EDITED BY
Ellwood Fisher & Edwin De Leon.

TERMS.

DAILY,	$10 00
TRI-WEEKLY,	5 00
WEEKLY,	2 00

☞ Subscriptions payable in advance. Any person procuring five subscribers shall receive one copy gratis. All letters to the Editors to be POST-PAID.

PRINTED BY G. A. SAGE.

OFFICE, Pennsylvania Avenue south side, between 3d and 4½ streets.

THE SOUTHERN PRESS.

DAILY.

Vol. 1. Washington, Wednesday, July 3, 1850. No. 15.

"The Southern Press,"—Tri-weekly
Is published on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays of each week.

"The Southern Press,"—Weekly,
Is published every Saturday.

ADVERTISING RATES.

For one square of 10 lines, three insertions, $1 00
" every subsequent insertion, - - 25
Liberal deductions made on yearly advertising.

☞ Individuals may forward the amount of their subscriptions at our risk. Address, (post-paid)
ELLWOOD FISHER,
Washington City.

Address to the People of the Southern States.

At a large meeting of Southern members of both Houses of Congress, held at the Capitol on the evening of the 7th ultimo, the Hon. HOPKINS L. TURNEY, of Tennessee, having been appointed Chairman at a previous meeting, took the Chair; and, on motion of the Hon. DAVID HUBBARD, of Alabama, the Hon. WILLIAM J. ALSTON, of Alabama, was appointed Secretary.

Whereupon, the Hon. A. P. BUTLER, of South Carolina, from the committee appointed at a preliminary meeting, reported an Address to the Southern people, recommending the establishment, at Washington City, of a newspaper, to be devoted to the support and defence of Southern interests; which was read, and with some slight modifications, adopted.

The following resolution was offered by the Hon. THOMAS L. CLINGMAN, of North Carolina, and unanimously adopted by the meeting.

Resolved, unanimously, That the committee, in publishing the Address, be instructed to give with it the names of the Senators and Representatives in Congress who concur in the proposition to establish the Southern Organ, as manifested by their subscriptions to the several copies of the plan in circulation, or who may hereafter authorise said committee to include their names.

Maryland.—Senator: Thomas G. Pratt.
Virginia.—Senators: R. M. T. Hunter, J. M. Mason. Representatives: J. A. Seddon, Thos. H. Averett, Paulus Powell, R. K. Meade, Alex. R. Holladay, Thos. S. Bocock, H. A. Edmundson, Jeremiah Morton.
North Carolina.—Senator: Willie P. Mangum. Representatives: T. L. Clingman, A. W. Venable, W. S. Ashe.
South Carolina.—Senators: A. P Butler, F. H. Elmore. Representatives: John McQueen, Joseph A. Woodward, Daniel Wallace, Wm. F. Colcock, James L. Orr, Armistead Burt, Isaac E. Holmes.
Georgia.—Senators: John McP. Berrien, William C. Dawson. Representatives: Joseph W. Jackson, Alex. H. Stephens, Robert Toombs, H. A. Haralson, Allen F. Owen.
Alabama.—Senator: Jeremiah Clemens. Representatives: David Hubbard, F. W. Bowdon, S. W. Inge, W. J. Alston, S. W. Harris.
Mississippi.—Senator. Jefferson Davis. Representatives: W. S Featherston, Jacob Thompson, A. G. Brown, W. W. McWillie.
Louisiana.—Senators: S. U. Downs, Pierre Soule. Representatives: J. H. Harmanson, Emile La Sere, Isaac E. Morse.
Arkansas.—Senators: Solon Borland, W. Sebastian. Representative: William R. Johnson.
Texas.—Representatives: Vol. E. Howard, D. S. Kaufman.
Missouri.—Senator: D. R. Atchison. Representative: James S. Green.
Kentucky.—Representatives: R. H. Stanton, James L. Johnson.
Tennessee.—Senator: Hopkins L. Turney. Representatives: James H. Thomas, Frederick P. Stanton, C. H. Williams, John H. Savage.
Florida.—Senators: Jackson Morton, D. L. Yulee. Representative: E. Carrington Cabell.

And upon motion, the meeting adjourned.

HOPKINS L. TURNEY, *Chairman.*

ATTEST:

WM J. ALSTON, *Secretary.*

THE ADDRESS

The committee to which was referred the duty of preparing an Address to the people of the slaveholding States upon the subject of a Southern Organ, to be established in the City of Washington, put forth the following:

FELLOW-CITIZENS: A number of Senators and Representatives in Congress from the Southern States of the Confederacy deeply impressed with a sense of the dangers which beset those States, have considered carefully our means of self-defence within the Union and the Constitution, and have come to the conclusion that it is highly important to establish in this city a paper, which, without reference to political party, shall be devoted to the rights and interests of the South, so far as they are involved in the questions growing out of African slavery. To establish and maintain such a paper, your support is necessary, and accordingly we address you on the subject.

In the contest now going on, the constitutional equality of fifteen States is put in question. Some sixteen hundred millions worth of negro property is involved directly, and indirectly, though not less surely, an incalculable amount of property in other forms. But to say this is to state less than half the doom that hangs over you. Your social forms and institutions—which separate the European and the African races into distinct classes, and assign to each a different sphere in society—are threatened with overthrow Whether the negro is to occupy the same social rank with the white man, and enjoy equally the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizenship—in short, all the honors and dignities of society—is a question of greater moment than any mere question of property can be.

Such is the contest now going on—a contest in which public opinion, if not the prevailing, is destined to be a most prominent force; and yet, no organ of the united interests of those assailed has as yet been established, nor does there exist any paper which can be the common medium for an interchange of opinions amongst the Southern States. Public opinion, as it has been formed and directed by the combined influence of interest and prejudice, is the force which has been most potent against us in the war now going on against the institution of negro slavery; and yet we have taken no effectual means to make and maintain that issue with it upon which our safety and perhaps our social existence depends. Whoever will look to the history of this question, and to the circumstances under which we are now placed, must see that our position is one of imminent danger, and one to be defended by all the means, moral and political, of which we can avail ourselves in the present emergency. The warfare against African slavery commenced, as is known, with Great Britain, who, after having contributed mainly to its establishment in the New World, devoted her most earnest efforts, for purposes not yet fully explained, to its abolition in America. How wisely this was done, so far as her own colonies were concerned, time has determined; and all comment upon this subject on our part would be entirely superfluous. If, however, her purpose was to reach and embarrass us on this subject, her efforts have not been without success. A common origin a common language, have made the English literature ours to a great extent, and the efforts of the British Government and people to mould the public opinion of all who speak the English language, have not been vain or fruitless. On the contrary, they have been deeply felt wherever the English language is spoken; and the more efficient and dangerous, because, as yet, the South has taken no steps to appear and plead at the bar of the world, before which she has been summoned, and by which she has been tried already without a hearing. Secured by constitutional guaranties, and independent of all the world, so far as its domestic institutions were concerned, the South has reposed under the conciousness of right and independence, and foreborne to plead at a bar which she knew had no jurisdiction over this particular subject. In this we have been theoretically right, but practically we have made a great mistake. All means, political, diplomatic, and literary, have been used to concentrate the public opinion, not only of the world at large, but of our own country, against us; and resting upon the undoubted truth that our domestic institutions were the subjects of no Government but our own local Governments, and concerned no one but ourselves, we have been passive under these assaults, until danger menaces us from every quarter. A great party has grown up, and is increasing in the United States, which seems to think it a duty they owe to earth and heaven to make war on a domestic institution upon which are staked our property, our social organization, and our peace and safety. Sectional feelings have been invoked, and those who wield the power of this Government have been tempted almost, if not quite, beyond their power of resistance, to wage a war against our property, our rights, and our social system, which, if successfully prosecuted, must end in our destruction. Every inducement—the love of power, the desire to accomplish what are, with less truth than plausibility, called "reforms"—all are offered to tempt them to press upon those who are represented, and, in fact, seem to be an easy prey to the spoiler. Our eqality under the Constitution is, in effect, denied; our social institutions are derided and contemned, and ourselves treated with contumely and scorn through all the avennes which have as yet been opened to the public opinion of the world. That these assaults should have had their effect is not surprising, when we remember that, as yet, we have offered no organized resistance to them, and opposed but little, except the isolated efforts of members of Congress, who have occasionally raised their voices against what they believe to be wrongs and injustice.

It is time that we should meet and maintain an issue, in which we find ourselves involved by those who make war upon us in regard to every interest that is peculiar to us, and which is not enjoyed in common with them, however guarantied by solemn compact, and no matter how vitally involving our prosperity, happiness, and safety. It is time that we should take measures to defend ourselves against assaults which can end in nothing short of our destruction, if we oppose no resistance to them. Owing to accidental circumstances, and a want of knowledge of the true condition of things in the Southern States, the larger portion of the press and of the political literature of the wotld has been directed against us. The moral power of public opinion carries political strength along with it, and if against us, we must wrestle with it or fall. If, as we firmly believe, truth is with us, there is nothing to discourage us in such an effort.

The eventual strength of an opinion is to be measured, not by the number who may chance to entertain it, but by the truth which sustains it We believe—nay, we know, that truth is with us, and therefore we should not shrink from the contest. We have too much staked upon it to shrink or to tremble—a property interest, in all its forms, of incalculable amount and value; the social organization, the equality, the liberty, nay, the existence of fourteen or fifteen States of the Confederacy—all rest upon the result of the struggle in which we are engaged. We must maintain the equality of our political position in the Union; we must maintain the dignity and respectability of our social position before the world; and must maintain and secure our liberty and rights, so far as our united efforts can protect them; and, if possible, we must effect all this within the pale of the Union, and by means known to the Constitution. The union of the South upon these vital interests is necessary, not only for the sake of the South, but perhaps for the sake of the Union. We have great interests exposed to the assaults, not only of the world at large, but of those who, constituting a majority, wield the power of our own confederated States. We must defend those interests by all legitimate means, or else perish either in or without the effort. To make successful defence, we must unite with each other upon one vital question, and make the most of our political strength. We must do more—we must go beyond our entrenchments, and meet even the more distant and indirect, but by no means harmless assaults, which are directed against us. We, too, can appeal to public opinion. Our assailant act upon theory, to their theory we can oppose experience. They reason upon an imaginary state of things to, this we may oppose truth and actual knowledge. To do this, however, we too must open up avenues to the public mind; we, too, must have an organ through which we can appeal to the world, and commune with each other. The want of such an organ, heretofore, has been perhaps one of the leading causes of our present condition.

There is no paper at the Seat of Government through which we can hear or be heard fairly and truly by the country. There is a paper here which makes the abolition of slavery its main and paramount end. There are other papers here which make the maintenance of political parties their supreme and controlling object, but none which consider the preservation of sixteen hundred millions of property, the equality and liberty of fourteen or fifteen States, the protection of the white man against African equality, as paramount over, or even equal to, the maintenance of some political organization which is to secure a President, who is an object of interest not because he will certainly rule, or perhaps ruin the South, but chiefly for the reason that he will possess and bestow office and spoils. The South has a peculiar position, and her important rights and interests are objects of continual assault from the majority; and the party press, dependent as it is upon that majority for its means of living, will always be found laboring to excuse the assailants, and to paralyze all efforts at resistance. How is it now? The abolition party can always be heard through its press at the Seat of Government, but through what organ or press at Washington can Southern men communicate with the world, or with each other, upon their own peculiar interests? So far from writing, or permitting anything to be written, which is calculated to defend the rights of the South, or state its case, the papers here are engaged in lulling the South into a false security, and in manufacturing there an artificial public sentiment, suitable for some Presidential platform, though at the expense of any and every interest you may possess, no matter how dear or how vital and momentous.

This state of things results from party obligations and a regard to party success. And they but subserve the ends of their establishment in consulting their own interests, and the advancement of the party to which they are pledged. You cannot look to them as sentinels over interests that are repugnant to the feelings of the majority of the self-sustaining party.

In the Federal Legislature the South has some voice and some votes; but over the public press, as it now stands at the Seat of Government, the North has a controlling influence. The press of this city takes its tone from that of the North. Even our Southern press is subjected, more or less, to the same influence. Our public men, yes, our southern men, owe their public standing and reputation too often to the commendation and praise of the Northern press. Southern newspapers republish from their respective party organs in this city, and in so doing, reproduce—unconscious, doubtless, in most instances, of the wrong they do—the northern opinion in regard to public men and measures. How dangerous such a state of things must be to the fidelity of your representatives it is needless to say! They are but men, and it would be unwise to suppose that they are beyond the reach of temptations which influence the rest of mankind.

Fellow-citizens, it rests with ourselves to alter this state of things, so far as the South is concerned. We have vast interests, which we are bound, by many considerations, to defend with all the moral and political means in our power. One of the first steps to this great end is to establish a Southern Organ here, a paper through which we may commune with one another and the world at large. We do not propose to meddle with political parties as they now exist; we wish to enlist every southern man in a southern cause, and in defence of southern rights, be he Whig or be he Democrat. We do not propose to disturb him, or to shake him in his party relations. All that we ask is, that he shall consider the constitutional rights of the South, which are involved in the great abolition movement, as paramount to all party and all other political considerations. And surely the time has come when all southern men should unite for the purpose of self-defence. Our relative power in the Legislature of the Union is diminishing with every census; the dangers which menace us are daily becoming greater; and, the chief instrument in the assaults upon us is the public press, over which, owing to our supineness, the North exercises a controlling influence. So far as the South is concerned, we can change and reverse this state of things. It is not to be borne, that public sentiment at the South should be stifled or controlled by the party press.

Let us have a press of our own, as the North has, both here and at home—a press which shall be devoted to Southern rights, and animated by Southern feeling; which shall look not to the North but the South for the tone which is to pervade it. Claiming our share of power in Federal Legislation, let us also claim our share of influence in the press of the country. Let us organize in every Southern town and county, so as to send this paper into every house in the land. Let us take, too, all the means necessary to maintain the paper by subscription, so as to increase its circulation, and promte the spread of knowledge and truth. Let every portion of the South furnish its full quota of talent and money to sustain a paper which ought to be supported by all, because it will be devoted to the interest of every Southern man. It will be the earnest effort of the committee who are charged with these arrangements, to procure editors of high talent and standing; and they will also see that the paper is conducted without *opposition*, and without *reference* to the political parties of the day. With these assurances, we feel justified in calling upon you, the people of the Southern States—to make the necessary efforts to establish and maintain the proposed paper.

A. P. BUTLER,
JACKSON MORTON,
R. TOOMBS,
J. THOMPSON.

☞ There is less prospect of an Adjustment now than ever.

Senate Debates.

IN SENATE, THURSDAY, *June* 27, 1850.

The Senate having under consideration the bill for the admission of California into the Union, the establishment of Territorial Governments for Utah and New Mexico, and making proposals to Texas for the settlement of her northern and western boundaries, and the pending question being upon the amendment offered some days ago by Mr. SOULE—

Mr. BARNWELL said: Mr. President, I am very reluctant to trespass upon the attention of the Senate in this stage of their proceedings. Disuse and disinclination combine to increase this reluctance; nor is it lessened by the consciousness that the allusions which have been made to my great predecessor invite comparisons which cannot but be unfavorable to myself. It is not my intention to enter upon the discussion of the opinions entertained and expressed by that great statesman; but, in expressing my own opinions, I may perhaps illustrate by reflecting his. Not that my recent intercourse with that distinguished senator was of so intimate a character as to enable me to speak of his private opinions, or to have formed my own upon them, but because it was impossible for any South Carolinian, deeply sympathizing with the people of that State in the unbounded affection and confidence which they manifested towards him from the beginning to the close of his illustrious career, not to have his political opinions greatly modified by those of that distinguished statesman. It is something, if we cannot equal excellence, to possess power to discriminate, and freedom from jealousy to admire it.

I turn now to the consideration of this Missouri Compromise line. I doubt not but that the position which my distinguished predecessor occupied in relation to this matter was not widely apart from that which I now occupy. With myself, he maintained that the slaveholding States of this confederacy are the equals of the other States with which they are associated. I speak not now of equality in wealth, in morals, or intellectual culture I speak of equality of political rights. Entering into this confederacy upon terms of perfect equality with the other States, I recognise nothing in their past history or present condition which has justly forfeited this their rightful position. They have fully, faithfully, and with patriotism discharged the duties which their relation towards the other States imposed upon them. I deny that any proof can be offered, from the past or the present, of such marked inferiority as to justify the withdrawal of any of the privileges exercised by any other portions of the confederacy. I might well go further and appeal to the intellectual and moral condition of the slaveholding States, manifestly indicating that they have not at all degenerated from those whose alliance you eagerly sought, association with whom you earnestly desired. Where is your warrant, then, for endeavoring to fix the brand of inferiority upon such a people? And yet such is the design which you have recently prosecuted, and are now about to consummate. Because their social condition differs from your own; because the institution of slavery exists among them, to which experience as well as habit has strongly attached them, and upon which their whole civilization rests, implicated with it by ties so deep and strong that their dissolution must place in most imminent peril all things which as men and patriots they should value and protect—the recollections of the past, the happiness of the present, and the hopes of the future; because they will not, at the dictation of others, abandon this institution, they have been denounced with the most unsparing bitterness.

Nor let it be said that this may be borne as the clamor of fanaticism. Not so, sir. Those whom the people have elevated to posts of honor, members of this Congress, have applied such language to the slaveholding States, which, if deserved, would justly condemn them to the abhorrence of the civilized world, even here in this grave Senate, and elsewhere in a far greater degree. If we are willing to attribute this bitterness to political animosities, and seek further back the fair exponents of popular sentiment, what is the language of many of the State legislatures? More vituperative, more vindictive, with actions indicative of deeper-seated hostility. And if we penetrate still deeper, and seek the symptoms of the disease in social life, even deeper malignity is exhibited—the strong bonds of religious union are broken asunder, and the deep, fixed rules of morals openly violated, and their violation justified. This it is which makes this conflict a mighty one. This it is that makes our discussions here so deeply important. These territorial questions are but the indications of the disease. There is a war steadily prosecuted against us; carried on incessantly, insidiously; the most cruel, the most relentless; by which we are to be stigmatized, debased, degraded, and destroyed. It is the perception of this deep-seated hostility in a large and increasing party in this country, already swaying our councils which makes it the imperative duty of the South to insist upon strict justice in the disposition to be made of these territories. It is not that they are valuable; it is not that they covet the gold of California; but because they regard their exclusion from this territory as a stigma to be stamped upon them.

Did not the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts contend that, however distant might be the sea upon which our flag floated, the property of every American citizen should be secured beneath its folds? Why, then, if we be your equals, should not our property receive this equal protection, by land and by sea? Why should we alone be singled out, and forbid to transport our property into these territories, our common property? Are we, indeed, such disreputable members of your community that we cannot be admitted into equal association with you? It is this injustice, this attempted discrimination, which has deeply moved the heart and mind of the Southern people; and if they were not deeply moved, they would deserve the inequality in which you have placed them, and the degradation to which you have doomed them.

I trust that the Senate will pardon the desultory character of these remarks, as until very recently my pursuits have been entirely removed from any active participation in political affairs.

But to proceed. When the citizens of the slaveholding States claim the right of admission with their property, upon terms of perfect equality with other citizens, into the territories recently acquired, they are met by the difficulty that foreign laws prevail there, by which their rights of property are endangered. Such is not my opinion; on the contrary, it seems to me that if under the Constitution you can make no law prohibiting slavery in the territories, preventing me from taking my property into them, so neither by treaty can you subject my property or myself to restrictions which you could not impose by your own authority. Whilst, however, I entertain this opinion, and would certainly act upon it without hesitation in politics, I cannot but recollect that many eminent statesmen and lawyers have expressed their judgment against these views. I know how sensitive is property to risk, and think, therefore, that as we have the right, so we ought to demand that the authority of those adverse laws (pretended, as I judge it to be) should be formally abrogated, and all impediments removed from the free admission and entire enjoyment of our property.

It is important, for a true estimation of the great issues which depend upon our right decision of those questions which have relation to the institution of slavery, properly to appreciate the feelings and opinions of the slaveholding people in reference to it. The Senator from Massachusetts, in that great speech which we all have read with admiration, refers to this subject, and expresses his surprise at the very marked change which has taken place in the Southern mind with respect to this institution of slavery. It is too marked not to have attracted the attention of observers much less actute than the distinguished Senator. The time was—we seek not to deny or extenuate the fact—when very many of the leading and distinguished statesmen of the South looked with dislike and distrust upon this institution of slavery; regarding it as a moral, social, and political evil, and anxiously sought for the means of removing it from the community of which they were members. But there has undoubtedly come about a great revolution in the public judgment upon this subject. The Senator refers it chiefly to the enhanced value of the products of slave labor; and I doubt not but that this had its influence. We are none of us insensible to considerations of this kind, and when the importance of the products of slave labor to the comfort, industry, and commerce of the world were considered, doubtless the sense of its value was enhanced.

But influences lying much deeper, and far more powerful, have been at work to produce this change. There has been a great change in the religious sentiment. In every condition of society, much that is annoying, much that is evil, passes close around us, and we naturally look upon the evil that is near with eyes which magnify its importance. All others, too, censured, it is not surprising that consciences, rendered sensitive by religion sunk under the censure. But, driven by the bitter and unsparing vituperation of those who assailed them without discrimination, the religious portion of the public were compelled to investigate, and have been very generally brought to the conclusion that there is nothing in the word of God which forbids or condemns this relation, but, on the contrary, much that justifies and sustains it: so that they may, with all good conscience, hold and govern as slaves the people committed to their charge. This I believe to be the deliberate judgment of by far the larger part of the religious community of the South. But there has, I may say, recently grown up a strong conviction that slave labor is cheaper than free, not merely in the cultivation of our great staples, but in all the productions of our Southern climate. Political economists had convinced themselves and others that slave labor was very dear, and could never stand in competition with free labor, when the nature of the production or of the climate permitted the conflict; that the productiveness of our labor was very inferior to that of free labor elsewhere. In this respect, also, the judgment of the Southern people has undergone a decided change. It is not important, in its relation to this subject, to determine whether this judgment be sound or otherwise. It is, however, of very grave importance that we should understand what that judgment is. I believe that it is the settled opinion of by far the larger portion of the Southern people that this institution of slavery, while it places them in a condition of personal comfort fully equal to that of other portions of the Confederacy, in a high degree also promotes the accumulation of national wealth.

There is still another change which has taken place in the opinions of Southern men—a change which is still making rapid and sure progress among them—the more important because it controls the views of those who deeply influence the political destinies of a country, its statesmen. Our own revolution had terminated gloriously; the people were exercising their power with extraordinary moderation and wisdom. The French revolution succeeded; the great statesmen of our country, especially in the South, regarded with the deepest interest this movement in the European mind in favor of freedom. Their feelings and their judgment coincided in producing the conviction that it would be eminently successful and productive of the highest prosperity. Very generally the opinion was entertained that man was qualified to govern himself; that all that was to be done was to remove the superincumbent weight of despotic authority, and leave him to the impulses of his own will, the exercise of his rightful power, and he would secure happiness, wealth, and greatness. Such was not the result of that great experiment. Such opinions are not now entertained by those who reflect most upon the subject of politics. Experience has taught them that very few nations are equal to this great office of self-government; that much depends upon the circumstances in which they stand—upon past recollections, upon institutions fixed as habits of living; that, in fact, much less depended upon the will of the existing generation, than from the capacity which they derived from their connexion with the past to bear them safely and successfully through this great and hazardous duty of self-government. It can hardly be denied that subsequent events have tended to strengthen those opinions. And in relation to any change in our institution of slavery, it must be remembered that the statesmen of that day were without the pregnant example of St. Domingo, Jamaica, and all other places where the fatal experiment has been made.

Time with its incidents has saddened perhaps, but sobered also, the judgments of our Southern statesmen. They no longer desire these sudden revolutions; no longer anticipate great happiness from great changes; but, eminently conservative, desire to abide by institutions which hitherto have brought them security and reasonable happiness, and under which a civilization has grown up in its past not inglorious, in its present with much to love, and in its future with much to hope for. In the condition of the non-slaveholding States, while they see much present prosperity and vigorous progress, yet allow me, with great respect, to say that the indications for the future do not seem to them without just cause for apprehension. A social condition with too little balance to secure stability, exposed to sudden and violent impulses, swaying to and fro with dangerous rapidity—they do not find in these such encouragement to change their institutions as will induce them to encounter much present loss and danger, for prospects of a future to their perceptions neither bright nor calm. These are among the causes which have produced the change alluded to by the Senator from Massachusetts; and at no time within my recollection—I might safely say at no time since the introduction of slaves into this country—has the institution of slavery rested upon a basis more firm in our attachment, from long use, and an approval from experience, than it does at present, within the Southern section of this country. And it is for this reason that their representatives, and, with even deeper earnestness, the people at home, resist with even jealous pertinacity any attempt to place them, on account of slavery, in a position of permanent inequality and inferiority. We, in vain seek in the history of the past reasons to justify this treatment. We find none in our present condition. Experience must at last test the true influence of institutions. However we may eulogize forms of government, if men, generous, elevated, intelligent, and virtuous, do not grow under them, what true value have they? These are the true tests of institutions, and you compel us to use language which might be deemed vainglorious and boastful, did not your scornful reproaches and attempts to degrade us force it from us. I deny that there are, either in ancient or modern times, any nations which have produced men, more distinguished for all that gives true dignity to character, than slaveholding States—ay, than the slaveholding States of this Union.

And now, having detained you far beyond my intention in the discussion of this great slave question, which, however, has very important relations with the subject more immediately under discussion, I come to the question of the Missouri Compromise.

I do not understand that that measure is sought by the South. It certainly is not by the State which I have the honor in part to represent. That State stands upon the ground which I have feebly delineated—the ground of equality. She claims for her citizens protection of all their rights; that their property shall be protected wherever the flag of this Union floats—on the sea or on the land. This it is their right to have; this it is your duty to bestow. But if you are compelled to succumb to a spirit which I will not characterize—for I desire to avoid all harshness of language, but which makes itself known here by acts of deep injustice towards the South—if compelled by this spirit of proseription to forego your rights and duty; if you are unable to administer this great trust of Government over the territories, and cannot secure to citizens of all the States those equal rights which belong to them all; if you are obliged to abnegate the authority of a Government, and treat these territories as property, then, as an extreme concession, the South, as far as I know their opinions, are willing to make this Missouri Compromise line the line of partition. Not that this makes an equal division line—very far from it—the advantage is altogether with the non-slave-holding States; but because it has more than once been adopted, and has met the acquiescence if not the approval of the people. Allow me to say, sir, that in so doing I consider the adjustment to be effected without any warrant from the Constitution. I have never been able to recognise the constitutional right of forming the original compromise. It is not the appropriate occasion either to condemn or to approve of it. The emergency seemed then to require some such arrangement to enable the States to remain in union; and a similar emergency seems now to require some similar arrangement. If this Government is willing and able to do justice, this is that which we require. It is the position which, for your sakes and for ours, you ought to occupy; but, if you deny us justice, reluctantly we acquiesce in this division of the property.

But let us deal fairly and openly with each other, not using doubtful or ambiguous language. If it is to be a partition let it be made in distinct and certain language. When we say, however galling may be the utterance of the words, that to the north of the line slavery shall be excluded, we claim from you to say, in language equally distinct, that on the south side of that line all obstructions shall be removed to the admission and enjoyment of our property in slaves. Even if there were constitutional difficulties in the use of this language, upon this adjustment of partition no difficulty could arise. Surely if we exclude slavery on one side of the line we can guaranty it on the other. But I acknowledge, sir, I attach no importance to this asserted constitutional difficulty. It seems to me to rest mainly upon a mere fallacy; that the claim of the right to be protected admits also the right to destroy. It is certainly very strange doctrine, that, because I demand from you that protection of my person and property, which the Constitution guaranties to me, I have thereby impowered you to tyrannize over my person and destroy my property. When the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, in negotiating the treaty of Ghent, asserted and maintained our right to be remunerated for the slaves taken by the enemy, did he thereby acquire for this Federal Government any new power in relation to slavery? No, Mr. President. On the contrary, the more secure any institution has been rendered from violation or change, the more imperative has become your duty to watch over and protect it. How is it with respect to the trial by jury, or the habeas corpus act? How strictly guarded is your power with respect to these great institutions, yet how absolute is your right, how strictly enjoined your duty to protect them! I think, therefore, that there is no difficulty in that aspect of the case.

If in the settlement of this question we are to effect any results satisfactory to the people, we must deal fairly with them. I must say, sir—and I say it without casting imputations upon any one—that this want of clearness and full understanding of the terms of adjustment constitutes one of the most objectionable features of this compromise. The Senator from Kentucky avows frankly that in his opinion the South obtains not one foot of territory under the bill; that the Mexican laws, still of force, exclude them as effectually as the Wilmot Proviso. It is true that he is too generous gratuitously to insult as well as exclude the Southern people; he would treat them with kindness and delicacy; yet he has often declared that they, in his opinion, derived no benefit from the territorial part of the Compromise. But if the measure should pass, and the decisions of the courts coincide with this opinion, will not the Southern people who have expected some advantage from this bill feel themselves injured or deceived? Such, in my opinion, would be the case, and their dissatisfaction be increased rather than allayed.

I have already detained you too long, Mr. President, and am myself unfit now to discuss the merits of this Compromise bill. It has already, however, been much discussed, and many far more able than myself will, I doubt not, exhibit the strong objections which stand against its adoption.

If a distinct partition could be effected upon the Missouri Compromise line, this territorial question could be adjusted; but the great question of slavery, which lies at the foundation of these difficulties—how this great question is to be settled, I acknowledge I cannot determine. I profess myself inadequate to the task of suggesting a sufficient remedy for the evil. Unless some great change can be effected in the public sentiment of the States with which we of the South are associated; unless they can be induced to treat with fairness and justice those who are their equals, and must maintain that equality; unless they can restrain their citizens from the plunder of our property, the invasion of our rights, incessantly harassing us with malignant aspersions, subtle and cruel devices to disturb our peace and endanger our safety, I confess I cannot tell what adjustment can be effected.

Of one thing, Mr. President, I feel secure: the abolitionist who hopes from the dissolution of the Union the destruction of the South, hoping and expecting that the institution of slavery cannot be safely and wisely administered by a people who for a hundred years have made it subservient to their interest and happiness, is utterly mistaken. There never has been any nation whose security would be more assured than that of the Southern States of this confederacy, forced into a separate government. Linked together within by the strongest ties of community of interests and the congeniality of sentiment—wielded together from without by calumny and opposition—that spirit of devoted patriotism which finds its best nature amid difficulties, trials met and overcome—that great principle of national glory and national strength—would tower to a height far transcending that which has ever yet been reached among them. I have no apprehensions for them. When, in the history of the world, has been ever known that a nation possessing the wealth, intelligence, civilization, and strength of the Southern States of this confederacy, was found incompetent to control its slaves? Ancient States stood secure, though similarity of races tended to confound the distinctions of condition, and weaken and endanger the authority of the masters. Greece enlightened and Rome conquered the world, resting their organization polity upon this institution of slavery. We are in no danger; we are fearless of the result, and can, with unterrified front, look upon the coming danger, lower it never so darkly. Of this, too, I am sure: if there are those who seek to retain us in this Union with purposes of deadly hostility to our institutions, who clamor for its preservation in the spirit of him who, saying "Art thou in health, my brother?" smote his adversary under the fifth rib—they, too, are mistaken. They pronounce us accursed and doomed; they bid us prepare for the change that must come. I hear the answer, not near, not loud, but clear and firm: We are setting our house in order, not to die but to live.

I beg pardon of the Senate, Mr. President, for having detained them so long.

Mr. FOOTE. It is with mingled sentiments of regret and surprise that I find the honorable gentleman who has just taken his seat has not been kind enough to enlighten us in regard to the points presented by me relative to the views of his illustrious predecessor, [Mr. CALHOUN,] touching the respective merits of the Missouri Compromise and non-intervention. We had a right to expect from him, after what had fallen from me, that on taking ground in favor of the Compromise line of 36° 30′, he would have informed us whether he agreed with me or not in supposing that, were Mr. Calhoun now alive, he would in his judgment, have preferred what he formerly approved most warmly. Any information upon a point so interesting as this would have been doubtless most gratefully received by the whole Senate. But the honorable gentleman has left us quite as much in the dark on this head as we were before we arose; and I do not know what better the Senate can do than to take it for granted that all that I have said on the subject is felt to be true beyond contradiction or argument. Sir, I now again challenge denial, from any quarter, and especially from the worthy two Senators from South Carolina in regard to all that I have this day asserted concerning Mr. Calhoun's opposition to the Missouri Compromise and his sanction of the non-intervention principle. Upon the basis of irrefutable testimony—the testimony of recorded speeches—do I make this assertion, and hazard this challenge; and if I am not met as I desire to be, I will ever hereafter claim to be recognised as a more faithful disciple and expositor of the great Carolina statesman than those who had much higher claims than myself to his confidence and kindness when in life. I tell honorable gentlemen again that I am upon the platform of non-intervention, reared by the genius of John C. Calhoun; and if they will not stand shoulder to shoulder with me upon that platform, I shall feel authorized to refuse recognition to them as his *professed* followers.

The honorable Senator to whom I am specially responding is fresh from the great theatre of conventional action in Nashville, where he has enjoyed an opportunity of interchanging sentiments and commingling opinions with many of the most able, accomplished, and patriotic men in the nation, in regard to the great questions which now distract the peace of this republic. He knows well that in that convention the views and wishes of Mr. Calhoun were held in the highest reverence; and I feel authorized courteously to demand of him whether or not he understands Mr. Calhoun to have preferred, at any time, the Missouri Compromise line to non-intervention? Well, sir, if he cannot deny that Mr. Calhoun did prefer non-intervention to any mere *geographical line*, I would like to know how he reconciles his present attitude with that great respect for the wisdom of his illustrious countryman which we had a right to expect *him* to exhibit who now occupies the seat which Mr. Calhoun once so highly adorned. Well, sir, at any rate, I shall solace myself under the merciless assailment to which I have been subjected of late, and especially in the State of South Carolina, with the fact that, if I am in error in preferring non-intervention to the Missouri Compromise, I err with John C. Calhoun and Thomas Jefferson; and among those who have a proper regard for the opinions of these illustrious sages, I shall not be over hastily condemned for supporting a bill upon every clause of which the principle of non-intervention is most plainly stamped. Sir, I am most profoundly astonished that the honorable Senator from South Carolina, [Mr. BARNWELL,] who has addressed us with so much ability on this occasion, should have undertaken to urge upon us, as he has done, that he should be contented with no Congressional adjustment which does not accord to the South a recognition of the right to carry slaves into our vacant territories below 36 deg. 30 min. Is this non-intervention? Is it non-intervention to exclude the South above 36 deg. 30 min.? Is it not better to open the whole country equally to the North and the South, as this bill proposes to do, without any attempt to exclude the inhabitants of either from any part of the Territory?—Is not this latter plan at least the one which Mr. Calhoun advocated when living? Is it not the one which he would advocate if now alive?—Surely this must be true, or he must be imagined by his warmest admirers to have been capable of the most shameful inconsistency—an inconsistency of which I, for one, would deem it almost impious to accuse him.

But the honorable Senator from South Carolina says that he desires special protection for Southern rights below the line of 36 deg. 30 min. for a reason which he very frankly assigns. And what is it; pray? Why, this simply; he dreads the authority of the honorable Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] upon the question whether the Mexican laws against slavery are or are not now valid and operative. What, sir! has it come to this? John C. Calhoun, when alive, proved that all these laws had been invalidated and utterly rescinded by the entrance of the Constitution into these Territories. He not only so asserted, but argued in this chamber in support of this view of the subject with unanswerable cogency! Other distinguished Southern statesmen have declared their concurrence in this opinion of Mr. Calhoun; and now, notwithstanding all this, the gentleman from South Carolina suggests that the question has been exceedingly dark and doubtful, since the honorable Senator from Kentucky has expressed a different opinion, and calls upon us to interfere, in order to save Southern rights from the destruction with which they are threatened by Mexican laws, which we had been all along taught to believe had become altogether extinct. Yes, sir, it is a Senator from the proud State of South Carolina who now calls aloud upon Congress for help against the already *nullified* laws of Mexico. It is he that begs that a congressional enactment may be passed which may give additional force and validity to the most undeniable constitutional rights. It is the voice of the successor of John C. Calhoun in this chamber, that is heard to cry out in behalf of the South and her institutions, "Help me, Cassius, or I sink!" Sir, I would scorn to ask; or to receive aid from Congress in support of our equal right to enter this Territory with our property, with our Northern brethren. I never entertained the least doubt in my life that the Mexican laws on the subject of slavery had become void in consequence of the entrance of the Constitution with its guaranties into the region where these laws once existed; nor will I consent to weaken rights guarded and protected by the organic law of the republic, by demanding the interposition of Congress for their maintenance. I propose now, in support of these views, to read another short extract from Mr. Calhoun's speech upon the Oregon bill, in the year 1848. I commend it specially to the consideration of his successor, here among us, and hope that he may profit by it:

"We are next told that the laws of Mexico preclude slavery; and, assuming that they will remain in force until repealed, it is contended that until Congress passes an act for their repeal, the citizens of the South cannot emigrate with their property into the territory acquired from her. I admit the laws of Mexico prohibit, not slavery, but slavery in the form it exists with us. The Puros are as much slaves as our negroes, and are less intelligent and well-treated. But I deny that the laws of Mexico can have the effect attributed to them. As soon as the treaty between the two countries is ratified, the sovereignty and authority of Mexico in the territory acquired by it becomes extinct, and that of the United States is substituted in its place, carrying with it the Constitution, with its overriding control over all the laws and institutions of Mexico inconsistent with it. It is true, the municipal laws of the territory, not inconsistent with the condition and the nature of our political system, would, according to the writers on the laws of nations, remain until changed, not as a matter of right, but merely of sufferance, and as between the inhabitants of the Territory, in order to avoid a state of anarchy before they can be brought under our laws. This is the utmost limits to which sufferance goes. Under it the peon system would continue, but not to the exclusion of such of our citizens as may choose to emigrate with their slaves or other property that may be excluded by the laws of Mexico. The humane provisions of the laws of nations go no further than to protect the inhabitants in their property and civil rights, under their former laws, until others can be substituted. To extend them further and give them the force of excluding emigrants from the United States, because their property or relig