The Middlebury Register.

VOLUME XIV. MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT, TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 26, 1850. NUMBER 48.

The Middlebury Register

IS PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY MORNING, BY

J. H. BARRETT & J. COBB.

OFFICE IN STEWART'S BUILDING, ON MAIN-ST.

TERMS.

By Mail, or at the Office, *per annum*, $1.50
If not paid within the year..... 1.75
By Carrier,..... 2.00
If not paid within the year,..... 2.25

☞ No paper discontinued until arrearages are paid.

☞ All communications must be Post Paid.

☞ V. B. Palmer is our agent in Boston and New York.

Law of Newspapers.

1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary, are considered as wishing to continue their subscription.

2. If subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publisher may continue to send them till all that is due be paid.

3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible till they have settled their bills and ordered their papers discontinued.

4. If subscribers move to other places, without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.

5. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper from the office, or removing and leaving it uncalled for, is prima facia evidence of intentional fraud.

6. A Postmaster neglecting to inform a publisher when his paper is not taken from the office, makes himself liable for his subscription price.

Last Wishes of a Child.

THE following beautiful little poem was written by James T. Fields for the Boston Book for 1850.

"All the hedges are in bloom,
And the warm west wind is blowing—
Let me leave this stifled room,
Let me go where flowers are growing!

"Look! my cheek is thin and pale,
And my pulse is very low,
Ere my sight begins to fail,
Take my hand and let us go.

"Was not that the robin's song
Piping through the casement wide?
I shall not be listening long,
Take me to the meadow side—

"Bear me to the willow-brook—
Let me hear the merry mill—
On the orchard I must look,
Ere my beating heart is still.

"Faint and fainter grows my breath—
Bear me quickly down the lane;
Mother dear, this chill is death—
I shall never speak again!"

Still the hedges are in bloom,
And the warm west wind is blowing;
Still we sit in silent gloom—
O'er her grave the grass is growing.

DIDN'T WANT TO QUARREL.—There is a noted mail contractor in Rumney, N. H. who can tell as big a story as most of 'em and who possesses one of the best natured, most accommodating dispositions in the world.

'I was passing though New Jersey,' said he, 'a few years since, and there came by us, in the air, a flight of crows, *nine miles long*, and so thick was the flock, you could'nt see the sun for 'em!'

The contractor told this in the tavern, where several persons were standing about, one of whom—a coarse-limbed, heavy-featured son of the Granite State—ventured to query the correctness of the assertion.

'*How* long did you say, neighbor?'

'Nine miles, sir.'

'Don't believe it,' was the reply.

'Wal, look 'ere—you,' said the contractor—'you're a stranger, and I don't want to quarrel with yer. So, to please *you*—I'll take off a quarter of a mile from the thinnest part!'

The stranger was perfectly satisfied.

☞ Which is the deepest, the longest, the broadest, and the smallest grave in Esther churchyard? That in which Miles Button lies buried; for it contains Miles below the sod, Miles in length, and Miles in breadth, and yet it is only a Button-hole.

☞ Have you ever broke a horse? inquired a horse jockey. 'No, not 'exactly,' replied Cimon; 'but I've broke three or four wagons.'

☞ Senators Borland and Foote, says the Washington Union, have made up matters quite amicably. Mr. Borland, who gave the first blow, finding that he had misunderstood Mr. Foote, frankly acknowledged his error, and thus ended the dispute.

☞ THE IOWA CONTESTED SEAT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENEATIVES.—The prospect is, that Mr. Miller, of Iowa, will be admitted to the seat claimed and usurped by Thompson; this will be a gain to the Administration.

☞ Jonas says it is an old maxim, that give a man an inch, and he'll take an ell; but the other day he saw a *foot* given one, and he took an *acre*.

☞ One of our exchanges informs us that a man was recently arrested in New Hampshire on a charge of keeping his mouth open on Sunday. A true bill was found, as it is against the law in that state to keep a dram shop open on the Sabbath!

☞ "You have broken the Sabbath, Johnny,' said a good man to his son.

"Yes," said his little sister, "and mother's long comb, too, right in three pieces!"

FAST DAY.—The Governors of Maine and New Hampshire have appointed Fast on the 5th of April in their respective states. Governor Briggs, of Mass., has appointed April 11th as Fast Day in that State.

"A RALLY FOR THE UNION" IN MISSISSIPPI.—Under this head, we find in the Natchez Courier a call signed by one hundred citizens to be held on the 9th, "of the friends of the integrity of the Union, who are not opposed to the admission of California with her present Constitution." Among the names, are some of the most distinguished citizens of the State—men who have as deep a stake in Southern institutions as any others in the Union.

SPEECH
OF DANIEL WEBSTER,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, ON THURSDAY, MARCH 7,

On the Subject of Slavery.

[CONCLUDED.]

Then, sir, there are these abolition societies, of which I am unwilling to speak, but in regard to which I have very clear notions and opinions. I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last twenty years have produced nothing good or valuable. At the same time, I know thousands of them are honest and good men: perfectly well meaning men. They have excited feelings, they think they must do something for the cause of liberty, and in their sphere of action they do not see what else they can do, than to contribute to an abolition press or an abolition society, or to pay an abolition lecturer. I do not mean to impute gross motives even to the leaders of these societies, but I am not blind to the consequences. I cannot but see what mischiefs their interference with the South has produced. And is it not plain to every man? Let any gentleman who doubts of that, recur to the debates in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1832, and he will see with what freedom a proposition made by Mr. Randolph for the gradual abolition of slavery was discussed in that body. Every one spoke of slavery as he thought; very ignominious and depraving names and epithets were applied to it. The debates in the House of Delegates on that occasion, I believe, were all published. They were read by every colored man who could read, and if there were any who could not read, those debates were read to them by white men. At that time Virginia was not unwilling nor afraid to discuss this question, and to let that part of her population know as much of it as they could learn. That was in 1832. As has been said by the honorable member from Carolina, these abolition societies commenced their course of action in 1835. It is said—I do not know how true it may be—that they sent incendiary publications into the slave States; at any event, they attempted to arouse, and did arouse, a very strong feeling; in other words, they created great agitation in the North against Southern slavery. Well, what was the result? The bands of the slaves were bound more firmly than before; their rivets were more strongly fastened. Public opinion, which in Virginia had begun to be exhibited against slavery, and was opening out for the discussion of the question, drew back and shut itself up in its castle. I wish to know whether any body in Virginia can now talk as Mr. Randolph, Gov. McDowell, and others talked there, openly, and sent their remarks to the press, in 1832. We all know the fact, and we all know the cause, and every thing that this agitating people have done has been, not to enlarge but to restrain, not to set free, but to bind faster the slave population of the South. This is my judgment. Sir, as I have said, I know many of them in my own neighborhood, very honest good people, misled, as I think, by strange enthusiasm; but they wish to do something, and they are called on to contribute, and they do contribute; and it is my firm opinion this day, that within the last twenty years as much money has been collected and paid to the abolition societies, abolition presses, and abolition lecturers as would purchase the freedom of every slave man, woman, and child in the State of Maryland, and send them all to Liberia. I have no doubt of it. But I have yet to learn that the benevolence of these abolition societies has at any time taken that particular turn. [Laughter.]

Again, sir, the violence of the press is complained of. The press violent! Why, sir, the press is violent every where. There are outrageous reproaches in the North against the South, and there are reproaches in not much better taste in the South against the North. Sir, the extremists of both parts of this country are violent; they mistake loud and violent talk for eloquence and for reason. They think that he who talks loudest reasons the best. And this we must expect, when the press is free, as it is here, and I trust always will be—for, with all its licentiousness, and all its evil, the entire and absolute freedom of the press is essential to the preservation of government on the basis of a free constitution. Wherever it exists, there will be foolish paragraphs and violent paragraphs in the press, as there are, I am sorry to say, foolish speeches and violent speeches in both Houses of Congress. In short, sir, I must say that, in my opinion, the vernacular tongue of the country has become greatly vitiated, depraved, and corrupted by the style of our congressional debates. [Laughter.] And it it were possible for our debates in Congress to vitiate the principles of the people so much as they have depraved their taste, I should cry out, "God save the Republic!"

Well, in all this I see no solid grievance, no grievance produced by the South, within the redress of the government, but the single one to which I have referred; and that is, the want of a proper regard to the injunction of the constitution for the delivery of fugitive slaves.

There are also complaints of the North against the South. I need not go over them particularly. The first and greatest is, that the North adopted the constitution, recognizing the existence of slavery in the States, and recognizing the right to a certain extent of representation of the slaves in Congress, under a state of sentiment and expectation which do not now exist; and that, by events, by circumstances, by the experience of the South to acquire territory and extend their slave population the North finds itself, in regard to the influence of the South and the North, of the free States and the slave States, where it never did expect to find itself when they entered the compact of the constitution. They complain, therefore, that, instead of slavery being regarded as an evil, as it was then an evil which all hoped would be extinguished gradually, it is now regarded by the South as an institution to be cherished and preserved and extended; an institution which the South has extended to the utmost of her power by the acquisition of new territory. Well, then, passing from that, every body in the North reads; and every body reads whatsoever the newspapers contain; and the newspapers, some of them, especially those presses to which I have alluded, are careful to spread about among the people every reproachful sentiment uttered by any Southern man, bearing at all against the North; every thing that is calculated to exasperate, to alienate; and there are many such things, as every body will admit, from the South or some portion of it, which are spread abroad among the reading people; and they do exasperate, alienate, and produce a most mischievous effect upon the public mind at the North. Sir, I would not notice things of this sort appearing in obscure quarters; but one thing has occurred in this debate which struck me very forcibly. An honorable member from Louisiana addressed us the other day on this subject. I suppose there is not a more amiable and worthy gentleman in this chamber—a gentleman who would be more slow to give offence to any body, and he did not mean in his remarks to give offence. But what did he say? Why, sir, he took pains to run a contrast between the slaves of the South and the laboring people of the North, giving the preference in all points of condition, and comfort, and happiness, to the slaves of the South. The Senator doubtless did not suppose that he gave any offence, or did any injustice. He was merely expressing his opinion. But does he know how remarks of that sort will be received by the laboring people of the North? They are the North. They are the people who cultivate their own farms with their own hands; freeholders, educated men, independent men. Let me say, sir, that five-sixths of the whole property of the North is in the hands of the laborers of the North; the cultivators of their farms, they educate their children, they provide the means of independence; if they are not freeholders, they earn wages, those wages accumulate, are turned into capital, into new freeholds, and small capitalists are created. This is the case. And what can these people think when so respectable and worthy a gentleman as the member from Louisiana undertakes to prove that the absolute ignorance and the abject slavery of the South is more in conformity with the high purposes of immortal, rational, human beings, than the educated, the independent free laborers of the North?

Now, sir, so far as any of these grievances have their foundation in matters of law, they can be redressed; so far as they have their foundation in matters of opinion, in sentiment, in mutual criamination and recrimination, all that we can do is to endeavor to allay and cultivate a better feeling and more fraternal sentiments between the South and the North.

Mr. President, I should much prefer to have it and from every member on this floor declarations of opinion that this Union should never be dissolved, than the declaration of opinion that in any case, under the pressure of any circumstances, such a discussion was possible. I hear with pain, and anguish, and distress the word secession—especially when it falls from the lips of those who are eminently patriotic, and known to the country, and known all over the world, for their political services. Secession! Peaceable secession! Sir, your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle. The dismemberment of this vast country without convulsion! The breaking up of the foundations of the great deep without rolling the surface!—Who is so foolish—I beg every body's pardon—as to expect to see any such thing? Sir, he who sees these states, now revolving in harmony around a common centre, expects to see them quit their places and fly off without convulsion, may look, the next hour, to see the heavenly bodies rush from their spheres and dash against each other in the realms of space without possessing the c ash of the Universe. There can be no such thing as a peaceable secession. Peaceable secession is an utter impossibility. Is the great Constitution under which we live here—covering this whole country—is it to be thawed and melted away by secession, as the snows on the mountain melt under the influence of a vernal sun? disappear almost unobserved, and die off? No, sir! No, sir! I will not state what might produce the disruption of the states; but, sir, I see it as plainly as I see the sun in heaven—I see that disruption must produce such a war as I will not describe in *its two-fold character*.

Peaceable secession!—peaceful secession! The concurrent agreement of all the members of this great republic to separate. A voluntary separation, with the money on one side and on the other. Why, what would be the result? Where is the line to be drawn? What states are to secede? What is to remain American? What are I to be? An American or nothing? Where is the flag of the republic to remain? Where is the eagle still to tower? or is he to cower and shriek and fall to the ground? Why, sir, our ancestors—our fathers and our grandfathers, those of them that are yet living amongst us with prolonged lives would rebuke and reproach us; and our children and our grandchildren would cry out shame upon us, if we of this generation should dissolve these emblems of the power of the Government and the harmony of the Union which are every day felt among us with so much joy and gratitude. What is to become of the army? What is to become of the public lands? How is each of the thirty states to defend itself? I know, although the idea has not been stated distinctly. There is to be a Southern Confederacy. I do not mean, when I allude to this statement, that any one seriously contemplates such a state of things. I do not mean to say that it is true, but I have heard it suggested elsewhere that that idea has originated in a desire to separate. I am sorry, sir, that it has ever been thought of, talked of, or dreamed of, in the wildest flights of human imagination. But the idea must be of a separation including the slave states upon one side and the free states on the other. Sir, there is not—I may express myself too strongly perhaps—but some things, some moral things, are almost as impossible as other natural or physical things; and I hold the idea of a separation of these states, those that are free to form one government, and those that are slave-holding to form another, as a moral impossibility. We could not separate the states by any such line, if we were to draw it. We could not sit down here to-day and draw a line of separation that would satisfy any five men in the country. There are natural causes that would keep and tie us together—and there are social and domestic relations which we could not break if we would, and which we should not if we could. Sir, nobody can look over the face of this country at the present moment—nobody can see where its population is the most dense and growing, without being ready to admit, that ere long America will be in the valley of the Mississippi.

Well, now, sir, I beg to inquire what the wildest enthusiast has to say on the possibility of cutting off that river and leaving free States at its source and its branches, and slave States down near its mouth? Pray, sir, pray, sir, let me say to the people of this country that these things are worths of their pondering and of their consideration. Here, sir, are five millions of freemen in the free States north of the river Ohio; can any body suppose that this population can be severed by a line that divides them from the territory of a foreign and an alien Government, down somewhere, the Lord knows where, upon the lower banks of the Mississippi? What would become of Missouri? Will she join the accommodement of the slave States? Shall the man from the Yellow Stone and the Platte River be connected in the new Republic with the man who lives on the southern extremity of the Cape of Florida? Sir, I am ashamed to pursue this line of remark. I dislike it—I have an utter disgust for it. I would rather hear of natural blasts and mildews, war, pestilence, and famine, than to hear gentlemen talk of secession. To break up! to break up this Government—to dismember this great country—to astonish Europe with an act of folly such as Europe for two centuries has never beheld in any Government? No, sir; no sir! There will be no secession. Gentlemen are not serious when they talk of secession.

Sir, I hear there is to be a Convention held at Nashville. I am bound to believe that if worthy gentlemen meet at Nashville in Convention, their object will be to adopt counsels conciliatory—to advise the South to forbearance and moderation, and to advise the North forbearance and moderation; and to inculcate principles of brotherly love and affection, and attachment to the Constitution of the country as it now is. I believe, if the Convention meet at all, it will be for this purpose; for certainly, if they meet for any purpose hostile to the Union, they have been singularly inappropriate in their selection of a place. I remember, sir, that when the treaty was concluded between France and England at the peace of Amiens, a stern old Englishman and an orator, who disliked the terms of the peace as ignominious to England, said in the House of Commons that if King William could know the terms of that treaty, he would turn in his coffin. Let me commend the saying of Mr. Windham in all its emphasis and in all its force, to any persons who shall meet at Nashville for the purpose of concerting measures for the overthrow of the Union of this country over the bones of Andrew Jackson.

Sir, I wish to make two remarks, and hasten to a conclusion. I wish to say, in regard to Texas, that if it should be hereafter at any time the pleasure of the Government of Texas to cede to the United States a portion, larger or smaller, of her territory which lies adjacent to New Mexico and North of 34 deg. of North latitude, to be formed into free States, for a fair equivalent in money or in the payment of her debt. I think it an object well worthy the consideration of Congress, and I shall be happy to concur in it myself if I should be in the public councils of the country at the time.

I have one remark to make. In my observations upon slavery as it has existed in the country, and as it now exists, I have expressed no opinion of the mode of its extinguishment or amelioration. I will say, however, though I have nothing to propose on that subject, because I do not deem myself so competent as other gentlemen to consider it, that if any gentleman from the South shall propose a scheme of colonization to be carried on by this government upon a large scale, for the transportation of free colored people to any owe or any place in the world, I should be quite disposed to incur almost any degree of expense to accomplish that object. Sir, following an example here in no more than twenty years ago by a great man, then a Senator from New York, I would return to Virginia—and through her for the benefit of the whole South—the money received from the lands and territories ceded by her to this Government, for any such purpose as to relieve, in whole or in part, or in any way to diminish or deal beneficially with the free colored population of the Southern States. I have said that I honor Virginia for her cession of this territory. There have been received into the treasury of the United States eighty millions of dollars, the proceeds of the sales of public lands ceded by Virginia. If the residue should be sold at the same rate, the whole aggregate will exceed two hundred millions of dollars. If Virginia and the South see fit to adopt any proposition to relieve themselves from the free people of color among them, they have my consent that the Government shall pay them any sum of money out of its proceeds which may be adequate to the purpose.

And now, Mr. President, I draw these observations to a close. I have spoken freely, and I meant to do so. I have sought to make no display; I have sought to enlighten the occasion by no animated discussion; nor have I attempted any train of elaborate argument. I have sought only to speak my sentiments, fully and at large, being desirous once and for all, to let the Senate know the opinions and sentiments which I entertain on all these subjects. These opinions are not likely to be suddenly changed. If there be any future service that I can render to the country, consistently with these sentiments and opinions, I shall cheerfully render it. If there be not, I shall still be glad to have had an opportunity to disburden my conscience from the burden of my heart, and to make known every political sentiment that there is exists.

And now, Mr President, instead of speaking of the possibility or reality of secession, instead of dwelling in these caverns of darkness, instead of groping with those ideas so full of all that is horrid and horrible, let us come out into the light of day; let us enjoy the fresh airs of Liberty and Union; let us cherish those hopes which belong to us; let us devote ourselves to those great objects that are fit for our consideration and our action; let us raise our conceptions to the magnitude and the importance of the duties that devolve upon us; let our comprehension be as broad as the country for which we act, our aspirations as high as its certain destiny; let us no be pygmies in a case that calls for men. Never did there devolve on any generation of men higher trusts than now devolve upon us for the preservation of this Constitution, and the harmony and peace of all who are destined to live under it. Let us make our generation one of the strongest, and the brightest link in that golden chain which is destined, I hoolly believe, to grapple the people of all the States to this Constitution, for ages to come. It is a great popular Constitutional Government, guarded by legislation, by law, by judicature, and defended by the whole affections of the people. No monarchical throne presses these States together; no iron chain of despotic power encircles them; they live and stand upon a Government popular in its form, representative in its character, founded upon principles of equality, and calculated, we hope, to last forever. In all its history it has been beneficent; it has trodden down no man's liberty; it has crushed no State. Its daily respiration is liberty and patriotism. Its yet youthful veins all full of enterprise, courage and honorable love of glory and renown. Large before the country has now, by recent events, become vastly larger. This republic now extends with a vast breadth, across the whole continent. The two great seas of the world wash the one and the other shore. We realize, on a mighty scale, the beautiful description of the ornamental edging of the Buckler of Achilles:—

"Next the broad shield complete the artist crowned,
With his last hand, and poured the ocean round;
In form like silver seemed the waves to roll,
And heal the buckler's verge, and bound the whole."

Mr. Calhoun.—I rise to correct what I conceive to be an error of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as to the motives which induced the acquisition of Florida, Louisiana and Texas. He attributed it to the great growth of cotton, and the desire of the Southern people to get an extension of territory, with the view of cultivating it with more profit than they could in a compact and crowded settlement. Now, Mr. President, the history of these acquisitions I think was not correctly given. It is well known that the acquisition of Florida was the result of an Indian war. The Seminole Indians residing along the line attacked one of our fortresses; troops were ordered out, they were driven back; and, under the command of General Jackson Pensacola and St. Marks were seized. It was these acts, and not the desire for the extended cultivation of cotton, which led to the acquisition of Florida. I admit that there had been for a long time a desire on the part of the South, and of the administration I believe, to acquire Florida, but it was very different from the reason assigned by the honorable Senator. There were collected together four tribes of Indians—the Creeks, the Choctaws, the Chickasaws and the Cherokees, about thirty thousand warriors—who held possession, almost the whole of them, with the Spanish authorities in Florida, and carried on a trade perpetually with them. It was well known that a most pernicious influence was thus exercised over them; and it was the desire of preventing conflict between the Indians and ourselves in the South, as I believe, which induced the acquisition of Florida. I come now to Louisiana. We well know that the immediate cause for the acquisition of Louisiana was the suspension of our right of deposite at New Orleans. Under a treaty with Spain we had a right to the navigation of the river as far as New Orleans, and a right to make deposites in the port of New Orleans. The Spanish authorities interrupted that right, and that interruption produced a great agitation at the West, and I may say, throughout the whole United States. The gentlemen then in opposition, a highly respectable party—the old Federal party, which I have never said a word of disrespect in regard to—if I mistake not, took the lead in a desire to resort to arms to acquire that territory. Mr. Jefferson, more prudent, desired to procure it by purchase. A purchase was made, in order to remove all difficulty and to give an outlet to the West to the ocean. That was the immediate cause of the acquisition of Louisiana. Now, sir, we come to Texas. Perhaps no gentleman had more to do with the acquisition of Texas than myself; and I aver, Mr. President, that I would have been among the very last individuals in the United States to have made any movement at that time for the acquisition of Texas; and I go further, if I know myself, I was incapable of acquiring any territory simply on the ground that it was to be an enlargement of slave territory. I would just as freely have acquired it if it had been on the Northern as on the Southern side. No, sir, very different motives actuated me. I know at a very early period—I will not go into the history of it—the British Government had given encouragement to the abolitionists of the United States, who were represented at the World's Convention. The question of the abolition of slavery was agitated in that Convention. One gentleman stated that Mr. Adams informed him that if the British Government wished to abolish slavery in the United States they must begin with Texas. A commission was sent from this World's Convention to the British Secretary of State, Lord Aberdeen; and it so happened that a gentleman was present when the interview took place between Lord Aberdeen and the Committee, who gave me a full account of it shortly after it occurred. Lord Aberdeen fell into the project, and gave full encouragement to the abolitionists. Well, sir, it is well known that Lord Aberdeen was a very direct, and, in my opinion, a very honest and worthy man; and when Mr. Pakenham was sent here to negotiate with regard to Oregon, and incidentally with respect to Texas, he was ordered to read a declaration to this Government, stating that the British Government was anxious to put an end to slavery all over the world, commencing at Texas. It is well known, further, that at that very time a negotiation was going on between France and England to accomplish that object, and our Government was thrown by stratagem out of the negotiation; and that object was, first, to induce Mexico to acknowledge the independence of Texas upon the ground that she would abolish it. All these are matters of history; and where is the man so blind—I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts is not so blind—as not to see that if the project of Great Britain had been successful, the whole frontier of the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, and the adjacent States, would have been exposed to the inroads of British emissaries. Sir, so far as I was concerned, I put it exclusively upon that ground. I never would run into the folly of re annexation, which I always held to be absurd. Nor, sir, would I put it upon the ground—which I might well have put it—of commercial and manufacturing considerations; because those were not my motive principles, and I chose to assign what were. So far as commerce was concerned, I would not have moved in the matter at that early period.

The Senator objects that many Northern gentlemen voted for annexation. Why, sir, it was natural that they should be desirous of fulfilling the obligations of the constitution; and, besides, what man at that time doubted that the Missouri compromise line would be adopted, and that the territory would fall entirely to the South? All that Northern men asked for at that time was the extension of that line. Their course, in my opinion, was eminently correct and patriotic.

Now, Mr. President, having made these corrections, I must go back a little further, and correct a statement which I think the Senator has left very defective, relative to the ordinance of 1787. He states very correctly that it commenced under the Old Confederation; that it was afterwards confirmed by Congress; that Congress was sitting in New York at the time, while the Convention sat in Philadelphia; and there was concert of action. I have not looked into the ordinance very recently, but my memory will serve me thus far, that Mr. Jefferson introduced his first proposition to exclude slavery in 1784. There was a vote taken upon it, and I think on that vote every southern senator voted against it; but I am not certain of it. One thing I am certain of, that it was three years before the ordinance could pass. It was sturdily resisted down to 1787; and when it was passed, as I had good reason to believe, it was upon a principle of compromise; first, that the ordinance should contain a provision similar to the one put in the constitution with respect to fugitive slaves; and next, that it should be inserted in the constitution; and this was the compromise upon which the prohibition was inserted in the ordinance of 1787. We thought we had an indemnity in that, but we made a great mistake. Of what possible advantage has it been to us? Violated faith has met us on every side, and the advantage has been altogether in their favor. On the other side, it has been thrown open to a northern population, to the entire seclusion of the southern. This was the leading measure which destroyed the compromise of the constitution; and then followed the Missouri compromise, which was carried mainly by northern votes, although now disavowed and not respected by them. That was the next step, and between these two causes the equilibrium has been broken.

Having made these remarks, let me say that I took great pleasure in listening to the declarations of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts upon several points. He puts himself upon the fulfilment of the contract of Congress in the resolutions of Texas annexation, for the admission of the four new states provided for by those resolutions to be formed out of the territory of Texas. All that was manly, statesmanlike, and calculated to do good, because just. He went further; he condemned, and rightfully condemned, and in that he has shown great firmness, the course of the North relative to the stipulations of the Constitution for the restoration of fugitive slaves; but permit me to say, for I desire to be candid upon all subjects, that if the Senator, together with many friends on this side of the chamber, puts his confidence in the bill which has been reported here, further to extend the laws of Congress upon this subject, it will prove fallacious. It is impossible to execute any law of Congress until the people of the states shall co-operate.

I heard the gentleman with great pleasure say that he would not vote for the Wilmot proviso, for he regarded such an act unnecessary, considering that Nature had already excluded slavery. As far as the new acquisitions are concerned, I am disposed to leave them to be disposed of as the hand of Nature shall determine. It is what I always have insisted upon. Leave that portion of the country more natural to a non-slaveholding population to be filled by that description of population; and leave that portion into which slavery would naturally go, to be filled by a slaveholding population—destroying artificial lines; though perhaps they may be better than none. Mr. Jefferson spoke like a prophet of the Missouri compromise line, I am willing to leave it for nature to settle; and to organize governments for the territories, giving all free scope to enter and prepare themselves to participate in their privileges. We want, sir, nothing but justice. When the gentleman says that he is willing to leave it to Nature, I understand he is willing to remove all impediments whether real or imaginary. It is consummate folly to assert that the Mexican law prohibiting slavery in California and New Mexico is in force; and I have always regarded it so.

No man would feel more happy than myself that this Union formed by our ancestors should live forever. Looking back to the long course of forty years' service here, I have the consolation to believe that I have never done one act which would weaken it; that I have done full justice to all sections. And if I have ever been exposed to the imputation of a contrary motive, it is because I have been willing to defend my section from unconstitutional encroachments. But I cannot agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that this Union cannot be dissolved. Am I to understand him that no degree of oppression, outrage, no broken faith can produce the destruction of this Union? Why, sir, if that becomes a fixed fact, it will itself become the great instrument of producing oppression, outrage and broken faith. No, sir, the Union can be broken. Great moral causes will break it if they go on, and it can only be preserved by justice, good faith, and a rigid adherence to the Constitution.

Mr. Webster. Mr. President, a single word in reply to the honorable member from South Carolina. My distance from the honorable member and the crowded state of the room prevented me from hearing the whole of his remarks. I have only one or two observations to make; and, to begin, I first notice the honorable member's last remark. He asks me if I held the breaking up of the Union by any such thing as the voluntary secession of states, as an impossibility, I know, sir, this Union can be broken up; every Government can be, and I admit that there may be such a degree of oppression as will warrant resistance and a forcible severance. That is revolution! Of that ultimate right of revolution I have not been speaking. I know that that law of necessity does exist. I forbear from going further, because I do not wish to run into a discussion of the nature of this Government. The hon rable member and myself have broken lances sufficiently often before on that subject.

Mr. Calhoun. I have no desire to do it now.

Mr. Webster. I presume the gentleman has not, and I have quite as little. The gentleman refers to the occasions on which these great acquisitions were made to territory on the southern side. Why, undoubtedly wise and skilful public men, having an object to accomplish, may take advantage of occasions. Indian wars are an occasion, a fear of the occupation of Texas by the British was an occasion; but when the occasion came, under the pressure of which, or under the justification of which the thing could be done, it was done, and done skilfully. Let me say one thing farther, and that is, that if slavery were abolished, as it was supposed to have been, throughout all Mexico, before the revolution and the establishment of the Texan Government, then, if it were desirable to have possession of Texas by purchase, as a means of preventing its becoming a British possession, I suppose that object could have been secured by making it a free territory of the United States as well as a slave territory.

Sir, in my great desire not to prolong this debate, I have omitted what I intended to say upon a particular question under the motion of the honorable Senator from Missouri, proposing an amendment to the resolution of the honorable member from Illinois; and, that is, upon the propriety and expediency of admitting California, under all circumstances, just as she is. The more general subjects involved in this question are now before the Senate under the resolutions of the honorable member from Kentucky. I will say that I feel under great obligations to that honorable member for introducing the subject, and for the very lucid speech which he made, and which has been so much read throughout the whole country. I am also under great obligations to the honorable member from Tennessee, for the light which he has shed upon this subject; and, in some respects, it will be seen that I differ very little from the leading subjects submitted by either of those honorable gentlemen.

Now, sir, when the direct question of the admission of California shall be before the Senate, I propose, but not before every other gentleman who has a wish to address the Senate shall have gratified that desire—to say something upon the boundaries of California, upon the constitution of California, and upon the expediency, under all the circumstances, of admitting her with that constitution.

Mr. Calhoun. One word, and I have done; and that word is, that notwithstanding the acquisition of the vast territory of Texas represented by the Senator from Massachusetts, it is the fact that all that addition to our territory made it by no means equal to what the northern states had excluded us from before that acquisition. The territory lying west between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains is three-fourths of the whole of Louisiana; and that which lies between the Mississippi and the Ohio, added to that, makes a much greater extent of territory than Florida and Texas and that portion of Louisiana that has fallen to our share.

Mr. Walker moved the postponement of the further consideration of the resolutions until to-morrow, which was agreed to.

MR. SEWARD'S SPEECH.

The following is an abstract of the speech of Mr. Seward, of New York, in the U. S. Senate, on the 11th inst., on the Slavery question. We copy from the Washington Republic:—

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of the motion to refer the President's Message and the accompanying copy of the constitution to the Committee on Territories with instructions to report a bill for her admission.

Mr. SEWARD said that, four years ago, California was a Mexican province, and known only to us from her port of San Francisco, which, even at that time, was looked at as a most desirable subject for acquisition. One year ago, California was a dependency of the United States, and her acquisition was considered as a most happy achievement. To-day, California is here applying for admission into this Union as as a State, and finds us here gravely debating upon a dissolution of the Union itself. The question now is, shall California be admitted into the Union? Several objections were urged against her admission. It was said that she has adopted a State government unceremoniously and without the previous expressed consent of Congress, and hence came here under an act of usurpation.

This charge was untrue—if not in fact, at least in spirit. California was torn from the empire of Mexico, and added to the domain of this Union; but in so doing a compact was made, whereby it was stipulated that those Mexican provinces should be admitted into this Union.

But it was said that she comes unauthorized. Michigan, and several other States, came in the same way. California pleads these precedents. Is not the plea sufficient? It was said that it was guaranteed that Michigan should be admitted by the ordinance of 1787; but that was nothing more than a compact, and California pleaded an equally binding one. California was compelled by the great law of self-preservation, to adopt this constitution, and seek admission as a State. She was a military colony, exposed to internal corruption and strife, and dangerous to the parent power; and for throwing it off she deserved not rebuke but praise and admiration.

The boundary of California was not a proper objection; there was none, and there could be no standard of measurement for States. Her territory was compact, contiguous, and united; no adjacent States were complaining or murmuring. A census, and laws regulating suffrage, were not available at the time. She was abandoned by Congress, and had to make the best regulations in her power. The pilgrim fathers, who were on the Mayflower, were not numbered by an act of Parliament;—yet they founded an empire. They were aliens there too.

The only objection to her constitution was, that it was too republican; for it adopts the principles of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are born free and equal.

He then examined the objection that California was brought here through Executive interference, and declared it unfounded, so far as any evidence had transpired. The President had all power under the military government; and if he preferred to lay that power down, and repose it in the people, he desired that such a President might always be found in this country.

He gave a sketch of the future prospects of this country, when the Caucasian race shall have settled it all over; when the population shall be two hundred millions of people; and asked whether it was desirable that this whole people should form one government or nation, or two? He thought the admission of California now had a great bearing on this point. California, if denied admission, might be the foundation of another empire on the other ocean.

The Senator from Kentucky had introduced a series of resolutions, which were proposed to be a compromise on all the questions growing out of the subject of slavery. He was opposed to this compromise. He was opposed to all the compromises which had been submitted. All legislative compromises were necessarily vicious and dangerous. They always take away the right to re-consider the subject, and are an usurpation of the powers of future Legislatures.

What did this compromise offer to him? For forbearance as to slavery in the District of Columbia—for forbearance as to the fugitive slaves—for forbearance as to slavery in the Territories—for forbearance as to slavery every where, he was offered freedom in California, where freedom was already established. For a small portion of human rights this compromise required him to use forbearance towards slavery everywhere.

He considered that California should be admitted independent of the subject of slavery; he would have voted for her admission as a slave or a free State. Her admission would take place in either case, and therefore her admission should form no part of a compromise.

He gave the history of the legislation on the subject of fugitive slaves, and declared that if the laws now in force were inoperative and insufficient, no more stringent laws would avail the slaveholder. He considered the compact in the Constitution and law of 1793, as to rendering up of fugitive slaves, as against the laws of nature. There was but one precedent, which was in a treaty between Russia and Constantine in the year nine hundred and two. He pronounced it inhuman, but it was law, and if slaveholders desired to carry out that law, they should make the law less stringent and secure to the alleged fugitive the common privileges of man—the right of trial by jury, and the presumption of freedom.

He would vote for the emancipation of slaves in this District. No compromise could purchase his forbearance on this point. He would vote any sum of money to purchase the freedom of slaves. He could never consent that a law to abolish slavery in this District should be defeated by an implied agreement that such a law should not be passed at a proper time.

Another feature in this compromise was the omission of the Wilmot Proviso in the territorial governments. Such an omission could not be satisfactory to the people of the North, and if a bill should be passed without the Wilmot Proviso, the spirit of the people would rise, and they would not leave in the Capital one servant who knew his master's duty and did it not.

He did not agree with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Webster) that, by the resolutions of annexation, Congress was bound to admit new States formed out of Texas, even if they were slave States. He thought that the power was in Congress to give its consent to the formation of those new States. He never would give his consent to the admission of a slave State.

He contended that, in the Convention which formed the Constitution, it was strenuously kept in view that no provision should be allowed in that Constitution which recognized slavery as property; and hence he argued that the assimilation of the purposes of the union of the States with the nature of a joint-stock association was unfounded in law and fact.

He examined the nature and character of slavery as an institution, holding it to be wrong and unjust, and that it was the duty and within the power of Congress to resist it now; and that, hereafter, Congress, in all cases, upon the admission of new States, should require, as an absolute pre-requisite, that the new State should be a free one. In regard to the territories, he considered the power to exclude slavery was vested in Congress, not only by the Constitution, but by the treaty-making power. The question was should that power be exercised?

He was told that nature forbade slavery in the new territories, and that the Mexican laws prohibiting slavery were in force there. Admitting both propositions, he still thought it wise and proper to carry the laws of the American Union into force there, even if it was to re-enact the laws of God.

It has been declared that the diffusion of slavery weakened its influence and power. In answer to this, he confined himself to the simple inquiry, whether it was weakened by the admission of slavery into Missouri and Texas?

He next adverted to the proclaimed dangers to the Union. It had been declared by one Senator that the Union was already dissolved. Another had expressed an opinion that it would be dissolved in a certain number of days.

For the Middlebury Register

Mandeville's Readers.

MR. EDITOR:—

Since your notice of these Readers, a friend has placed a set of them in my hands. I have given them a very thorough examination—not having omitted a sing'e page or paragraph; and now, with your permission, I wish to present your readers with the deliberate convictions of my judgment in relation to them, as books for the use of our schools. I will do this in as concise a way as I am able, lest I trespass too much on your space and the time of your readers.

On opening these books, the first thing that claims our attention, is the method of teaching reading, and especially the *first lessons* in reading, which they develope. In the first book or Primer, the child is required, after learning the alphabet, to be drilled in reading *fragments* of words, followed by *fragments* of sentences. These cover several pages, adorned with pictures to illustrate these *fragments*, arranged in *grammatical* classes, beginning with *modifying* words and phrases, and *connectives*, and continuing on through all the *grammatical classes* of words, which the little child is required to read and spell until he is able to distinguish the *class* to which each belongs, wherever found! This is what is demanded of little children from four to six years of age! Of the practicability of such a demand, I need not speak to any competent and experienced teacher. It is requiring of such children, that is acquired with considerable difficulty by persons three times their age.

In the second book, this grammatical operation is continued and carried still farther, and the learner is required to comprehend not only all the grammatical *classes* of words, but their grammatical *relation and connections* to considerable extent, even to the *connectives* of our