that now they have learned that it is merely a howl and nothing else, and they treat it accordingly. [Applause.]

Both Mr. Everett and Mr. Bell by virtue of the simple declaration that they are in favor of the Constitution, the Union, and the Enforcement of the laws, have pledged themselves to silence, to quiet, to leaving things as they are, to the faithful and honest execution of every law, and from such men in these days that is ample.—It is impossible to go back into the history of any man who has filled public station in this country for twenty years and not find that in the sharp struggles of parties here he has uttered an obnoxious sentimet, that there he has been guilty of an imprudent or unpopular vote, that here he has answerd a question thrust at him in the heat of a canvass, which pushed to its logical consequences, would involve a great error. If you allow yourselves to be misled by that style of canvasing, you will strip the country of the services of nine out of every ten of its best men,—confine it to people who have been so insignificant that they have never been called upon to make a declaration upon any great converted question; who have all the time been skulking along endeavoring to get upon the popular side for the time being, eschewing pen, ink, paper and printing, as if they were the inventions of Mephistopheles, and trusting by their very insignificance to worm themselves up into high station, as I have seen divers in these latter days, even to the Presidential chair. It is this shear cowardice, this fear to take gentlemen upon their course and conduct, and not upon their expressions and their abstract opinions, that has driven great men from the President chair. It is because gentlemen are affraid of being turned out of Congress, are afraid of going before their constituents and being hissed for making the avowal of obnoxious opinions, that you have weak men in public and race of great men has gone to the grave.—[Applause.]

Well, now what are the opinions of Mr. Lincoln? Let us meet the question right in the eye: What are the opinions of Mr. Lincoln, because there are certain parties in this country who say that if he is elected they will desolve the Union.—I do not assert that all Mr. Breckinridge's friends say so, I believe that the vast majority of them have no such idea. I believe that very many of them who say so, would not attempt it when the time came. [Laughter.] I believe in the "sober second thought." I believe that the difficulties of the practical execution, that that horror at shedding fraternal blood would make the boldest pause. I do not fear the result, I am confident that Mr. Breckinridge himself entertains no such policy. I am not here to misrepresent any political antagonist. I am not here to sow dissensions between any regions of the country. I merely say that there are parties who declare that that event will be cause for a dissolution of the Union; and that declaration on their part is made the pretext of an echo, from other quarters, that if Lincoln be elected such will be the result and in my judgment it will not be tried; but since it is said that in that event they are gong to take steps at least to break up the Confederacy, let us see upon what ground they are going to do it.

Mr. Boteler says, in his address, in the most authorative manner, that on the real great questions, among the conservative portions of the Republican party there is an acquiescence in what we suppose to be essential to our safety—the right of slave trade between the States, the right to continue slavery in the District of Columbia, and the execution of the fugitive slave law. What else is open? Nothing, literally nothing, excepting the more condition of the Territories? Then, what now is the condition of the Territories? Absolutely free in point of fact; no slave in them, remaining as they were at the time of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise;—in spite of that repeal remaining as free from slavery as if that compromise had never been repealed. What is there, then, to change? From the extremist point of veiw, nothing. It is only with reference to the question of slavery in the Territories that we are told by the address from the National Committee of the Union party, that there is a controversy open, and as to them it is said that the controveray is a "controversy of abstractions. But it can be stronger than that. So far as the opinions of Mr. Lincoln and his friends go, the Territories are in the exact condition in which they want to keep them. They say "let the subject alone, and they have nothing to say; if you attempt to carry slavery, we will attempt to exclude it; if you attempt to extend it, we will oppose the extension; if you attempt to plant slavery in Territory which we think is now free, we not only will not vote with you, but we will vote against you, and we will use the power of the government for the purpose of keeping it where it is." It is not necessary, even if it was their design, now to propose the passage of any law on the subject of slavery at all. The Territories are practically in the exact condition that they were when Mr. Clay introduced his great compromise bill, which was the foundation of peace until the controvery was reopened by the Democrats in 1854. The condition of the Territories remain as it was when Mr. Clay had his bills passed saying not one word on the subject of slavery, but resting on his resolutions. What were his resolutions? The second of the resolutions which Mr. Clay brought in the Senate in the great occasion in 1850 runs in this wise—I pray you; gentlemen be not shocked, because I told you that Mr. Clay held some oldfashioned notions, but this resolution was the foundation of the legislation of that day; it was attacked by the extreme Southern men in the Senate, it was denounced as being no compromise at all; but it was the view on which great men, such as Mr. Benton on one side, and Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster on the other side concurred for the settlement of the Territorial difficulties, and therefore, it bears a historic significance even beyond the vast authority of the name of the man who reported it. It runs in this wise:

"That as slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any Territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law either for its introduction or exclusion from any part of said Territory."

Silence upon the slavery question, leaving the Territory as it was and nothing more, was the the great wisdom of that compromise. [Applause] Here you see what Mr. Clay thought. He thought slavery did not exist there because the laws of Mexico excluded it. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 excluded it from all the residue of the Territory. It was on that basis, coupled with the unfitness of the country for slave labor even the laws did not exclude it, that Mr. Webster made the great declaration that there was an irrepealable law, of one kind or another which forever settled the condition as to slavery of every foot of territory in the United States.

Now, gentleman, what Abraham Lincoln thinks; is what Mr. Clay thought with reference to salvery, and the condition of the territory, that it is free. It is therefore needless to pass any law upon the subject. He thinks, it is time, and so do a great many others who bear Mr. Clay's memory in high esteem; not with Mr. Douglas that a bunch of squatters, congregated under a bush, can pass a law to determine the condition of the territory for you and me; but that the great national Legislature, which under the Constitution has the power "to make all needful rules and regulations concerning the territiory," has the power, if it see fit, to exclude or to admit slavery in any Territory and that in the absence of a statute there is no law to authorize it and then slavery can no more exist than man can exist without air to breathe. Here is the language of Mr. Clay upon that subject—that is an evil, and ought not to be extended voluntarily.

"I am extremely sorry to hear the Senator from Mississippi say that he requires first the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific; and also that he is not satisfied with that, but requires, if I understood him correctly a positive provision for the admission of Slavery south of that line. And now, sir, coming from a Slave State, as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to state that no earthly power could induce me to vote for a specific measure for the introduction of Slavery where it had not before existed, either south or north of that line. Coming as I do from a Slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate, and well matured determination that no power—no earthly power shall compel me to vote for the positive introduction of Slavery, either south or north of that line. Sir while you reproach, and justly too, our British ancestors for the introduction of this institution on the Continent of America, I am, for one unwilling that the posterity of the present inhabitants of California and New Mexico shall reproach us for doing just what we reproach Great Britain for doing to us. If the citizens of those Territories choose to establish slavery, I am for admitting them with such provisions of their Constitution; but, then, it will be their own work, and not ours, and their posterity will have to reproach them, and not us for forming Constitutions allowing the institution of Slavery to exist among them. These are my views, sir, and I choose to express them; and I care not how extensively and universally they are known. The honorable Senator from Virginia has expressed his opinions that Slavery exists in those Territories, and I have no doubt that opinion is sincerely and honestly entertained by him; and I would say with equal sincerity and honesty that I believe that *Slavery nowhere exists within any portion of the territory acquired by us from Mexico.* He holds a directly contrary opinion to mine, as he has a perfect right to do; and we will not quarrel about the difference of opinion?

Then agian, touching the power.—

The power then, Mr. President—and I extend it to the introduction as well as to the prohibition of slaver in the new Territories "does exist with Congress. I think it is a "power adequate either to introduce or exclude slavery. I admit the argument in "both its forms of application."

Judge by the standard of Henry Clay, the opinion of Mr. Lincoln, together with the opinion of all the other great men of the North, excepting possibly, a few Democrats, for ought I know to the contrary, is that, slavery is an evil which they are unwilling to extend, and that the power of exclusion exists, leaving open the question of the necessity or expediency exercising it. Now, what with reference to the expediency of exercising it? The opinion is expressed as distinctly as can be, that since slavery does not, in point of fact, exist in the Territories, and since they think it can only exist dy affirmative legislation, they have no legislation, to ask unless legislation is asked on the other side; and hence that great declaration of Mr. Sherman, when he was candidate for Speaker in the House of Representatives, in the face of the storm of villification and abuse with which he was assailed by the Democrats during the whole of that long controversy,—a declaration which gentlemen may not be willing to repeat, but which it behoves every man who wishes to know the truth of the history of the country to bear in his mind and ponder—in substance, if not in the words, was, "I tell gentlemen now here, that there is not one subject of sectional controversy which can possibly arise unless it is thrust on us by our opponents." That was said when he was the candidate of the Republican party for Speaker of the House of Representatives. It was said in the face of the Republicans who were voting for Lim It was a sentiment that I knew he had entertained, ever since I had the honor of sitting in the House with him. It might have been thought of some persons a rash declaration for a man in the doubtful and ticklish condition of a candidate for Speaker within 3 or 4 votes for an election, and therefore the more manlyand elso the more significaet It was received id silence by his party, and he received again and again their votes for that position.

Does that look like reopening the slavery question? Ever body who knows any thing the history of our country must know that from the first day of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise down to this time, whatever of ex citement there has been in the country, and especially in the North, however much exaggerated sentiment there may have been uttered, however furious the onslaughts of their newspapers and speakers on the South and its institutions—never more violent, never more excited, never more outrageous than the retorls and retaliations of Southern Democrats upon them—judging by the record, (the only way to judge of the purposes of political parties,) there never has been an act attempted that looked beyond reinstating things as they were prior to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. There were measures which I thought were unwise; there were some which I thought were imprudent; they were all, I thought unnecessay, because I knew they never could become laws, even if ill results would not have followed from them, if they had become laws; because the fixed Democratic majority in the Senate prevented their enactment; but the scope of these proposed laws was confined to the reinstatement of things as they were before the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The controversy has raged about the Territory of Kansas. The struggle has been on the part of the Administration, in Democratic hands, to force slavery into it against the will of the people. The struggle on the part of the whole body of the Northern people has been to prevent slavery from being forced into Kansas. Nobody can doubt that that is an extension of slavery. Nobody can doubt that that is carrying slavery where it has not heretofore existed. Nobody can doubt, therefore, that it is within the position that leading Northern gentlemen, Mr. Lincoln among them, take with reference to slavery, and especially the opinion of that great man, Mr. Edward Bates, that they are opposed to its extension to its going where it is not now, and that is all.

I happen to have been a party to all this controversy sometimes voting in a manner that did not satisfy some of my friends, and sometimes perhaps voting in a manner that not altogether satisfy me on a cooler reflection subsequently, at all times however struggling to do what I thought was best under the circumstances, and with the little power that I had; but I was at least a witness of them; I saw what passed; I heard the argument, I think I remember the history. Turn to the journals of Congress and you will find I think that that controversy sums itself up in these several points:

The first bill was a bill to repeal the laws of Kansas passed by the Legislature whose legality was contested. You remember that it was supposed—nay, asserted and proved, there is no supposition about it now; everybody admits it and everybody knows it since the great investigation ordered by the first Congress in which I was by your votes—and that Legislature was elected by Missourians and others out of the Territory of Kansas. A bill was introduced to repeal the laws of that Legislature, forced on the people by non-residents of the Territory. Was that agitating the slavery question? The next was a bill introduced by my friend Mr. Dunn, now deceased, reorganizing the Territory of Kansas, reinstating the Missouri Compromise, and providing that any slaves which might be there might be removed within one or two years after the passage of the bill, which bill was met by the Democrats in the North with an attack upon the Republicans for establishing slavery in the Territory, and more than one member of Congress lost his election by reason of that Democratic argument. That, you see, merely went to reinstating the Missouri Compromise line. The third was the bill to admit Kansas under the Topeka Constitution. That failed, but it was only to make it a free State. It was an unwise bill, a bill that ought not to have become a law, because there was a mere handful of people in the Territory; but it did nothing so bad as what the Democrats tried to do the next year when they framed the Lecompton Constitution by a minority of the people, and attempted to force that on the people of Kansas. The next bill was to abolish the existing laws and to reorganize the Territory of Kansas without one word relating to slavery in any way. In other words, as the contest progressed, the hot blood cooled and the whole body of the Northern representatives began to see that all they wanted was to wipe out the Territorial laws, leaving the Territory to the people, and they stopped there in that bill.

The only other controversy that arose was in reference to the Lecompton Constitution. The Democratic party had again taken the lead in forcing a slave constitution upon the people against their will, and I, together with other Southern representatives, Mr. Marshall, (now supporting Mr. Breckinridge,) Mr. Gilmer, of North Carolina, Mr. Underwood, of Kentucky, Mr. Harris, of Maryland, [applause] and one or two others, concurred in defeating it, under the lead of Mr. Crittenden. I take it that it was not agitating the slavery question. If it was, it was agitating it in very strange company, and under very singular auspices.

Now, gentlemen, the statement I have just made covers the history of the controversy in Congress since I went there up to the beginning of the last session on the subject of the Territories. The wild platform adopted at Philadelphia in 1856, said "it is both the right and duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those torn relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery." At Chicago (to show what men do when they become cool.) all that resolution is wholly left out, and there is in it no declaration of a duty to pass any law at this time on the subject. They declare the condition of the Territories to be free in their opinion, in the absence of any law on the subject, just as Mr. Breckinridge declares them to be slave in the absence of a law on the subject. But they proposed no action on the subject, and they repealed and omitted that resolution which was in the platform of 1856. If anything more significant could be required, it is that in the three or four or five bills which were introduced during the last session by Mr. Grow, of Pennsylvania,—in all conssience a stiff free-soiler enough for anybody,—as Chairman of the Committee on Territories, to organize certain new Territories, there was simply a declaration in the precise spirit of the resolution which I have read as reported by Mr. Clay, that nothing in these bills which were absolutely silent on the subject should be taken to authorize slavery in the Territories—a simple declaration of opinion, needless, in my judgment imprudent, because liable to be distorted and misrepresented; but not at all amounting to a law of affirmative exclusion, but leaving the law as it stood at the time of the passage of the bills.

Well, gentlemen, how are you to judge of the purposes of a party? By hunting up the speeches of small men who want to carry a neighborhood vote? By extracts from furious editors of small papers, who think they are never safe unless they are beyond the most extreme in their neighborhood? Are we to judge of men's opinions by the imputations of their enemies and their exaggerations for a purpose? Are we to suppose that our friends are black because their enemy daub them black? Or are we not rather to look at the facts and to remember that among the millions of the North there are men as wise as we are, as honest as we are, as well educated as we are, having as great interests at stake in the perpetuity of the Union as we have, and as earnestly and honestly devoted to the integrity of the Constitution as we are, and that they are not likely deliberately to invite civil war, deliberately to moot questions which are wholly needless, whatever their opinions may be on them. Let us at least give them credit for common sense and take their declarations rather than the declarations of their enemies and of our enemies. Is a Democrat's impeachment evidence against anybody on a question of politics?—[Laughter, and cries of "No, no."] Now, we all know, that there are men who are furious at the South on the negro question, and there are men at the North who are furious on the negro question. I am thankful that they are in an equally small minority in both sections. Their power is clamor. I do not believe that between them they could set a regiment in the field, even if they desired to do so. And, gentlemen, if a collateral proof was required, of how far the conservative masses of the North, the conservative leaders of the Republican party, or rather of the whole body of the Opposition in the North to the Democratic party are misrepresented, there would be no better or more convincing proof than in the fact that whilst the whole body of the Republican party are denounced as Abolitionists, the Abolitionists themselves have very quietly refused their support and are organizing separate tickets for themselves. [Laughter and applause.] Can Mr. Breckinridge's friends say as much of the Disunionists? Why are not the Abolitionists satisfied with the representations of our Southern brethren? They cannot want anything more than to invade the South; they cannot want anything more than to disturb our firesides; they cannot want anything more than to break up the slave trade between the States. They cannot want anything more than scenes of blood and destruction throughout the country; they cannot want anything more than to repeat John Brown's crazy and bloody exploit by the thousand times a year. That is what we are taught by leading orators of the Democrats to expect, if not the result of a set purpose, the tendency of the conduct of the conservative millions of the North. And that, in the face of the fact that, great as was the storm raised by that insanity of John Brown, and reckless as were the imputations upon gentlemen of certain political opinions, throughout the whole North, yet, with all the powers of the United States to rake evidence from one end of the country to the other, with a diligent examination, extending through months, by the Senate of the United States, by an able and honorable committee, headed by Mr. Mason, of Virginia, and after a careful examination by the Legislature of Virginia, there was no evidence found that implicated any body of confederates, or any man holding political position, or aspiring to hold any position, anywhere in the North, with that insane performance. It is, as I have said before, instead of being a source of disquietude, the most quieting of all the occurrences of the last half century. It has lifted the veil of misrepresentation, and enabled us to see what men are doing. Till that event occurred, and till these investigations were had, such was the uniformity of the imputation of extreme antislavery opinions to a great body of men at the North, and of an earnest determination to intermeddle with Southern institutions to their damage, that gentlemen, even of calm minds, were perhaps justified in having a doubt, or even perhaps in forming opinions, adverse to them upon the subject. But when investigations were made, after that occurrence, subsequent to all the provocations, all the series of outrages in Kansas Territory, where Northern men were allowed to be hunted down by the hundred, during, I believe, more than a year, for the express purpose of extending slavery into it by Border Ruffians—notwithstanding all that excitement, nobody could be found implicated, except those at Harper's Ferry, directly with Brown, and one or two accomplices who had fled. No man of name, not even any of the leading Abolitionists at the North, was found concerned in it. Why, it is, as a general thing, true, that the Abolitionists at the North, so far rom exciting rebellion, are of the Quaker's opinion, that it is wrong to shed blood, and are the most peaceable and quiet, if the silliest and most misled, of people in the world. (Laughter.)

Gentlemen, I have stated what I believe to be the condition of affairs at the North. It with these views of Mr. Lincoln and his leading friends, they should succeed in reaching power, my opinion is that they will act upon these opinions, and unless the question is forced on them by being raised by Democratic agitation, they will let it rest where it is, because they have nothing to accomplish, and there is no reason why they should reopen the question, and they declare that their only purpose is to oppose the extension of slavery into territory now free, or in the words of Mr. Bates—who is entitled to speak for them—in enumerating the opinions of Mr Lincoln, his personal and political friend, "his opinions are that slavery is an institution in the States of the States which choose to have it, and it exists within these States beyond the control of Congress; that Congress has supreme legislative power over all the Territories, and may at its discretion allow or forbid the existence of slavery within them; that Congress, in wisdom and sound policy ought not so to exercise its power, directly or indirectly, as to *plant and establish* slavery in any Territory therefore free, and that it is unwise and impolitic in the Government of the United States to acquire tropical regions for the mere purpose of converting them into slave States."

Then, gentlemen, even all the present Territories of the United States, unless Democrats agitate to extend slavery in fact, it is settled, according to the confessions of the Union party, according to the confessions of every body, excepting Mr. Douglas upon one side and Mr. Breckinridge upon the other. Who is in favor of acquiring more territory to reopen the question? I am not. Are you? ["No, no."] Is John Bell? Is Edward Everett? Is Mr. Lincoln? Not one of them. Which is the party that does not frown on the filibusters, or, if not quite that, what party claims to be the party of expansion; what party proposed to buy Cuba, at an expense of $300,000,000—a small item of $18,000,000 interest per annum, to be saddled on you and me; who proposed to take military possession of Sonora and Chihuahua, which, if once gotten, would never be given up? Who was negotiating a treaty which virtually inaugurated a protectorate over Mexico, which must sooner or later resolve itself into a conquest and annexation? Not those opposed to the Democratic party.

The Democratic leaders are the persons who alone propose to acquire additional territory. If they do acquire it, they must take the responsibility of the agitation that will arise out of it. That it will be fierce is certain; that it can be settled is uncertain. That the acquisition can be prevented and ought to be prevented is of all things the most clear. If great international necessities should force upon us, contrary to our will additional territory, I take it that irrespective of the abstract opinions of this party or that it will be apt to settle itself according to the existing condition of the territory when it is acquired. I doubt very much if you were to acquire the *Terra Adjacente* of Mexico to-morrow with the Mexican population densely filling it, slavery could ever be carried there; for it could only be carried there by consent of the people, it at all, and the Mexicans having abolished it once would not be likely to reinstate it. On the other hand, if you acquired Cuba with its immense negro population, no amount of opposition could prevent its admission into the Union with its slaves as it stood. When acquired, in other words, the law of settlement the law of settlement would be the statesman's law applied by Mr Clay to the territory acquired from Mexico, the *status quo*, the condition in which, it is when acquired. If it is free, it is impossible in this country ever to make it slave for the whole body of the Northern vote is irrevocably committed against it. If it is slave, the body of the Northern as well as of the Southern is committed against an abolition of Slavery in a State, and Cuba must be acquired as a State if acquired at all. The whole conservative body of the country would be resolately and positively opposed to freeing the mass of negroes in that Island, against the will of the people of the Island just exactly as they would to freeing them in Louisiana itself. So I take it that if in future years we should be driven upon the acquisition of further territory, the the question will be settled as it was settled in 1850 and that no power in this country can prevent its being so settled—if indeed it be adjusted at all. If you acquire a territory free, it remains free. If you acquire the Island of Cuba, slavery will remain the law of the Island until the inhabitants change it.

Gentlemen, we have the threats against the Union in the event of the election of one of the candidates, only another instance of that persistent agitation of the slavery question and appealing to mens fears and attempting to shake their nerves, which has been the policy in my judgement of the Democratic party for a great many years past.—Break up the government? Why, gentlemen, who are going to do it! Mr. Douglas is not, for his whole charge against his Democratic opponent is that he is a disunionist. Mr. Bell is not because he is named as the Union candidate. Mr. Lincoln is not, because one of the grounds of charge against him is that he says the South shall not secede if she wants to do so. [Laughter and applause]. Mr. Breckinridge disavows being a secessionist and I believe him. The great body of his followers, I believe disavow it likewise. I believe them. As to the remaing small body of noisy disunionist, I have no doubt there are such persons in the United States, but I think that now, as heretofore, in the event of no great greivance occurring, of no great outrage being perpetrated, and no war being made on the Southern States and their institutions; upon every thing being allowed to continue as it has been hitherto; and to go on as it has preceded heretofore; the sun being allowed to rise not covered with blood; and the moon being allowed to rise not turned to darkness,—if these things shall continue, my impression is that the hottest of the disunionists will count their numbers, and they will count their numbers on the other side, and they will prudently, upon a reconsideration of the whole matter, wait for a more convenient season [Great Laughter and applause.]

Then, gentleman, is there any thing to be afraid of! Are we surrounded with terrific forms and shapes that haunt us as we pass along the streets, and make the merchant tremble for his ships upon the ocean, and the person holding stocks fear lest the Stock Board should show a decline in his favorite securities! Or are persons who want to speculate in property calculating the duration of the Union, to see whether land be worth a year's value in fee, or whether there will be so many people engaged in war that possible rents will not be so high as they expected.—Are these the considerations that we are now called upon to wieigh? Are we on the borders of a civil war, or are we merely determining a question of political parties? If we are in the former, then, gentlemen, it requires very different methods from any that have been taken heretofore. It is not a New York or New Jersey contract for fusion that will avert that danger. Is there so near a prospect that the Union will be broken up, in the event of the triumph of Mr. Lincoln? Then, why do you not all turn in and vote for Mr. Breckinridge, who has the Disunionists in his ranks—for they will be quiet if he is elected. Why does not Mr. Douglas cease his clamor about disunion, and get his friends to unite throughout the South and likewise in the North, with his political opponents. Or, gentlemen, if we are not to be so generous as that, and can biggle over a matter of men, when the existence of the Government is at stake, as the Democrats say they are the only party competent to preserve the Union, and are now in an unfortunate and distracted minority, why do they not hold out the olilve branch to us, and say; Know-Nothins as you are; enemies of civil and religious liberty, stained with midnight assassination, still, to save the Government, we will even vote for you." [Great applause.]

That would be a condition equal to the occasion—as the alarmists adn agitators state it. There would be a necessity which would justify it. That would be the subordination of every political division to the existance of the goverment But this puling question "shall I join with you," "why then don't you join with me," —this miserable question as to who shall have the honor of saving the goverment and who shall make the sacrifice is unworthy of the crisis that disunionists and Union-savers assert to be at, hand and which the latter profess to desire to avert. In my judgment, the Union receives more discredit from being saved all the time, than it would from being let alone to save itself. [Applause.] Thank heaven, it si not a Maryland ieda; we do not deal with politics in that way in Maryland; we do not make bargains with our political opponents anb lie down in the same bed after they have spit at us, over us for years. [Applause.] It is a New York idea, originating in local hostilities and interests—which has migrated into New Jersey and tends to spread. It originated since the Baltimore Convention, since the nomination of Mr. Bell. "Oh! let us make a fusion to beat Mr Lincoln"—not to elect Mr. Bell—observ the phrase, "to beat Mr. Lincoln," because all these evils will follow his election! What good is that going to do Mr. Bell? [That's it."] If there are these dangers, the men who cry out against them ought to be consistent in their proposals for fusion; it should be errried into every Northern State: Mr. Breckinridge, Mr. Douglas, and Mr Bell ought to unite there Every gentleman in the South ought to be willing to abandon his political diversities of opinion with his neighbor and sacrifice them on the altar of his country, if the country demand the sacrifice For when the struggle is for life or death, for peace or civil war, it is out of place to allow political divisions of opinion, to keep asunder lovers of the country. All parties should be merged in the presence of the overruling necessity of the country. And when gentlemen make an argument which should lead them to subordinate their indivinual opinions and lay them down in that way in order to induce others to make political sacrifices; and yet show no desire thmselves to make them, I say it is a cry of wolf, with no wolf threatening the fold at all. "Oh! fuse in New York and New Jersey, Pennsylvania, for there they are weak!" How about Georgia? What dose Mr. Breckinridge say to that? How about Virginia? How about South Carolina? What of Alabama? What of Mississippi? There is no fusion there, it is war to the knife between the Union-savers on both sides. [Laughter.] But up in one or two doubtful States in the North, where men are given to bargaining, and where political principles are only the counters laid down on the gambling board, there they can make bargains and fuse to save the Union [laughter]—and their customers.

Gentlemen, I am disgusted at the suggestion, and think the honorable gentlemen who have given their assent will regret it when it is too late. I will do anything that is honorable to aid the election of John Bell to the Presidency. [Great applause.] I will not give the lie to all political truth by casting a vote or half a vote for men with whom I differ on every political question. [Continued applause.] In the presence of a common enemy, policies is silent, but so long as it is a question of politics, my duty requires me to vote for men in whom I have confidence personally, who I suppose will pursue those views of policy that I and my friends believe to be right, and to vote against all who are opposed to them. To that extent I will support John Bell; but I will not vote for Mr. Douglas to defeat Mr. Lincoln, nor for any other purpose. [Renewed applause.]

Gentlemen, what good is fusion going to do Mr. Bell? If they really want to elect him, and not merely to frighten weak people into giving a Democrat a chance of being elected before the House of Representatives or before the Senate, they have a short way to do it. If the case is as grevious as they say, and they believe it, then it is to them a bagatelle whether Mr. Breckinridge or Mr. Bell be President; and if the Breckinridge and Douglas men, throughout the whole body of the South, will, upon that one ground, (thus marking the earnestness of their belief, that, the only way to avert revolution and disaster, and to keep their homes unsullied and free from the blood of their wives and children, is to defeat Mr. Lincoln and elect somebody that is safer and better) vote for John Bell, it would be something that I could appreciate. They can mark that feeling in a manner which will speak in tones of thunder to every man of common sense north of Mason and Dixon's line; they can do it by just casting their votes for John Bell, and by making the avowal that he shall be President if their united votes can make him so. And they can say, that if they fail there, then if Mr. Lane does not come before the Senate but Mr. Everett does, they, the Democrats, will vote Mr. Everett into the Presidential chair. [Great applause] Let them say it, and we shall begin to believe that they are in earnest.

New York politicians are very well content as they say, to defeat Mr. Lincoln and let a Democrat be elected. They are not proposing to aid Mr. Bell, nor can it. It only humbles his party; it deprives it of power in the future; it almost puts an end to the possibility of its ever being powerful in a State where it has been made a subject of barter and sale upon Change. Who can fling back a democrats charge of bargain and corruption?—Who hereafter can ever cast in the teeth of the Democrats their covering up their divisions by compromises? What becomes of the perpetual assault upon them that in the South they have one opinion, and in the North another, that in the South they are extreme slavery men, and in the North have Free-soilers in their ranks who receive their highest honors? Who hereafter can ever cast the imputation on them that the Kansas-Nebraska act was supported with one signification in the North and another in the South? Are not the mouths of those who differing from Mr. Douglas and Mr. Breckinridge on these very points yet agree to give Mr. Douglas say 25 votes in order that they may buy 10 votes for Mr. Bell—are not their mouths sealed forever?

Let us work it out, gentlemen, in a national point of view. Is it wise thus to act?—Where does it send the election? If successful, it sends it to the House of Representatives. There was a time—I hope it has not passed, but I fear that the course of policy which has been pursued by a portion of Mr. Bell's friends has rendered it now almost impossible—there was a time when, had the election failed out of doors, and Mr. Lincoln been defeated, Mr. Bell would have gotten in my judgment, and gotten cheerfully, the vote of every Republican State in the lower House. The insane method of assault upon, and misrepresentation of, Mr. Lincoln's opinions, of the purpose of his party, have, I fear, put an end to the possibility of a single vote from that quarter, if the election should go to the House of Representatives. In my judgment, it will be an impossibility to elect anybody there, such is the division of parties. The Republicans have not a majority; the Americans have not a majority.

The Republicans and the Peoples' Party have fifteen States. Possibly they might buy two under the enormous pressure of the occasion. [Laughter.] The Democrats have enough to elect if they can get all the American States, together with Oregon and California, which now belong to them in the House. Whether they will go that way or not, it is not my province here to say; but it is perfectly certain that the Democratic States will not go for Mr. Bell. Does anybody think they will? Look at the Speaker's election. Do not forget things that have occurred within a few months past. Go and examine that list, and tell me whether there is a single Democratic State that, under these circumstances, will cast its vote in the House for John Bell. Then there is no election, and this accompanied probably with such scenes of violence and tumult as possibly men of greater firmness than I have may desire to encounter, but from which I pray to be delivered. I have gone through two contests in the House of Representatives for the election of the comparatively unimportant office of Speaker, with the House divided as it is now. I have seen these scenes of violence, I have heard words of menace, I have looked from day to day to some outbreak that would drench that hall in blood, and be the beginning of a real (and not a newspaper) revolution in the country: but by the infinite blessing of Providence that danger has been averted. I will not rush upon the bosses of His buckler and tempt Him too far. I will not try that House of Representative again to do the business which the *people* ought to do in their majesty and in their calmness. [Applause.] I will not tempt them with the immense bribes that can be urged, with the intensity of political passions excited to the uttermost, with the fierceness of men, some of them possibly only too willing to convert a political into a revolutionary strife in that Hall. I do not wish to see the immense temptations of a Presidential election forced on the House of Representatives without a necessity, and only in the last resort—something to be shunned and not to be sought for—something to be trembled over whenever it comes—something to be thankful to God for if it shall pass without civil violence.

And what next? If there be no election by the House when the 4th of March comes, who is the President? The Vice President elected by the Senate. Who are in the Senate? A clear Democratic majority. If Mr. Lane's name goes to the Senate, of course he will by them be cheerfully elected President. But suppose Mr. Everett's name goes to the Senate? Oh, say the confiding New Yorkers he will be elected by the Democratic Senators. Well, gentlemen I should go for credulity somewhere else than the Stock Exchange. Expect them to elect Edward Everett! Why, gentlemen, they have the game in their own hands. I do not expect so much from their liberality. I should rejoice in such a result. Nothing after the terrific scenes in the lower House, could give this country such peace and quiet and relief as to know that when the wished for 4th of March shall come, such a man as Edward Everett will be in the Presidency, no matter by whom or how chosen. [Applause.] But I have not that faith in the Democratic Senators and I am not sure they would make an election in the Senate if his name and Mr. Hamlin's should be alone before them.

I think they migh prefer rather to wait until the 4th of March, let the Presidential office be vacant, have a year of interregnum, and a new election, in the midst of which, without a head to the government, who will tell me what would occur? Or, they might take the other alternative, doubtful in law, but which they may undertake to solve, and, therefore, may solve to suit themselves; and, instead of having an interregnum, Mr. Breckinridge, being then a member of the Senate, they may elect him President of that body, and treat him as President of the U. States, after the 4th of March. The Constitution of the United States appears to have left a very unfortunate, it may prove, some day, a very dangerous, gap. It is possible that a construction may close that gap, but none has yet. It declares, in the event of the death, resignation, or disability of the President and Vice President, happening after entrance into office, Congress may declare what officer shall discharge the duties of President, till removal of the disability, or an election.

Congress has provided that the President of the Senate becomes, for the time being, the President, and in his absence, the Speaker of the House of Representatives becomes the President. But there seems to be no provision for a *failure to elect* both President and Vice President. The Constitution—and the law which was intended to provide for the vacancy of the Presidency follows the language of the Constitution—does not authorize Congress to provide for that case. There seems to be no provision anywhere for the case of the Presidential office being absolutely vacant at the commencement of a term,—the case of an absolute failure to elect either a President or Vice President. Whether in that contingency the President *pro tempore* of the Senate would assume to exercise the powers of President of the United States, or whether it would be treated by the Senate (the only legal body existing on the 4th of March) as vacant, no mind can now determine; and legal arguments may possibly be adduced on both sides. We may well rest assured that the majority of the Senate will settle it in which ever way will best suit their interests. It rests with them; it rests with no one else; you and I have no power over it. When the matter goes to the Senate, if they see fit to make no election, we are pushed upon this dangerous alternative, a vacant or a disputed Presidency.

If the people wish to run afoul of those difficulties, well and good. They were not originally intended to be made by bargaining politicians. The provision of the Constitution is for a case of accident or failure, after a *bona fide* effort of the people to elect, not for a conspiracy of a few politicians in a corner, in one State of the United States, to adjourn their political difficulties, and their personal hatreds, into the Halls of Congress. I, therefore, enter my protest solemnly against any such style of electioneering. Others may engage in it. In the State of New York, it is none of my business. I am not called upon to vote for Mr. Douglas or Mr. Breckinridge, and I have nothing more to say about it, except that it is with them; but it is not our style, here in Maryland, of standing to our principles, and conducting our canvass, and doing our best to elect our own candidates. [Great applause.]

What I have said, gentlemen, covers the exposition I desired to make to you this evening. I am aware that there is a great cry about sectionalism, and a great scramble for the vacant title of National. I wish, gentlemen, that there were a National candidate for the Presidency. I wish there were a really National party—not merely one which has the principles that will suit the whole land, but one whose power extended unbroken from North to South, as did the Whig party, in its days of glory. [Applause.] I trust that, ere I die, I shall again see the lines of these divisions obliterated. But when people talk about sectionalism, and one party casts upon another the imputation of being sectional, I am free for my part to say, that they are all sectional, in any proper sense. Mr. Douglas—is he a National candidate? He is, it would seem, the regular nominee of the Democratic party; but the Democratic party is not the nation; for the regular Democratic party is as much a whole party, as a man is whole when cloven by a sabre from head to heels. Where is his strength? In the North! He has a few supporters in the South, it is true. Mr. Breckinridge—is he a national candidate?—He has a great strength in the South. Whether it will be as powerful there as he supposes, remains to be seen. Circumstances now indicate that somebody will have a say, in political matters, in the South, besides the Democrats, hereafter; but his strength is in the South. In the North it is the shrunk shank of a decripid old man. Mr. Lincoln's strength is undoubtedly in the North; he has supporters in some of the border slave States.—Is Mr. Bell's strength in the South, although he has supporters sporadically over the whole North?

Gentlemen, it is the misery of our condition that turn wherever we may, we find that this infernal strife has split everybody into a thousand pieces; and no man can tell where to find the piece that belongs to him.—[Laughter.] Nay, more, gentlemen, if I may be allowed to quote words which I found in a sacred place, from a very eloquent gentleman, (Rev. Mr. Stockton,) whom, doubtless, many of you have heard in the pulpit here in Baltimore, I say of the condition of the people of this country and its party, especially of that great Opposition party to the Democrats which now is rent into fragments and struggling together, as he said of the Christian religion; that the vase in which the precious spirit of Christianity was held had been broken by sectarian strife into so many pieces that not only was its beauty marred and gone and its precious essence poured out and lost, but that he who on a mission of love attempted to collect its fragments and put them together, was in danger, in the attempt to reconstruct the vase, of cutting his fingers. It is the danger—it is the sickness of the times; and, instead of attempting to cure it, men who ought to know better, are acting so as to aggravate it. The patient is in a fever, and they wrap him up in blankets. His blood is boiling, and they dose him with strong drinks and fire-water, and call that—curing!

Gentlemen, there is a degree of timidity that is, of all things, in my judgment, the most dangerous in political life. Half the blood that was shed in the French Revolution was shed from sheer terror. It was not courage; it was not ferocity, it was sheer terror that made them cut their neighbors throats to-day, lest those neighbors should cut theirs to-morrow. That is the state of mind in which the conduct of too many in this canvass tends to throw the people of the United States. I lift my voice against it.

Whether these sentiments are popular here or not, is to me a matter of secondary moment. I have a duty to perform to myself, as well as to you. I agree with that most honorable and distinguished gentleman, my friend, Mr. Millson, of Norfolk, who, in his late letter, said, if I am not mistaken, that he thought it his duty to warn his constituents, as well when there was danger of invasion of their rights, as when, in point of fact, there was *none*. And, acting upon that high principle, I say here now, this night, that peace is within our grasp, if we only see fit to hold fast to it. If we choose to encourage war, we may encourage it too far.

Gentlemen, there has been a sort of hesitation on the part of the opponents of the Democratic party to meet them directly in the eye, to make formally the issue with them as to the correctness and safety of their principles and policy, and their mode of conducting the government. And the reason the Opposition have failed in other parts of the South, is, in my judgment, because they have *not* met the Democrats in that way, the reason that we have not failed in Maryland is because we have not been afraid to strike a blow that would overthrow our enemy. [Applause.] It only requires that there should be energy and union, and the day is ours.

Gibbon t