

we regard it—slaves in gross, of the colored race, transferable by sale and delivery, as other property. I shall not contest the point. I leave that to the learned gentlemen who discuss it. I believe, however, that there are no slaves of that description in Mexico, and suppose there never will be. I understand that in this regard, this sort of feudal servitude in which men are sold for debt, exists in California and in some parts of Africa. But when we say, in the existence of African slavery, as we see it here among us, it is utterly impossible to find itself or to be found in Mexico as any other natural impossibility upon anything else. Why, sir, California and New Mexico are Asiatic in their formation and their scenery. They are composed of vast ranges of mountains, of an enormous height, sometimes broken by deep valleys. The sides of these mountains are barren—entirely barren. Their tops are capped by perpetual snows. There may be in California, now made free by her constitution—and there are, no doubt—some fertile valleys, but it is much less fertile when we get into New Mexico. Pray, what is the evidence upon this subject, which any gentleman has collected by information sought by himself, or stated by others? I have read all I could read, and learned all I could learn upon the subject in New Mexico, and I have not seen any possibility induce anybody to go there with a slave: There are some narrow strips of tillable land upon the borders of the rivers; but the rivers themselves dry up before midsummer. That is the native people can do, and do, to make some little articles of commerce, and also to raise some wheat, and all that by irrigation. Who expects to see a hundred black men cultivating tobacco, corn, cotton, rice, anything, on lands in New Mexico, made fertile only by irrigation? I look upon it, therefore, as a fixed law, to see a current extension of the day—that both California and New Mexico are destined to be free, no far as they are settled at all—which I believe, especially with regard to New Mexico, will be very little for a great length of time—free by the arrangement of things, by the powers above us.

I have therefore, sir, to say in this respect also, that this territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

a proper law, authorizing the judicatures of the several States of this government to do all that is necessary for the capture of fugitive slaves, and the restoration of the same to their owners. I have never seen, and where I see the subject—I agree with you, and I speak to the people of the North. I say that the South has been injured in this respect. It has a right to complain. The North has been too careless upon what I think is the constitution pre-emptorily and emphatically explain upon it as it is.

Complaint is made again, sir, of the resolutions that emanate from the several State legislatures and are sent here to us, not only upon the subject of slavery in this District, but sometimes recommending Congress to consider the means of abolishing slavery in the States. I should be very sorry to be called upon to present any resolution, not referable to any acknowledged power in Congress, and therefore should be very unwilling to receive from Massachusetts instructions to present resolutions expressing any opinion upon slavery, as it exists at the present moment in the States. For two reasons. In the first place, I do not consider that the legislature of Massachusetts has anything to do with it; and, in the next place, I do not consider that I, here, as her representative, have anything to do with it. And if the legislature of the State do like it, they have a great deal more power to put it down than I have to uphold it. It has become, in my opinion, quite too common a practice for State legislatures to present resolutions upon all subjects, and insisting upon here upon all subjects. I do not think that it is necessary that I do, or needs information more than I do, or desires it more than I do; but I do not like to have it come in too imperative a shape. I noticed with pleasure some remarks made the other day in the senate of Massachusetts by a young man of talent, standing, and character, for whom the best hopes are entertained upon this subject—I mean Mr. Hilliard. He told the senate of Massachusetts that he would vote for no instructions whatever to be forwarded to members of Congress, nor for any resolutions of any kind, relative to the subject of slavery, as to what her members of Congress ought to do. He said he saw no propriety in one set of public servants giving instruction and reading a lecture to another set of public servants—that their own master should be made to manage them quit their places, and fly off, without convulsions, may look out the next day to see the heavenly bodies rush from their spheres, and jostle against each other in the realms of space, without producing a crush of the spheres. Possible, is the constitution under which we live here, covering this whole country, to be thawed and melted away by secession, as the snows on the mountains are melted under the influence of a vernal sun, to disappear, never to be seen again. I will not state what might produce the disruption of these States. I see it as plainly as I see the sun in Heaven; and should it happen, it must produce such a war as I will not describe, in its two fold character. Peaceful secession, if it were to be attempted, would be the act of all the members of this great body to separate! A voluntary separation, with alimony on the one side and the other? What would be the result? Where is the line to be drawn? What States are to be associated? What States are to be separated? What is the flag to remain? Where is the eagle still to tower? Or is he to cower, and shrink, and fall to the ground? Why, sir, our ancestors, our fathers and grandfathers, those of them who still remain among us, but who have been separated from their children, and their children and grandchildren would cry out shame upon us, if we of this generation should bring dishonor upon those of our fathers, and power, and harmony of the Union, which we see around us, not without much joy.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

I shall still be glad to have had the opportunity to discuss my conscience, and from the bottom of my heart make known every political sentiment upon this subject. And now, Mr. President, instead of speaking of the possibility or utility of secession—instead of dwelling in these caverns of darkness—instead of groping with these ideas, so dark, that he is horrid and horrible—let us come out into the light of day, and cherish those hopes that belong to us; let us devote ourselves to those great objects that are fit for our consideration and our action; let us raise our conceptions to the magnitude and the importance of the duties that are devolved upon us; let our comprehension be as broad as the country for which we act, and our aspirations as high as its certain destiny. Never did there devolve on any generation of men higher trusts than are now devolved on us for the preservation of this constitution, and the maintenance of the happiness of government, guarded by legislation, law, and judicature, defended by the holy affections of the people. No national torch presses these States together; no iron chain of despotic power encircles them; they live and act upon their own resources, in their own representative in its character, founded on principles of equality, calculated to last, we hope, forever. In all its history it has been benefited. It has trodden down no man's liberty; it has crushed no State; it has been in all its history a benevolent protector of the rights of the people. The general prosperity, the general glory, and the general renown. And at last it has received a vast addition of territory. It was large before; it has now become vastly larger. This republic now stands with a vast breadth across the whole continent. The two great seas of the world wash the one and the other shore. We may realize the description of the ornamental edging on the buckle of Achilles: "Now the broad shield complete, the artist crown'd, In living silver smelt the waves around; With his last hand, and pour'd the ocean round; And beat the buckler verge, and bound the whole."

Mr. CALHOUN. Mr. President, I rise to correct what I conceive to be the error of the distinguished senator from Massachusetts, as to the motives which induced the admission of Florida, Louisiana, and Texas. I have the honor to state that it was the desire of the southern people to get an extension of territory with the view of cultivating cotton with more success than they would in a crowded settlement. Now, I think the history of the acquisition of Florida was the result of a well known and a well understood treaty with the Indians. The Seminole Indians crossed over land and took one of our fortresses. The troops were ordered out, and were driven back. Then, under the command of Gen. Jackson, Pensacola was taken, and the acquisition of Florida for more territory, that caused the acquisition of Florida. I admit, however, that it had been for a long time the desire, on the part of the South, and of the administration, I believe, to acquire Florida; but it was not until the acquisition of Texas, that the acquisition of Florida was a necessary consequence. The Spanish authorities interrupted that right. This brought on great agitation in the West, and I maintain, throughout the whole of the United States. Some gentlemen, then, in opposition to a highly respectable party, who were in favor of restoring the territory to Spain, desired to acquire that Territory. Mr. Jefferson, more prudent, desired it should come in by purchase. The purchase was made to remove that difficulty, and to give to the West an outlet to the ocean. That was the intention. What has become of the territory? The Spanish authorities interrupted that right. This brought on great agitation in the West, and I maintain, throughout the whole of the United States. Some gentlemen, then, in opposition to a highly respectable party, who were in favor of restoring the territory to Spain, desired to acquire that Territory. Mr. Jefferson, more prudent, desired it should come in by purchase. The purchase was made to remove that difficulty, and to give to the West an outlet to the ocean. That was the intention. What has become of the territory?

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

country which was more naturally a non-slaveholding people, and which was governed, not by the laws of the other portions by us, destroying the artificial line, although that is perhaps better than none. Mr. Jefferson spoke like a prophet upon the Missouri compromise. Indeed, I am willing to leave it to Nature to settle and organize these extensive territories—let us give the principle of the gentleman, and give us free scope and a sufficient time to get in—we ask nothing but that, and we never will ask it. When the gentleman says he is willing to leave it to Nature, I understand that he is willing also to remove all impediments now put in our way, and to let our people from going there—I mean the consummate folly of citing the Mexican law prohibiting slavery in New Mexico and California.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. (Mr. BAYLI in the chair), and, taking up the President's California message and the accompanying documents.

At the suggestion of Mr. CARTER, the House unanimously resolved that the time to be occupied by Messrs. STANLEY, HILLIARD, and WEBSTER, in their respective speeches, should be taken from the time of the member entitled to the floor. (Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky,) in the regular order of debate. Whereupon Mr. HILLIARD rose and said that the Methodist Episcopal Church, with which he was connected, had devolved upon some of its members the duty of enforcing Christianity on their fellow-citizens. That duty had been devolved on himself. That calling consequently on the members of the church, he had the honor to speak on any gentleman personally. He had fulfilled that obligation strictly, never assailing any gentleman personally in the course of his speeches. On the other hand, he had supposed that no gentleman could allow himself to be assailed in his religious professions. That he had done by vulgar minds only. It had been in the hall of the House of Representatives, within his experience, on two occasions; first by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. THOMPSON STEVENS,) in calling on that gentleman, in favor of the extension of a minute upon that officer, in his (Mr. H's) address, as a minister of the Gospel; and next by the member from North Carolina, in charging him with deserting the Scriptures, for the purpose of encouraging the North and South to enter into a hostile attitude. It had not been his purpose for a single moment yesterday to interfere with the speech of that gentleman.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. (Mr. BAYLI in the chair), and, taking up the President's California message and the accompanying documents.

At the suggestion of Mr. CARTER, the House unanimously resolved that the time to be occupied by Messrs. STANLEY, HILLIARD, and WEBSTER, in their respective speeches, should be taken from the time of the member entitled to the floor. (Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky,) in the regular order of debate. Whereupon Mr. HILLIARD rose and said that the Methodist Episcopal Church, with which he was connected, had devolved upon some of its members the duty of enforcing Christianity on their fellow-citizens. That duty had been devolved on himself. That calling consequently on the members of the church, he had the honor to speak on any gentleman personally. He had fulfilled that obligation strictly, never assailing any gentleman personally in the course of his speeches. On the other hand, he had supposed that no gentleman could allow himself to be assailed in his religious professions. That he had done by vulgar minds only. It had been in the hall of the House of Representatives, within his experience, on two occasions; first by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. THOMPSON STEVENS,) in calling on that gentleman, in favor of the extension of a minute upon that officer, in his (Mr. H's) address, as a minister of the Gospel; and next by the member from North Carolina, in charging him with deserting the Scriptures, for the purpose of encouraging the North and South to enter into a hostile attitude. It had not been his purpose for a single moment yesterday to interfere with the speech of that gentleman.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.

Now, Mr. President, I have established, so far as I propose to go into any observations to the House, that the territory, which I have just mentioned, as shall ever live there by an irreparable law—a most irreparable law that the law which appeals to the right of holding slaves under legal enactments. And I will say further, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, sir, that if a resolution to have a law to prohibit slavery, I would vote to put it into no prohibition whatever. The use of such a prohibition would be idle as it respects any effect upon the Territory. I would not take pains to refer to an ordinance of nature, nor to a law of God. The Wilmot Proviso for the purpose of a taunt and reproach—an evidence of superior votes or superior power—to wound the pride, even—whether a just and rational pride, or an irrational pride—to wound the pride of the gentleman and people of the North, is a most unbecoming and unbecoming act. They would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege. Whether they are expected to realize any benefit from it or not, they would think it to be an act taking away from them what they regard as a proper equality or privilege.