at present organized. On a survey of the entire ground, I maintain that it will appear that the action of the Democratic party for the last fifteen years on the slavery question has been wise, patriotic, and statesmanlike.

I proceed, however, to the consideration of the great question before the country. Immediately after the Presidential election in 1856 I met the veteran Secretary of State, then a Senator from Michigan on the floor of the Senate, and in reply to an inquiry as to how he was, he answered: "Well in health, but depressed in spirits. Sir," said he, "I formerly thought that the Union would never be dissolved; but I am now not without painful apprehensions of a different result. They say that the excitement in the North has grown out of the Kansas *bill*. A hundred Kansas bills would not have produced this result. These people mean to abolish slavery in your section. You may think that they are not fanatics; but the misfortune is that they are. You will gain nothing by making to them concessions; you cannot thereby help us; but you will ruin yourselves. By standing firm you can at least protect yourselves."

His words made the deeper impression upon me because they were in accordance with my own settled convictions. But now the evil has attained such alarming dimensions that it demands consideration. When a dark and rapidly advancing cloud has already covered half the heavens, and the mutterings of the distant thunder and the wailings of the coming storm are loudly heard, none but a false sentinel will proclaim a calm. Eminently futile, too, and mischievous, are declarations of Southern men against agitation and in favor of union and harmony. When a man is threatened with violence, will he stay the hand of the assailant by proclaiming his love of peace? When a country is invaded by a public enemy, can the inhabitants protect themselves by passing resolutions in favor of peace and harmony? All the world regards such things as evidence of weakness or cowardice, and as only calculated to stimulate the invaders.—When Philip of Macedon was threatening Greece, his hired partisans recommended repose and quiet, and denounced Demosthenes as a political agitator. It was in the midst of men who were crying out "peace! peace!" that Patrick Henry thundered that there was "no peace!" If the Abolitionists in the North could be induced to abandon agitation on the subject of slavery it would be well; but they reject with derision the suggestion, and become only more insolent as Southern men cry out the louder for quiet and union.

When, some twenty-five years ago, the abolition society at Boston, under the lead and guidance of a British subject, attracted public attention, though it declared that its purposes were merely peaceful, and intended to persuade men to liberate the slaves, yet so insignificant in numbers was it that the candidate for Congress in that district refused to reply to its interrogatories, or to give any pledges as to his course on the subject of slavery. For this he was complimented by Harrison Gray Otis, who nevertheless said with prophetic sagacity:

"And can you doubt, fellow-citizens, that these associations will act together for political purposes? Is it in human nature for such combinations to forbear? If, then, their numbers should be augmented, and the success they anticipate realized in making proselytes, how soon might you see a majority in Congress returned under the influence of the associations? And how long afterwards would this Union last?"

Though few in numbers, the Abobolitionists went resolutely and actively to work.

There was a strong feeling in favor of liberty pervading the public mind generally, while its attention had never been called to the specific differences—physical, mental, and moral—existing between the white man and the negro. The point of operations selected was one remote from negro slavery, where the people were ignorant of its actual features, and thus fitted more easily to be imposed upon. In that vicinity, too, were the remains of old prejudices against the Southern section of the Union. The effort of the Abolitionists was directed to the corrupting of knowledge at its fountain heads, by the diffusion of publications directed to that end. Its first fruits were seen in its influence on women, preachers, teachers, and professors, persons of lively sensibilities generally, not so much accustomed to deal with matters of fact, more easily deluded by cunningly-devised sophisms, and more frequently acting from the influence of feelings. Soon abolition sentiments appeared in books of education; got possession of schools, colleges and churches. As its powers increased, its efforts were multiplied, until it covered the land with its publications. Some twelve months ago it was stated in the newspapers that one of the anti-slavery organizations had resolved to circulate, during the following year, in the State of New York, one million of its tracts. Can such an amount of printed matter as this, consisting, as it does, of ingeniously written misrepresentations and falsehoods, fail to produce some effect? Remember that this is repeated from year to year, and aided by hired and voluntary lecturers, speakers and preachers. Abolitionism, to a great extent, pervades the literature of the free States. So strong is the feeling against slavery there that the writers of novels and plays, to secure the public patronage, exercise their wits in imagining all that can be conceived as worst in human nature, and represent it as a true type of the state of society in the South.—The bulk of the newspaper press, too, in the North is anti-slavery. Such is the character of the entire press of the dominant party there, and of a large portion of the neutral and religious papers; while a part even of the minority, or Democratic press, avoid the subject as much as possible, instead of attempting to stem the current. Though Northern city papers are much read in the South, on the contrary, our papers have little or no circulation in the North.—If they had, the efforts of the anti-slavery party would, to some extent, be counteracted. The cities of New York and Philadelphia, for example, are not abolitionized; and this is attributed, by some, to the fact that they are engaged largely in Southern trade. But the mechanics of Massachusetts are just as much interested, and yet they are intensely anti-slavery in their feelings. The true solution, I think, will be found in the fact that these cities are the resort of so many Southerners; that our state of society is thereby better understood, and cannot be so successfully defamed. The same reason applies to the free States on the borders of the slaveholding country. It is not, as the Abolitionists allege, that their consciences are so much blunted that they cannot appreciate the evils of slavery, but simply because they do understand it, that they cannot be imposed upon by the falsehoods of anti-slavery writers. In addition to this reason, the Western States have a large influx of Southern emigrants. While Vermont is intensely abolitionized, New Hampshire, adjoining it, is less so. This may be accounted for from the fact that New Hampshire was originally strongly Democratic, and its press resisted, therefore, to some extent, the statements of the Abolitionists. Had not New Hampshire been a small State and surrounded by adverse influences, she would probably not have been overpowered.

The anti-slavery movement has gone on with increasing strength until it has educated a large portion of the Northern people to entertain feelings of hostility to slavery and the Soutern States. The movement has progressed independently of political occurrences, but it has occasionally been accelerated or retarded by them. For example, in 1850 it was weakened somewhat, partly by the great discussion at that time, which enlightened somewhat the popular mind, and also by the peculiar character of the legislation of the period. California was admitted as a free State, with boundaries reaching far South of the Missouri line, and giving the North the majority in this body; while the principle of non-intervention applied to Utah and New Mexico was regarded as a fruitless abstraction, the general opinion prevailing that, to use the words of Mr. Webster, the law of God had excluded slavery from them. As to the fugitive slave law, it was seen that it could practically, like its predecessor, the act of 1793, be rendered a nullity by State action and individual resistance. It is a great mistake to suppose that the repeal of the Missori restriction in 1854 produced the present anti-slavery organization. In 1847 and 1848 the House of Representatives, by large majorities, repeatedly passed the Wilmot proviso; and this was understood to have been done in accordance with the wishes of their constituents. Prior to 1850 most of the churches had been divided by this issue.

From year to year the anti-slavery sentiment acquired more and more political influence; and in 1848 it took possession of the greater portion of the Whig party in the free States. No one was so influential in effecting this result as the Senator from New York. In a speech delivered during that year in Ohio, the object, in part, of which was to induce the anti-slavery men to join the Whig party rather than the Buffalo-platform Freesoilers, he uses such expressions as these. I call the attention of Senators particularly to them, because I shall have occasion to refer to them again presently:

"The party of freedom seeks complete and universal emancipation." * * * * *

"Slavery is the sin of not some of the States only, but of them all; of not one nation only, but of all the nations. It perverted and corrupted the moral sense of mankind deeply and universally, and this corruption became a universal habit. Habits of thought become fixed principles. No American State has yet delivered itself entirely from these habits. We, in New York, are guilty of slavery still by withholding the right of suffrage from the race we have emancipated. You, in Ohio, are guilty in the same way by a system of black laws still more aristocratic and odious. It is written in the Constitution of the United States that five slaves shall count equal to three freemen as a basis of representation; and it is written also, in violation of Divine law, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave who takes refuge at our fireside from his relentless pursuer. You blush not at these things, because they have become as familiar as household words; and your pretended freesoil allies claim peculiar merit for maintaining these miscalled guarantees of slavery which they find in the national compact. Does not all this prove that the Whig party have kept up with the spirit of the age? that it is as true and faithful to human freedom as the inert conscience of the American people will permit it to be? What, then, you say, can nothing be done for freedom because the public conscience remains inert? Yes, much can be done, every thing can be done. Slavery can be limited to its present bounds. It can be ameliorated. It can be and must be abolished, and you and I can and must do it. The task is simple and easy, as its consummation will be beneficent and its rewards glorious. It requires only to follow this simple rule of action: To do every where and on every occasion what we can, and not to neglect or refuse to do what we can at any time because at that precise time and on that particular occasion we cannot do more.

"Circumstances determine possibilities." * *

"But we must begin deeper and lower than the composition and combination of factions or parties wherein the strength and security of slavery lie. You answer that it lies in the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions and laws of slaveholding States. Not at all. It is in the erroneous sentiment of the American people. Constitutions and laws can no more rise above the virtue of the people than the limpid stream can climb above its native spring. Inculcate the love of freedom and the equal rights of man under the paternal roof; see to it that they are taught in the schools and in the churches; reform your own code; extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and defend him as you would your paternal gods; correct your own error that slavery has any constitutional guarantee which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished." * * * * * * * *

"Whenever the public mind shall will the abolition of slavery the way will open for it.

"I know that you will tell me this is all too slow. Well, then, go faster if you can, and I will go with you; but remember the instructive lesson that was taught in the words, 'these things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the others undone.'"

Such efforts as this were persevered in from time to time. In 1850 he made that speech in which he proclaimed that there was a "higher law" than the Constitution, for which he received the emphatic denunciation of Mr. Clay. His subsequent efforts have been in this same line; and at Rochester more recently he endeavored to render the slaveholders of the South as odious as possible, and declared that there was an "irrepressible conflict" between the free and the slaveholding States. To stimulate the Northern people to attack us, he affirmed that unless they abolished slavery throughout the entire South we would extend slavery over all the Northern States. In substance, he says to protect themselves they must destroy our social and political system.—When a man says that there is an irrepressible conflict between him and me, and that my head or his must fall, he proclaims himself my deadliest enemy. It avails nothing if he even adds that he intends to act quietly and legally, but that my head must fall to save his own. In the present instance, the Senator says that it is for the South to decide whether its system of society shall be destroved peaceably or by "violence." He is benevolent enough to say that if we will submit, the work shall be done quietly and peaceably. By his efforts and those of others the bulk of the old Whig party was abolitionized, and its members, with the aid of accessions from the Democratic ranks and Abolition societies, have constituted that political orgnaization which to-day threatens the existence of the Republic. It claims for itself the name of Republican party, and by its opponents is designated as the Black Republican party.—The latter designation is proper to distinguish it from the old Republican party, whose "image and superscription" it seeks to counterfeit; and also because its efforts are entirely directed to advance the black or negro race.

What are the principles of this party, as indicated by its declarations and acts? It has but a single principle, and that is hostility to negro slavery in the United States. Some of its members have called it a party for human freedom; but this is a mistake; for though there are in the state of slavery in different parts of the world men of all races, yet it has manifested no sympathy for any but the negro; and even to negro slavery it seems indifferent outside of the U. States. I maintain it has no principle whatever but hostility to negro slavery in the United States. A man might be for or against the tariff, the bank, the land distribution, or internal improvements; he might be a Protestant or Catholic, a Christian or infidel; but if he was only actuated by an intense feeling of hostility to negro slavery, or, as that is interwoven with the social system of the South, if it were only known that he was anxious that the Federal Government should exercise all its powers for the destruction of the Southern States, that man would have been accepted as a good member of the Black Republican party.

But while all the members of the party are actuated by this principle of feeling, they differ as to the particular steps or measures to be taken. The most moderate of them say they are merely opposed to the extension of slavery, and therefore they are for prohibiting it in the Territories, and opposed to the admission of any other slaveholding States. The Senator from Vermont (Mr. Collamer) said not long since that this was his position, that he was for confining slavery to its present limits, so that in time it might cease to be profitable, and in that way be extinguished. As this position is taken by many men who claim to be moderate and conservative in their views, let us examine it for a few moments. They say that if slavery be confined to its present limits, the slaves will increase in numbers to that extent that slave labor will in time be so abundant that the supply will exceed the demand; and that the owners will, from choice, set them free rather than be at the expense of maintaining them for their labor. Let it be assumed for illustration that it costs ten cents to feed and clothe a slave: then if, owing to the great number of slaves who exist in the territory, their labor would be worth less than ten cents per day, undoubtedly it would be an advantage for the owners to liberate them. But remember that when the labor of a negro should be worth only ten cents, that of the white man would likewise come down to this price. The result, therefore, is, that population is to be crowded in the South to that extent that every laborer is to be reduced to the starving point, as it was in Ireland during the times of the famine. Now, I would ask the Senator from Vermont this question in all candor: if a system was proposed to be instituted by which his constituents were to be reduced to the starving point, and thus crushed, would he counsel them to await such a result? or would he not advise them to stand from under before they were destroyed? As there are already four million slaves in the South, when their numbers are increased many times no one will pretend that they ever would be removed. The plan is to keep the negroes and such whites as are compelled to stay among them down at the starving point for all time. And this is the policy of the most moderate and conservative of the Black Republican party.

There are others of them who say, that in addition to this the fugitive slave law must be repealed; slavery abolished in the District of Columbia, the forts and arsenals, and wherever the United States has exclusive jurisdiction. Others of them contend likewise that the slave trade between the States must be abolished, and also the coastwise trade between the States. Other classes insist, too, that slavery should be attacked in the States themselves. The largest number of the party, however, stand on the same ground of the Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward.) He says that slavery has no "constitutional guarantee" which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished; that "circumstances determine possibilities;" that they must stand ready "to do everything when and on every occasion that we can;" and that "whenever the public mind shall will the abolition of slavery, the way will be open for it;" that "it can be and must be abolished, and you and I can and must do it." More recently he said: "The interest of the white race demands the ultimate emancipation of all men. Whether that consummation shall be allowed to take effect, with needful and wise precautions against sudden change and disaster, or be hurried on by violence, is all that remains for you to decide."

He also declares that he will go with those who can show him the fastest road to effect the object. Such is the governing principle and spirit of the party, to use all the power they have, or can by any possibility acquire, for the abolition of slavery.

When we look to the acts of this party, in what attitude is it presented? It has made the whole newspaper press subject to its control intensely hostile to the Southern section of the Union. Such is the power of the public press that it was able to keep England and France for centuries in a state of hatred and war with each other. Only a few weeks since, to prevent a collision between the two countries, the Emperor of France publicly checked the press of his own country; and yet the fiercest articles in the French journals were moderate in comparison with the general tone of the anti-slavery press towards the South.

This party, too, sends up representatives to the two Houses of Congress from time to time, who, neglecting all the public business of the country, devote themselves to preparing and reciting denunciatory harangues against the Southern States. Some years ago an intelligent foreigner, who happened to hear one of the tirades in this body, expressed his astonishment at the quiet manner in which it was listened to by Southern Senators. He declared that if, when a European Congress had met for business purposes, a similar course had been taken, the Congress would at once have been broken up. In our State Legislatures such things, if they occur, are soon stopped by personal collisions. In Congress, out of deference to sectional feelings, there is no attempt to check such men as choose to embark in the trade of heaping all manner of obloquy on our constitutents.

This anti-slavery party has torn to pieces most of the great Christian associations of the country, in spite of all the resistance which the *esprit du corps* and Christian charity prevailing among them could present. It has stricken down every public man in the North within its reach who has shown a willingness to administer the Constitution fairly in relation to slavery.

Whenever it has obtained to control of the Legislature it has caused them to pass the most stringent acts for the nullification of that clause of the Constitution which provides for the return of fugitive slaves. When, many years ago, the State of South Carolina threatened to nullify a law of Congress, the whole Union was thrown into a state of the greatest excitement; but so common have these proceedings become in the free States that they now scarcely excite a remark when passed.

This party, too, has organized societies and hired agents to steal and carry away slaves from the Southern States; and when a gang of twenty or more is taken off at a time it is made a matter of public rejoicing, and their papers boast of the perfection of the *underground* railroads, and of the millions of dollars' worth of property that they have taken from the South.

The Federal system, instead of giving us protection, only affords our enemies immunities and facilities for attack. Instead of being a shield the Union has beed converted into a sword to stab us the more deeply.

It is idle for Senators to say that a majority of the people of their States are not in favor of these unlawful proceedings. If only one man out of every hundred should be a thief and the other ninety-nine should not restrain them, by legislation or otherwise, this minority of thieves would be able to steal all the property in the community. If societies were formed in Massachusetts to steal property in Connecticut or New York, the Legislature and people of the State would doubtless take steps to restrain them. This is done even with reference to foreign countries to prevent war between them. American citizens are punished for going into Canada to disturb that British community.

If societies were formed in Canada for a similar purpose, and were, in fact, to steal an equal amount of property from New England, New York, Ohio, and other Northern States, to what is carried away by the Abolitionists from the South, we should be involved in a war with Great Britain in less than six months. What would be the feeling of those border States if Canadian orators should boast that their societies had robbed them of $45,000,000 worth of their property, just as they now say they hold that value of Southern runaway slaves? But men who combine to plunder the people of the Southern States, so far from being punished, are in many of the free States encouraged by the legislation there.

During the last session the Senator from New York (Mr. Seward) introduced a proposition for additional legislation to prevent the foreign or African slave trade to the United States. In 1808 Congress passed laws to prohibit that trade, and since that time, a period of more than fifty years, as far as I know or have reason to believe, the law has been violated but in a single instance. What other law on your statute books has been so well kept? I repeat, what law has Congress ever passed, which there was a temptation to violate, that has been as well observed? That it was not broken often is not owing to any want of opportunity. Northern as well as foreign ships have been engaged in the trade, and the extent of the Southern coast affords much greater facilities for the introduction of slaves than does the Island of Cuba, into which large numbers are annually carried. This law has not been broken simply because the people of the South *were not willing to violate it*. Now, sir, let me state a case for the consideration of the Senate. Suppose, instead of what has actually occurred, the State of Georgia, where some negroes were landed, and a number of other Southern States, had passed the strongest laws which could be devised to defeat the act of Congress forbidding the African slave trade and encouraging that traffic by all the means in their power. Suppose, further, that Southern Senators, and other prominent public men, had, in their speeches, earnestly recommended the violation of the law of Congress, and that all through the South money was subscribed and associations formed to defeat the law, and provide facilities by railroad or otherwise for the introduction of Africans, and mobs gotten up to overpower the United States marshals, could not a hundred negroes have been imported for every one that the Abolitionists have stolen? Yes, with a shore-line of more than ten thousand miles, millions might have been imported. This proceeding would have been a violation of the laws of the United States, just like that which has occurred with reference to the fugitive slave law. In the case supposed, however, the Southern men would have had greatly the advantage on the score both of political economy and morality. They might have said with truth, that the negroes imported from Africa added to the production and wealth of the United State, while those carried North by the Abolitionists were generally converted into idle vagrants. It might also have been said that African savages were by being brought to the United States partially civilized, and not only made more intelligent and moral, but also christianized in large numbers; while the negroes carried to the North become so worthless and so vicious that many of the States there were seeking to exclude them by legislation, as communities do the plague and other contagious disorders.—And the Senator from New York, who has declared that it is a religious duty of the people of the North to violate the fugitive slave law, and urged them, instead of delivering up the runaway negroes, to protect and defend them as they do their paternal gods, stands up in the face of the American Senate and complains of violation of the laws against the African slave trade! Was there ever such an exhibition?—I repeat, was the like ever seen since the creation of the world? I may use strong language, but truth demands it. That Senator, too, has fully endorsed the incendiary and revolutionary doctrines of the Helper book, as a large majority of the members of his party in the House have done.

Such, then, Mr. President, are the views of this party as indicated alike by its declarations and its acts. Its members are moving on with an accelerated velocity. While the more moderate of them now occupy the ground of the Abolitionists twenty years ago, most of them are far in advance of that position. Ought we to stand still until all the States are as thoroughly abolitionized as Massachusetts now is?—If not, what can be done to arrest the mischief? I propose, then, seriously to consider this question.

In my judgment there are two modes in which it can and ought to be met. The first is under the Constitution; the second may be outside of it.

If abolitionism be a popular delusion, can it not be dispelled by proper efforts? Truth can overcome error; but to enable it to do so it must be properly presented to the human mind. As the anti-slavery party have acquired their present ascendancy by vigorous and widely-extended efforts, if they are to be overthrown it is only by decided and persevering exertions on the other side. There are, in my opinion, sufficient conservative elements in the free States for this purpose, if they can only be properly arrayed in opposition. It is necessary that the discussion should be widely extended and also directed to the merits of the question involved. The constitutional argument is sufficient for the intelligent and honest; but if it be said, for example merely, that slavery as existing in the Southern States is a great wrong and a great evil, yet that under the Constitution the people of the North have no right to interfere with it, the party so defending will in the end lose ground; because masses of men when excited by real or imaginary wrongs will in time break over mere legal restraints which they regard as unjust and criminal. They hold that "where there is a will there is a way," and will find some mode of action. But in this case the real issue is, whether or not the negro is the equal of the white man physically, intellectually, and morally? Though usually evaded in the discussion, this is the real question which lies at the foundation of the controversy. If the people of the Northern States should regard the negro as being the equal of the white man, then they will continue to feel a sympathy for him in slavery, and can be excited to efforts for his liberation. If, on the contrary, he be different in material respects from the white man, and also inferior, then his case must be decided on its own merits and not from any supposed analogy to that of the white man. It is not, as the Abolitionists in their silliness assert, a mere question of color or prejudice against a black skin. If the negro were in fact in all other respects like the white man, his blackness would have been of no more consequence than the difference between black and red hair or light and dark eyes. The feeling against him grows out of the fact that he is in all respects different from the white man and inferior. When I put the question to any one that I may meet here, the chances are that he will at once agree with me, in private conversation, and admit, in the language used some time ago by the Senator from Illinois, (Mr. TRUMBULL,) that Omnipotence has made a difference between the white man and the negro; and yet it is this very opposite view in favor of negro equality which gives its main force and vitality to the anti-slavery movement. When, sir, some twelve years ago I, in discussion, threw out suggestions about the difference of races, I was denounced as one who attributed injustice to Almighty God in alleging that He had made the negroes inferior. Will any Senator on the other side of this chamber tell me why it is that Providence brings half the children that are born in New England into the world with constitutions so feeble that they cannot live until they are twenty-one years of age? Or will they, upon their views of His justice, explain why it is that in the same family one brother is provided with a good constitution and strong intellect, while a second has from his birth the seeds of debility and incurable disease, and a third is mentally imbecile or perhaps idiotic? Would the injustice to the feeble be greater if they were black men? Are we to refuse to believe the facts which nature constantly presents to us because they do not harmonize with our ideas of the justice of the Creator? The Bible itself does not explain to us why it is that, while ten talents are given to one man, to another but a single talent is given. For the inequality of the negro Providence is reponsible, as He is for the entire creation which surrounds us. When human laws are in accordance with the system of nature they are wise; but if in opposition to it they are productive only of mischief. The question is significantly asked in the Scripture, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" The ancients expressed their opinion on this subject in the fable which represented a black man as having been killed in an effort to wash him white.

There is no middle ground which can be maintained on this question. If the negro be your equal, why do you exclude him from your parlors? If he be unequal, your whole argument has in fact lost its foundation and fails. If it once be admitted that the negro is inferior, then the entire edifice of Abolitionism falls to the ground, because it is intimately interwoven with, and owes its vitality to, the opposite belief. When pressed boldly on this issue, the Abolitionists of late are trying to evade it. It is a singular and striking fact, that when this issue has been made in the free States directly, and discussed before the people, they have decided the point against the negro. Such was the case in Connecticut and New York on the question of suffrage, and also in the States of Illinois and Indiana on the proposition to exclude free negroes from those States. In the contest, too, in Illinois, in the year 1858, which resulted in the triumph of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, (Mr. DOUGLAS,) this was the leading issue. Had that Senator contented himself with simply saying that slavery was an evil which his constituents had no constitutional right to interfere with, I do not believe he would have been successful. But he understood the question, went at once into the merits of it, and carried the war into the enemy's ranks. And his opponent early in the contest began to cower and shrink from his blows, and tried in vain to evade the issue. The American people understand the negro, and where a direct appeal is made to them they truly respond. Though the story of Dean Swift, in which, in a certain country, he represents the horse as being greatly superior to the man, is an ingenious one, yet it misleads nobody among us, because horses are so common that their qualities are understood. So the romances of the Abolitionists, in which they represent the negro as being equal and even superior to the white man, deceive no one familiar with the negro. In southern Ohio, for example, where free negroes are quite common, there is little or no Abolitionism; while in the northern part, in which the negro is seldom seen, anti-slavery carries every thing before it. European writers know little or nothing of the negro, and hence our professors, preachers, and other mere book-men of the North are easily led astray by European and American Abolitionists; but the people of the country, who are accustomed to look at facts, are not so readily imposed on. A thorough investigation of the subject shows the negro to be inferior, and hence the principles which apply to white men cannot be extended to him. No farmer assumes that what is advantageous to the hog, for example, is necessarily so to the sheep. To determine, therefore, what is to be done with the negro, you must study the negro himself. Remember, I do not undertake to decide how or when the negro race became different from the white. They may, as many men of science contend, have been created of different species, or they may have been rendered different since their creation by an act of Providence. Some plausibly say, that inasmuch as we learn from Scripture that a certain race were condemned to be slaves through all time, the negro best fulfils this description, and hence take him as the representative of that class. Without attempting to decide who is right as to theory, I think it clear that the difference between the white race and the negro is as great as that between certain different species of animals of the same genus that approximate each other in their structure and habits. But it is said, Do you deny the manhood of the negro? No more than I should deny the *monkeyhood* of an ape if I should say he is not a baboon, or the *duckship* of a mallard if I deny that he is a canvass back duck.

Instead of indulging in vague generalities about human liberty and the rights of man, examine the nature and condition of the negro himself. Four thousand years ago, in the climate best suited to his constitution, he was a savage and a slave. In his own country he stands in the same category with ivory, dates, and other tropical productions. If transferred, as merchandise, to a foreigner, he is usually benefited by escaping from a master who will eat him in times of scarcity to one who treats him with more lenity and often with kindness. Egypt was the seat of the earliest civilization known to man, and the Egyptians held the negro as a slave, but were not able to civilize his race; though subsequently, in contact with the Carthagenians, Romans, and Saracens, he still remained a savage and a slave.

In the West Indies, and in other portions of America where they form independent communities, notwithstanding the advantages they had from the teachings of white men, and their great powers of imitation, they seem to be returning to their original savage state. When we turn to the free negroes of the United States, what shall I say of them?—Why Northern as well as Southern men, and even Canadians, characterize them as the most worthless of the human race. Formerly the Abolitionists ascribed their degradation to the want of political and social privileges. But during the middle ages, in Europe, the Jews were not only without political privileges, but were, as a class, odious and severely persecuted, yet they were nevertheless intelligent, energetic, and wealthy. In point of fact, in some portions of the Northern States, the negro has been made a pet of, and, but for his native inferiority, must have thriven and even become distinguished. On the other hand, it is an indisputable fact that the four million negroes who are held in slavery in the South, when their condition is considered with reference to their physical well-being and comfort, their productiveness as laborers, their intelligence, morality, and religion, stand superior to any other portion of their race. While the free negroes in the North, with fresh accessions from abroad, diminish in numbers, the slaves of the South increase as rapidly as the white race, and, upon the whole, perhaps, add as much to the wealth of the country in which they are located as any equal number of laborers in the world.

What the Abolitionists have to do is to find, or create, a negro community which is superior to that of the slaves of the South. When they shall have done this, they will have laid some grounds for their appeals in behalf of emancipation. Hitherto they have enlisted the sympathies and feelings of the North by falsely assuming that the negro and white man have in all respects the same nature. Let the inequality which the Creator has made be recognised, and their system falls to the ground.

But the Abolitionist sometimes say that, even if it be true that the negro is inferior, for that reason, namely, on account of his weakness, he ought not to be enslaved. Does this reasoning apply to children? The average of human life is less than forty years, and how can you justify depriving human beings of liberty for more than half that time?—If children were the equals of adults it would be wrong to control them. It is simply because they are inferior that we justify their subjection to the will of others. Upon these principles the negro, being, as compared with the white man, always a child, is benefited by the control to which he is subjected.

When pressed on these points by an array of facts, the Abolitionists fall back on the opinions of Mr. Jefferson and others of the last century. But since their day the sciences have made a prodigious advance, and in all that relates to the peculiarities and distinctions that exist between the different races of men, there has been the greatest progress of any. In fact, it is a science which has almost grown up in our day, and it has made such strides as to have taken possession of the intellect of America. Already there are hundreds who have adopted the doctrine to one who believed it ten years ago. It is only necessary for the true men to take it up boldly, and press it home, and the Abolitionists can be routed throughout the North.

The shrewder anti-slavery men, however, seeing that they cannot make longer a successful fight for the negro, affirm that their objection to slavery is not on his account, but for the sake of the white men, and that they and the South are injured by the institution, and that our people are for that reason wanting in enterprise and industry. To that argument I have this to say in reply. Where, Mr. President, in all history was it known that one nation was so strongly under the influence of benevolence as to cause it to make war upon another merely to compel the nation attacked to become more enterprising and prosperous? Who has invaded Spain or Turkey to compel the Spaniards or Turks to become more industrious and thrifty? Will any one gravely pretend that this torrent of fanaticism in the North has no other origin except a desire to compel the people of the South to be more industrious, and to take better care of their own interest, and be more attentive to their own business? The idea is preposterous. I have no doubt but that misrepresentations on these points have contributed to strengthen the anti-slavery party. But, sir, is there any difficulty in making a complete defence on this point? With no wish, Mr. President, to wound the sensibilities of any one, or to claim superiority for my section, let us, nevertheless, look at some of the principal facts. One of the best tests of the prosperity of a country and its healthy condition, is the progress of its population. Compare the population of the fifteen slaveholding States with that of all the free States as shown by the census of 1840 and 1850, the last decade ascertained. If we deduct from both sections the foreign emigrant population, which is an accidental increment, it will be found that the slaveholding States have increased much faster in population than the free States.

Again, sir, a fair estimate of the wealth of the two sections will show that the citizens of the Southern States are as rich per head, I think in fact richer, than those of the free States. It was shown by Mr. Branch, a colleague of mine, some two years ago, that of the old Atlantic States the slaveholding had more miles of railroad in proportion to their white population than the free States. There are other evidences of our material wealth, to which I will presently advert. On the score of morals, it may be said that we have fewer criminals and paupers, and, proportionally, church accommodations for a larger number of members.

It is said, however, that any one who merely looks at the two sections will see the inferiority of the Southern system. But you must remember that our population is extended over a territory of nine hundred thousand miles in extent, while many of the Northern States have a dense population. It is the tendency of an agricultural people, with an unlimited area, to extend itself rapidly at first, while commerce and manufactures concentrate population. Tried by this standard, any one of a dozen monarchies which I passed through during the past summer has the advantage of any portion of the Union. Even in Italy, oppressed as it has been for ages, in its agricultural landscape, can bring to shame the best cultivated State of New England. According to the logic of the Abolitionists, these States ought to be placed under the dominion of the House of Austria or the Pope of Rome. The entire State of Massachusetts is not larger than one of the Congressional districts of North Carolina. Where a million of people are brought within a small area, the eye of an observer rests on many habitations and fields. In time, the whole Union, if filled with people, may be superior to the best cultivated parts of Europe; but even now, the inhabitants of sparsely-settled districts have as much wealth and comfort, all things being considered, as those who live in crowded communities. At no period of our history have the Southern States been more prosperous than at present, and even during the commercial pressure of 1857, which has so seriously affected the Northern States.

I do not, however, propose, Mr. President, to enter into a general argument on these topics, but to maintain that the conservative men of the North have within their reach facts enough to establish two propositions. The first is, that the negro, in the condition of slavery, is not a proper object for sympathy, and is, in fact, benefited by his subjection.—The second one is, that the white race are not injured by the institution; that the Southern States constitute, in the aggregate, a prosperous community, and ought not to be the subject of denunciation at the North. Should this be made to appear, then, whatever of real feeling exists against us will be diminished, and in that event, we may expect that persons who, like the Senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD,) patronize abolition from such motives as induce a jockey on a race-course to back the horse that he thinks likely to win—all such persons, I say, will find it expedient to abandon anti-slavery agitation as a trade. To effect such results, however, the friends of the Constitution in the North must make up their minds to undergo the labor of a thorough canvass of their region against the anti-slavery men, and by proper publications refute their misrepresentations.

The Abolitionists declaim constantly against the *slave power*. Why, sir, it is sixteen years since there was any attempt by the Democratic party to nominate a citizen of the slaveholding States for the office of President; and for the last ten years, in the Conventions of all parties, the contest has been solely among Northern men. In fact, during that period no electoral vote has been given in a slaveholding State for the office of President to any Southern man. Our only object has been to select among Northern gentlemen one who was not our *enemy*. The men chosen have been assailed by our opponents, not because they were neglectful of any Northern interest, but simply because they were willing to do us equal justice with the other section, and refused to exercise the powers of the common Government against us.

It has been urged that the Southern States should, by retaliatory legislation, prohibit the sale within their limits of the productions of those of the Northern States that have failed to do us justice. As the Constitution of the United States has been interpreted, both by the Federal and State courts, there is ample power to effect this by imposing a tax on articles after they have been imported and the packages broken; in other words, on retailers. Two objects are expected to be effected by this system. In the first place, to make it the interest of the Northern States to counteract the efforts of the Abolitionists; and, secondly, to prepare the Southern States for a separation, if they should find it necessary to take such a step.

I have often thought, Mr. President, that it was unfortunate that the framers of the Constitution made no provision for the expulsion of a State. If the Union be a place of misery, then, to punish refractory members, they should undoubtedly be kept in it as criminals are detained in penitentaries; but if, on the other hand, it be a beneficial and desirable thing to remain in the Union, then bad members ought to be excluded from it. No State, in my judgment, has a right to enjoy the advantages of the Union and yet refuse to submit to the obligations it imposes. Such laws of Congress as are held by the courts to be constitutional ought to be obeyed by all the States that share the advantages of the Union. If, for example, when a dozen years ago the State of Massachusetts passed laws to nullify the act for the recovery of fugitives, if she had been expelled from the Union, two striking effects would have been produced. In the first place, the consciences of the inhabitants of that State would have been freed from all responsibility for the sin and turpitude of slavery; and, secondly, their goods, when brought into the United States, would have been taxed as those of other foreigners are. The impression which such an occurrence would have made on their minds and those of the country generally, might possibly then have arrested the anti-slavery movement when it was comparatively feeble. In the present condition of things, such a course would not be practicable, perhaps.

If, however, Mr. President, this hostile movement of the anti-slavery party cannot be arrested under the Constitution, let us consider the second remedy, namely, a temporary or permanent separation of the Southern from the Northern States.

Senators on the other side of the chamber do not think this will occur. When Giddings and others proclaim that "the South cannot be kicked out of the Union," such a declaration is received by the anti-slavery party of the country with evident satisfaction, and generally with applause.—You, Senators, and your supporters, do not believe there is danger in any event, because prominent slaveholders and men of wealth occasionally tell you they are conservative, and that the Southern people will submit to any treatment you may think fit to impose. But you should remember that these persons are not always the readiest to volunteer to defend the country in time of war, and that many of them dread civil commotions. During our Revolution there were wealthy tories in every one of the colonies; and at the time General Washington evacuated the city of New York, he was urged by one of his subordinate officers, a Northern man, to burn the city, for the reason that two-thirds of the property to be destroyed belonged to tories.

You do not believe, also, because you say that if the South were in earnest it would be more united, and would not send up, as she does from certain districts, members of Congress who assist you in party movements, and in answer to your threats proclaim their love of the Union.

You should understand, however, that the constituencies of such members are merely misled as to the purposes, principles, and power of your party by those newspapers on which they rely for information. Let them have proper knowledge as to the condition of the country where your influence prevails, and they will manifest the same feeling that the rest of the South does. Gradually a knowledge of your movements and objects is spreading over the Southern States. Two occurrences have materially contributed to unmask your objects and disclose the dangers which threaten. The first was the vote which Mr. Fillmore received in 1856. When it was seen that a man like him, of avowed anti-slavery opinions, merely because he showed his willingness to enforce the fugitive slave law, and declared his purpose to give to the South the benefits of the Constitution, was beaten largely in every free State, by a mere adventurer like Fremont, a great impression was made on the conservative men of the South. They began to realize the state of feeling in the North, and more disunionists were made by that occurrence than perhaps any one which preceded it.

The second incident which caused even a much stronger impression on the minds of the Southern people was the manner in which the acts of John Brown were received in the North. Instead of the indignation and abhorrence which the attrociousness of his crimes ought naturally to have excited, there were manifestations of admiration and sympathy. Large meetings were held to express these feelings, sermons and prayers were made in his behalf, church bells tolled and cannon fired, and more significant than all these were the declarations of almost the entire Republican press that his punishment would strengthen the anti-slavery cause. Yet Senators tell us that these things were done because of the courage Brown exhibited. But our people think you are mistaken. Though the mere thief may be and usually is a coward, yet it is well known that men who engage in robbery or piracy as a profession generally possess courage. Criminals have been executed frequently in New England who, both in the commission of their crimes and in their death, manifested as much courage as John Brown, and yet none of them called forth such feeling of sympathy. At a meeting in Boston, where thousands were assembled, when Emerson, a literary man of eminence, proclaimed that Brown had made "the gallows as glorious as the cross," he was rapturously applauded. At the large meeting at Natick, where the Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Wilson) was a spectator, the principal orator, Wright, declared that the people of the North look upon "Jesus Christ as a dead failure," and hereafter will rely on "John Brown, and him hanged."

In the Southern States, where old-fashioned Christian notions still prevail, it would be thought right to beat such blasphemers even out of a church, if they congregate there. We are told now that they were not interrupted because the people of Massachusetts are *law abiding*, and in favor of the *liberty of speech*. But our constituents do not believe one word of this, because they know that of all the people in the Union, the inhabitants of Massachusetts are the most excitable and the most intolerant and overbearing. They know that men who dare to oppose the anti-slavery party there are persecuted with intense hatred; that mobs can be gotten up on the smallest occasions, and that ten thousand men can be assembled on the shortest notice to rescue a runaway negro from the custody of a United States marshal.

Our people know that these things could not have occurred unless there had been an intense feeling of hostility to the South, and, therefore, strong sympathy with our assailants. Is not this the reason why your leading editors have declared that the punishment of John Brown will strengthen the anti-slavery cause? Such is the construction the people of the South put on this whole matter, and hence the demonstrations you witness among them.

But you hold that the South is unable and unwilling to resist you; and the Senator from New York (Mr. Seward) has declared, in substance, that the Union is never to be dissolved. He also told the Senate that the contest between the free and the slaveholding States had ended by the former winning the victory. He and the rest of you expect us in future to submit quietly to what you may see fit to order. Had the British Parliament believed that the colonies would resist their tax bills, our Revolution would not have occurred; but Lord North and others declared that the clamor in America came from a few seditious agitators, and that the great body of the people were so loyal to the Government that they were ready to submit to the action of the Parliament. They affirmed that there was no danger of resistance; and, least of all, their thinking of dissolving the union with the mother country. Our ancestors wisely determined that the cannon of Great Britain were less dangerous than her acts of Parliament.

Let us look at this matter for a few moment calmly. At this time the population of the South is nearly thirteen million, of which more than eight million are free persons and four million slaves. At the beginning of our Revolution the population of the Colonies, both free and slave, was less than three million. The slaveholding States are then far more than four times as strong as were the Colonies when they dissolved the union with Great Britain.

It is likely that, after having been independent for eighty years, our people are less attached to their rights? But many of your Abolitionists say that slaveholding has enfeebled our people, and rendered them so spiritless that they are neither willing nor able to make defence. Edmund Burke thought differently, and said that of all men slaveholders were the most tenacious of their rights, and defended their liberties with the highest and haughtiest spirit. I do not refer to the war of the Revolution, when all the States were slaveholding; but in the last war with Great Britain the Southern States sent out more men than the Northern, and it has never yet, as far as I have heard, been pretended that Harrison and Johnson, Scott and Forsyth, were not as brave as those who went from the free States to the Canada line, or that Jackson and the men under him in the Southwest did not exhibit a proper courage. To the war with Mexico, though much the less populous section, the South sent nearly twice as many men as the North. A leading Black Republican editor says that one regiment from New York would be able to conquer all the Southern States. A regiment from the State of New York certainly conducted itself well during the Mexican war; but it has not, I think, been affirmed that it behaved better than the regiments from the slaveholding States. If you, therefore, think that one of your regiments is able to subdue the South, our people will probably differ with you in opinion. You say that fear of the slaves will prevent any resistance to you. As a sudden movement of a few negroes, stimulated by Abolition emissaries, might destroy a family or two, there is undoubtedly apprehension felt. Fifty persons, however, are killed in this country by vicious and unmanageable horses to one who suffers from the act of a rebellious negro. There is, in fact, about as much reason to apprehend a general insurrection of the horses as of the slaves of the South, when left to themselves. When, during the war of 1812, the British armies were in the slaveholding territory, though they induced a number of slaves to join them, they found no advantage to result from it, and their Government paid for all carried off at the close of the war. Though the Spartans and Romans were the greatest slaveholders in the world, and though, too, they held in the most rigid servitude men of their own color and race, and therefore liable to rebel in great force, yet they were strong enough to overthrow all their enemies. In our opinion the slaves are a positive element of strength, because they add to the production of the country, while the white race can furnish soldiers enough. Every man, too, among us is accustomed to ride and to carry weapons from his childhood.

There are, however, other important elements to be taken into account. During the last fiscal year the exports of the United States, exclusive of specie, were $278,000,000. Of this amount the free States furnished exclusively $5,281,000, the slave States $188,693,000, and the two sections jointly also $84,417,000. Of this latter sum of $84,000,000 the slave States probably furnished one-third, but certainly one-fourth. A fourth added to the amount exclusively furnished by them makes a total of $210,000 000 as the value of their exports to foreign countries. They also exported a large amount to the free States. New England alone received about fifty million dollars worth of Southern productions; and to the rest of the free States were sent doubtless more. The entire exports from the slaveholding States to the free States and to foreign countries combined must greatly have exceeded $300.000,000. As the South sells this much, it of course can afford to buy a like amount. If, therefore, it constituted a separate Confederacy, its imports would exceed $300,000,000—a duty of twenty per cent. on this amount, which would be a lower rate than has generally been paid under our tariffs heretofore, would yield a revenue of $60,000,000. More than $50,000,000 of this sum could well be spared for the defence of our section, and the support of larger armies and navies than the present Government has. Though it may seem strange to you that the South should in this way raise as large a revenue as the whole Union has ever done, and this too with a lower tariff, you must remember that most of the tariff taxes the South pays go in fact in the shape of protection to those Northern manufacturers who threaten us with negro insurrections and subjugation. Do you think that, with these prospects before our people, they are ready to submit unconditionally to you? They have the strongest feelings of contempt for the avaricious and greedy, the canting and hypocritical, the mean, envious, and malicious Abolitionists. Little as they may think of the free negro, he is, in their judgment, more respectable than the white man who comes down to his level; and with all the world to choose a master from, your negro-worshipper would be their last choice.

In making up our calculations we must also look to the other side. The free States have a population of seventeen or eighteen million. Though this is considerably more, numerically, than our strength, yet it is much less relatively than was the population of Great Britain in 1776. I have no doubt that your people are courageous, generally; but the best and bravest of them are in the Democratic ranks; and, while they would defend their section, if attacked, I doubt if they would easily be induced to assail us. Many of your Abolitionists belong to the "*peace party*," and have little appetite for cold steel, though they are most efficient in getting up popular clamors, and are formidable at the ballot-box. It is also true that while every thing the South needs she can either produce or commonly get cheaper in Europe, under a system of free trade, your Northeastern States are especially dependent on the South for its productions and freights. How many of your manufacturers and mechanics would emigrate to the South to avoid the payment of tariff taxes? If it were known that one-third of the stores in New York could not be rented, how much would real property fall then? Deprived of Southern freights, what would be the loss on your vast shipping interest? I give you, in this calculation, the benefit of the assumption that all the free States would go with you. In fact, I do not believe that the Northwest would remain connected with New England, still less that you could retain California and Oregon.

But you, Senators, do not believe the South will resist.—Look for a moment at the course of things there. In those sections that I am best acquainted with there are hundreds of disunionists now where there was one ten years ago. By disunionists I mean men who would prefer to see the Union continue if the Constitution were fairly administered, but who have already deliberately come to the conclusion that this is impossible, and would willingly to-day see the Union dissolved. In some of the States this class constitutes decided majorities now, and in others where they are not, the majority is ready to unite with them upon the happening of some further causes. In my judgment the election of the Presidential candidate of the Black Republican party will furnish that cause. The principles of that party, as announced in the contest of 1856, were such that no honorable Southern man could possibly belong to it. I see that the general committee in their call properly take this view, and only extend their invitation to the Opposition in the free States. What precise anti-slavery platform they adopt is not very important, as they will of course make it so as to obtain the support of their most moderate members, knowing that the ultra ones will go with them any how. In fact, they know that, in the language of the Senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD,) "circumstances determine possibilities," and that he and they are willing "at all times" to do all they can, in power or out of it, to overthrow slavery.

It is said, however, that we ought to wait for some overt act; and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HALE) the other day declared that it was wrong and insolent for Southern men to talk of resisting merely because they, the Republicans, elected men to carry out "*their views!*" That Senator is very wise, and knows that when a man wishes to subdue a wild horse he treats the animal with the greatest kindness at first, and commits no *overt act* on him until he is *well and securely tied*. Suppose that your candidate was known to be in favor of making a treaty with Great Britain by which the United States were to be reannexed as colonies to that country, and he had been elected by the majority of votes, would the minority, who might still wish to preserve their independence, be bound to wait until the treaty had been actually ratified, and British armies had taken possession of the country, and begun to maltreat the inhabitants? In the present case, the very inauguration of your candidate makes him commander of the army and navy. One of his first acts would be, doubtless, to station them advantageously, while, at the same time, he could carefully remove from the South all the public arms, lest the people should take them for defence. He would fill the Southern States with postmasters, and other officials, whose efforts would be directed to dividing, as much as possible, the people of the South, and to forming connections with the negroes. Doubtless some such policy as this would be adopted before any direct blow was struck at slavery any where. Should we, under these disadvantages, begin to resist, a long and bloody struggle, like that of our Revolution, might be the consequence. The very impression that Fremont was to be elected produced some disturbances, among the slaves; and with a Black Republican President, a hundred such forays as John Brown's might occur in a single year. Though the negroes left to themselves are harmless, yet, when assisted and led on by Europeans in St. Domingo, they destroyed the white inhabitants. As the Senator from New York (Mr. SEWARD) holds that the constitutional guarantees in favor of slavery being "in violation of the divine law" cannot be enforced, and "ought to be relinquished," he would be on the side of the negro.

The objections are not personal merely to this Senator, but apply equally to any member of the party elected by it. It has, in fact, been suggested that, as a matter of prudence, for the first election they should choose a Southern Freesoiler. Would the colonies have submitted more willingly to Benedict Arnold than to Lord Cornwallis? By way of palliation it has been said that, even if a Black Republican should be elected he would probably disappoint his party, and be more conservative than they are; and that the worst he would do might be to plunder the country by legislation or otherwise. This, however, would be only a reprieve to us; for the very fact of his election on such grounds, and our submission, as it would destroy our friends in the North, would demoralize and degrade our own people and render them incapable of resistance, while our enemies, flushed with success, would select afterwards more ultra agents to carray out their "views." No other "*overt act*" can so imperatively demand resistance on our part as the simple election of their candidate. Their organization is one of avowed hostility, and they come against us as *enemies*; and should we submit we shall be in the condition of an army which surrenders at discretion, and can only expect such terms as the humanity of the conqueror may grant.

But we are asked how we will go about making a revolution or dissolving the Union? This would possibly have been a difficult question to answer during the first year of our Revolution, when our forefathers were avowedly fighting to get good terms of reconciliation with the mother country. Mr. Jefferson said that six weeks before the Declaration was made, a majority of the men who made it had not even thought of independence. The people of the colonies, though they had not authorized anybody to make it, accepted it, nevertheless, as a fact.

Who anticipated the sudden revolutions that overthrew several monarchies in France? Though it requires skill to create governments, yet men often destroy them very unscientifically. As the main strength of all goverments is in public opinion, so, when that is forfeited, they often seem to fall easily and suddenly. As the Government of the United States, with the attachment of its citizens, is the strongest in the world, so, when that is lost, it would become one of the weakest.

I may say, however, that I do not think there will be any secession of the Southern members of Congress from this Capitol. It has always struck me that this is a point not to be voluntarily surrendered to the public enemy. If lives should be lost here it would seem poetically just that this should occur. I cannot find words enough to express my abhorrence and detestation of such creatures as Garrison and Wendell Phillips, who stimulate others to deeds of blood, and, at the same time, are so cowardly that they avoid all danger themselves. As from this Capitol so much has gone forth to inflame the public mind, if our countrymen are to be involved in a bloody struggle, I trust in God that the first fruits of the collison may be reaped here. While it is due to justice that I should speak thus, it is but fair to myself to say that I do not remember a time when I would have been willing to sacrifice the life of an innocent person to save my own; and I have never doubted but that it was the duty of every citizen to give his life cheerfully to preserve the Union of these States, while that Union was founded on an honest observance of the Constitution. Of the benefits of the Confederacy to all sections, provided justice be done in the administration of the Government, there can be no question.

Independently of its advantages to us all there are reasons why it should be maintained. Considerations of this kind were, during the last year, brought to my mind from new points of view, and with added force. When, last spring, I landed in England, I found that country agitated with questions of reform. In the struggle, which was maintained on both sides with the greatest animation, there were constant references to the United States; and the force of our example was stimulating the liberals, and tending to the overthrow of aristocratic and monarchic restrictions. Our institutions and our opinions were referred to only to be applauded, except by a small but influential aristocratic clique. That oligarchy cannot forget the Revolution of July, 1776, which deprived Britain of this magnificent western empire; and it sees, with even bitterer feelings, its own waning power and vanishing privileges under the inspiriting influences of our posterity. It, however, is always ready to take by the hand any American of prominent position who habitually denounces and depreciates his own Government, and labors for its overthow.

In this connection, I remember a statement made to me by the late American Minister at Paris, Mr. Mason. He spoke of having had a conversation with one whose name I do not feel at liberty to mention, but whose influence on the opinion of continental Europe is considerable, who admitted to him that there was nothing in fact wrong in our negro slavery; but who, nevertheless, declared that if the Union of our States continued, at no distant day we should control the world; and, therefore, as an European he felt it to be his duty to press anti-slavery views, as the only chance to divide us. I have other and many reasons to know that the monarchies of Europe, threatened with downfall from revolutionary movements, seek, through such channels as they control, to make similar impressions. A hundred times was the question asked me, "Will you divide in America?" But never once was the inquiry made of me, "Will slavery be abolished, will your country become more respectable in the eyes of the Abolitionists?" The middle and lower classes of England, who are struggling to acquire additional privileges, look with satisfaction and hope to our progress. France, too, is imbued with American ideas, and, notwithstanding its despotic form of government, is one of the most democratic countries in Europe. Italy I found in the midst of revolutions, and its monarchies falling down without even a day's notice, and its inhabitants, while recalling the republican ideas of past ages, looked with exultation to that great trans-Atlantic Confederacy, where there are no kings and no dukes; and more than once, while passing through Tuscany or Lombardy, the enthusiasm of the people reminded me, by their music and banners and shouting, of my own countrymen at a Fourth of July celebration. Germany, the receptacle of millions of letters from this side of the water, is being rapidly educated, and is already far advanced to a stable free system. The Swiss and the Belgians are boasting of the resemblances of their Governments and ours. Every where, too, are our countrymen distinguished and recognized for their intellectual activity and energy. The people abroad have, perhaps, exaggerated ideas of our immense progress, our vast power, and growing ascendancy in the civilized world. The masses, pressed down by military conscriptions and inordinate taxation, look with pride and confidence to the great American Republic, that in time they hope will dominate over the earth and break the power of its kings. But the Senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD,) and those who act with him, have determined that these hopes shall no longer be cherished, and that our system shall fall, to gratify the wishes and meet the views of the British Exeter Hall Anti-slavery Society. He holds that our Government has hitherto been administered in "violation of the Divine law," and that our former institutions must give way to the "*higher law*," abolitionism and free negroism. This is the issue we are now called upon to meet.

Should the decision of the ides of November be adverse to the fortunes of the Republic, it will become the high duty of the South at least to protect itself. Northern gentlemen, I believe, with great unanimity say that, if the conditions were reversed, they would not be willing to submit for a moment; and many, like Mr. Fillmore, do us the justice to say that it would be "madness or folly to believe" that we would "submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate" as Fremont. The general tone of feeling in the South and the rapid formation of vigilance committees and military companies indicate that our people have not forgotten the lessons of the Revolution, and there may be a contest among the States as to which shall be most prompt to resist.

To avoid any such necessity our people are disposed generally to make every effort consistent with honor. They will with great unanimity go into battle upon the old platform of principles, and waiving all past issues heartily support the standard-bearer who may be selected. But the fate of the country mainly depends upon the success which may crown the efforts of those brave and patriotic men in the North who, in spite of the odds arrayed against them, have so long maintained an unequal struggle against the anti-slavery current. They fight under a flag which waves in every State of the Union. Should it fall it carries with it an older and still more honored emblem—that banner under which Washington marched to victory, which Jackson maintained triumphantly, and which has been borne gallantly and gloriously over every sea. I have still confidence in the good fortune of the United States, and in view of the many provincial occurrences in the past, still anticipate a triumph for the Republic.

Military Meeting in Onslow.

A portion of the citizens of Onslow assembled in Jacksonville, on Saturday the 14th inst., for the purpose of organizing a company of cavalry.

The meeting organized by appointing J. F. Merrill, Esq., chairman, and A. J. Johnson, secretary.

Dr. E. W. Ward was elected Captain of the company.

On motion of Mr. Augustus Huggins,

Resolved, That this company shall be known under the name and style of the "Onslow Cavalry."

On motion of Col. J. W. Humphrey,

Resolved, That the uniform of the "Onslow Cavalry" shall be made of materials manufactured in North Carolina.

On motion of Mr. C. Huggins, this meeting postponed the further election of officers until next meeting.

On motion the meeting adjourned to meet Tuesday, the 24th inst. JNO. F. MERRILL, Chairman.

A. J. JOHNSON, Secretary.

Jan. 15th, 1860.

AN ABOLITIONIST SEES VIRGINIA AND CHANGES HIS SENTIMENTS.—Mr. Joshua Coppic, a Quaker gentleman of Butler township, in this county, has always been a warm Abolitionist. He is an uncle of Edward Coppic, and went on to Virginia for the purpose of bringing home the remains of his nephew for interment. On his way home he was detained at Wellsville for a couple of hours, and there had a conversation with Mr. D. T. Lawson, in which he said: "I come home a converted man. The Virginians are as kind-hearted and Christian a people as I ever was among. Our anti-slavery agitation at the North is all wrong. I am satisfied it has put back the cause of the slave, and I am going home to do what I can to put it down, and I hope thee will do the same. I am satisfied all Virginia wants is Christian treatment, and at the proper time she will do more for the slave than we ever can." Mr. Coppic never before opened his eyes to the disastrous consequences of Northern fanaticism, but now having learned them, like an honest man, he will endeavor to put down agitation. There are a great many people of the same class; and when they get fairly to understand where they are drifting, they will cut loose from the rampant Abolitionists, and set to work to create a tone of healthy conservatism.—[*New Lisbon Patriot.*

COTTON VESSEL BURNT.—*Apalachicola, January 25.*—The American barque *Gleaner*, Capt. Chandler, loading at this port for Amsterdam, took fire on Monday night, and was scuttled and sunk. She had on board 1370 bales Upland Cotton, of which only 100 bales, which were on deck, were saved.

$40.
THE $40 DOUBLE LOCK STITCH FAMILY
SEWING MACHINES.
NOW ON EXHIBITION AT BARRY'S DAGUERREOTYPE GALLERY, MOZART HALL.
SOMETHING NEW.
COMPLETE WITH THE TABLE.
SEWING WITH TWO THREADS FROM TWO SPOOLS.
Patented January 4th, 1859.
No Complicated Machinery—No Getting out of Order!
ESPECIALLY ADAPTED FOR FAMILY AND PLANTATION USE.
1000 STITCHES IN A MINUTE!

These machines are warranted first class, and fully equal to the highest priced machines.

OBSERVE:—We invite all to bring any garment, COARSE or FINE, HEAVY or LIGHT, which we will make up at once, thus establishing the reputation of our Machines—the only low-priced machine as yet offered, sewing with two threads, and

GUARANTEED NO HUMBUG!

These machines will Gather, Hem, Stitch or Fell in the most beautiful and substantial manner. Our new and improved hemmer will turn a hem of any width, stitching at the same time without any previous basting.

We warrant these Machines to be just what we here represent, and we guarantee to refund the money to any person who, after learning their use, is not satisfied with his bargain.

☞ Testimonials can be seen at the rooms, and reference given. E. T. BARRY & CO.,
Proprietors of the Patent for Middle and Eastern North Carolina, to whom apply for County Agencies.
June 20th, 1859.—244&43-1awly.

WILMINGTON, N. C., 11th July, 1859.
Messrs. E. T. BARRY & Co.—*Gentlemen*:—
THE SEWING MACHINE of Scovil & Goodell's pattern, which I purchased from you some time since, sews with great rapidity and neatness. Its great recommendations are its simplicity of construction and its adaptation to family use. The negroes and children about the house soon acquire a knowledge of its use, and sew apparently as well as the most experienced. I have no hesitancy in recommending it as a useful invention.
Respectfully your ob't. serv't.,
July 15.—46-tf M. LONDON.