire into their motives, because I perceive among them the name of the venerable Macon, of North Carolina, who so recently occupied a seat here, and to whose successor, now near me, it belongs, to vindicate him from any aspersion upon his intention; and also the name of an honorable gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr SMITH,) now in his seat; for whose conduct it would be presumptuous in me to assign reasons, he being so eminently able to answer for himself.

The resolution for the final admission of that State was reported by a committee, on the 3rd of December, 1817, being the third day of the session, was forthwith, by *unanimous consent*, read a first, second and third time, and actually passed on the same day, although any one member might have required its postponement. This shows how far there was a disposition to retard her progress into full communion with the American family.

I do not intend to exhaust the patience of the Senate, by following the gentleman through all the little, trifling incidents to which he has resorted to sustain his general position. Their importance and pertinency may be illustrated by his thrice told story of an illumination at the surrender of Detroit, which flashed upon the world, for the first time, in the gentleman's speech. I have not been able to find any one who ever heard of it before. [Here Mr. Benton spoke to Mr. S. in an under tone.] He now tells me that it was in a small village in New Hampshire. I doubt the fact; but even if some individual there had the folly to put an extra candle in his window, is it to be gravely attributed to a general animosity of the people towards their fellow-citizens, who were thousand of miles distant?

Another matter of almost equal gravity, was that General Hull, a few years ago, was actually invited to dine with some of his friends; and the convivialities of the festive board are, by the gentleman's imagination, converted into the acrid humours of inveterate hostility. This occur-

ence took place long since the termination of the last war. General Hull had just then presented to the public some new explanatory statements in an appeal well adapted to excite commiseration. Some persons who had known that veteran officer of the Revolution, in other and better days, listening only to his own story, were convinced that he had been wronged. Their sympathy was excited, and they extended the hand of charity and friendship to sooth the feelings of his estimable family, as well as to alleviate his own sufferings and smooth his path to the grave. And this act of personal friendship and benevolence is adduced as proof that not only those individuals, but the inhabitants of New England generally, are actuated by unhallowed passions of enmity toward others. After Aaron Burr's conspiracy, and subsequent to his arrest as a criminal, he was invited to a dinner at Richmond, and sat down at the same table with the Chief Justice, before whom he was soon to be arraigned upon a charge of high treason. Did any one ever imagine that this was to be charged as a state offence, for which the people of Virginia were responsible? Nay, may not circumstances have existed which would exempt even the individuals from imputation! Sure I am that not the slightest shade rests upon the fame of that wonderful man, to whose intellect the most powerful minds, and to whose goodness the purest hearts, do willing homage.

It has been broadly and strongly asserted, that "*the North have from the beginning done all in their power to cripple and strangle the West;*" and all historical facts, no matter how various or opposite their character, which pass through the alembic of the gentleman's speech, are made to yield the bitter spirit of Northern hostility.

If the act be in any degree doubtful in its appearance, it is of course viewed in its most offensive aspect. And if it be one of unmixed wisdom and beneficence, still its brightness is to be overshadowed by the ascription of impure and sombre motives. When the stream fertilizes and gladdens every thing in its course, still it may be insisted that the invisible fountain is corrupted and poisonous. At one time to decline a reduction of the price of the Public Lands, or even to require any price whatever, is crying and unheard-of injustice—the poverty of the people is pourtrayed to us in glowing colors—and we are told that we are grinding them into the dust by our exactions. But when we do reduce the price, or even relinquish existing debts, we are answered by the gentleman that no thanks are due to us; so far from a favor, it is an offence, because it carries with it an implication of poverty and inability to pay, which should be repelled as an insult. Even the system of internal improvements has, in his view, ceased to be beneficial to the West—nay, positively injurious. All its fruits have been blasted by the friendly salutations of the Northern breeze. He tells us that if a road or canal be of any utility to a State, its benefits are to be measured only by the distance which it passes within her limits; and thus the 1,721,845, dollars expended upon the Cumberland Road, this side of Ohio, although projected as a Western measure, urged as a Western measure, and adopted and sustained as a Western measure, is, in fact, only for the benefit of the East: But unfortunately for his argument, that East lies wholly on the South side of Mason's and Dixon's line. By this criterion, no matter what great avenues and markets are open to our citizens, they are of no value to them, if beyond the limits of their

own particular State. By this means, too, he charges all the works for public defence, and improvement of harbors to the particular section in which they are located. He might have extended the principle, and considered a fortification to be for those merely who inhabit the little island upon which it is placed ;—or a light house, for the sole accommodation of its keeper, the only tenant of the rock where it stands.

Sir, every man who produces or consumes any thing that is transported along our coast, or imported from, or exported to, any foreign country, is interested in these facilities to our commerce and navigation. If we owned not a ship in the United States, but depended solely upon foreigners for the vehicles of our commerce, still we must afford these accommodations, or pay more than their expense in the enhanced price of transportation, and rate of freight and insurance. Suppose we had adopted the gentleman's new criterion of the benefit of avenues of intercommunication, when we were securing the navigation of the Mississippi, that great highway of nature, and had said that the productions of each State may float upon its majestic current, to its own borders, but no further, and that even this privilege is to be extended to those only whose territory is actually washed by its waters ? Would this have satisfied the demands of the inhabitants, and secured to them the benefits which they now enjoy ?

The gentleman undertook a comparison of the appropriations for the improvement of certain sections of country, but *entirely overlooked* the immense donations of *Public Lands* to his own favorite region, which, at the *minimum price*, have amounted to no less than *nine million seven hundred and fifty-nine thousand five hundred and four dollars*, as appears by a statement from the Secretary of the Treasury—an amount far greater than the aggregate of all the sums embraced by his enumeration.

“The North,” says the gentleman, have “from the beginning, done all in their power to cripple and strangle the West.” Sir, before such an assertion was hazarded, all our history should have been dispassionately examined. It should have been recollected that *of the old thirteen States, nine were North of the Potomac*—that in their hands was the whole Western country to be moulded at pleasure—that they could have sealed up the magnificent Mississippi, and devoted the immense regions upon its borders to beasts and savages ; or if populated, they could forever have refused to receive them into the American family, or extend to them the rights and privileges of American citizens. Even the five New England States, constituting, as they did, more than one third of the whole number, might forever have excluded Louisiana and Florida, and have rejected every treaty for enlarging or confirming the privileges of the West. The power of the North was ample, complete, and irresistible, over the whole region beyond the Alleghanies ; and instead of being employed to wither and destroy, it has been assiduously exerted to cherish, sustain, and strengthen. Its inhabitants were regarded as children—bone of our bone—flesh of our flesh : their infant steps were sustained, and their path defended by the strong arm of the nation. We rejoiced in their prosperity ; the blessed fruit of our own benignant care. We received them cordially to the full communion of all the inestimable blessings of free Government and Republican institutions, which had been purchased by the blood of our fathers. We part-

ed to them our inheritance—we gave them of our strength—we resigned to them our power. From being more than two thirds of the whole number, we have voluntarily, by our own generous acts, made ourselves a minority of the States. And now we are told—here, in the Senate Chamber of the United States—that “the North have, from the beginning, done all in their power to cripple and strangle the West!!!”

Sir, I deeply deplore the cause, be it what it may, which can at any time, or in any place, give birth to declarations of such a character, tending to alienate the affections, and poison the mutual confidence, of different portions of our country.

Heaven itself has made them for union and happiness; and man and woman might as well quarrel with each other for the difference of their formation, as the great geographical divisions of our Republic, for the features and adaptations which their Creator has given them.

Mr. S. said he would now turn his attention to some of the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HAYNE.) That gentleman, after expressing his regret that the controversy should become *sectional*, and, lamenting the supposed necessity of assuming an unfriendly attitude, proceeded to present the Southern States and New England in hostile array against each other. He (Mr. S.) believed, that the responsibility of giving the debate that character must rest principally upon the gentleman himself, for there had been nothing in any previous speech which called for the attack which he had made upon the North-eastern States. I, said Mr. S. will not follow his example; but, as far as possible, consistently with my duty, avoid every unpleasant allusion. From my earliest recollections, I have been deeply impressed with the sentiments inculcated by the Farewell Address of the Father of his Country, in which we are taught “to frown indignantly upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate one portion of our country from the rest,” and to lament that geographical discriminations of Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western, should ever occasion the belief that there could be any distinction of views or interest.

But if these distinctions are insisted on by the citizens of one portion of our country—if the line of the Potomac is to be constantly drawn by those who live South of it, must they not expect that those who live North will sometimes remind them that there are two sides to that line? Or, if they point to a still narrower circle, and, making the six North-eastern States their line of demarkation, constantly allude to them in ungracious tones, must not New England of necessity assume a corresponding attitude, and poise herself upon her own energies?

Sir, we do firmly believe that we have exercised towards our distant brethren that “*charity*” which “suffereth long and is kind;” which “envieth not;” which “vaunteth not itself;” “doth not behave itself unseemly;” “is not easily provoked;” “thinketh no evil;” “rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.”

The gentleman’s attack upon New England has rested almost exclusively upon the transactions of the late war. If his only object had been to condemn certain measures of the leaders of a party there in opposition to the war, I should not deem it necessary to make a single remark in reply. I resisted them to the utmost of my ability at the time of their greatest strength, and my opinions are still unchanged. But I can

assent to no indiscriminate censure. If it was intended to fix any stigma upon the general character of the people of New England, I, although the humblest of their representatives here, feel bound to repel it. We have the explicit declaration of Mr. Monroe himself, then secretary of War, and since deliberately made, that the confidence of the Government in the *People of Massachusetts*, was never shaken for a moment.

[Mr. HAYNE explained, by saying that he never intended to cast any reproach upon the people of New England. That his remarks were confined to a particular party, which he had designated and described.]

Mr. S. resumed. Although such were the ideas conveyed by one portion of the gentleman's speech; yet, taken in connexion with his declaration of war, at its commencement, a different result would seem to follow. He at first regretted that the contest should be *sectional*, and then arrayed the South against New England as opposing *sections of country*; and having thus proclaimed the war by geographical lines, he of course assumed a hostile attitude toward the people of that territory which he assailed. Why should he regret the peculiar *character* of the contest *as sectional*, if it was merely one of old political parties? I am quite willing, however, to receive the explanation which the gentleman has just given, and shall omit some of the remarks which I had contemplated. If his only object, in entering the territory of New England, was to thrust at the dead, or wave his sword in triumph over their graves, I do not envy him either the glory or the magnanimity of the achievement. But there are some topics to which I shall advert, because they have been treated in a manner calculated to produce an injurious effect, whatever may have been the purpose of their introduction.

The *Hartford Convention* has filled no small space in this discussion; it is wielded as a powerful engine against the Northeastern States. I remember it well, and have never spoken of it but in terms of decided condemnation. It had but few friends while living, and still fewer mourners to follow it to the grave; and if its skeleton is now dug up, and held on high to the view of the whole nation, it will cast its shade upon a small part only of the fair surface of New England.

The sermons of Osgood and Parish have been produced here, and inflamed passages read, avowedly as evidence of *public sentiment*, and the gentleman called the writers "pious and good men." So do not I, Sir, they were infuriated fanatics, political madmen; condemned by the sober-minded of their own party; and I would as soon produce the outpourings of Bedlam as proof of *public* opinion as effusions such as theirs.

The honorable Senator told us, with great emphasis, that the enemy was *permitted* to establish himself, and to open a custom-house upon the soil of Massachusetts; and so much reliance did he place upon this, as a cause of reproach, that it was reiterated three times in the course of his speech. It is most unjust. The people of that State, without distinction of party, were at all times resolved to defend their territory, and prompt in resisting the approach of the enemy. The gentleman's allusion could not be misunderstood: it was to the capture and detention of Castine, a small village situated on a little peninsula, on the eastern side of the Penobscot river, in the remote parts of Maine; where the adja-

cent country contains but a sparse population. It is connected with the main land only by a narrow neck, and is surrounded on its various sides by water deep enough to float ships of the largest class, which might, within point blank shot, command every part of the village. I verily believe that a large naval force might bring more guns to bear upon that place than there were men in it at the time of its capture. So situated, and destitute of the means of efficient defence, an overwhelming British fleet captured and took possession of it. I would ask the gentleman what resistance he himself would have made? Could he have withstood the batteries of that fleet with nothing but his sword or his musket? The idea of successful resistance would have been mere fatuity. But it is said the enemy retained the place and opened a custom-house. It was not taken until about the first day of September, 1814, and the treaty of peace was signed in December of the same year, of which information reached us in February following. Could it have been retaken? The British had there a large military and naval force. The neck which connects the peninsula with the main land is so low and narrow, that a canal was dug across it, and Castine was thereby converted into an island. All access to it was completely commanded by the guns of the enemy's fleet, and we had not a single ship to aid us: beside which, the whole seaboard of Maine, for more than two hundred miles, and its numerous rivers, bays and inlets, containing millions of shipping, were constantly harassed by the enemy ranging along the coast, and requiring the presence of the militia at every point to repel his threatened depredations. And, even if the militia could have been spared for the enterprise, and it had been possible to re-capture the place, the British might easily have taken possession of any of the numerous adjacent islands in the Penobscot bay, and carried on all his operations with great facility.

Are we then to be repeatedly reproached with the capture of Castine, and that too *here—in this Capitol*—within these walls, which have but just risen from the conflagration of the enemy, and are hardly yet purified from the pollution of hostile feet; and having at this moment at your public navy yard here, a monument bearing an inscription perpetuating the presence, and the barbarism of the British! And these acts done, not under the guns of their ships, but by a few thousand men marching fifty miles by land, through a population of two hundred thousand persons; and you having here, in aid of the militia, a thousand regular troops, a public armory, and the brave little band of sailors commanded by the gallant Barney!

The gentleman from South Carolina, himself, told us, I would not otherwise have alluded to the fact, that his own State was completely overrun during the war of the Revolution. It was so indeed. The British considered it entirely subdued, and, for a time, held over it resistless sway. I mention it not as a reproach: it was inevitable. But that gentleman should have been the last to suggest the idea that the presence of an enemy upon the soil is a necessary impeachment of the patriotism or gallantry of the people.

Maine, from its local position, was more exposed than any other State in the Union; having Lower Canada on the north, New Brunswick on the east, and from two to three hundred miles of sea coast, which the

enemy commanded, on the south. She owned one ninth part of all the tonnage of the United States, and at the commencement of the war there were not two hundred regular troops in the State. Her citizens did not wait to be solicited, but voluntarily tendered their services to their country, and three regiments were immediately organized, by which her territory was defended at all points, until, in 1813, all the troops raised for the defence of Maine, even those in the garrisons, were, by order of the Secretary of War, marched to the Niagara frontier. The British having a strong force in each of the adjacent provinces to the north and the east, and a powerful armament on the sea, were, by that withdrawal of the troops, tempted to annex the lower and unsettled parts of the country to their colony of New Brunswick; and, with this view, took possession of Castine, in September, 1814. It was immediately determined to compel the adversary to withdraw, by carrying the war into his own territory. An army of ten thousand men, commanded by a distinguished citizen of Maine, was to invade New Brunswick, at the opening of the Spring; and such progress was actually made, and with such zeal and alacrity did the people offer their services, that it was well ascertained that the whole number of troops would be raised within the limits of Maine and New Hampshire. The peace alone prevented the plan being carried into execution; and I hazard nothing insaying that had the invasion been made, with such troops and such a commander, it would have been no second edition of the campaigns of Hampton and Wilkinson.

Notwithstanding all that has been said of the late war as derogating from the character of New England, I boldly ask, from what part of the country was it sustained with more efficient aid? The gentleman tells us that money was withheld by a combination of all the banking interest. One bank, sir, in the town of Boston alone, advanced the Government two millions of dollars; and a single individual there a million more. The large amount loaned in the town of Salem, my friend from Massachusetts now before me, (Mr. SILSBEE,) whose ample fortune was entrusted to his country, can well attest. Sir, without the hard money—not the depreciated paper of broken banks—but the gold and silver which the citizens of New England caused to be paid into the Treasury from loans and the customs, your tottering credit must have fallen completely prostrate. And when clouds of despair lowered around you, and thick darkness enveloped your whole horizon, it was the gleams of glory from the ocean that dispelled the gloom and illumined your path. That sun of glory arose in the East, and was lighted up by the Mariners of New England. You manned not a ship—you fired not a gun upon the lakes or upon the ocean, without the aid of the sons of New England; and in every battle upon the water, they poured out their blood in your defence. Upon land, too, their achievements were unequalled. Those who, having voluntarily tendered their services, were not permitted to defend their own homes, but marched to the frontiers of New-York, constituted the regiment which well earned their expressive appellation of the *bloody ninth*—which stood alone against twice their force of British veterans, whilst half their own numbers had fallen upon the field! They composed, too, the twenty-first regiment, which, at the battle of Niagara, by a desperate effort, in face of a blazing battery

of deadly artillery, took the eminence which it commanded, and meeting the foe man to man, repulsed and defeated him in successive onsets, and destroyed forever the boasted invincibility of the British bayonet.

I would not have inquired what service South Carolina rendered during the war, had not the Senator from Missouri, in contrast with the East, made it a theme of praise and gratitude. When he introduced that topic, I was, indeed, somewhat curious to hear his enumeration of her exploits—and what were they? Why, Sir, that she sent her able and eloquent representatives to raise their voices in Congress. I trust that I fully appreciate their services, and that no one is more cordially disposed to award them their full measure of honor or gratitude. But I believe that the enemy would rather that we should have sent thousands of our most eloquent orators, to make their most eloquent speeches upon the floor of Congress, than to have met the single crew of that frigate which compelled the haughty and boastful *Dacres* to strike the flag of the *Guerriere*, and bow in submission to *Isaac Hull*.

When the gentleman from South Carolina spoke in terms of commendation of the merits and exertions of the republicans of the East, I was relieved and gratified. I supposed that he was willing to embrace, within that description, all who cherished true republican principles. But what was my astonishment when he afterwards narrowed down his description, and confined his approbation to the few who united with him in the *last Presidential election*. He told us that the “*democracy of New England*” had *always* acted with the *South*—not only in the war of 1812, but “*in the civil contest of 1828,*” that it was then, *as now*, the *ally of the South*. This is, indeed, restricting our republicanism to very narrow limits—by the test of the electoral votes, to one fiftieth, and by any other just criterion, to a small part only of the people. And thus veterans of the democratic party, those who sustained it in the darkest times, and have been ever true to their principles and to their country—who were its fearless and unwavering champions, during embargoes, non-intercourse, and war, are now denied the name of republican, because they have dared to think for themselves, as to the qualification of a candidate for the Presidency, and bowed not down to the idol which others had set up. While, on the other hand, some of their most violent opponents, even aiders and abettors of the Hartford Convention, those ultra federalists, who opposed Mr. Adams because their unforgiving spirits could never forget that he had once left their party, are received into full communion and cordially embraced by those who claim to be, by their own appointment, exclusive guardians of pure, primitive, unspotted democracy.

The gentleman seems to have no other criterion of republicanism than adhesion to the *South*. Not the assertion of principles, but devotion to Southern men. He told us, in so many words, that “*the South had made New England,*” and it seems that, in his view, those only are of the true faith who will bow down and worship this new Creator.

A very considerable portion of the Speech of the Senator from Missouri was devoted to a comparison of the liberality of the North and the South, and he yesterday reminded us that, in the last election of Presi-

dent, there was but one vote in all New England for the Southern and Western candidate.

Since he has chosen himself to introduce this test of sectional disinterestedness and magnanimity, let us bestow upon it a moment's attention. The whole number of votes which have been given for President in the electoral colleges since the organization of this government has been two thousand and nineteen, of which NINE only have been thrown, in all the States South of the Potomac, for candidates residing north of that river, viz one in Virginia and one in North Carolina in 1796; four in North Carolina in 1800; and one in Illinois, and two in Louisiana, in 1824. While, during the same period, the States North of that river have given no less than *seven hundred and nineteen votes* for Presidential candidates living South of it. They have supported Southern men three times unanimously; at another time with but a single dissenting vote; in another instance with but six; and again by a large majority.

Upon these facts I make no comment.

The subject of slavery, incidentally touched by the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr Webster,) has been taken up and dwelt upon with great zeal by those who followed him. It is a topic of such delicacy and difficulty that I have always abstained from referring to it in debate; and others from the North have, very generally, practised the same forbearance.

I have deeply lamented that the sensitiveness of the slaveholding States should have been so often operated upon, out of this House, to produce unkind feelings and unjust accusations against their brethren. We have been told that it can always be made a bond of union in political warfare, and I much fear that the cry of hostile designs to their rights and property has been too often rung as an alarm to rally the whole slaveholding population in one array against those who have never indulged an unfriendly thought.

The people in the North do undoubtedly condemn slavery in the abstract, and deeply deplore its existence in our country; but they have not the remotest intention of disturbing this domestic relation, by thrusting themselves between the master and his bondmen. They know that, as the institution actually exists, they have no right, by the Constitution, to attempt to overturn it; that to do so might dissolve the Union; and that their interference, so far from relieving the slave from bondage, would probably aggravate his condition and rivet his chains more firmly.

The gentleman has spoken of the *prejudices* of the East. Sir, what he has thus denominated are disinterested, pure, benevolent, and elevated *principles*. They wish indeed that their friends of the South could be relieved from what they deem a great moral and political evil; but they are aware that the remedy is to be found and applied by those only among whom the evil exists, and have no disposition to touch it with inexperienced hands.

Had the gentleman been content to express, in general terms, his approbation of involuntary servitude, and his exultation at its existence I should have made no reply. He might even have insisted, as he did, that it added to the physical strength of a country: although I cannot

well understand how withdrawing one half of the whole population from the contest can strengthen the common arm in the hour of battle ; and although such was not the opinion even of Southern statesmen after the experience of the revolution. Mr. Madison, in 1788, said, “ what parts of the United States are most likely to need protection. *The weak parts, which are the Southern States.*” And again, “ It was said, and I believe with truth, that every part of America does not stand in equal need of protection. It was observed that the Northern States are most competent to their own security.”

But the gentleman has chosen to make this very topic the ground of a comparison degrading to the republicanism of the East. He asserted that from the possession of slaves there had always been a greater love of liberty in the South than in the North ; and rested his assertion upon the authority of Mr. Burke. What kind of love of liberty is it which Burke says is generated and fostered by the institution of slavery ? He says that to slaveholders liberty is not only an enjoyment, but “ a RANK and *privilege,*” and subsequently speaks of their “ *haughtiness of domination.*”

Who does not perceive that this love of liberty is but the love of rank, of power, of absolute and uncontrolled dominion, and that too over their fellow men, extorting from them the most abject submission ? It is the same love of liberty which is possessed by the *privileged classes—the aristocracy,* in other countries—an attachment to their own immunities, to arbitrary control and domination over others, and impatient of all restraint upon themselves.

Let it be remembered that this delineation is not mine, but was furnished by the Senator from South Carolina. If I had imputed such sentiments to any portion of our country, I should have felt myself obnoxious to the charge of unkindness. I trust, Sir, that he has done himself and his friends injustice ; and that such is not the democracy of the South. It was not that of Mr. Jefferson, as is shown not only by the proposition against involuntary servitude which he made to the Old Congress, but by the general tenor of all his political writing.

It is not the democracy of New England. We have heard, in this debate, of the oligarchy and aristocracy of New England ; and they are so often spoken of elsewhere, as terms of general application, that I fear very erroneous opinions are prevalent, as to the character and institutions of that people.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for reminding us of the oppression, which drove our forefathers from their native land ; for I delight to recur to the patriarchal founders of Massachusetts—the *Puritans*—who, for the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, left their country, friends, civilization, plenty and security, for exile in a wilderness, across a world of waters, exposed to every suffering, and every danger ; those indomitable spirits who would yield to no usurped dominion, but resolved to live free or cease to live. When they landed upon the Rock of Plymouth, it was with the Bible in their hands, and its precepts in their hearts, and they laid deep the foundations of a Christian Commonwealth. From the sacred volume they imbibed the true spirit of all our institutions ; the native equality of the human race—formed of the same materials—fashioned by the same hand—animate

by the same breath—and destined to the same grave. Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you, was, to them, the impressive command by which Heaven itself placed all mankind upon the common level of moral right and mutual obligation, and declared that “man was not made the property of man.”

They acted upon the principles which they professed, and constituted one society of equals and brethern. As their numbers increased and spread over a greater area, it became impracticable for all to unite in transacting the public business at one place, and they therefore formed territorial districts, of convenient extent, by some called townships, but there denominated *towns*, which continued to be multiplied as population advanced. These *towns* were then, and are still, throughout New England, pure *democracies*, in which the whole people, in their original sovereign character, assemble at one place, to order their own business in their own way, each free man having an equal voice, and every man being free. In these primary assemblies they choose their own agents, prescribe their duties, call them to account, and censure or approve as their conduct may seem to deserve. They raise money, direct its expenditure, and order and control all measures of general concernment.

Here, too, are supported our *Free Schools*—an institution unrivalled in the history of human Education, by which children, of all classes, are brought together upon the basis of perfect equality, and receive instruction from the same source, without distinction or partiality. The funds for the support of these Schools are annually raised by vote, in the primary assemblies of the towns, where the poor man, having perhaps a dozen children, but wholly destitute of property, has an equal voice in determining the amount, and its appropriation, with him who has hundreds of thousands, and is childless. The sums, thus ordered, are directly assessed upon property. The annual amount, in my own State, is not less than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. A system more perfectly democratic in its immediate character and ultimate tendencies, was never devised by man. It is upon this broad foundation of universal instruction that all our political institutions rest: It sustains, too, our Colleges, our Academies, our Hospitals, Asylums, and all those benignant charities, whose streams extend to the uttermost regions of the earth.

I thank the gentleman, too, for his reference to the American Revolution. He told us that the South had no ships, nor commerce to cause them to resist Great Britain. Sir, that resistance was not for ships and commerce merely, but against the principle of taxation without representation, which extended equally to all the colonies. It was the claim of the Imperial Parliament, to “bind us in all cases whatsoever;” and, if we had not resisted, they would have bound our infant giant limbs in fetters. And Massachusetts has the enviable distinction, that glory of which nothing can deprive her, to the end of time, of having been the first to make this resistance, alone and unaided, in defiance of the whole power of the British Empire. Lord North himself declared, on the floor of Parliament, that Massachusetts alone was to blame; that, but for the evil example of her violent opposition, the obnoxious tea would have been every where else quietly received; and that she should be visited with exemplary vengeance. And Col. Barre, who has been some-

times called the friend of America, declared, that her conduct, as the prime mover of all the disturbances, had been so reprehensible, that the Boston Port bill, which was intended to reduce thousands to starvation, was a measure of mercy. While another member thundered forth against Massachusetts the anathema which was not long since uttered in the other end of this Capitol against New England, "*delenda est Carthago.*"

The true character of a people is best ascertained by their conduct at those times when rising against oppression, and absolved from the restraints of law—they are a law unto themselves. With this view look at the destruction of the tea by what has been called a "Boston mob." They assembled in the night, went on board the ships, hoisted the chests upon deck, and poured their contents into the sea, with the order and regularity of an ordinary business operation. No other article of property was touched, not an act of violence committed; but when the work was done, the multitude who had assembled to witness the scene, quietly and peaceably retired to their respective homes.

Since gentlemen are fond of introducing their reminiscences, they will indulge me in another exemplification of the conduct of an educated, moral, fearless, republican people. After what has been denominated the Boston massacre, an event calculated to inflame the multitude to the highest degree of excitement, when, as the historian tells us, they seemed utterly regardless of personal danger, and immovable by the bayonets of the soldiery—did they resort to tumult and outrage, to conflagration and bloodshed? No. They assembled in *town meeting*, chose a committee of citizens to require of the royal governor the removal of the troops. When they came into his presence, he was surrounded by his high officers, civil and military, and spoke in such lordly language as became the viceroy of a king. "They must go:" was the firm and laconic reply. Seeing this spirit, and lowering his tone, he attempted to compromise, by offering to send away one regiment. The Chairman, the venerable Samuel Adams, fixing upon him his piercing eye, and stretching forth his tremulous hand, exclaimed, "all or none, Sir." The mock majesty of artificial creation shrunk before the native dignity of true republicanism—the mandate was obeyed—the troops were removed.

Such were the people who constituted the militia that fought the battles of Lexington, of Bunker's Hill, and of Bennington. "This night," said a Grecian commander to his soldiers, "we shall sup with Pluto." A speech which has been thought worthy to be handed down to us through many centuries. How immeasurably more elevated and touching was the simple address of the gallant Stark to the husbands and fathers, his *neighbors and friends*, whom he commanded at Bennington—"There are the enemy—we conquer them, or *this night Mary Stark is a widow.*"

I shall not attempt to enumerate the worthies or the achievements of New England—time indeed would fail me to delineate her character, or speak of her services. They stand out in brilliant colors upon every page of your history. She may be followed through every section of our country, by the blood and exploits of her sons—to your own native South Carolina, where Green and Sullivan fought, "and Scammel fell"—

to the West, where their bones rest on the battle grounds of St. Clair's defeat, and of Harrison's victory. Every valley is vocal with the voice of her children—her blood swells every vein of this great republic—her fame is reflected from the whole bright surface of this wide spread and mighty nation.

I glory in such a blessed parentage, and in the brotherhood of her hardy, educated, enlightened, virtuous, generous, brave, republican population.

With deep felt gratitude I reverently thank God that, of all places upon His earth, He gave me my birth in the land, and among the descendants, of the PURITAN PIRGRIMS OF NEW ENGLAND.



WERT BOOKBINDING
JAN 1989
Grantville, PA

