



No 4265.423







THE UNIFORM RECORD

OF

ALL POLITICAL PARTIES

IN MAINE,

DOWN TO 1856,

IN

4265.423

OPPOSITION TO HUMAN SLAVERY.

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS O. J. SMITH,

TO THE

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION,

Holden in Portland, July 8, 1856.

THE UNIFORM RECORD

ALL POLITICAL PARTIES

IN MAINE

DOWN TO 1850

U.S. 7585.54

282.068

Aug. 26, 1880.

HON. FRANCIS O. J. SMITH

REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

Held in Portland, July 6, 1850

## SPEECH.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW CITIZENS; I regret the necessity I have been under of commencing to address you at such an inopportune hour. I will then detain you but in a few words. I do congratulate you, one and all; I congratulate one and all, the independent freemen and electors of Maine, on the nomination that has this day been made for the office of Governor.

It is a nomination most eminently "fit to be made." It is a nomination that nobly, and truly, and truthfully represents THE GREAT CAUSE OF HUMAN FREEDOM! to the support of which the freemen of this State are now challenged by the myrmidons and sycophants of the slave power at the South. You have accepted the challenge, and raised your banner ready for the fight.

Of Mr. HAMLIN, you have nominated for Governor, it may be said, perhaps with more emphasis than of any other man, that he has done our State *great service*. Through a succession of years, and from the first hour he entered that high and august body of legislators, where the State Commissioned him to represent you, he has given no vote, uttered no sentiment,

countenanced no measure, that is no square up to the great requirements of the great cause of human freedom. We have a right to be proud as a State, of the record which he has made there, and before the country, for our State. In honoring such a man, we do most honor ourselves.

[Here Mr. Smith remarked, that as it was the appropriate hour, about 6 o'clock, for an intermission, if the assembly, through the President, would consent to an adjournment, he would meet them and address them more at large than he could otherwise be expected to do. An adjournment was accordingly made for an hour and a half, when the City Hall was jammed to its utmost capacity. Mr. Smith came into the Hall about 8 o'clock, and on being announced, was received with the most rapturous applause by the whole assembly. When these demonstrations of enthusiasm subsided, a profound stillness pervaded the vast audience, so that, except in occasional outbreaks of applause of the speaker, the fall of a pin would have been noticed throughout a speech of more than two hours. We never before witnessed such marked and profound attention in a course of people so vast. He proceeded as follows:]

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW CITIZENS; When you indulged me with an intermission this afternoon, I was about to call your most serious and thoughtful attention to the past record of our

people, as a proud and patriotic State, and also to the past records which they have made as party politicians, under both *Whig* and *Democratic* organizations. There is in these records much that is worthy of your most careful revision and remembrance. For I hold, that next to the religion of a people, their political principles are entitled to be regarded as resting upon grave realities; and the record of them should be such as to be cherished and consulted with patriotic pride by us all. It is well for us to talk often with the past. And the reputation of our State before the world, and upon the pages of history, should be to every honest mind a sacred portion of the inheritance which he is directly interested to preserve and defend for his children and for society.

If we compute the aggregate number of individuals in our State, who are filling offices in the State Government, we may find it to be perhaps five hundred. Include all the offices that are filled in our towns, large and small, we may estimate the office holders in our State to number 1500 perhaps 2,000. But call them 3,000. And we here have the utmost number who are immediately interested in the emoluments of public office. Our aggregate population at this time approximates 600,000. We have as it will probably appear in our approaching election 140,000 voting men in the State. How small indeed is this number of 3,000 office holders in a population of 600,000 souls, and a voting list of 140,000, who can have an interest for the sake of personal gain, in permitting the proud history and reputation of our State to be stained and

degraded, by placing the State politically before the country and the world, in a false position! In a condition of direct opposition to the honest humanity of our people!

I then have a right to call upon men of all parties and of all religions, to look with me, into the past history of the politics of our State, and see anew—call carefully up to their remembrance, what have been the declared sentiments of our people as a State, what the declared principles of our people as political partizans also, upon this great and now all absorbing question of human liberty and human bondage.

And here I will make the assertion, and I challenge any man and every man, be he a writer, a speaker, editor, or partizan of any and of whatever party, for proofs in contradiction of me, I here assert, that never, until the year 1856 had dawned upon the State, has one sentiment, or one principle been enunciated in the name of the State, or in the name of any political party, or religion, or other association whatsoever, within the State, adverse to the sentiment and principles of human freedom, which you have this day announced as the platform upon which you rest the nomination of your candidate for Governor.

Upon this great question, the record of our State, and of our people, is PURE! And it is a record of which our people before the world, and before God, may well be proud! As one of her humble citizens, I do feel proud of it! And that man, claiming to be a freeman, who would put into the ballot box of his town, a ballet to alter, reverse and to stain that record, may



well feel that he is no longer worthy to be a freeman, and if his hand with that ballot were blackened with palsy, he might well own there would be justice in the vengeance!

I will call your thoughts now to a few indisputable facts, which this record of the State furnishes. Mr. HAMLIN, your nominee, was elected to the Senate of the United States first, to fill a vacancy, occasioned by the death of Mr. FAIRFIELD in 1847. The term he was thus elected to complete expired in 1851. It devolved upon the Legislature of 1850 to elect a Senator for the succeeding term. That legislature was elected in September, 1849. In June, 1849, the Democratic State Convention was holden, consisting of six hundred delegates, and here in this Hall, beneath this same roof, that covers us, were passed in the name of the *Democracy of Maine*, those two emphatic resolutions in favor of freedom and against slavery, and the extension of slavery into free territory, which your convention this day has incorporated into and made the platform upon which your candidate for Governor is presented to the people!

In 1849 these resolutions—this platform of freedom was democratic—*pure democracy!* Can they be otherwise in 1856? Are they made less so, because the friends and supporters of FREMONT and DAYTON, approve, adopt and make these resolutions their own? Where else than upon these resolutions—where else than upon this platform, ought all, who still claim to be democrats, in our State, to be found now, if they are not within the temptations of public office to drag them off—if they

do not desire to be false to their own honest convictions upon this question of slavery—if they do not wish to trample under foot the proud record of our State?

But I need not rehearse these resolutions,\* for I have another passage of

\* These resolutions were as follows:

**Resolved,** That the institution of human slavery is at variance with the theory of our Government, abhorrant to the common sentiment of mankind, and fraught with danger to all who come within the sphere of its influence; that the federal government possesses adequate power to inhibit its existence in the territories of the Union; that the constitutionality of this power has been settled by judicial construction, by contemporaneous expositions, and by repeated acts of legislation; and that we enjoin upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to make every exertion and employ all their influence to procure the passage of a law forever excluding slavery from the territories of California and New Mexico.

**Resolved,** That while we most cheerfully concede to our Southern brethren the right on all occasions, to speak and act with entire freedom on questions connected with slavery in the territories, we claim the exercise of the same right for ourselves; and any attempt, from any quarter, to stigmatise us or our Representatives for advocating or defending the opinions of our people upon this subject, will be repelled as an unwarrantable act of aggression upon the rights of the citizens of this State.

That the readers of this Speech may have the means of tracing out men and names, at this juncture, that may be known to them, that were actors in penning these same two resolutions in the Democratic Convention of 1849, which the Republican, FREMONT and DAYTON, and HAMLIN Convention of 1856 have adopted and re-proclaimed, a list of the delegates, being 607, who attended the former Convention is hereto appended—The resolutions were by this 1849 Convention adopted with only one dissenting voice, one BION BRADBURY, Esq. of Eastport. The delegates were as follows:

*Aroostook.* Plymouth grant, C. Bradford; Leavit pl., Samuel G Tuck; Letter A, range 2, L D Harmon; N. 11, Varnum Putnam; Rockebema plan, Jesse Gilman; New Limerick, Hiram M Eaton; Monticello, J C Wellington; Smyrna, Levi Berry, jr; Van Buren pl, John R Graves; No. 12 r 3, Joel Dodge; Haynesville, Josiah Jellison; Presque Isle, G W Towle; Houlton, Shephard Cary; Nelson, Herria; Portage Lake, John L Cilley; Masardis, Stephen P Huse; Hancock pl, Daniel Savage; No. 11 pl, G W Smith; Westfield pl, C A Jordan; Maple Grove, Wm H Flanders; Salmon Brook pl, Wm Towle; Amity, Columbus Dunn; Williams col grant pl, Lewis Delette; Portland

democratic history—of history, which and justly to sacrifice themselves, their all democrats who reflect too seriously consciences and their votes to the vas-

acad gr pl, Wm Carter; Crystal pl, John V Putnam; Orient, James Sundee; Linneus, Thomas Nicholson; Bridgewater pl, Thomas P Packard; Bancroft, Joseph E Shorey; let H pl, Ivory Hardison; No. 12, r 4, Daniel Lord; Belfast acad gr, Melzar Drake; Madawaska pl, Francis Thibodeau, W P Vinal; Molunkas, Hiram Hawes; No. 8 r 8, Sonah Spofford; Reed pl, Abram M Miles; Benedicta pl, James Ryan; Golden Ridge, B L Staples; Let D, Mark Trafton; Hodgdon, Joseph R Haven; No. 5, r 3, Lysander Strickland; No. 11, r 6, J S Thompson; Dayton pl, James Brown; No. 9, r 6, Ira Fish; Weston, Joseph Foss; No. 1, r 5, Wm A Washburn; Let I, r 2, Wm Trundy; No. 6, r 4, John Dorsey; Framingham acad gr, S H Peavy; No. 13, r 15, P G Chase.

*Cumberland.* Auburn, Thomas J Howard and Nathan Woodbury; Bridgton, Sewall C Strout and George G Wight; Brunswick, Robert P Dunlap, T S McLellan and James Otis; Casco, Richard Maybury; Cape Elizabeth, Samuel M Skillin, Hiram Staples; Cumberland, G M Sturdivant, Moses Leighton; Danville, Elijah L Townsend; Durham, Jas Strout, Chas C Cobb; Freeport, Nath'l Curtis, Rufus Soule; Falmouth, John Williams, Jeremiah Hall; Gorham, Hugh D McLellan, Dan'l C Emery, John Lewis; Gray, Sam'l Mayall, Moses Palmer; Harpswell, Alex Ewes, J E Dannels; Harrison, C Caswell; Minot, Eliner W Harris; New Gloucester, Benj H Mace, Benj Morse; North Yarmouth, James C Hill, William C Storer; Naples, Washington Bray; Ot'sfield, Joseph Lombard; Poland, David Dunn, David W True; Portland, Ezra Carter, Jr, Edward Fox, Sam'l J Anderson, Benjamin Larrabee, George McAllister, John Yeaton, Allen Haines, L De M Sweat, James T McCobb, Benj Kingsbury, jr, George T Hedge; Pownal, Sam'l S Troy; Raymond, Sam'l S Brown; Scarborough, John Larrabee, John S Larrabee; Sebago, John E McDonald; Standish, Wm H Lowell, Josiah Moulton; Westbrook, Levi Morrill, Geo Libby, Aaron Quimby; Windham, D P Baker, Ezra Brown.

*Franklin.* Freeman, E H Oliver; Industry, J C Manter; Weld, John Robinson; Chesterville, Wm Whittier; Jay, Daniel Merriitt, Aru A Holmes; No. 3, range 2, John Haley, jr; Strong, Luther Sweatland; Temple, Wm Nye; Avon, J E Bates; Carthage, Wm Winter; Salem, James Davis; Madrid, Sylvanus Dunham; No. 1, range 3, Wm Chism; No. 1 range 1, S F Hinkley; Wilton, Enoch Scales, Thomas Hender; New Sharon, H E Dyer, Chas Follansbee; No. 2, range 2, John W Lowell; Jackson pl, B B Mace; Phillips, M Sherbourne, D Howard; No. 1, range 4, Stewart Foster; No. 1, range 3, West of Bing Purchase, B L Morrison; Farmington, A B Caswell, Henry Clark; pl No. 6, James R Pratt, jr; Letter E, Ephraim Rand.

*Hancock.* Tremont, Eaton Clark; No. 21 pl, Wm Mace; Surry, Leonard Jarvis; Franklin, Sabine J Hardison; Gouldsboro', J L Hovey; Cranberry Isles, James F Rawson; Mariaville, Arno Wiswell; Eastbrook, Moses Smith; Sullivan, Josiah Bean; Aurora, James Wallace; Castine, Geo L Vose; Trenton, Geo W Newbegin; Greenfield, Sylvanus Twitchell; Amherst, Geo F Foster; Mount Desert, John M Noyes; Bucksport, John

Lee, Burnham Wardwell, Amos Smith; Otis, Benj Davis; Waltham, Jotham S Dyer; Eden, Isaac H Thomas; Ellsworth, Tho's D. Jones, Samuel K Whiting; Hancock, Wm Burnett; Brooksville, Erastus Redman; Orland, Parker Tuck; Bluehill, F A Holt, Alex Fulton; Wetmore Isle pl, Richard C Abbott; No. 2, Chas Littlefield.

*Kennebec.* Monmouth, J Blake, J Cupston; Wayne, J E F Dunn; Pittston, G H Rabinson, S Young; China, J H Brackett, John Hatch; Litchfield, John Randall, E Hatch; Vassalboro', E Small, G Aillsbury; Greene, Ingersoll Parker; Leeds, O D Turner, Josiah Day, 2d; Belgrade, Richard Mills, C S Buckley; East Livermore, Gideon Hinkley; Readfield, A P Morrill, J R Bachellder; Albion, L. Blake, D B Fuller; Hallowell, E E Rice, J H Withington, D H Goodno, Isaac Foster; Mt Vernon, G Taggart; Windsor, Veranus Pierce, Samuel R Cottle; Winslow, A J Dingley, J H Drummond; Sidney, E G Morrison, Orren Rowe; Waterville, Paul L Chandler, Joseph Nudd; Wales, Samuel Larabee; Gardiner, N Hutchins, Stephen Webber, R Thompson, G W Bachellder, Fayette, R B Dunn; Sebasticook, J C Hudson; Winthrop, Oliver Foster, Jona Whitney; Clinton, Chas Jewett, Wm G Miller; Clinton Gore, Nelson Hunter; Augusta, Lot M Morrill, J A Thompson; Gilman Smith; J S Turner; Rome, P H Gilbert.

*Lincoln.* Alna, Onakes Rundlett; Arrowsic; John Fisher; Bath, Wm. V. Moses, J W Frye, George M Jewell, Hiram Turner; Boothbay, Robert Spenny, Moses R White; Bowdoinham, J W Russell, Josiah M Mellow; Bowdoin, Elisha Patterson, Enoch Riggs; Bremen, Wait W Keen; Bristol, Peaslee M Wells, Elisha Hatch; Cushing, James Payson; Dresden, Elihu Hatch, Elwell Costellow; Damariscotta, Benj Chapman; Edgecomb, Joseph Merry; Georgetown, Moses Riggs; Jefferson, Leander Weeks, Albert Richardson; Lewiston, Charles Millett, Benj Dunn; Lisbon, James Booker, Jacob Gould jr; Newcastle, E W Barker, Isaac C Washburn; Nobleboro', David Hall, Lot Chapman; Philipsburg, Aaron D Young, Chas W Patten; Perkins, Danl Witham; Richmond John B Stuart, John A Plummer; St. George, Ira M. Gilman, Levi Smalley; Thomaston, Edwin Rose, Joseph Berry; East Thomaston, Iddo K Kimball, Edwin S Hovey; South Thomaston, Henry Spaulding; Topsham, Joseph Merrill, Wm Ricker; Townsend, Wm Pierce; Union, Christopher Young, Jhon Lermond; Waldoboro', Thomas Simmons, John Balch, Wm G Reed; Warren, Joshua Patterson, John W Smith; Washington, Charles Reed, John B Rust; Webster, R D Jones West Bath, Nelson Ham, Chas Clifford, sub Westport, Danl McKenny, Whitefield, W F Carlton, J Y Norris; Wiscasset, Arnold Blaney, Daniel Carr; Woolwich, Benj F Tallman; Patricktown, Wellington Nelson; Monhegan, Joseph Sterling; Muscle Ridge, A K P Higgins.

*Oxford.* Albany, Samuel Brown; Andover, Farnum Abbott; Bethel, Abernethy Grover, Mitchell Mason; Brownfield, Elijah Bradbury; Buckfield, H M Hutchinson, Sydenham Bridgham; Byron, Hosea Austin; Canton, William Thompson; Dixfield, Geo W Turner; Denmark, Samue

cillating interests of mere party leaders, may well be proud of, as I am proud of it. And this is its origin and character. The same Democratic

Gibson; Fryburg, H D E Hutchins, E L Osgood; Greenwood, Sammel H Houghton; Gillead, James Burbank; Hartford, Sampson Reed; Hedron, Sullivan Bicknell, Hiram, N B Hubbard; Hanover, A R Knapp; Lovell D G Towae; Livermore, Lea Strickland, Daniel W Ludden; Mexico, John M Eustic; Mason, Solomon Everett; Newry, Albert H Small; Norway, Luther F Pike, Otis True; Oxford, Benajah Pratt; Paris, Hiram Hubbard, America Thayer; Peru, Robinson Turner; Porter, Nath'l Rounds; Rumford, Lyman Rawson; Roxbury, John Reed; Stoneham, E E Barker; Stow, Ebenezer P Nutter; Sumner, Jeremiah Howe; Sweden, Thos Trull; Turner, Philo Clark, S P McKenny; Waterford, Elbridge Gerry; Woodstock, G W Cashman; Hamlin's Grant, D H Crockett; Andover North Surplus, Joseph Morse, Letter B Enoch Abbott; Riley Plantation, Alonzo Fairfield; Lryeburg Aoademy Grant, Edmund F Maines; Milton, J B Greenleaf; Franklin Pl E R Hopkins; Letter A, No. 2, Jas Brown.

*Penobscot.* Bangor, Hastings Strickland, John McDonald, Benj Wiggin, D F Leavitt, Sam'l H Blake, Oliver Frost; Corinth, John Thissel, Chester, Andrew J Heald; Lagrange, Columbus Foster; Maxfield, Thos P Bunker; Eddinton, John S Comins; Lee, Edward Bowles; Mattamiscontis, Dan'l W Orcut; Passadumkeag, Alvin Haynes, 2d; Glenburn, Andrew Miner; Enfield, Nath'l Webster; Bradley, Horace Blackman; Bradford, Jos Chadbourne, Lincoln, Jas H Bowler; Orrington, Dan'l Nickerson, Jas L Alwood; Lowell, Jos Stickney, Carmel, Hiram Ruggles; Springfield, Francis A Reed; Brewer, Edward H Burr, Noah Hanson; Patten, Ichabod Morrill; Argyle, Jeremiah M Frees; Burlington, Isaac Hanson; Charlestown, E M Thurston; Hampden, Dan'l Emery; Zebulon Young; Hermon, L D Phillips; Exeter, Sam'l N Woodman, Noah Baker; Kirkland, Sullivan Patterson; Howland, Wm R Miller; Plymouth, Jas Woodman; Newburg, Wm Miller; Levant, C W Piper; Dexter, Jethro Goodwin; Greenbush, John Ballard; Dixmont, Jos Gilman Stetson, Jos Higgin; Newport, Hiram Rose; Etna, J H Whitten; Edinburgh, Obed W Haynes; Carroll, Galen Gates; Alton, Wm J Thomas; Orono, Abel Moore, Martin McPheters; Milford, Peleg Hall; Oldtown, Solomon Moulton, Ephraim R. Lamas; Garland, Jos Knight, 2d; Mattawamkeag, Asa Smith; No. 5, Range 6, John Merrick; No 7, Range 3, Benj Osgood; Nickertow Plantation, Arvida Hayford; Patagumpus Plantation, Thos. Fowler; West India Plantation, James H Haynes No 4 Range 1, Zadock Gates; Maine, C W Philbrick; No 1 Plantation, M. Thompson; Corinna, Jacob J Elliot, David Jones; Whitney Ridge, T. Dunham; Orville, Sam'l Newbegin; Millnocket, Sam'l Braden; No 2 R. S O Peasons; Grand Falls, Chas Littlefield; No 8, Samuel Clark.

*Piscataquis.* Brownville, Abram Jaquith; Bowerbank, Curus Chase; Parkman, Jos Drew; Wellington, Goe. W. Stanton; Greenville, John G Walden; Dover, S W Elliot, E S Clark; Kingsbury, Amos Decker; Milo, Wm A Luce; Ellotsville, John F Thombs; Blanchard, Thos D Packard; Atkinson; Daniel Chase; Kilmarnock

Jona J Hant; Sangerville, Abner Oaks; Gulford, Joseph Kelsey; Shirley, David Marble; Abbot, J S Monroe; Williamsburg, John A Dunning, Sebec, Joseph Chase; Monson, James Bell; Foxcroft, Lyman Lee; Plantation No 3, Range 5, William Muzzy; Letter B, Range 10, T H Worcester; Barnard, Alvan Wing.

*Somerset.* Hartland, R Gower; Lexington, Thomas Hutchins; Embden, J Steavens, Jr.; Cornville, D Paine; Bingham, W McIntire; Aason, Thos M Greenleaf; Ripley, J Hale; Solon, Wm C McFadden; Detroit, J C Warren; Brighton; Sam'l Waterhouse; St Albans, J Wilshire; Concord, D S Witham; Pittsfield, R Hunter, Fairfield, Nathan Fowler, J Kendall; Norridge-wock, Thos C Jones, M H Pike; Palmyra, J S Ney; Bloomfield, A Weston; Canaan, Levi Johnson; Madison, C Fletcher, A F Churchill; Smithfield, J W Varney; Moscow, J S Nirhols; Showhegan, J Warden, S Haywood; Mercer, D Clark; North Aason, D Bunker; Athens, L D F Palmer; Harmony, A Stevens; Forts Pl., N W Burnham, No 1 range 2, West of Ken. River, J A Wentworth; No 1 range 3, E Ken. River, Sam'l Moor, No 2 North Div. Bing Pur., C Littlefield; Pl No 2, James N Wetts.

*Waldo.* Appleton, Ambrose Arnold and John Hanley; Palermo, Nathan Worthing and Jacob Buffon; Thorndike, Jas D Lamson; Books, Leonard Rowe; North Haven, David Smith; Burnham, William Milikea; Waldo, George C Harding; Liberty, William Sanborn; Lincolville John Hodhdon and Francis Flechter 2d; Northport, James Lankester; Jackson, Ruben Deering; Frankfort, Upton Treat, F D Huntress and George H Hall; Knox, J F Elliot, Searsport, William McGilvery and John C Black; Camden, Ephram K Smart, C Young, Jr. and P J Carleton; Prospect, P Simonton and Joseph Mudgett; Troy, Jesse Smart; Monroe, Horace McKinney and Asa Thurlough; Montville, Geo N White and Nathan Pierce; Searsmont, Sumner Pattee; Freedom, Robert Elliot; Unity, Jas B March; Belfast, Hugh J Anderson, Wm T Colburn and James P Furber; Belmont, John Greer; Hope, Jones Taylor and Nath'l Alford; Swanville, Samuel Eames; Islesborough, E G Knight.

*Washington.* Cooper, Gilheit D. Foster; Crawford, M J Talbot; Danforth plantation, Parker Tewkesbury; Empunds, Wm Woods; Pl No 14, J Burgin; Marrion, Phineas Foster; Pl No 7 Zadoc Bishop; Cutler, John C Talbot, jr; Wesley Reuben Gray; East Machias, Joshua A Lowell; Aixander, John K Damon; Columbia, Albert Keen; Trescott, Geo W Peavey; Robbinston, C Cooper; Calais, Benj Young, Wm L McCollister; Topsfield, Mathras Viekey, jr.; Cherryfield, J C Washburn; Mepybemps, Warren Gilman; B. ring, George Wells; Codyville, John Gray; Addison, W V Bowen; Dennysville, Benj Kilby; Whitneyville, Sam'l H Talbot; Eastport; *Bion Bradbury*, J D Odell; Northfield, S. A. Scribner; Beddington, Jas Flanders; Chartotte, Ximenes Philbrook; Big Lake S. R Byram; Princeton, C H Robb; Talmadge, N Dinsmore; Jonesboro, A D Getchell; Lambert's Lake, James Joy; Lubez, J W Lyman, Samuel

Convention of 1849, that passed the resolutions you have this day re-adopted for your platform, constituted a State Committee, and empowered them to write and publish an address "to the Democratic Republican Electors of the State of Maine." This committee very shortly discharged this duty. The address was published.— The names of the committee were affixed to it. To some now present these names may not be unknown.— I will read them. They are *Ephraim K. Smart*, [the announcement of his name was followed by a general shout of laughter and ridicule, and Mr. Smith proceeded:]

Yes, I perceive, some of you seem to know who and where Mr. Smart now is! The other names are, *Micah J. Talbot*, *Moses Sherbourne*, *Daniel C. Emery*, [and his name caused another general laugh, when Mr. Smith proceeded,] and I perceive you also know who and where Mr. Emery now is!—

Staples, jr; Baileyville, A H Staples; Machias, Geo Walker; Marshfield, Orestes Brown; Jackson Brook, James L Dudley; Pl No 19, Francis Mc Kussick; Pembroke, Ezra Stinchfield; Pl No. 9, Sewel L. Bolter; Waite Pl., John Dudley; Perry, Syvanus Leland; Whiting, Wm. S. Peavey; Weston, Joseph Foss; Centerville, Samu'l Furlong; Machiasport, John Hunter; Steuben, C. S. Clark; Harrington, William Trundy.

York. Action, David Libby; Alfred, Wm. C. Allen; Berwick, J M. Hanson, G. C. Wallingford; Biddeford, J. T. Smith, Jacob K. Cole; Buxton, Stephen Hanson, Jona, McKenny; Cornish, C. R. Ayer; Elliot, Geo. A. Hanscom, N. Hanscom 3d; Hollis, Saml. Sawyer, John M. Goodwin; Kennebunk, J. Titcomb, R. Smith; Kennebunkport Joshua Herrick, Ivory Bickford; Kittery, Gowen Wilson, Chas. G. Bellamy; Lebanon, F. A. Wood, John Chase; Limerick, Luther S. Moor, Abner Burbank; Limington, S. M. Bradbury, Robt. Morton; Liman, Magness J. Smith; Newfield, Geo. Ayer; North Berwick, Thomas J. Hobbs Jr.; Parsonfield, M. Swett, G. L. Bennet; Saco, J. W. Leland, A. A. Hanscom, L. D. Wilkinson; Shapleigh, Elisha Bodwell, M. Goodwin jr.; Sanford, Saml. B. Emery, Saml. Lord; South Berwick, Wm. Young, T. C. Parker; Waterboro, Robt. P. Berry, Jos. Allen; Wells, S. Mildram, Geo. Hatch; York, L. Jenkins, Wm. H. Sweat. Chas. Came.

The last name is *Alpheus A. Hanscom*.

I dare say these gentlemen, when they signed the document I hold in my hand, were sincere, felt as freemen may well feel on this great question of human liberty. They wrote, also, as freemen may well be proud of writing on this great theme of freedom. The topics of the address are divided off under appropriate heads or titles, and the one to which I wish to invite your special attention is under the instructive title of—

"*The duty of the Democracy of Maine.*"

Under this title, the address proceeds as follows :

"We should make a most decided demonstration in the coming gubernatorial canvass. The hills and valleys of our State should everywhere become vocal with loud condemnation of the acts of the Whig party and the present administration. We should boldly declare the principles upon which we stand."

Yes, fellow citizens, men who feel honest, will ever feel bold in declaring their sentiments. The democracy of Maine, all the people of Maine, of all parties, as I will demonstrate directly, were honest in 1849 in their hostility to the extension of slavery, and they did declare boldly their sentiments accordingly in 1849. I invite the honest democracy now to take their eyes off from party leaders, and look back with me upon this record of their party, made up in 1849, to stand for ever as their testimony to the world.

I return to the address. It says—

"We should boldly declare the principles upon which we stand. The true democracy should every where *unite* in opposition to any scheme cre-

ating a Bank; in opposition to the Tariff \* \* \* and in opposition to

' *The extension of slavery in territories now free.*'

Aye, fellow citizens, it was true democracy in Maine, in 1849, "to unite in opposition to the extension of slavery in territories now free." And let me assert, that no man has *dared* since 1849, and prior to the year 1856, to say any thing in the name of "true democracy" contrary to this freedom sentiment. Will men, can our intelligent citizens, *at the bidding of party leaders*, be made to say in 1856, that "opposition to the extension of slavery in territory now free," is not as much true democracy as it was in 1849?—What do we mean, what do we understand, when we say "men change, but principles are eternal?" Do we mean that the principles of 'true democracy' in 1856 can be exactly the opposite of what they were in 1849? Honest men—intelligent men will recognise no such doctrine. What they were in 1849 upon principle, they will be found to be upon principle in 1856, regardless of names, and regardless of interested, office hunting leaders. The great heart of our people will be true to itself at this crisis.

But I return once more to the language of the address:—

"We owe it to ourselves to give no countenance to slavery propagandism, and unless the people of California and New Mexico shall form State governments inhibiting slavery, the democracy of Maine will consider it the imperative duty of Congress to extend over those territories the provisions of the ordinance of 1787."

Yes, fellow citizens, the proud record of the *true* democracy of Maine, as

yet untarnished by a vote actually cast *in favor of slavery*, in 1849 boldly declared, that unless the free territories of California and New Mexico should *positively inhibit slavery*. Congress should spread over them the ordinance of 1787! And what was that ordinance? It was originally drafted by Jefferson and afterwards re-written by Mr. Nathan Dane of Massachusetts, and the Congress of the Confederation of States adopted it as a law, that slavery should never exist in the territories that had been ceded to the Confederacy north-west of the Ohio River. An extension of this perpetual charter of freedom over the newly acquired territory of California and New Mexico, by Congress, was the doctrine boldly declared as the platform of the "true democracy" of Maine in 1849! And can it be, that in 1856, at the mere beck or command of a few party leaders, this great doctrine and platform of freedom is to be suddenly renounced and repudiated, and by that true democracy? [Cries of no, no, resounded throughout the Hall.] I too, say no. And I will not believe our intelligent citizens, whose record and history and politics are so full of pledges to freedom, are so wedded to party as to make any such sudden turn upon their heels.

But I proceed once more with the language of the address:—

"It is very evident there are those within the limits of the United States, who will be satisfied with nothing short of the *actual* introduction of slavery into our free territories, or a dissolution of the Union. If any one is inclined to doubt this assertion, we could cite him to the declaration of Mr. Belser, the person recently nominated as the Taylor candidate for

Governor in the State of Alabama.— We present abundance of evidence showing a determination to establish slavery in the territories by force; but let a single extract from the late letter of Mr. Belser suffice. He says—

“I am against the Wilmot proviso, and view such legislation as unconstitutional, oppressive and unjust. I believe that if it is never adopted by Congress, that under the existing law, no slave holder can take with him his slave to New Mexico or California.— I go for dividing these territorial acquisitions, and if this division cannot be *peaceably* effected, I will be found with that party at the South, number whom it may, who are for maintaining our claim to a portion of this inheritance at all hazards.”

“Thus it will be seen, that those who appropriated the whole of Texas for slaveholding purposes, are for introducing slavery into California and New Mexico *at all hazards*. Such men will find no sympathy in Maine. Their demands are altogether too unreasonable, and if submitted to, it will finally be required of us to go the length of opposing the admission of California and New Mexico into the Union, provided the people of those territories establish free states. The propagation of slavery, into a portion at least, of this territory, is, according to Mr. Belser and others to be maintained, “at all hazards.”\* But these pretensions have finally created something like disgust in the minds of pa-

triotic men, in all sections of the Union. Every sensible person must see how

*ly about*, only by the passing a resolution to that effect by a few party leaders in a political Convention? *We shall see.*

Extracts from Mr. Washburn's Speech :

And first I will quote from Mr. McMULLIN, of Virginia:

“And I tell you, sir, and I want the country to know it—I want the gentlemen from the free States, our Republicans, our Seward Republicans, our Abolitionists, or whatever else they may be called, to know it—that if you restore the *Missouri Compromise*, or repeal the *Fugitive Slave Law*, THIS UNION WILL BE DISSOLVED.”

Mr. McMULLIN at the same time added:

“I hope that if any gentleman deems I do not properly represent the state of public feeling in the South, he will correct me.”

And no member has ever disclaimed the sentiments imputed to the South.

Mr. SHORTER, of Alabama, said a few months ago:

“We tell you plainly that we take issue with you; and whenever you repeal the Fugitive Slave Law, or refuse to admit a State on account of Slavery in her Constitution, or our equality in the Territories is sacrificed by an act of Congress, then the star of this Union will go down to RISE NO MORE.

“Should we be forced to DISSOLVE THE UNION in order to preserve Southern institutions and Southern civilization, we will do it in *peace* if we can; IN WAR IF WE MUST, and let the GOD OF BATTLES decide between us.”

South Carolina, through one of her Representatives, [Mr. BOYCE,] declares as follows:

“That party which places itself upon the position of giving power to the North will eventually succeed; and when that party does succeed, in my opinion, THE UNION WILL BE AT AN END.”

The North, according to Mr. BOYCE, although a majority of the States and of the people, has no right to power. Speaking through another Representative, [Mr. KEITT,] the same State admonishes us thus:

“Let the North refuse admission to a State because of Slavery in her Constitution, and the HISTORY OF THIS UNION IS CLOSED.

And the same gentleman adds:

“The South should establish in the platform the principle, that the right of a Southern man to his slaves is equal in its length and breadth, to the right of a Northern man to his horse. She should make the recognition of the right, FULL, COMPLETE, and INDISPUTABLE.”

Or, in other words, should insist upon the principle, that if a citizen of Maine may take his horse to South Carolina, and hold it there as property, the citizen of South Carolina may as well take his slave into Maine as property. This results from the Southern doctrine, now so popular, of the “equality of the States.”

But, sir, I am not driven to reply upon the testimony of members of Congress upon this point.— The same settlements have been avowed in Southern Democratic conventions—as witness the fol-

\* Only for want of time, I omitted to read the following extracts from Southern sources, collated in an able speech of HON. I. WASHBURN, JR., of our State, in the House of Representatives at Washington, June 21, 1856, clearly demonstrating that the “true democracy” of 1856 in Maine have the same threatenings to warn and contend against, of dissolution of the Union for the sake of slavery, which they “boldly declared” in 1849 to exist, and which had then “created something like *disquiet in the minds of patriotic men, in all sections of the Union.*” Why may we not expect the true democracy of Maine to feel in 1856 this same “something like disgust,” if now, in 1856, they are true to their principles, and to freedom? Can it be that a great and noble party; long numbering a large and decisive majority of our State, and still confessedly very numerous, can be wheeled direct-

impossible it is, to draw the people of the north into the odious work of an unlimited propagation of slavery. It is encouraging to know, also, that in the south the spirit of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Mason and Pickering still exists; and that there are eminent men, whose feelings revolt at the present lust for the "diffusion of slavery." But a few weeks ago, that distinguished and honest advocate of American Democracy (and who, fellow citizens, do you think he is?) THOMAS H. BENTON, [The father of the people's JESSIE, cried out several voices, and FREMONT's father-in-law,] boldly declared to the people of Missouri, his opposition to slavery and its extension. He said—

following, given as a sample, from the resolutions of a convention in Mississippi, on the 8th of January last:

"That the passage by Congress of any law abolishing Slavery in the District of Columbia, or prohibiting the slave trade between the States, or prohibiting Slavery in the Territories, or other places subject to the laws of Congress, or the refusal of Congress to admit a State into the Union because its Constitution recognises Slavery, would afford evidence of a fixed and deliberate design, on the part of that body, to impair, weaken, and finally destroy the institution of Slavery in the States, would be such a violation of our rights as would amount to intolerable oppression, and justify a resort to measures of resistance."

According to this, if Congress should attempt to do now, what for sixty years it did without objection, measures of resistance will be justified. That the above extracts express prevailing Southern doctrine, without respect to party, I cite the following resolution recently adopted by an American State convention in Alabama:

"Resolved, That in view of the increased dangers that threaten the institutions of the South, this convention deems it necessary to, and does hereby, re-endorse and adopt the following resolution, known as the Georgia platform, to wit:— That the State of Alabama, in the judgement of this convention, will and ought to resist, (as a last resort,) to a disruption of every tie which binds her to the Union, an action of Congress upon the subject of Slavery in the District of Columbia, or in places subject to the jurisdiction of Congress incompatible with the safety, the domestic tranquillity, the rights and honor of the slaveholding States or any act suppressing the slave trade between the slaveholding States; or any refusal to admit, as a State, any Territory applying, because of the existence of Slavery therein; or any act prohibiting the introduction of slaves into the Territories; or any act repealing, or materially modifying the laws now in force for the recovery of fugitive slaves."

"As to the Wilmot proviso, I consider it Jefferson's proviso, constitutional and if passed by Congress to be obeyed as other laws. \* \* \* My personal sentiments are against the institution of slavery, and against its introduction into places where it does not exist. If there was no slavery in Missouri to-day, I should be opposed to its coming in. If there was none in the United States, I should oppose its coming into the United States; as there is none in New Mexico or California, I am against sending it to those territories."

The address then proceeds to comment on Mr. Benton's views as follows:

"A great majority of the people of these United States, we are confident, will stand by this doctrine. IN THE ATTEMPT TO EXTEND THE BLIGHT OF SLAVERY OVER THE FREE LANDS OF THIS NATION, THE STURDY REPUBLICANS OF MAINE, IN COMMON WITH THE PATRIOTIC OF THE WHOLE UNION, WILL DEMAND A HALT.— *In this they ask nothing sectional.*"

Fellow Citizens, said Mr. Smith, it was "the true democracy," calling themselves also by the other name of "the sturdy REPUBLICANS of Maine," that in 1849 proclaimed this language, this sentiment, this creed! Had this document been written by any delegate to your own Convention to-day, for the platform upon which FREMONT and DAYTON and HAMBLIN are presented for the support of the sturdy Republicans of Maine in 1856, could language have been chosen, could sentiments have been conceived, more fitting or appropriate to the occasion? I know not who penned this document. But be he who he may—let him belong now to what party he may, he maybe proud of it—may glory in it—but he should curse his own soul, if he has fallen from its noble behests in favor of human freedom!

It is a proud record of where the democracy of Maine has stood, in other years—where they will still stand, in 1856, if true to themselves. It is a proud record from which no man had the impudence, or dishonesty, before the year 1856, to ask any one of that democracy, or of any other party to depart, or renounce. And as yet, I am rejoiced in the belief, that down to this hour, no vote other than of party leaders, or partizan office seekers has been given in any assemblage in Maine, to renounce and reverse this proud record of a once great party in Maine.

The address says—mark it well—“In the attempt to extend the blight of slavery over the free lands of the nation, the sturdy Republicans of Maine, *in common with the patriotic of the whole Union, will demand a HALT! In this they ask nothing sectional.*—They only ask what they believe to be fair and right, and just to all sections. They desire none other than a national administration of the government.

“They will stand by the Union, and by their political friends in the South, in all *democratic* measures, and adhere strictly to their constitutional obligations; *but they will not surrender what rightfully belongs to the free laborers of the whole country.*”

FELLOW CITIZENS, continued Mr. Smith, this position in favor of freedom—this exposition of the *duty*, of the democracy of Maine in 1849, is word for word, and line for line, sentiment for sentiment, the position, and the duty, owned, acknowledged and this day proclaimed, of the Republicans of Maine, and of all men true to the cause of human freedom, in 1856! Mark you, democracy in 1849, proclaimed, that opposition to the extension of slavery into free territories

“*asks nothing sectional!*” Of 607 delegates in the Convention, represented by this address, in 1849, and which passed the two resolutions which your Convention to-day have incorporated into the Republican platform of Maine, *one man only*, MR. BION BRADBURY, of Eastport, raised then a dissenting voice! He—an honorable man, I grant—an honest man, I doubt not—he stood out, *the lone star, in Maine, of slavery, in 1849!* Nor never since that day, until the year 1856, has this lone star found in Maine one glimmer of sympathy, or support in favor of the cause of extending “the blight of slavery over the free lands of the nation.” If there be any man entitled to favor, or credit in early devotion and unswerving constancy to this doctrine of *political paganism* to which the true democracy of Maine are in 1856 being invited by leaders and drivers to become converts, in the face of all past records, of their party and of their State, and in the face of all their past convictions of humanity, he only—Mr. Bradbury alone, has earned it, and is entitled to it!

It was this Convention of 1849, holden in this Hall, on the 28th and 29th days of June, that nominated JOHN HUBBARD a candidate of the “true democracy” for the office of Governor. Now I hold in my hand a slip cut from my file of the Eastern Argus under date a few days short of a month after this nomination of Dr. Hubbard was made—namely, July 26, 1849.—This slip contains a correspondence between the county delegation of Waldo in the nominating Convention and their gubernatorial nominee, on this same interesting and great question of the extension of slavery into free ter-



ritories. This correspondence is prefaced by editorial remarks, indicative also of the decided opinions then entertained by the editor of that paper. The time was, when the Eastern Argus was esteemed by all its patrons and followed, as safe to stand by, and almost to swear by. But some years since a revolution of sentiment was worked in the minds of its supporters, so that few held themselves longer bound by *all* the doctrines that the paper had maintained from time to time, for they were somewhat difficult very often to reconcile. [Laughter and cries of that is so.] The safer sentiment, consequently obtained among the true democracy, as all know who have taken that paper, that no man was bound any farther back by that paper, than what was contained in the then last Argus! [Great applause and laughter throughout the Hall.] Now I shall not therefore read the editor's remarks upon the slip I hold in my hand and claim for them any binding authority upon any man's politics. For it has long been well understood, the principles of the Argus are very much like the Frenchman's flea, upon which if you put your finger, the flea would no longer be there! [Laughter and shouts of applause.] Nor do I undertake to say who was the editor at the time these remarks were penned and printed.—For it is also well understood that the editor of the Argus is as uncertain as the principles of the paper, and again, like the Frenchman's flea, put your finger upon him, and *he is no longer there!* [Renewed and long continued shouts of laughter and applause.]

The title prefixed to the article I am about to read, is as follows—

“HUBBARD AND FREE SOIL.”

[The announcement of this title instantly convulsed the whole assembly with laughter unrestrained for some minutes, after which Mr. Smith proceeded as follows:]

I am not at all surprised, that at this day the association these names, HUBBARD AND FREE SOIL, excites your merriment. But it is not my fault that they are so associated at this day—it is the fault of the Eastern Argus, the editor of which wrote *then* as follows:

“HUBBARD AND FREE SOIL.”

“The following correspondence defines precisely, tersely, and without any possibility of mistake Dr. HUBBARD's position on the free soil issue.—It is a position fully sustainable, and in entire accordance with the sentiments of the great body of the democratic party of Maine, and in fact of the North generally.

“In view of the action of the democracy of the legislature—of the resolutions of our State Convention—and of this letter from our candidate for Governor—the question becomes peculiarly appropriate—What are the *Free Soil party* hoping to accomplish by separate organization? We think it would puzzle their wisest leaders to answer it.”

Here then is the evidence, that in July 1849, the party of the Eastern Argus—the true democracy of Maine—the supporters of John Hubbard, were so identical in views upon the subject of slavery, *with the Free Soil party*, that the Argus rebuked that party for desiring a separate organization! and it asserted that “it would puzzle their wisest leaders to answer” in what could consist the good of a separate organization of the Free Soil party from the Democratic Party! Then follows this correspondence with Dr. Hubbard:

AUGUSTA, July 16, 1849.

HON. JOHN HUBBARD—*Sir*:—The undersigned, the delegation from the county of Waldo, would respectfully request a statement of your views in relation to the extension of slavery into territories of the United States which are now free. Your position as a candidate for the office of Governor of this State, is a sufficient apology for what might

otherwise appear to be an officious interference with the opinions of others.

Very respectfully,

Your friends and servants,

|                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| ADAMS TREAT,      | P. SIMONTON,     |
| THOMAS M. MORROW, | GEORGE N. WHITE, |
| WILLIAM MERRIAM,  | NATH'N WORTHING, |
| AUTHUR TREAT,     | DAN. WENTWORTH,  |
| JESSE SMART,      | JOSEPH BACHELER, |
| JOHN HODGDON,     | DAVID SMITH.     |

HALLOWELL, July 17, 1849.

Gentlemen:—Yours of the 16th, requesting “a statement of my views in relation to the *extension* of slavery into territories of the United States now free,” is before me. The question in all its practical bearings, as a subject of deliberative and solemn legislation, is an extensive one. I can only give, here, a brief statement of the principles which would guide my action upon it.

1st. I believe Congress to have entire constitutional jurisdiction over the whole subject of slavery in the *territories* of the United States.

2d. I am opposed to slavery in all its bearings, moral, social, and political, and especially am I opposed to its *extension*.

3d. I would adopt all constitutional and equitable means to prevent the extension of slavery into territories now free.

Hoping, gentlemen, that this brief expose will meet your views, I am with sentiments of respect and regard,

Yours, JOHN HUBBARD.

Fellow Citizens—If MR. HAMLIN, your candidate for Governor were to sign his name to this same letter of Dr. Hubbard, and date it July 17, 1856, instead of July 17, 1849, would he not cover the exact ground upon which you place the support of him at this day?

Then, it was *pure democracy*!—Now, it is called *black republicanism* and *disunion*!

But, will the democracy of Maine be expected to *follow* leaders who are running away from all the principles of government in respect to freedom and slavery, to which for a life-time democrats in the ranks as well as leaders have professed and pledged themselves to support? In the support of Mr. Buchanan exactly the reverse of every principle and of every sentiment embodied in this Hubbard letter, is involved and demanded? And the Argus says, these principles and sentiments

were not only “sustainable” in 1849, but were “*in entire accordance with the sentiments of the great body of the democratic party of Maine, and in fact of the North generally.*”

After this full and complete commitment of the democratic party, and of the people of Maine, to this opposition to the extension of slavery, does it not require bold confidence to ask, and to expect, that *this same democratic party* and *this same people* will in 1856 wheel entirely round, and in Mr. Buchanan, give their support and their votes, to exactly the opposite principle and doctrine of government? and to trample into degradation this proud record of their devotion to freedom?—Will you believe they will do so? [No, no, was responded from every part of the Hall.]

No more do I believe it of the Electors of Maine. They will follow the flag of freedom wherever that waves, and floats, and yield deference to party leaders up to that furthest mark. But, when those leaders abandon that flag, and attempt to stripe it with one additional black stripe, or black star, that is emblematical of human slavery, the ballot boxes of our people will revolt, and no longer own obedience to the influence of such leaders.

Having exhibited to you the position and doctrines of the democratic party, and of their candidate for Governor, in 1849, upon this great question of human slavery, I will now call your attention to the record which the *whig party* also, at that time, made up on this same great subject. Bear in mind, that I have tendered the challenge to every man of every party to disprove the assertion which I make, that no party in Maine ever before the

dawn of the present year, had the boldness to invite the electors of Maine to give the slightest countenance to the extension of slavery over free territory; but all parties have been united hitherto as one man, and one people, throughout our noble State, against such an extension of slavery under any form whatever. In the address to the democracy in 1849, from which I have read, various accusations are embodied against the whig party; but not one syllable of fault on this question of slavery. For whigs then were as true to freedom, as democrats themselves claimed to be. [Great applause.] And I will now read to you the whig record of that day. A Convention of the whigs, assembled in representation of the whole party in the State, at Augusta, on the 18th day of July, 1849, among other resolutions passed this one on slavery—namely—

*“Resolved, That we now reiterate the Sentiments expressed in the Halls of Congress upon the question of the admission of Missouri nearly thirty years since, by MELLETT WHITMAN and other whigs of our State, in relation to the farther extension of slavery; while they would be just to all the constitutional rights of the North, we ARE DECIDEDLY OPPOSED TO THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF SLAVERY.”\**

Fellow Citizens, upon that high and

\*And what may also be appropriately remembered at this juncture, and in connection with what I have said in my speech, of Hon. GEORGE EVANS, this same Whig Convention unanimously passed the following resolution, indicating where Mr. Evan's position then was, and I fain hope, still is, on this question of slavery in *free territory* :—

“Phineas Barnes, Esq., of Portland, and Hon Isaac Reed of Waldoborough, being present, were called upon to address the convention, and after some remarks from Mr. Appleten, the resolves were unanimously adopted.

Mr. Cochran of Waldoborough presented the following resolve, which was unanimously adopted.

*“Resolved, That in the Hon George Evans, we recognise Maine's able Representative, fearless*

patriotic ground did the whigs of Maine, as well as the democrats of Maine, plant themselves in 1849.—Neither of these parties then dared to assail the other on the ground of defection to freedom. Who is there of the patriotic whigs of 1849 so forgetful of principle—so faithless to patriotism, as to trample upon this proud record in 1856? [Several voices cried out Evans—George Evans—Little, are the men!]

Say rather, exclaimed Mr. Smith, *Little George Evans*, if it be so, for fallen indeed is Mr. Evans—the great man has indeed become Little, if it can be that he will be guilty of such defection to freedom now. I respect Mr. Evans too much—he fought too well the whig battles of other days—he has grown too old in years, and earned himself too much of fame, to be now tempted in the decline of life to turn traitor to freedom and to the holy record of the whig party upon this great question of human liberty, for the paltry trappings, or the paltry income of a small office, even if accepted at the hands of a corrupt democracy. I will not yet believe it of him, although their prominent men among the supporters of the Buchanan Slavery Platform, already sneer contemptuously at the uses which they are now making in this State of some who were formerly prominent members of the whig party. And one of them to-day illustrated his subject by a comparison that has less of vulgarity than of truth in it.—He said it reminded him of certain men, who dressed their kept mistresses

statesman, and eloquent advocate of the rights and interests of the northern laborer. His high talents, untarnished integrity, and devoted patriotism, demand the gratitude not only of our own State, but of the nation.

in silks and satins, while they dressed their own wives in homespun and calicoes! I inquired how he meant to be understood? Why says he, for the sake of using the whig leaders our party leaders give the whigs the best of the offices, and content our own folks with *those that are mere calico!* [Great laughter and applause.]

But, continued Mr. SMITH, is GEORGE EVANS one of these? Is this subserviency to the cause of slavery, which the supporters of Buchanan, or what is the same in effect, opposition to FREMONT and HAMLIN, involves, the price that Mr. EVANS is to pay for the *silken* office which he holds at the hands of the present administration? If Mr. EVANS shall appear in *that silk dress* before the people of this State, as the advocate of slavery—to tarnish and desecrate the great testimonials reared by the concurrence of all political parties in Maine to freedom, in the sacred records I have already read to you this evening, and reared also to himself in Congress, I pledge my best efforts and humble opportunity, in return, to meet him before our people and shame him in the act.— But let no man say, Mr. EVANS will o this, until Mr. EVANS shall himself proclaim it!

But I now come to yet one more record, that lifts its proud voice from the past, and speaks with fresh life to the hearts of the Electors of Maine.— I have referred you to records written in the name of the democratic party of our State; I have referred you to the records written in the name of the Whig party of Maine; I now refer you to the record which both those parties concurred in writing, in the name of the State and whole people, to

live forever upon the Statute book of our State Government! And I go again to that ever memorable year 1849.

Gov. DANA then filled the Executive chair. The Legislative session was being held in summer. In the Governor's Message, he denounced the institution of slavery in the abstract, and its extension into the new territories of California and New Mexico.— But he also held, that Congressional prohibition of it there would be inoperative and of no practical use, because the territory was sure to be free without it. But the Legislature acted upon the subject, and acted with decision, and unmistakable boldness. I will now read their resolutions as they were originally reported and as they passed both branches of the Legislature:

"Resolved, That we hereby declare for ourselves and in behalf of the people of this State, our uncompromising opposition to the extension of slavery into any territory of the United States which is now free."

"Resolved, That in organizing governments for New Mexico and California, the introduction and existence of slavery in those territories should be positively prohibited by an act of Congress."

"Resolved, That our Senators in Congress are hereby instructed, and our representatives requested, to vote against any act establishing governments for said territories that does not contain *an express prohibition of slavery.*

"Resolved, That the Governor be requested to forward copies of the foregoing resolutions to each of our senators and representatives in Congress, and to each of the Governors of the several States of the Union."

These Resolves passed the Senate on the 14th of June, 1849, *unanimously*; and on the 10th of July, 1849, they passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 113 yeas, to 2 nays.\* On the 17th of July

\*To enable the reader to possess himself of full knowledge of this legislative record, we present it as follows:—

These resolves were adopted in the Senate of Maine, June 14, 1849. The following Senators voting for them:—

Oliver Bean, Readfield; Wm. V. Bowen, Addison;

Gov. Dana sent them back to the Senate with a Veto, on the ground of an informal-

ity, and not of any objectionable abstract principle involved; and the Senate re-passed

Gilman M. Burleigh, Dexter; Hiram Chapman, Damariscotta; Philo Clark, Turner; Eleazer Crocker, St. Albans; Daniel Dam, Newfield; John P. Davis, Naples; John P. T. Dumont, Hallowell; Manley Eames, Dover; Paulinus M. Foster, North Anson; Sam'l W. Fox, Berwick; Joab Harriman, Clinton; James Hobbs, Jr., Fryburg; John Hodgdon, Houlton; Iddo K. Kimball, East Thomaston; Chas. Meguire, New Gloucester; Thomas M. Morrow, Searsmont; Anos Pickard, Hampden; Isaac Pool Edgecomb; Oliver Prescott, Vassalboro; Benj. Rea, Brooksville; Henry Richardson, Oldtown; Ephraim Sturdivant, Cumberland; Micah J. Talbot, East Machias; Adams Treat, Frankfort; Leander Valentine, Westbrook.

No vote in the Senate against the resolves.

The same resolves were adopted in the House, July 10th; 113 yeas to 2 nays:—

YEAS.—Moses L. Appleton, Bangor; Isaiah Avery, Exeter; Joseph Avery, Jefferson; Joseph Bachelor, Monson; E. F. Baker, Steuben; Thos Baker, Waterville; Wm. Baker, Moscow; Edward Bean, Charleston; Sam'l Belcher, Farmington; Alden Boynton, Wiscasset; James Brown, Dayton Plantation; David Bryant, Windsor; Alvah J. Buker, Canaan; Thomas P. Bunker, Maxfield; John Burrill, Jr., Baldwin; Henry Carter, Portland; Samuel Clark, Pittston; John C. Cochran, E. Thomaston; Wm. S. Cochran, Waldoboro'; Geo. Cox, Vassalboro'; Joseph Curtis, New Castle; Wm. Curtis, Brunswick; James B. Dascumb, Bloomfield; Josiah Day, 2d, Leeds; John Dudley, Waite Plantation; Geo. W. Duncan, Bath; Henry T. Emery, Eastport; Nathaniel Fenderson, Scarboro'; John Fogg, Etna; Royal Fogg, Monmouth; Phineas Foster, Marion; Francis Fuller, Winthrop; Benj. A. Gardner, Charlotte; S. K. Gilman, Hallowell; Samuel Gould, New Portland; Jonas Greene, Byron; Ebn'r Greenleaf, Westport; Nathan Grover, Bethel, Levi Guptil, Belgrade; Sam'l Haines, Clinton; John R. Haley, Kittery; Daniel Hall, Gray, Elias Ham, Shapleigh; Alonzo Hamilton, Saco; Oliver Hanscom, Lebanon; James F. Hill, Gouldsboro'; Isaac M. Hobbs, N. Berwick; John Hodgdon, Lincolnville; Amasa Holman, Dixfield; Isaac S. Hooper, Cambridge; Darius Howard, Phillips; Horace P. Hubbard, Topsham; David Huston, Bristol; John Hutchinson, Corinna; Warden Johnson, Wellington; Sam'l Jordon, Westbrook; Wentworth Jordon, Webster; Joseph Kinsman, Cornville; Henry Leach, Smithfield; Thomas B. Lincoln, China; Thomas Littlefield, Auburn; Nathan M. Lord, Newfield; Howard B. Lovejoy, Fayette; Joseph Mahoney, Searsmont; James Mann, Gorham; Jacob Marston, Parsonsfield; Robert Martin, Poland; Henry Mason, Porter; James McGown, Ellsworth; Elisha Merriam, Belmont; Wm. Merriam, Camden, Jona. C. Merrill Durham; H. L. Morrison, E. Livermore; Chas. M. Morse, Wilton; Stephen Myrick, jr., Lewiston, Joel Nevens, Carmel; Jas. W. North, Augusta; Clifford B. Norton, Industry; Thomas O'Brien, Thomaston; E. H. Oliver, Freeman; James Percy, Arrowsic; N. D. Phillips, Orrington; Daniel Putnam, Belfast; Henry C. Reed, Norway; Sampson Reed, Hartford; Daniel Rogers, Windham; Daniel Savage, Hancock Plantation; George P. Sewall, Oldtown; P. Simonon, Searsport; Jesse Smart, Troy; Turner Smith, Northfield; Thos. B. Spaulding, Milo; Joseph Spear, Warren; Charles Spofford, Deer Isle; Isaac Strickland, Turner; Hastings Strickland, Bangor; Samuel Sweetser, N. Yarmouth; Ziba Tayer, Paris; Francis Thibodeau, Madawaska; Sam'l Thing, Freeport; Arthur Treat, Waldo; Aaron True, Litchfield; Isaac N. Tucker, Gardiner; Silas L. Wait, Sidney; Jas.

C. Warren, Detroit; Samuel Webber, jr., Waterboro; Dan'l Wentworth, Knox; R. Wentworth, Buxton; Amherst Whitmore, Brunswick; D. S. Witham, Concord; Nathan Worthing, Palermo; Christopher Young, Union. Geo. N. White, Montville.

NAYS 2.—C. R. Abbott, Bucksport; Jabez Knowlton, Newburg.

These resolves were vetoed by Gov. Dana, and on the 25th of July were passed by the Senate over his veto, every Senator voting for them except Mr. Bean, of Kennebec, who was absent. Besides those voting for the resolves as above (June 14) were the following who were then absent:

Wm. W. Tripp, Wilton; Thomas Dyer, 3d, Saco; Joseph Merrill, Topsham; James H. Fatnum, Rumford.

So the Senate passed the Resolves over the Governor's veto by an unanimous vote.

In the House the same resolves were also passed over the Governor's veto (July 27) by a vote of 94 yeas to 20 noes:—

The AYES were as follows:—

Samuel Andrews 2d, Bridgton; Joseph Avery, Jefferson; Joseph Bachelor, Monroe; Thomas Baker, Waterville; Wm. Baker, Moscow; Edward Bean, Charleston; Sam'l Belcher, Farmington; Ozias Blanchard, Blanchard; Moses Bradbury, Biddeford; David Bryant, Windsor; Thos. P. Bunker, Maxfield; John Burrill, jr., Baldwin; Wm. T. Chadbourn, Standish; Sam'l Clark, Pittston; Wm. Curtis, Brunswick; Joseph Curtis, New Castle; Geo. W. Duncan, Bath; Josiah Day, 2d, Leeds; Nath'l Fenderson, Scarboro'; John Fogg, Etna; Royal Fogg, Monmouth; Wm. L. Foot, S. Berwick; Geo. M. Freeman, York; Phineas Foster, Marion; Francis Fuller, Winthrop; Sam'l Furlong, Calais; S. K. Gilman, Hallowell; Sam'l Gould, New Portland; Nathan Grover, Bethel; Levi Guptil, Belgrade; John R. Haley, Kittery; Dan'l Hall, Gray; Elias Ham, Shapleigh; Alonzo Hamilton, Saco; Wm. Hesketh, Bowerebank; Oliver Hanscom, Lebanon; James F. Hill, Gouldsboro'; Nath'l Hilton, Wells; John Hodgdon, Lincolnville; Darius Howard, Phillips; David Hueston, Bristol; John Huthinson, Corinna; Warren Johnson, Wellington; Sam'l Jordon, Westbrook; Wentworth Jordon, Webster; Henry Leach, Smithfield; Thos. B. Lincoln, China; H. B. Lovejoy, Fayette; Joseph Mahony, Searsmont; James Mann, Gorham; Jacob Marston, Parsonsfield; Robert Martin, Poland; Henry Mason, Porter; Jas McGown, Ellsworth; Cephas Meeds, Limington; Elisha Merriam, Belmont; Wm Merriam, Camden; Nathl Mitchell, Kennebunkport; H. L. Morrison, E. Livermore; Chas M Morse, Wilton; Daniel March, Casco; Joel Nevens, Carmel; Jas W North, Augusta; Clifford B Norton, Industry; Parker W Perry, Orland; N D Phillips, Orrington; Daniel Putam, Belfast; Sampson Read, Hartford; Daniel Rogers, Windham; George P Sewall, Oldtown; Putnam Simonon, Searsport; Jesse Smart, Troy; Turner Smith, Northfield; David Smith, Vinalhaven; Thomas B Spalding, Milo; Joseph Spear, Warren; Chas Spofford, Deer Isle; Ziba Tayer, Paris; Arthur Treat, Waldo; Aaron True, Litchfield; Isaac Tucker, Gardiner; Silas L Waite, Sidney; Tobias Walker, Kennebunk; Jas C Warren, Detroit; Josiah Webster, Glenburn; Daniel Wentworth, Knox; R Wentworth, Buxton; Nathan Weston, Jr, Orono; Geo N White, Montville; Wm Winter, Carthage; D S Witham, Concord; Nathan Worthing, Palermo; Christopher Young, Union. Jones Greene, Byron.

In the House of Representatives, June 13, 1849,

them on the 25th of July, without alteration, by the vote of every Senator present,

Mr. Appleton of Bangor by leave laid on the table the following resolve—

#### RESOLVE RELATIVE TO SLAVERY.

Whereas the people of Maine regard slavery with feelings of profound abhorrence; as conflicting with the great principles of freedom and free government, detrimental to political progress, and ought not to be upheld or sanctioned in the capital of our glorious Union, the very sanctuary of Liberty; therefore

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their utmost influence to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia by all constitutional means.

On motion of Mr. Sewall of Oldtown the rules were suspended and the resolves read once.

On motion of the same gentleman, the rules were again suspended and the resolves read a second time.

On motion of the same gentleman the yeas and nays were ordered and the resolve was passed, yeas 112; nays 14—as follows.

YEAS.—Constant R Abbott, Bucksport; Moses L Appleton, Bangor; Asaiah Avery, Exeter; Joseph Bachelor, Monroe; E F Baker, Steuben; Thomas Baker, Waterville; Edward Bean, Charleston; Saml Belcher, Farmington; Alden Boynton, Wiscasset; Moses Bradbury, Biddeford; James Brown, Dayton plantation; David Bryant, Windsor; Isaiah Bruce, Patricktown; Thomas P Bunker, Maxfield; Henry Carter, Portland; Sam'l Clark, Pittston; John C Cochran, E Thomaston; Wm S Cochran, Waldoboro'; George Cox, Vassalboro'; Joseph Curtis, New Castle; William Curtis, Brunswick; Jas B Dascomb Bloomfield; Josiah Day, 2d, Leeds; Geo W Duncan, Bath; Henry T Emery, Eastport; John Fogg, Etna; Royal Fogg, Monmouth; Wm L Foote, South Berwick; Phinehas Foster, Marrion; Geo M Freeman, York; Francis Fuller, Winthrop; Sam'l Furlong, Calais; Benj A Gardner, Charlotte; Sam'l Gould, New Portland; Jonas Greene, Byron; Eben'r Greenleaf, Westport; Levi Guptill, Belgrade; John R Haley, Kittery; Dan'l Hall, Gray; Elias Ham, Shapleigh; Alonzo Hamilton, Saco; Oliver Hanscom, Lebanon; George Hathaway, Addison; Wm Hesketh, Bowerbank; Nath'l Hilton, Wells; Isaac M Hobbs, N Berwick; John Hodgdon, Lincolnville; Amasa Holman, Dixfield; Isaac S Hooper, Cambridge; Dar'us Howard, Phillips; Horace P Hubbard, Topsham; David Huston, Bristol; John Hutchinson, Corinna; N H Ingalls, Bluehill; Warren Johnson, Wellington; Thomas Johnson, N Gloucester; Wentworth Jordan, Webster; Joseph Kinsman, Cornville; Jabez Knowlton, Newburg; Henry Leach, Smithfield; Thos B Lincoln, China; Thos Littlefield, Auburn; Nathan M Lerd, Newfield; H B Lovejoy, Fayette; Joseph Mahoney, Searsmont; James Mann, Gorham; Jacob Marston, Parsonsfield; Robert Martin, Poland; Henry Mason, Porter; Jas McGown, Ellsworth; Cephas Meeds, Limington; Elisha Merriam, Belmont; Wm Merriam, Camden; Jona C Merrill, Durham; H L Morrison, E Livermore; Stephen Myrick, Jr, Lewiston; Joel Nevens, Carmel; Jas W North, Augusta; C B Norton, Industry; Jas Percy, Arrowsic; Ximenes Philbrick, Buckfield; N D Phillips, Orrington; Dan'l Pntnam, Belfast; Henry C Read, Norway; Sampson Read, Hartford; Dan'l Rogers, Windham; Geo P Sewall, Oldtown; Putnam Simonton, Searsport; Turner Smith, Northfield; Joseph Spear, Warren; Chas Spofford, Deer Isle; Sam'l Sweetser, N Yarmouth; John C Talbot, Jr, Lubec; Ziba Thayer, Paris; Francis Thibodeau, Madawaska; Arthur Treat, Waldo; Elisha Trowbridge, Portland; Aaron True, Litchfield; Thomas Trull, Sweden; Isaac N

being 30 of the 31 in number; and the House passed them on the 27th of July by a vote of 94 to 20; notwithstanding the Governor's objections!

Well might *Ephraim K. Smart*, and other signers of the Democratic Address, exclaim—"In the attempt to extend the blight of slavery over the free lands of the nation, THE STURDY REPUBLICANS OF MAINE, in common with the patriotic of the whole Union, WILL DEMAND A HALT!—In this they ask NOTHING SECTIONAL! They only ask what they believe to be fair, and RIGHT, and JUST to all sections!"

In view of such a record—a record in which the pride of all our citizens, of all parties, should enlist unhesitatingly to make IMMUTABLE, the *Eastern Argus*, too, might well exclaim—

"It is a position fully sustainable, and in entire accordance with the sentiments of the great body of the democratic party in Maine, and in fact, of the North generally."

Let us, one and all, hold this record high up; and, before the country, and before man, and before God, let us proclaim, that we deem it sacred to humanity, and that we will be true to it in Maine, *let who else may turn traitor to the cause of FREEDOM!* [Great applause and shouts of "we will; we will!"]

FELLOW CITIZENS, I have but few brief inquiries to submit to you, before I retire. And first, let me ask, who is it that now demands that we should no longer halt, but that the democracy of Maine, even, shall with quickened march, persevere "in the attempt to extend the blight of slavery over the free lands of the nation?"

A few party leaders, claiming to represent in Convention at Cincinnati "the sturdy Republicans of Maine!" They, too, never

Tucker, Gardiner; Silas L Waite, Sidney; Tobias Walker, Kennebec; Sam'l Welster, Jr, Waterboro'; Daniel Wentworth, Knox; R Wentworth, Buxton; Nathan Weston, Jr, Orono; Geo N White, Montville; Benj I Wilson, Castine; Wm Winter, Carthage; D S Witham, Concord; Nathan Worthing, Palermo; Christopher Young, Jr, Union.

until the Convention holden in June, 1856, at Cincinnati, heard the impudent request made within the limits of Maine, in the name and authority of any party, or party Convention, *that Maine should turn upon her heel against Freedom to support human slavery!*

To show this, more conclusively, let me for a moment call your attention to the reading of the only sentiment which the party leaders of the now Buchanan party, dared to enunciate in their State Convention, holden at Augusta on the 21st day of June, 1855—a few days more than one year since. Their resolution reads:

5. *Resolved*, That the National Administration by its faithful execution of the laws; by its adherence to the constitution; by its admirable foreign policy and by its resolute maintenance of the old land marks of the Democratic party, will command the respect and support of all true men. *It being understood, that this approval of the National Administration is expressive of no opinion in relation to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.*"

Here then is the proof, that one year since, only, so uniform had been the opinion, the convictions, *the creed* of the democracy of Maine against the policy of suffering slavery to extend into free territory, that even their party leaders did not *dare* present a resolution in their Convention, that *might be construed that way*, without affixing to it a *caveat*, a *proviso*, an avowed understanding, *that nothing of the kind should be imputed to the democracy of Maine!*

This very resolution—the last on record in this State down to 1856, is a tribute to the firmness, to the intelligence, to the love of freedom, that has ever characterized the sturdy Republicans of Maine!

Then, I say, the record of Maine, of all parties in Maine, is clean, is uniform, is unstained and unquestionable, *in favor of freedom*, and against slavery, down to the year 1856!\*

Shall it now be repudiated? Shall it *now* be dishonored? Shall it *now* be blotted out

lowers of the Southern interests that ruled the Cincinnati Convention, and made Mr. Buchanan the nominee of that party, for the Presidency, is no less marked in principle, than by men in Maine who participate in the undertaking.

For instance; in 1849, the democratic County Convention holden in Cumberland, passed *unanimously* the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Democracy of Cumberland will adhere strictly to the OLD JEFFERSONIAN CREED, and *strenuously resist any attempt to modify its character*, by the addition of new articles; and therefore, *THOUGH UNCOMPROMISINGLY opposed to the introduction of slavery into free territory*, IT WILL NEVER CONSENT TO MAKE SUCH OPPOSITION A TEST OF POLITICAL ORTHODOXY."

Now the democratic State Convention holden at Bangor on the 1st inst. resolve, "THAT THE PEOPLE OF A TERRITORY LIKE THOSE OF A STATE, shall determine for themselves their own democratic institutions."

Of course, then, the doctrine of the Convention of 1856 is, that it is competent for the people of territory that is free, and that is *not yet a State*, to legalize slavery in that territory, regardless of the will and judgment, and legislation of Congress!

It is remarkable, that Hon. ROBERT P. DUNLAP, who may, without disrespect, be denominated a *stereotype party democrat*, and who presided at the Democratic State Convention of 1856, was a delegate to, and presiding officer of the Cumberland County Convention of 1849, that passed *unanimously*, the above quoted resolution! And the Hon. GEORGE F. SHEPLEY, (who cannot as well be denominated a *stereotype*, as he may, a *daguerrotype democrat*, for he does not like Mr. Dunlap, exist in fixed metal, but in the refraction of political colors artistically blended;) was by this same Cumberland County Convention of 1849 nominated for the office of Senator to the State Legislature of 1850, and was elected accordingly, and helped to elect Hon. HANNIBAL HAMLIN to the United States Senate at that session of 1850; and yet was a delegate to the democratic State Convention of 1856, and was there one of the cheered speakers in *ridicule of the Jefferson doctrine of the sovereignty of Congress over the free territories!* He, who in 1849, solemnly voted for the resolution, "*strictly to adhere to the old Jeffersonian creed,*" and to "*strenuously resist any attempt to modify its character by the addition of new articles!*"

That it was a part of "the old Jeffersonian creed," that Congress had supreme legislative power over the legislation of the territories. I need only remind Mr. Dunlap and Mr. Shepley, and their Buchanan coadjutors, of the historical fact that is undoubtedly well known to them, that Gen. ARTHUR ST. CLAIR, of Revolutionary renown, was for fourteen years Governor of the northwestern territory; and that *under Jefferson's administration*, in 1804, he was removed from that office, *for asserting the doctrine of territorial popular sovereignty, and denying the pow-*

\* The sunsets now sought to be fastened upon the democratic party of this State, by the fol-

in support of Mr. Buchanan? Of what is it supposed the Electors of Maine are made that this tergiversation is demanded of them? Can they be wheeled about at the bidding of a few party leaders? Who is there, of our fellow citizens, apart from office holders and office seekers, that is not interested in upholding the political reputation of the State? Who among democrats, does not love to preserve the principles of that party uncontaminated by treachery? If there are any who do so love that party's good name, they must in honor, in conscience, and upon principle, *decline to support Mr. Buchanan's election to the Presidency!*

But for whose interest, let me next ask, is this *sudden wheel about* of the democratic party of Maine, and of the whig party of Maine, also, demanded?

By that of less than 350,000 slave holders in all the Union! And are they to control at pleasure the principles, the policy, the consciences, and the government of upwards of twenty millions of souls?

Are we in Maine to yield ourselves up, the flexible instruments to work out the purposes of these sectional slave holders?

For the mere hope of cheap cotton, are the manufacturers of New England to do this?

For the mere purpose of employing a few thousand tonnage of navigation in the freighting of that cotton, or of other products of *slave labor*, are our ship owners, and merchants of Maine to surrender up their independence, and their humanity, to these 350,000 slave owners?

And what else do these slave holders of the South, and their panders at the North, demand at our hands?

To aid them in converting the free soil of Kansas into a nursery of slavery. Yes, we of New England, who expend our public treasure, and our private munificence, in building up institutions of religion, of science, of benevolence and of education, we who by both our public moneys and private munificence, have aided in providing in our own State, or elsewhere, institutions for practically making the blind, see, for making the deaf, hear, for making the dumb speak, for restoring the insane to reason, and even for searching out the hidden brain of the idiotic, and smiting it into active intelligence as the rock of old was smitten to gush forth the living waters to the thirsty multitude—we who are reared in the building up of these high and holy institutions of light, of knowledge, of benevolence and of moral culture, that the human soul may expand and grow in happiness—we are asked to forget and abandon all these noble impulses, and turn our backs to these great and glorious works and lend our aid and our influence to these 350,000 slave-holders in crushing out all the life of knowledge, all the uplifting of human souls in the common territory of our country that is now free, and sink the souls of half the population which that territory, dedicated by nature and by God to freedom, is destined to support, into the depths of irredeemable darkness and ignorance! Yes; and our brothers, our relations, our neighbors, who have emigrated there, invited by a genial soil, and under the protection of a government of freedom, as they supposed,

---

er of Congress to impose certain conditions and restrictions upon the people of Ohio in the formation of their State Government.”

But this is not all. The Whig County Convention for Cumberland, holden August 23, 1849, and nominating Senatorial candidates for the September election against Mr. Shepley and associate nominees, passed the following significant and decisive, and instructive resolutions, on the subject of slavery, viz:—

“Resolved, That we cordially unite with all liberal, patriotic, and philanthropic hearts and minds in the community, whether they be whigs or democrats, in pronouncing for the perpetual freedom of all soil upon which the fatal stamp of slavery is not irrevocably infixed; that we see no difference between our principles on this point, and those of the most devoted to the cause of human rights, and uncompromising in their hostility to the extension of slavery, and determined in their resolution to *circumscribe*, so far as it is not in their power to *extinguish*, this most hideous of all social calamities, and the most dreadful of political enormities, excepting only, the scourge of civil war.”



have been compelled to abandon all these high and holy institutions, ignore their teachings to the heart of man, leave them all behind, and uphold the accursed influences and teachings of human slavery and of slave-holders, or expose themselves to brutal massacre, and their property to the rapine of worse than thieves. The bones of some of our own citizens who have fallen in this delusive promise of democratic freedom in that land, are now bleaching there, hideous testimonials of a faithless and treacherous federal administration which is sought to be perpetuated in the election of *Mr. Buchanan*. Shall we perpetuate it? [Cries of *no, no.*]

But this—all this, we of Maine are asked to do and to submit to, thus suddenly, and after upholding for years, and writing upon our statute books for all eternity, such a proud, such a GLORIOUS RECORD in favor of human freedom, as I have exhibited to you this evening!

In the name of God, may I not ask, if OUR PEOPLE are capable of such degradation; if they could thus suddenly become traitors to the cause of human liberty and republi-

can government in our land; if they could so tarnish the past, and be insensible to the shame of the present, and so reckless of the future, what vengeance of heaven, though heated a hundred fold hotter than the lightning that splinters and blasts the gnarled oak, would not be justly merited by them under Divine Providence?

FELLOW CITIZENS, this huge sin must not be laid to our charge. As one people, with one mind, let us watch and preserve untarnished, *the glorious record of our State*, and of its political parties, which the past emblazons to the country, and to the world.—Our honor is involved in it. *The pride of our children is in it!* And if others falter—if others are tempted—if others are false to liberty, false to humanity, false to the honest pledges of their own souls, let us dare to do that—let us dare pursue that, one, straightforward, patriotic course, in the cause of freemen and of liberty, for which, on the great final reckoning that awaits the world of mankind, we can rush fearlessly into the presence of Almighty God, and boldly claim, that WE HAVE BEEN AT ALL TIMES FAITHFUL TO LIBERTY, AND TO HUMANITY!

[From the most intense and profound quiet, the vast throng of listeners to Mr. Smith's Speech burst forth at its conclusion in immense and reiterated applause.]

## “The True Issue.”

We append the following article which appears under the above head in the Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer*, the leading Democratic paper, as we understand it, in the South. The sentiment of the article appears to be different from that which we read in Northern Democratic journals, which generally admit that slavery is an evil, but maintains that the fact of its being so has practically little to do with the question of its extension. There are in this article some admissions which it may be safer to make in the Southern than in the Northern States, such for instance as that the ‘abolitionists’ (by which the Southern mean Republicans) ‘are clearly right if Slavery be morally wrong;’ and that Northern Democrats cannot consistently maintain that Slavery is moral, inexpedient and profane, and yet continue to submit to its extension.’

It will be seen that the *Enquirer* openly advocates the introduction of Slavery into new territory. But read the article :

The Democrats of the South in the present canvass cannot rely on the old grounds of defense and excuse for Slavery; for they seek not merely to retain it where it is, but to extend it where it is unknown. Much less can they rely on the mere constitutional guarantees of Slavery, for such reliance is pregnant with the admission that Slavery is wrong, and but for the constitution should be abolished. This constitutional argument for Slavery, standing alone, fully justifies the abolitionists. They are clearly right if Slavery be morally wrong, for to get rid of it under the constitution, or by amending the constitution, is confessedly unpracticable. In truth, the constitution cannot help Slavery, if it be a violation of the laws of God, and of morality. In that case, the constitution should secede, rather than continue to guaranty what they consider immoral and profane. The constitution cannot help Slavery for another season. That institution extending through fifteen States, and interramified with the interests, the feelings, and the very existence of

millions of men, is much stronger than the constitution. It would be far easier to change or violate the constitution, than to abolish Slavery. Besides, slavery is older than the constitution, existed before it, and independently of it. We derive no right to our slaves from it, and weaken our cause by seeming to rely on it. Nor will it avail us aught to show that the negro is most happy and best situated in the condition of Slavery. If we stop there, we weaken our cause by the very argument intended to advance it; for we propose to introduce into new territory human beings whom we assert to be unfit for liberty, self-government, and equal association with other men. We must go a step farther.— We must show that African Slavery is a moral, religious, natural, and probably, in the general, a necessary institution of society. This is the only line of argument that will enable Southern Democrats to maintain the doctrines of State equality and Slavery extension.

For if Slavery be not a legitimate, useful, moral, and expedient institution, we cannot without the reproof of conscience and the blush of shame, seek to extend it, or assert our equality with those States having no such institution.

Northern Democrats need not go thus far. They do not seek to extend Slavery, but only agree to its extension, as a matter of right on our part. They may prefer their own social system to ours. It is right they should. Our friends are conservatives at home and conservatives of the Union—conservatives of religion, of marriage, of property, of State institutions, and of Federal institutions. But whilst they may prefer their own social system, they will have to admit in this canvass that ours is also *rightful and legitimate*, and sanctioned alike by the opinions and usages of mankind, and by the authority and expressed injunctions of Scripture. They cannot consistently maintain that Slavery is immoral, inexpedient and profane, and yet continue to submit to its extension.

We know that we utter bold truths.— But the time has now arrived when their utterance can be no longer postponed.— *The true issue should stand out so boldly and clearly that none may mistake it,*

**FOUR "FREESOIL" GEMS FROM  
THE DEMOCRATIC PAPERS, DURING  
THE GUBERNATORIAL CAM-  
PAIGN OF 1849.**

[From the Age.]

"Now as to the question of slavery; a question that is before Congress and before the country, and which must be met *fully and directly*. So far as the extension of that institution is concerned, over territory *now free*, either acquired or to be acquired, the universal opinion of all parties and all men in this section of the country, is, *such extension must not take place, either by the sanction or permission of the National Government.*"

[From the Portland Argus.]

"But we say, with all frankness, with firmness, and with a full consideration of all the responsibility for the avowal, THE DEMOCRACY OF MAINE OUGHT NOT AND WILL NOT SANCTION ANY VOTE WHICH WILL LEAD TO THE INTRODUCTION INTO THE UNION OF ANOTHER INCH OF SLAVE TERRITORY."

[From the Bath Times.]

"The Northern Democrats take the right ground. They disclaim all disposition to interfere with slavery in the States—that is a matter for themselves to manage—but they contend that slavery has no claims in those parts of the country, either acquired or to be acquired, which are now free.

"Most sincerely do we hope our northern men may stand firm. The South has no right to ask for territory for slavery to spread in, and the North has no right to grant such a request if made."

[From the Belfast Republican Journal.]

"The action of Mr. Wilmot, of Penn., at the last session of Congress, and the approval then extended to his proposed restriction of slavery in new territory, and the similar course of Mr. King, of N. Y., (leading democrats,) at this session, we believe *correctly represents the democratic sentiment of the North*. It is an expression of democratic sentiment, too, at an opportune moment for we cannot think that any discussion arising out of such a proposition should not at all interfere with the vigorous prosecution of the war; and it will be sustained by the North, because

*it is believed to be just and politic, and as in no way interfering with the constitutional rights of the South*. The free labor of the republic has a direct interest in the question, no less strong than any that the South may have; and the same right that the South has to promote that interest will be exercised by the free States to promote theirs. The empire that is about becoming absorbed in our Union, *must not be yielded to the blight of slavery*: that institution must not be extended to the shore of an immense ocean, over whose future fate the present age has control. Nations yet unborn will have cause to hold this age accursed, were this to be so. Labor, whose dignity and appreciable influence, not merely as the material architect of nations, but as the creator of intellectual and social prosperity, are based upon its freedom, would have cause forever to execrate such a lamentable step as this."

### Slave States and Free States.

There are fifteen slave States which cast 120 electoral votes. There are sixteen free States which cast 176 electoral votes, and yet Slavery is sought to be made national and Freedom sectional.

There were six northern States, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Massachusetts, Indiana and Illinois, which represent 122 electoral votes, and yet, although they alone constitute a majority over the electoral votes of the South, if they, with the other ten free States vote for a Northern President, the South threatens disunion—and Fillmore asks us here at Albany this question—"Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a chief magistrate?"

For ourselves we can see no "madness" in expecting a submission to a majority provided for by the constitution, and no "folly" in the fact that States casting votes to the ratio of 22 to 15 should elect any person of their choice who is eligible to that office under our fundamental law.

Let some one give a reason for the submission of the North to the South. The North has the most votes, the most wealth, the most schools, churches and colleges; the North pays the most taxes; she is strongest in every social and political inter

est in every social and political interest.— In productions and improvements she is superior. In peace she is more prosperous—in war she would be more powerful. The North advances the fame of free institutions, while the South keeps alive their reproach.

There is no reason for any such submission. On the contrary, it is degrading to our country and to ourselves. It would not be asked unless it were for the purpose of aiding slavery—by increasing the value of slaves, and that alone is sufficient reason for asserting our simple right to the supremacy. Instead of doing so base a thing, let us catch up the motto of Brutus and all cry—"Peace! Freedom! and Liberty!"—*Albany State Register*.

## Hear Daniel Webster!

MR. WEBSTER, in the year 1837, in a speech in Niblo's Garden, New York, discussed the Slavery question at length, and spoke of the *danger of its extension*. After remarking that "Congress had no power over the States already in the Union," he said:—

"But when we come to speak of admitting new States, the subject assumes an entirely different aspect. Our rights and our duties are then both different. The free States, and all the States, are then at liberty to accept or to reject. When it is proposed to admit new members into this political partnership, the old members have a right to say on what terms such new partners are to come in, and what they are to bring along with them. In my opinion, the people of the United States will not consent to bring into the Union a new, vastly extensive, and slaveholding country, large enough for a half a dozen or a dozen States. In my opinion they ought not to consent to it."

MR. WEBSTER in 1848, in the U. S. Senate, when discussing the Oregon Bill, said:—

"I have said that I shall consent to no extension of the area of Slavery upon this continent, nor to any increase of Slave representation in the other House of Congress. I have now stated my reasons for my conduct and my vote. We of the North have already gone, in this respect, far beyond all that any Southern man could have expected, or did expect, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. I repeat the statement of the fact of the creation of five new slaveholding States out of newly-acquired territory. We have done that which, if those who framed the Constitution had foreseen, they never would have agreed to Slave representation. We have yielded thus far, and we have now in the House of Representatives twenty persons voting upon this very question, and upon all other questions, who are there only in virtue of the representation of slaves."

The speech from which we have just quoted, concludes with the following emphatic words:—

"I have made up my mind, for one, that under no circumstances will I consent to the further extension of the area of Slavery in the United States, or to the

FURTHER INCREASE OF SLAVE REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES."

MR. WEBSTER in his celebrated "7th of March speech," in 1850, said:—

"It has happened that, between 1837 and this time, on various occasions, I have expressed my entire opposition to the admission of new Slave States, or the acquisition of Slave Territories, to be added to the United States. I know, sir, no change in my own sentiments OR MY OWN PURPOSES, in this respect."

In this same speech, when Mr. Webster expressed his willingness to forego the exercise of the Congressional *prohibitive* power for Utah and New Mexico, "because Slavery was excluded from them by the law of God," he took care to add the following emphatic words:—

"Sir, wherever there is a substantive good to be done, wherever there is a foot of land to be prevented from becoming slave territory, I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of Slavery. I am pledged to it from the year 1837; I have been pledged to it again and again; and I will perform those pledges."

And again, in a subsequent speech on the Compromise Bill, made on the 17th of June of the same year, MR. WEBSTER said:—

"And here let me say that neither here nor elsewhere has anything been advanced to show that on this subject I have said or done anything inconsistent, in the slightest degree, with any speech, or sentiment, or letter or declaration, that I ever delivered in my life; and all would be convinced of this if men would stop to consider and look at real differences and distinctions."

In his letter to Robt. H. Gardiner, and others, citizens on the Kennebec, written in June 1850, MR. WEBSTER said:—

"Gentlemen, one of the exciting questions of the present moment respects the necessity of excluding Slavery, by law, from the territories lately acquired from Mexico. If I BELIEVED IN ANY SUCH NECESSITY, I SHOULD, OF COURSE, SUPPORT SUCH A LAW. I could not do otherwise, consistently with opinions very many times expressed, and which opinions I have no inclination to change, and shall not change."

In the summer of 1851, only one year before his death, MR. WEBSTER delivered a speech at Buffalo, N. Y., from which the following are extracts:—

"Now, gentlemen, permit me to say that I speak of concessions. If the South wish any concession from me, they will not get it; not a hair's breadth of it. If they come to my house for it, they will not find it, and the door will be shut; I concede nothing. But I say I will maintain for them, as I will maintain for you, to the utmost of my power, and in the face of all danger, their rights under the constitution, and your rights under the constitution."

Again, in the same speech he said:—  
"My opinion remains unchanged, that it was not within the original scope or design of the constitution, to admit new States out of foreign territory; and, for one, whatever may be said at the Syracuse Convention, or at any other assemblage of insane persons, I never would consent, and never have consented, that there should be one foot of slave territory beyond what the old thirteen States had at the formation of the Union. Never, never! The man cannot show his face to me, and say that he can prove that I ever departed from that doctrine. He would sneak away and slink away, or hire a mercenary press to cry out—What an apostate from liberty Daniel Webster has become! But he bows himself to be a hypocrite and a falsifier."



































