[CONTINUED FROM THE FIRST PAGE.]

at once gave it up, and the slaves were made free. Such a wife was worthy of even Washington.

This is sufficient to show how the Father of our Republic regarded this subject. He has left his living and dying testimony against Slavery. What would be the language of the patriarch, could his pure spirit return and take a position among us at this moment? On which side of this contest would he range himself? Let no man doubt; he would enlist with the friends of Freedom. Let me press this inquiry a little further. How would he be received in the "Old Dominion?" Let the case of Underwood, lately driven from Virginia, answer.

Sir, I blush to say what is now on my lips. If Washington was alive, and a candidate for the Presidency, with the Anti-Slavery sentiments that he held while living, he could not receive a single electoral vote south of Mason and Dixon's line.

The testimony of Jefferson is still stronger. He says:

"There must be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people, produced by the existence of Slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other; our children see this, and learn to imitate it." "The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one-half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other!" "With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed."

Again, he says:

"Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever; that, considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of institutions, is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural interference. The Almighty has no attribute that can take sides with us in such a contest."

Again:

"What an incomprehensible machine is man! who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment, and death itself, in vindication of his own liberty; and the next moment be deaf to all those motives whose power supported him through his trial, and inflict on his fellow men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose."

In a letter to Dr. Price, of London, who had interested himself in behalf of emancipation, he says:

"Northward of the Chesapeake, you may find here and there an opponent to your doctrine, as you may find here and there a robber and a murderer; but in no greater number."

In another letter, written to a friend in 1814, we find the following emphatic language:

"Your favor of July 31st was duly received, and read with peculiar pleasure. The sentiments do honor to the head and heart of the writer. Mine on the subject of the slavery of negroes have long since been in the possession of the public, and time has only served to give them stronger root."

"The love of justice and the love of country plead equally the cause of these people, and it is a reproach to us that they should have pleaded it so long in vain."

Again:

"We must wait with patience the workings of an overruling Providence, and hope that that is preparing the deliverance of these our brethren."

Brethren! Brethren! do we hear from the great founder of the Democratic party? The language of Virginia statesmen now is, "Goods and chattels," "property," "human cattle."

Hear him further:

"When the measure of their tears shall be full, when their groans shall have involved Heaven itself in darkness, doubtless a God of justice will awaken to their distress."

In the original draught of the Declaration of Independence, he denounces the King for keeping open the slave markets in the Colonies against their will; he calls it an "*execrable commerce*."

In a letter to Mr. Sparks, February 4, 1824, he avows his firm adherence to his opinions formed in early life on this subject. Such is the language of the great Virginia statesman, the pride of the free Democratic world. We have been taught to look to him as the exponent of Democratic principles. They will stand the test and scrutiny of time, and must prevail. By the side of Jefferson, on this great question, stood Franklin, Rush, Jay, Adams, Gates, George Clinton, Madison, Monroe, and hosts of other leading and patriotic spirits.

Mr. Jefferson has also left his dying record. In a letter to James Heaton, on the subject of Slavery, dated May 20, 1826, six weeks before his death, he says:

"*My sentiments have been forty years before the public. Had I repeated them forty times, they would have only become the more stale and threadbare. Although I shall not live to see them consummated, they will not die with me; but, living or dying, they will ever be in my most fervent prayers.*"

The eloquent Patrick Henry has left his record against Slavery. He says:

"Would any one believe that I am master of slaves of my own choice? I will not, I cannot, justify it. I believe a time will come when an opportunity will be offered to abolish this *lamentable evil*."

Again, he says:

"It would rejoice my very soul, that every one of my *fellow-beings* was emancipated. We ought to lament and deplore the necessity of holding our *fellow-men* in bondage."

Here is the language of a noble man. He did not call them "property," but "fellow-men." Virginia gentlemen do not use such language at this day.

Mr. Monroe, in a speech in the Virginia Convention, said:

"We have found that this evil has preyed upon the very vitals of the Union, and has been prejudicial to all the States in which it has existed."

I shall refer to only one more patriot of the Revolution—the gallant and noble Lafayette. He perilled his life and fortune for our cause, and, in his last days, looked with anguish upon the system of Slavery in this Republic. In a letter to Mr. Clarkson, near the close of his life, he says:

"I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America, if I could have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of Slavery."

In a remarkable and interesting letter, written by him in the prison of Magdeburg, he says:

"I know not what disposition has been made of my plantation at Cayenne; but I hope Madame de Lafayette will take care that the negroes who cultivate it shall preserve their liberty."

Himself in prison, in bondage, he was still anxious for the liberty of others—even a few "Africans."

I am fond of quoting from Southern men. There was a time when Liberty was national, and to that time I always turn with delight. In these degenerate times, we hear no note from Freedom's harp south of this Capitol. Let us cherish and preserve the music of better days.

Colonel Mason, a leading and distinguished member of the Convention that formed the Constitution, from Virginia, when the provision for prohibiting the importation of slaves was under consideration, said:

"The present question concerns not the importing States alone, but the WHOLE UNION. *Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the emigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. They produce the most pernicious effect on manners. Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country.* As nations cannot be rewarded or punished in the next world, they must be in this. By an inevitable chain of causes and effects, Providence punishes national sins by national calamities. He lamented that some of our Eastern brethren had, from a lust of gain, embarked in this nefarious traffic. As to the States being in possession of the right to import, this was the case with many other rights, now to be properly given up. *He held it essential, in every point of view, that the General Government should have power to prevent the increase of Slavery.*"

This is very good Republican doctrine. It sounds very like what we hear from this side of the Hall every day, for which we are called "Black Republicans" and "Sectionalists." Strange to say, sir, the descendants of this man, and the Representatives from his then noble State, denounce this doctrine now as "treason" and "Northern fanaticism."

More than this, sir; to utter such sentiments here at all, is a dangerous business. If I should say that "every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant," who would warrant my head? For uttering such sentiments now, in the State of Virginia, a man would be mobbed, or driven from the State, within twenty-four hours.

I have tarried longer with the fathers of the Republic than I intended. I love to travel back into those olden times, and pore over the record of the acts and thoughts of the great high-priests of Liberty. No man can read the history of those times without being forcibly impressed with the strong opposition to Slavery that then existed. The record is full. You find it in the Declaration of Independence—the great charter of Human Rights; you find it in the Ordinance of 1787, so often referred to in the discussion of this question. I have often admired the wisdom and united action that secured all the territory, then owned by the United States, to Freedom. This act furnishes conclusive evidence that all regarded Slavery as an evil, and that they determined it should have no more land to blast and desolate. The men of that day determined, if they could not eradicate the evil where it then existed, they would at least prevent its extension. Virginia had then just ceded to the United States the territory northwest of the Ohio river, out of which has since been formed the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Thomas Jefferson, as early as 1784, with a foresight and a patriotism that entitles him to gratitude for all coming time, conceived the plan for excluding Slavery from this territory forever. The plan was not adopted that year; but in 1787 the Representatives of the old Confederation, assembled from nearly all the States, revived and modified the plan, and adopted it, with a unanimity unparalleled in the history of the Government. At that time, South Carolina vied with Massachusetts, and Virginia stood side by side with New York—all advocating the eternal principles of Human Freedom, and uniting their efforts to save a future Empire from the withering curse of Slavery.

Would to God we could see the like once more! Would that this great nation could turn its energies and united voice to the building up an Empire, in the central portion of its domain, where the tread of Slavery shall never blight the soil, nor degrade the image of God! Would that the descendants of noble sires could unite in this noble and holy mission, as did their fathers of old! But the prayer is a vain one. Our Southern brethren turn a deaf ear to these appeals. They have chosen another god than the god of Liberty. The Moloch of Slavery has become beautiful and lovely to them, and they are seeking to extend his dominions. They have even converted the children of light; and, in their kneading-trough, have transformed many of them in dough.

The Ordinance was reported on the 11th of July, 1787. The committee which reported it consisted of Messrs. Carrington and R. H. Lee, of Virginia; Kean, of South Carolina; Dane, of Massachusetts; and Smith, of New York.

The sixth section of the Ordinance is in these words:

"There shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted: *Provided, always,* That any person escaping into the same, from whom labor or service is lawfully claimed in any one of the original States, such fugitive may be lawfully reclaimed and conveyed to the person claiming his or her labor or service as aforesaid."

The Ordinance was passed on the 13th of July. The Journal of Congress thus recites its passage:

"According to order, the Ordinance for the government of the Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio was read a third time and passed, as follows:

"Massachusetts	Holton	Aye.
	Dane	Aye.
New York	Smith	Aye.
	Waring	Aye.
	Yates	No.
New Jersey	Clarke	Aye.
	Schureman	Aye.
Delaware	Kearney	Aye.
	Mitchell	Aye.
Virginia	Grayson	Aye.
	R. H. Lee	Aye.
	Carrington	Aye.
North Carolina	Blount	Aye.
	Hawkins	Aye.
South Carolina	Kean	Aye.
	Huger	Aye.
Georgia	Few	Aye.
	Pierce	Aye."

Every State represented voted in the affirmative—every Southern man voted for it—while but one single delegate from the North (Mr. Yates, of New York) voted against it.

Thus was this great measure of Freedom carried. No Southern rights were invaded then. The statesmen of that day thought only of doing their duty to their country and to posterity. The idea of property in man had not perverted their judgment. They rejected that guilty phantasy.

This early policy of restricting Slavery was adopted two years before the adoption of the Constitution, but at the exact time when that instrument was being framed. The Convention that formed the Constitution and the Continental Congress that passed the Ordinance were both in session at the same time—one in New York and the other in Philadelphia—and there is no doubt there was a full understanding on this subject. The clause in the Constitution giving Congress "power to make all needful rules and regulations" respecting the Territories, &c., must have been suggested by the Ordinance, and designed to sanction and approve it.

This view is confirmed by the fact that the first Congress under the Constitution, in which were Madison and other members of the Constitutional Convention, passed an act confirming and re-enacting the Ordinance. The adoption of the Constitution rendered some changes necessary, such as the appointment of officers for the Territory, &c. The preamble of this act of Congress recites, that "it is necessary certain provisions should be made," &c., in order that the Ordinance "*may continue to have full effect.*" This act was signed by President Washington, who was also President of the Constitutional Convention.

I am willing to rest the constitutional power of Congress to prohibit Slavery in the Territories on this action of Congress, sanctioned as it was by Madison and Washington.

From this time down to 1850, Congress exercised exclusive legislative control over the Territories, prohibiting Slavery in every case where it had no existence at the time, and regulating it in cases where it existed. If I had time, I would refer particularly to the acts of Congress establishing Territorial Governments, and show how uniformly Slavery was prohibited in every free Territory. Such was the case in Michigan and Illinois, by acts passed under Mr. Jefferson's Administration. Such was the case in Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Oregon.

In the great contest in 1820, which resulted in the Missouri Compromise, the same principle was reaffirmed. Missouri was admitted as a slave State, on condition that the residue of the Territory north of 36° 30′ should be forever free. A majority of the Southern members, in both branches of Congress, voted for Slavery prohibition in this case. The Senate was equally divided between the North and South. Out of twenty-two members from the South, fourteen voted for the restriction, and eight against it; and of the Northern Senators, twenty voted for it, and two against it.

Of seventy-six Representatives from slaveholding States who voted on the question of restriction, thirty-nine voted for it, and thirty-seven against it. Of the Representatives from the free States, ninety-five voted for it, and only five against it.

On the passage of the bill, as amended with the restriction, a very large majority of the Northern members voted against it. They were in favor of the restriction, but opposed to the admission of Missouri as a slave State. A very large majority of the Southern members voted for it, on its passage—all the Senators except two; and all the Representatives except thirty-seven.

Thus was this measure passed. It was a triumph for the South. They gained the point they were then contending for, viz: the admission of Missouri as a slave State.

Writing of this restriction or Compromise, Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, under the date of March 2, 1820, said:

"We have carried the question to admit Missouri and all Louisiana to the southward of 36° 30′ free of the restriction of Slavery, and *give the South, in a short time, an addition of six, and perhaps eight, members to the Senate of the United States.* It is considered here by the slave holding States as a *great triumph*. The votes were close—ninety to eighty-six, (the vote was so first declared)—produced by the seceding and absence of a few moderate men from the North. To the north of 36° 30′ there is to be, by the present law, restriction, which you will see by the votes I voted against; but it is at present of no moment. It is a vast tract, uninhabited only by savages and wild beasts, in which not a foot of the Indian claim to the soil is extinguished, and in which, according to the ideas prevalent, no land office will be open for a great length of time."

It was generally regarded as a Southern victory. The North was put off with a prospective consideration. The "uninhabited tract" was then regarded of little value. After enjoying all the benefits of Missouri and Arkansas, as slave States, for more than thirty years, and when a "land office" was about to be opened in Freedom's "tract," the South all at once discovered that there was great wrong in the bargain; that it was unconstitutional, and unjust to them. They do not propose to give up what they obtained in 1820; but they coolly say to the North, "we will retain our portion of the Territory, and *take* that which belongs to you."

Gentlemen should remember that some things are constitutional which are not for their pecuar interests. It has always seemed to me that he South were very much disposed to call everyhing unconstitutional that in any way interfered with the *interests* of Slavery.

There were no doubts of the constitutionality of the Missouri restriction when it passed. When this subject was under discussion in 1820, Mr. Taylor, a distinguished member of Congress from New York, remarked, in the debate, "that he knew of no one who doubted the constitutional power of Congress to make the prohibition."

Before signing the bill, President Monroe took the opinion of his Cabinet as to its constitutionality. It is well known that John C. Calhoun, John Q. Adams, and William Wirt, were members of the Cabinet. I present the following facts upon this point, from Mr. Monroe's manuscripts.

A paper endorsed, "*Interrogatories, Missouri,* March 4, 1820. *To the Heads of Departments and Attorney General.*"—Questions on opposite page:

"Has Congress a right under the power vested in it by the Constitution, to make a regulation prohibiting Slavery in a Territory?

"Is the eighth section of the act which passed both Houses on the 3d instant, for the admission of Missouri into the Union, consistent with the Constitution?"

With the above is the original draught of a letter, in the handwriting of President Monroe. It is not addressed to any one, but is supposed to have been written to Gen. Jackson. The letter is as follows:

"DEAR SIR: The question which so lately agitated Congress and the public has been settled, as you may have seen, by the passage of an act for the admission of Missouri as a State unrestrained, and Arkansas, likewise, when it reaches maturity, and the establishment of 36° 30′ north latitude as a line, north of which Slavery is prohibited, and permitted to the south. I took the opinion, in writing, of the Administration, as to the constitutionality of restraining Territories, *and the vote of every member was unanimous, and** which was explicit in favor of it, and as it was that the 8th section of the act was applicable to Territories only, and not to States, when they should be admitted into the Union. On this latter point I had at first some doubt; but the opinions of others, whose opinions were entitled to weight with me, supported by the sense in which it was viewed by all who voted on the subject in Congress, as will appear by the Journals, satisfied me respecting it."

*The words in italics are erased in the draught.

I will now give the evidence of a distinguished member of the Cabinet:

Extracts from the Diary of J. Q. Adams.

"*March 3, 1820.*—When I came this day to my office, I found there a note requesting me to call at 1 o'clock at the President's House. It was then one, and I immediately went over. He expected that the two bills, for the admission of Maine and to enable Missouri to make a constitution, would have been brought to him for his signature, and he had summoned all the members of the Administration, to ask their opinions, in writing, to be deposited in the Department of State, upon two questions: 1. Whether Congress has a constitutional right to prohibit Slavery in a Territory? And 2. Whether the 8th section of the Missouri bill (which interdicts Slavery *forever* in the territory north of 36½ latitude,) was applicable only to the territorial state, or would extend to it after it should become a State? As to the first question, it was UNANIMOUSLY agreed that Congress have the power to *prohibit Slavery in the Territories*."

There being some division of opinion in regard to the second question, Mr. Adams contending that it would apply to a State, and the other members holding differently, the second question was modified so as to receive the unanimous approval of the Cabinet. This will appear from the following extracts from the Diary of Mr. Adams:

"*March 5.*—The President sent me yesterday the two questions, in writing, upon which he desired to have answers, in writing, to be deposited in the Department of State. He wrote me it would be in time if he should have the answers to-morrow. The first question is in general terms, as it was stated to the meeting on Friday. The second was modified to an inquiry whether the 8th section of the Missouri bill is consistent with the Constitution? To this I can without hesitation answer by a simple affirmative; and so, after some reflection, I concluded to answer both. * * *

"*March 6.* * * * I took to the President's my answers to his two constitutional questions, and he desired me to have them deposited in the Department, together with those of the other members of the Administration. They differed only as they assigned their reasons for thinking the 8th section of the Missouri bill consistent with the Constitution, because they considered it as only applying to the Territorial term, and I barely gave my opinion, without assigning for it any explanatory reason. The President signed the Missouri bill this morning."

Comment upon these extracts is unnecessary. There was no doubting the constitutional power to prohibit Slavery then. Even Mr. Calhoun affirmed it. The invention is of later date and by smaller minds.

To show the importance attached to the Missouri Compromise at the time it passed, and its sacred character, I quote from Niles's Register, published in a slaveholding State, under date of March 11, 1820, as follows:

"There is no hardship in this; the Territories belong to the United States, and the Government may rightfully prescribe the terms on which it will dispose of the public lands.

"This great point was agreed to in the Senate—thirty-three votes to eleven; and in the House of Representatives, by one hundred and thirty-four to forty-two, or really by one hundred and thirty-nine to thirty-seven; and we trust that it is determined 'forever,' in respect to the countries now subject to the legislation of the General Government. It is true, the Compromise is supported only by the letter of a law repealable by the authority which enacted it; *but the circumstances of the case give to this law a moral force equal to that of a positive provision of the Constitution*; and we do not hazard anything in saying that the *Constitution exists in its observance*. Both parties have sacrificed much to conciliation. *We wish to see the compact kept in good faith*, and trust that a kind Providence will open the way to relieve us of an evil which every good citizen deprecates as the supreme curse of this country."

For more than thirty years the compact stood! The Constitution itself was not more sacred! Men of all parties, and from all sections, acquiesced in its provisions, and admired the wisdom of those noble men who formed it. I verily believe, that ten years ago, a representative of the American people would have sooner set fire to this Capitol, than he would have voted to abrogate this covenant of peace. Even the Senator from Illinois, seven years ago, chanted its praises. In speaking of this Compromise at Springfield, Illinois, in 1849, Mr. Douglas is reported to have said:

"The Missouri Compromise had then been in practical operation for about a quarter of a century, and had received the sanction and approbation of men of all parties, in every section of the Union. It had allayed all sectional jealousies and irritations growing out of this vexed question, and harmonized and tranquillized the whole country. It had given to Henry Clay, as its prominent champion, the proud sobriquet of the '*Great Pacificator*,' and by that title, and for that service, his political friends had repeatedly appealed to the people to rally under his standard as a Presidential candidate, as the man who had exhibited the patriotism and the power to suppress an unholy and treasonable agitation, and preserve the Union. He was not aware that any man, or any party, from any section of the Union, had ever urged as *an objection* to Mr. Clay, that he was the *great champion of the Missouri Compromise*. On the contrary, the effort was made by the opponents of Mr. Clay to prove that he was not entitled to the exclusive merit of that great patriotic measure, and that the honor was equally due to others as well as him, for securing its adoption—*that it had its origin in the hearts of all patriotic men who desired to preserve and perpetuate the blessings of our glorious Union—an origin akin to that of the Constitution of the United States*, conceived in the same spirit of fraternal affection, and calculated to remove forever the only danger which seemed to threaten, at some distant day, to sever the social bond of union. *All the evidences of public opinion at that day seemed to indicate that this Compromise had become canonized in the hearts of the American people, as a sacred thing, which no ruthless hand would ever be reckless enough to disturb.*"

The deed is done! The Compromise that was "canonized in the hearts of the American people," has been broken! The South has not kept faith with the North! In an evil hour, the ambition of "reckless" and selfish men tempted her! She upheld the "ruthless hand" that smote the compact, and disturbed the peace of the Union. She has some excuse—the prize of more slave States was too much for her patriotism. But what shall we say of the man whose "ruthless hand" was uplifted for this work of destruction? Words fail me! History will give him a page. The record will not vary much from that of another man, who sought to betray and sacrifice his country, when Liberty was in its birth-struggle.

The country knows how wantonly this work was done. It knows the actors. It knows how an Administration—calling itself Democratic—lent all its powers of patronage and corruption to seduce the venal men of the North, and push on the work. Deaf to the prayers of the people, it was intent only on its own selfish and personal aggrandizement. The chief man in this great conspiracy has his reward. After sanctioning and approving all the outrages in Kansas for the sake of a renomination, he went to Cincinnati to claim the reward of fidelity to the Slave Power. He was denied even a complimentary vote, and was carried off the field by only three faithful followers—not one of them from the South. I say nothing of Southern ingratitude in this case. The funeral is none of ours. Let those who mourn his "taking off," settle the account. I thank God, however, that the present occupant of the White House will have but one more opportunity in his annual message to insult and belie the free, intelligent, and Liberty-loving people of the free States.

The country knows why this work was done. It was for the benefit of Slavery. The Missouri restriction was repealed for the purpose of making more slave States—and for nothing else. This was not the avowed purpose; but any man with half an eye could see that it was the *real* purpose. If there was any doubt, when the Kansas and Nebraska bill passed, that this was the object, subsequent events in Kansas must have removed all doubt.

The country knows who did this work. It was the party called Democratic. Yes, sir, the Democratic party is responsible for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise—responsible for the strife and discord that now prevail in this land, as a consequence of that repeal. That party is responsible for all the outrages in Kansas. The murder of innocent American citizens—the wanton and cruel treatment of women and children—the burning of towns—the plunder of property—the destruction of printing presses—the seizing of ballot-boxes by ruffian invaders—and all the fraud and violence practiced in that Territory, are the result of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and chargeable to the Democratic party.

The country knows, also, that the Democratic party now stands upon this measure, and makes it the *test* of party orthodoxy. No man, who refuses to sanction the Nebraska bill, can hold any place in the party. Every man must now subscribe to the Slavery-extending policy of the party, or be "read out." He may be sound on all the old principles of the party, but, if he falters on this Slavery plank, he is declared spurious, and must lose his standing in the party. The gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. BARKSDALE,] in a recent speech upon this floor, said:

"The Democracy tolerate no man who is not sound on the Slavery question."

We all know what is meant by being "sound" on the Slavery question. To question the right of Slavery to extend itself into new Territories is unsound. To deny the right of slaveholders to carry their slaves from the States into the common Territories, and there hold, sell, and use them, is to violate the Democratic creed.

This is the issue—the only issue—of the Democratic party at this time. The platform was built expressly to sustain this one idea. It has not a single Northern plank in it. Buchanan stands squarely upon this single plank—or, rather, he is absorbed in it, having lost his personal identity. All who support him must adopt the extension creed, and swear that Slavery is right—a God-appointed institution.

The following extract from the *Richmond Enquirer*, the organ of Governor Wise, and the great mouthpiece of the Southern Democracy, proves what I say:

"THE TRUE ISSUE.—The Democrats of the South in the present canvass cannot rely on the old grounds of defence and excuse for Slavery; *for they seek not merely to retain it where it is, but to extend it into regions where it is unknown. Much less can they rely on the mere constitutional guaranties of Slavery*, for such reliance is pregnant with the admission that Slavery is wrong, and, but for the Constitution, should be abolished. This constitutional argument for Slavery, standing alone, fully justifies the Abolitionists.

"Nor will it avail us aught to show that the negro is most happy and best situated in the condition of Slavery. If we stop there, we weaken our cause by the very argument intended to advance it; *for we propose to introduce into new territory human beings whom we assert to be unfit for Liberty, self-government, and equal association with other men. We must go a step further.* We must show that African Slavery is a *moral, religious, natural,* and probably, in the general, a *necessary institution of society.* This is the *only line of argument* that will enable Southern Democrats to maintain the doctrines of *State equality* and Slavery extension.

"For if Slavery be not a legitimate, useful, moral, and expedient institution, we cannot, without reproof of conscience and the blush of shame, seek to extend it, or assert our equality with those States having no such institution.

"*Northern Democrats* need not go thus far. *They do not seek to extend Slavery, but only agree to its extension, as a matter of right on our part.* They may prefer their own social system to ours. But while they may prefer their own social system, *they will have to admit in this canvass* that ours is also *rightful and legitimate*, and sanctioned alike by the opinions and usages of mankind, *and by the authority and express injunctions of Scripture.* They cannot consistently maintain that Slavery is immoral, inexpedient, and profane, and yet continue to submit to its extension."

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and I ask the people of the free States, to mark this extract. I call attention to its concluding words. The people of the free States must "agree to the extension of Slavery, as a matter of right on the part of the South," and, while they may prefer free institutions, they must "*admit in this canvass*" that Slavery is right, "by the opinions and usages of mankind, *and by the authority and express injunctions of Scripture.*" Here is the issue! Here is the platform! Governor Wise endorses it, and, speaking of the candidate, says:

"*Buchanan has been especially faithful on the subject of Slavery.* I undertake to say that not only no man North, but *no man South*, can show a better record than that of James Buchanan on that vexed and dangerous question."

Wise tells us, if Buchanan is elected, Kansas is sure to be a slave State. I have no doubt he is right. For one, in that event, I shall regard the question as settled. To make Kansas a slave State, and administer upon the political estates of Pierce and Douglas, is all that is expected of Buchanan, if he is elected. Buchanan agrees with Pierce and Douglas, and stands upon the platform that they have made. Douglas says:

"Buchanan and myself have for several years back, ever since I came into public life, HELD THE SAME POSITION on the Slavery question, from beginning to end."

Now, hear what Buchanan says:

"I have been placed on a PLATFORM OF WHICH I HEARTILY APPROVE, and I must square my conduct by that platform."

Then comes the victimized Franklin Pierce:

"I congratulate you that your choice has fallen on a man who stands on the IDENTICAL PLATFORM THAT I OCCUPY, and that he will take the SAME, with the standard lowered never an inch!"

Such is Democracy in the year 1856. The party has become the ally of Slavery—the supporter of the worst aristocracy that ever cursed the earth. It has repudiated its old principles. It no longer follows Washington and Jefferson. It now swears by Calhoun and Douglas.

In the eyes of those who control and govern the party, Slavery is no longer an evil—no longer a curse to the State, and a crime against God and man; but it is right—sanctioned and approved by God, and a blessing to mankind. The slave is no longer a *man*, but simply "property"—fit only for labor, and no better than a horse or a mule. And I am sorry to say, sir, that the doctrine is fast gaining ground at the South, that all who labor are fit only to be slaves. The great doctrine of equality of rights among all men, as advocated by Jefferson, scarcely finds a believer in the South.

If the Declaration of Independence was to be re-adopted to-day, how many men on the other side of the Hall, how many of the leading spirits of the Democratic party, would vote for its great central Democratic truth, "That all men are created free and equal?" I fear the number would be small. To accord with the present notions of Southern men and Democratic leaders, the Declaration of Independence should be amended so as to read: "All free white men, and especially slaveholders, and those who can live without labor, are created free and equal."

In speaking of the trial, in this city, for the killing of Keating, a laborer at Willard's Hotel, the Charleston (S. C.) *Standard* says:

"*If white men accept the offices of menials, it should be expected that they will do so with an apprehension of their relation to society, and the disposition quietly to encounter both the responsibilities and liabilities which the relation imposes.*"

The "relation" of "menials" to society, "imposes" submission to insults from "gentlemen." The same authority says:

"*It is getting time that hotel-waiters at the North were convinced that they are servants, and not 'gentlemen' in disguise. We hope that this Herbert affair will teach them prudence.*"

Northern laborers should take notice! They must be "convinced that they are *servants*, and not gentlemen in disguise."

This language of feudalism and aristocracy has a strange sound to me. Born and bred to toil, I have learned to look upon labor as honorable. I am a Northern laborer! Many a time have I moistened the soil with the sweat of my brow; and in the work-shop I have paid my devotions. Before I look upon labor as degrading, I must despise my father and mother—I must forget my origin, and all the past years of my life. This I cannot do. But one thing I can do. I will never cease to despise and abhor an institution that first enslaves, degrades, and chattellizes man—then teaches the doctrine that labor is degrading, and unworthy a gentleman. I would rather have the honest heart, the peace of mind, and the hope of Heaven, of one hardy son of toil, "than all the wealth that sinews bought and sold ever earned."

Mr. Chairman, to show you that my view of the Cincinnati platform and the present issue is correct, I give the following extracts from the *Worcester Palladium*, for many years one of the ablest Democratic papers in New England:

"The platform asserts the right of slaveholders to carry Slavery out of the slave States, and plant it in the Territories. For that, we find no warrant in the Constitution, and no sanction in the opinions held by the Democratic party or its leading men, through almost the whole period of the existence of the Republic.

"In comparison with this item of the creed, the others are counted as nothing. What, therefore, is the inference? It is, and it can be, nothing more or less than that the Democratic platform is narrowed down to one point—*to one plank*—and that a full and explicit adoption of all the rest is of no avail, so long as this is discarded. The conclusion is therefore inevitable and irresistible, that all there is in the platform is surplusage, except the single plank of SLAVERY EXTENSION; and that while a man may believe everything that has been considered essential by the party and its conventions in other days, he is to be *excommunicated*, 'read out,' as a Democrat, unless he is prepared to stand upon the single plank that is now set up as the test of membership, and swear upon his conscience that Slavery Extension is and ought to be a cardinal purpose of the Democratic organization.

"We are not going into any argument to show that the Democratic party has left us; nor do we assent to the declaration that we have left them. But we do say, that, in reconstructing their platform, they have put in a *new and additional plank*, which they plainly tell us is more important, in their estimation, than all the others; and that they will recognise no man as a member of their party, unless he will stand square upon that plank. That plank is *Slavery Extension*. WE REJECT IT. *We disown it. We will not stand upon it, if the whole world beside stand there. It is not Democratic. It is unchristian. It is a violation of human rights. It is a charter to perpetuate human wrongs; and we wipe our hands of all responsibility for it, in theory or practice.*"

How long the people of this country are to be humbugged and misled by the name of Democracy, I know not. But this much I do know: that the principles of Liberty and Equal Rights are to be of short duration, if the present policy of the Democratic party, and the moneyed interest of the slave aristocracy, are to prevail and become the settled policy of the Government.

Upon what claim of right is this new article of Democratic faith founded? What reasons are given for the extension of Slavery? When the Missouri restriction was repealed, we were told that it was done by the right of "popular sovereignty"—sometimes called "squatter sovereignty." These words were rung in our ears for months, to justify that repeal. We were told, over and over again, that the people have the right to "govern themselves;" that is, the right to establish Slavery. I must say, Slavery always looked to me very much like governing others. This was a Northern invention, designed to work Northern dough. The South never admired the machine, for it might work for Freedom. They demanded a new contrivance. The *Richmond Enquirer* said: "The squatter sovereignty gun must be spiked," and it was done. It will be used in some localities at the North—but the patent has been rejected, and the whole thing condemned. Even its own fathers will not own it. A new invention was devised at Cincinnati, and labelled "State Equality." This is a Southern invention, and I presume will have a longer life.

"State Equality!" What does this mean? It has a popular sound. It means the right of slaveholders to carry their slave property from the slave States into the free Territories, and plant it there, on an equal footing with general property. The advocates of this doctrine begin by assuming, what is not true, that slaves are property by the Constitution and by common law; and then they reason that the owners of such property have the same rights, in all respects, as the owners of general property. They beg the question of property in man by universal law, and then construct their argument. Their superstructure has no foundation. There is no common law under Heaven that sanctions property in man. This idea is contrary to law, and abhorrent to reason.

If we admit the assumption of Southern men—that slaves are property at common law, and by the Constitution—the argument they build upon the premises is good, and they are right in their conclusions. If slave property has the same rights as other property, the owners of such property have a right to carry it where they please. If the same rights of property attach to slaves that attach to horses, the owner of the one can carry his property as rightfully into the Territories as the owner of the other, and, for aught I can see, into the States—even into the free States.

The whole system of Slavery rests upon assumption. This assumption of "property in man" underlies all the others. Heretofore, those interested in extending the system of human bondage have not ventured upon this ground. But finding that the monstrous iniquity has no other refuge, they now plant themselves boldly upon the odious and anti-Democratic principle, that "property in man" has the same rights as property in horses.

The gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. KEITT,] in a recent speech upon this floor, in anticipation of the Cincinnati Convention, enunciated this doctrine in the following language:

"The South should establish in the platform the principle, that the right of a Southern man to his slave is equal in its length and breadth to the right of a Northern man to his horse. She should make the recognition of the right *full, complete, and indisputable.*"

Nearly every Southern man who has spoken this session has contended for the same principle. This is not law; neither is it right. Against this tyrannical assumption, I place the opinion of Lord Brougham. He says:

"Tell me not of rights; talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the right; I acknowledge not the property. In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim. There is a law above all the enactments of human codes, the same throughout the world, the same in all times; it is the law written by the finger of God on the hearts of man; and by that law, *unchangeable and eternal*, while men despise fraud, and loath rapine, and abhor blood, *they shall reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man.*"

Such also were the sentiments of Wilberforce, Pitt, Burke, Martin, Fox, Granville, Grattan, Curran, and a host of others, who triumphed over the slave power in England, after a desperate struggle. Such are the sentiments of all classes in England now. The contrary doctrine finds advocates only in this Republic.

Against this doctrine I place the decisions of the courts. The Supreme Court have repeatedly held that slaves are regarded as *persons*, and not property, in the "full, complete, and indisputable" acceptation of that term. In passing upon a case involving this point, the Supreme Court say:

"The Constitution treats slaves as persons. In the second section of the first article, which apportions Representatives and direct taxes among the States, it provides that 'the number shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free *persons*, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons.' And again, in the third section of the fourth article, it is declared that '*no person* held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such labor may be due.'"

The courts of many if not all of the slaveholding States, have taken the same view of the subject.

The Supreme Court of Mississippi says:

"It has been determined in Virginia that slaves are *persons*." "In the Constitution of the United States, slaves are especially designated as *persons*." "The right of the master exists, not by force of the law of nations or of nature, but by virtue only of the positive law of the State."

In another case, the same Court says:

"Slavery is condemned by reason, and by the laws of nature. It exists, and can exist, only through municipal regulations."

The Supreme Court of Kentucky, in 3 Marshall, page 470, says:

"Slavery is sanctioned by the laws of this State; but we consider that as a right existing by a positive law of a municipal character, without foundation in the law of nature."

The Supreme Court of Louisiana says:

"The relation of slave and owner, in the States of the Union in which it has a legal existence, whether free or slaveholding, is a creation of municipal law."

And they declared a slave, taken to France by her owner, and brought back to Louisiana, emancipated by the mere act of taking a slave to a country where Slavery was abolished. Judge Barbour, of Virginia, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States on this subject, says:

"But how can this apply to persons? They are not the subjects of commerce; and not being imported goods, cannot fall within a train of reasoning founded on the construction of a power given to Congress to regulate commerce, and the prohibition to the States from imposing a duty upon imported goods."

In giving a history of the adoption of the Constitution, Mr. Madison informs us that the term "*persons*" was inserted by the Convention which framed it, and other phraseology stricken out, because "it admitted that there could be property in men;" an idea which Mr. Madison said "he thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution."

All, or nearly all, the slaveholding States have from time to time prohibited the introduction of slaves as merchandise, and some of them for any purpose; and all their courts have maintained the validity of these laws. Yet, if slaves were mere property, like cattle and horses, cotton or iron, they could not be precluded by any State.

I need not labor this point further. There is no doctrine better settled, by State and National courts, and by legislative precedents, than that Slavery is the creature of State laws; that it is contrary to reason, the common law, the common sense and general understanding of mankind; that it can exist only where State laws sanction it. The moment the slave is, by consent of his master, beyond the jurisdiction of the State by which he is held, he is free. The master has no property in the slave, that exists all over the world, but such only as exists in the State that, by positive law, sanctions Slavery.

The decision in the case of Forbes *vs.* Cochran, (2 Barn. and Cresswell, 463,) in the Court of King's Bench, covers the whole ground. It is as follows:

"The right to slaves, when tolerated by law, is founded not on the law of nature, but on the law of the particular country. It is a law *in vitum*; and when a party gets out of the *power* of his master, and gets under the protection of another power, without any *wrongful* act done by the party giving that protection, the right of the master, which is founded on the municipal law of the particular place only, does not continue. The moment a foreign slave puts his foot on our shores, he ceases to be a slave, *because there is no law here which sanctions his being held in Slavery*. And the local law, which held him in Slavery against the law of nature, has lost its force."

Then, sir, the slaveholder has no right of property in his slave, which gives him any right to carry such property into any Territory where the laws do not sanction Slavery. If he does, his right at once ceases, and the slave is as free as his master. This is the law of Christendom. It works no hardship to him who claims property in his fellow-man. He knows the law. The hardship is on the other side—that man should be held in Slavery anywhere. Southern men talk about being excluded from the Territories, because they cannot carry their slaves there. As well might a man who has one, two, and three-dollar bank notes, talk about being excluded from this District, because he cannot pass bank notes here of less denomination than five dollars. Is the slave so much a part of his master, that the one cannot emigrate without the other? This is all idle talk. As before stated, Slavery exists by *local* law; and the moment you get beyond the locality where such laws exist, the shackles of Slavery fall.

But I am not done with this doctrine of "State Equality." It is not equality, but *inequality*, that the South claim. They set up a claim of property in man, and think it hard that such property has not the rights of general property. They complain that they cannot take this kind of merchandise into the Territories. This complaint has no foundation. Do these complainants forget that this kind of property has a quality and confers rights which no other property has or can confer? Do they forget that every slave, reckoned by them as only property, is *three-fifths* a man? This right of manhood for political purposes, as well as property, belongs to the slaveholder. The slave is no man *for himself*, in the eyes of Southern gentlemen or of the law; but every five human beings held in bondage make three political men of their master. What other property has this wonderful faculty? I know of none. To illustrate this point: Suppose a Southern man goes to Kansas with five hundred slaves, and Kansas is made a slave State; this one man, by his human property, becomes *equal* on this floor and in his vote for President, and in all the political affairs of the country, to three hundred and one hard-working, intelligent men in New Hampshire, or in any other free State. Call you this "*equality!*" No, sir! It is downright *inequality*. The extension of Slavery produces an *inequality* of States.

The principle of allowing parts of a nation political power in proportion to the number of men they hold in bondage, is so undemocratic and detrimental to Liberty, that I am surprised that any man outside of the privileged States should be willing to extend it one inch beyond the States to which it already applies. Such a principle as this would have been repudiated by the heathen democracy of Athens long centuries ago.

By the Constitution of the United States, in the apportionment of Representatives to Congress, five slaves count the same as three freemen. Under this provision of the Constitution, from 1789 to 1792, the South gained seven Representatives; from 1795 to 1813, she gained fourteen; from 1813 to 1823, she gained nineteen; from 1823 to 1833, the gain was twenty-two; from 1833 to 1843, the gain was twenty-five. At this moment, the South has twenty additional members on this floor on account of this principle.

The present ratio of representation is 93,731. The free States have 144, and the slave States 90 Representatives. The free white population of the free States, in 1850, was 13,438,667; and the free white population of the slave States was 6,184,404. The number of free colored persons in the free States is about equal to the same class in the slave States. The free States have 144 Representatives on this floor, or on an average one Representative for 93,324 free white inhabitants. The slave States have 90 Representatives, or on an average one Representative for 68,715 free white inhabitants. This is the way this principle works.

In the next Presidential election, the free States will have 176 electoral votes, or on an average one electoral vote for 76,356 free white inhabitants. The slave States will have 120 electoral votes, or on an average one electoral vote for 51,536 free white inhabitants. The South will have 20 electoral votes as a premium for Slavery.

If we examine particular States, we shall find the contrast even more unequal than in the aggregate. For instance, South Carolina has a white population of 274,567, and *six* Representatives, or one Representative to 45,761 free white inhabitants. She has eight electoral votes, or one for 34,321 white inhabitants. New Hampshire has a white population of 317,456, and *three* Representatives, or one for 105,818 inhabitants. She has five electoral votes, or one for 63,491 free white inhabitants. It will be observed from these figures that *three* white men in South Carolina have as much influence in the votes upon this floor as *seven* white men in New Hampshire. And this, sir, is the "*equality of the States,*" so much talked of on the other side of the House!

Perhaps, sir, the institution of Slavery is so elevating in its effects upon human character, that three men in South Carolina are equal to seven in New Hampshire. The country should consider the subject in this light before they pass any hasty judgment. It certainly has some very *striking* examples.

The following statistics of the third Congressional district of New Hampshire, represented by me, and the district represented by Hon. Lawrence M. Keitt, of South Carolina, from the census of 1850, will illustrate the working of this principle, and be found suggestive of other things:

	Cragin.	*Keitt.*
Free whites	103,615	43,759
Native adults who cannot read and write	182	2,210
College	1	—
Pupils	273	—
Academies and schools	981	128
Pupils	28,746	2,746
Public libraries	27	2
Volumes	28,405	5,700
Votes polled at the last election	21,766	7,500

Georgia has a free white population of 521,572, and eight Representatives, or one for 65,196 white inhabitants. Maine has a free white population of 581,813, (60,000 more than Georgia,) and six Representatives, or one for 96,969 inhabitants. Virginia has a white population of 894,800, and thirteen Representatives, or one for 68,830 free white inhabitants. Massachusetts has a white population of 985,450, (about 100,000 more than Virginia,) and eleven Representatives, or one for 89,586.

But some one will say: "The South pays direct taxes in the same proportion, as an offset for this property representation." This is true. Let us examine this point, and see whether the South has been the gainer or loser by this provision.

A direct tax has been resorted to only four times since 1789, by the General Government, viz: in 1798, 1813, 1814, and 1816, and is not likely to be resorted to again. The whole amount assessed was fourteen millions of dollars. Of this, the South paid for her slaves only $1,256,553.

In 1837, the surplus revenue of the Union, amounting to over $37,000,000, was distributed among the several States in proportion to their electoral votes. By the census of 1830, the North had 7,008,451 free persons, and the South had 3,823,289. The free States received $21,410,777.12; the slave States, $16,058,082.85. Every free man of the North received but $3.50, while every free man of the South received $4.20, in that division.

At that time, the South had 126 electoral votes, of which 25 were on account of slaves. She therefore received by that arrangement $3,186,127.50, on account of the representation of her slave property. From that, if we deduct the $1,256,553 paid by her as a direct tax on account of her slaves, there is left $1,929,574.50 as the bonus which the South has received from the Treasury of the nation, on account of the representation of slaves—Southern property represented in Congress.

Such has been the practical operation of this provision of the Constitution. In view of it, Mr. Pickering once said in Congress: "The terms were not bad for the South to take." So we should think.

By it the South has had an extra representation in Congress of from ten to twenty members, and a corresponding extra voice in all the affairs of Government. In addition to this, she has received nearly $2,000,000 out of the National Treasury, in consequence of his unequal representation—this representation of Southern property.

But, sir, this is in the Constitution, and we abide by it. I have alluded to this subject, not for the purpose of making war upon the Constitution, but for the purpose of giving a practical reason why we are opposed to the extension of Slavery. We are opposed to the extension of the principle of property representation, and especially to a privileged class. Daniel Webster once said:

"I have made up my mind, for one, that under no circumstances will I consent to the extension of the area of Slavery in the United States, or to the further increase of slave representation in the House of Representatives."

So I say, and so say the people of the free States.

I have gone into a somewhat tedious detail of figures, to show that the North is the sufferer—that the people of the free States have reason to complain of inequality, and not the South. The South have more than their equal rights. Two thousand millions of dollars of Southern property—*so called by them*—is represented on this floor. It has twenty Representatives here; while not a cent of Northern property is represented. No man is here to represent our horses and cattle, our iron, our ships, or our mills; and I thank God it is so. Free and independent men—free, intelligent, and liberal thought—and the interests of free, educated, and well-paid labor—have their Representatives here from the North. Property representation is confined to the South.

And yet, sir, we hear Southern men talking about "State Equality," as though the South did not enjoy equal rights with the North. We are told that Slavery must be extended, in order to secure and preserve to the South her equal rights.

This argument is often presented in a different shape. We have been told many times this session, that the Territories are common property, and that the Southern man has the same right to occupy them that the Northern man has. All this we admit. We admit that they are common property, purchased by the common treasure; and that men from all sections have an equal right in them. But we deny that the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories impairs any man's right. Gentlemen talk as though they could not move into a new Territory without their slaves. They say that, unless they can take their slave property there, and hold and use it as they do in the States, they are excluded. Not so, sir. As well might the banker say he was excluded, because he could not take his bank with him into the Territory. His bank charter is the creature of local law. Slave property is the creature of the same law; and neither are property beyond the locality governed by said laws.

But, sir, how stands the account between the North and South, in relation to the Territories acquired, and paid for out of the common Treasury, since the adoption of the Constitution?

Since that time, territory has been purchased or acquired, out of which *five* slave States have been formed, and only *two* free States. The free States have paid more than two-thirds the cost of the acquisitions, and obtained less than one-third of the States. This is what I suppose Southern gentlemen call "State Equality." These States have the following extent of territory and representation in Congress:

	Square miles.	Senators.	Reps.
1. Louisiana	41,346	2	4
2. Missouri	65,037	2	7
3. Arkansas	52,191	2	2
4. Florida	59,268	2	1
5. Texas	325,369	2	2
Five slave States	543,369	10	16
1. Iowa	50,914	2	2
2. California	188,981	2	2
Two free States	239,895	4	4

These figures show, again, the beauties of "State Equality." But as the present contest relates mainly to the Territory of Kansas, I propose to show the "equality" that has been observed in the division of the purchase out of which this Territory was formed. In 1803, the United States purchased of France the territory known as the "Louisiana purchase," and paid therefor *fifteen millions* of dollars—the North paying, at least, *ten* millions as her share. Out of this particular territory, thus far, four States have been formed—three slave, and one free, as follows:

	Square miles.	Senators.	Reps.
1. Louisiana	41,356	2	4
2. Missouri	65,037	2	7
3. Arkansas	52,191	2	2
Three slave States	158,584	6	13
1. Iowa, free	50,914	2	2

The free States have received one-fourth the number of States—less than one-fourth the number of square miles—one-fourth the number of Senators, and one-seventh the Representatives. I call the attention of gentlemen to these figures. This looks as though the South had been *excluded* from the Territories. South of Mason and Dixon's line, this is called "State Equality." We are taught a different system of addition in the free States; but, according to Southern calculations, our arithmetic is all wrong.

Kansas and Nebraska constitute the balance of the Louisiana purchase; and, if they were made free States, there would be an equal division of this territory between the North and South. Against this the South are contending. Not satisfied with three-fourths, as the division now stands, they claim Kansas for Slavery; and this, sir, notwithstanding it was pledged to Freedom, thirty-six years ago, in consideration for the admission of Missouri as a slave State. And because the North will not tamely submit to this, they talk of aggression on the part of the free States, and threaten a dissolution of the Union.

The people of the North are not given to bragging or to threats. They have other modes of proving their courage and patriotism. They appeal to history. If ever an attempt should be made to dissolve the Union of these States, because Slavery is not allowed to spread over free Territories, I presume the North will demonstrate not only their love for the Union, but their ability to maintain and defend it.

The mania of Slavery extension has seized the entire South, and taken possession of the Democratic party—once the advocate of Freedom and Equal Rights. To secure the extension of this giant evil, the Missouri Compromise was repudiated, and the fires of agitation rekindled throughout the land. The embankment against the further spread of human bondage, erected in 1820 by our patriotic ancestors, was broken down at the command of the Slave Power, and the faith of the nation violated. A compact as sacred as the Constitution has been broken, and for the purpose of making Kansas a slave State.

The South claim Kansas for Slavery. We cannot consent! We will not consent! Knowing that God is the avenger of wrong, we dare not consent. By no agency of ours shall this beautiful Territory be made desolate by the touch of Slavery. Knowing how our forefathers, appealing to God for the "rectitude of their actions," implored his assistance in their great struggle for Liberty, we dare not offer up a different prayer now. Knowing that the God of Liberty gave us the victory then, we dare not mock and insult Him now—as we should do by tamely consenting to the enslavement of Kansas. We make no war upon the South—we only defend against her warfare. They fight for Slavery—we for Liberty. We ask them to look upon the effects of Slavery in the slave States. We ask them to compare the free States with their own. We ask them to turn back a few years, and read what their own statesmen said, and then blame us for desiring Freedom for Kansas.

Governor Randolph, in his address to the Virginia Legislature, in 1820 said:

"We have been far outstripped by States to whom nature has been far less bountiful. It is painful to consider what might have been, under other circumstances, the amount of general wealth in Virginia."

Mr. Curtis, in a speech in the Virginia Legislature, in 1832 said:

"There is a malaria in the atmosphere of these regions, which the new-comer shuns, as being deleterious to his views and habits. See the wide-spreading ruin which the avarice of our ancestral Government has produced in the South, as witnessed in a sparse population of freemen, deserted habitations, and fields without culture! Strange to tell, even the wolf, driven back long since by the approach of man, now returns, after the lapse of a hundred years, to howl over the desolations of Slavery."

Another member said:

"I am gratified to perceive that no gentleman has yet risen in this hall, the avowed advocate of Slavery. The day has gone by when such a voice could be listened to with patience, or even forbearance. I regret that we should find one among us who enters the lists as an apologist except on the ground of necessity. If there be one who concurs with the gentleman from Brunswick [Mr. Gholson] in the harmless character of this institution, let me request him to compare the condition of the slaveholding portion of this Commonwealth, barren, desolate, and seared as it were by the avenging hand of Heaven, with the descriptions we have of the same from those who broke its virgin soil. To what is this change ascribable? Alone to the withering and blasting effects of Slavery."

Mr. Moore, in speaking of the evils of Slavery, said:

"The first I shall mention is the irresistible tendency which it has to undermine and destroy everything like virtue and morality in the community.

"In that part of the State below tide-water, the whole face of the country wears an appearance of almost utter desolation, distressing to the beholder. The very spot on which our ancestors landed a little more than two hundred years ago, appears to be on the eve of again becoming the haunt of wild beasts."

Mr. Ritchie, once the editor of the *Union*, in Speaking of Slavery in 1832 said:

"It is probable, from what we hear, that the committee on the colored population will report some plan for getting rid of the free people of color. But is this all that can be done? Are we forever to suffer the greatest *evil* which can scourge our land, not only to remain, but to increase in its dimensions? Yes, something must be done, and it is the part of no honest man to deny it.

"When, within a period equal to that in which the Federal Constitution has been in existence, those numbers will increase to more than two millions within Virginia; when this, the fairest land on all this continent, for soil, and climate, and situation, combined, might become a sort of garden spot if it were worked by the hands of *white men alone—can we, ought we*, to sit quietly down, fold our arms, and say to each other, 'Well, well, this thing will not come to the worst in our day.' Something ought to be done; means sure, gradual—systematic, but discreet—ought to be adopted for reducing the mass of evil that is pressing upon the South.

"The disease is deep-seated. It is at the heart's core. It is consuming our vitals."—*See Richmond Enquirer of January 7, 1832.*

I ask the attention of gentlemen to these extracts, and especially the last. Compare it with the one I gave in another place, from the same paper, of recent date. We advocate now just what was advocated in Virginia in 1832, and what was then the sentiment of the country; and for this we are called enemies of the country, disunionists, &c. Comment is unnecessary.

This is a true picture of nearly every Southern State to-day. We cannot consent that Kansas should be added to their number. Slavery has seared and blackened quite enough of this beautiful land.

No, gentlemen; you must not ask it. If you do, we tell you plainly, firmly, but kindly, that we cannot and will not consent. If you insist, we must resist by all the lawful, constitutional, and moral power that God has given us. We cannot consent to do a wrong, or suffer it to be done, if in our power to prevent it.

Before you can claim our co-operation in this work, you must blot out the history of the past. You must show us that our education is wrong; that our Christianity is wrong. In the language of the noble Henry Clay, in a speech on this floor, upon this subject, in 1827, we say: "If they would repress all tendencies towards Liberty and ultimate emancipation, they must do more than put down the benevolent efforts of this society. They must go back to the era of our Liberty and Independence, and muzzle the cannon which thunders its annual joyous return. They must blow out the moral lights around us, and extinguish that *greatest torch* of all which America presents to a benighted world, pointing the way to their rights, liberties, and their happiness. And when they achieve all these purposes, their work will be yet incomplete. *They must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate the light of reason and the love of Liberty.* Then, and not till then, when universal darkness and despair prevail, can you *perpetuate Slavery*, and repress all sympathies, and all humane and benevolent efforts among freemen, in behalf of the unhappy portion of our race doomed to bondage."

Nor have we forgotten that the same great orator, in 1850, said:

"I have said that I never could vote for it myself; and I repeat that *I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power ever will make me vote to spread Slavery over territory where it does not exist.*"

The South has forced upon us this issue, and we accept it. We claim Kansas for Freedom, by right and by compact. "Kansas for Freedom" is inscribed this day upon ten thousand banners, which float all over the free North. Her army of freemen are marching to the music of "LIBERTY and Union." Our platform is the Declaration of Independence. Our candidate is the brave and gallant Fremont, in whose veins runs the same blood that vitalized Washington. Our hopes are in God, whose aid we invoke, as did our fathers of old.

We are in the midst of a political revolution. It is a necessary purifier. Let it go on! When the atmosphere becomes putrid with disease, the thunder and lightning are necessary to remove the seeds of death. So in this Republic. When dangers lurk in every avenue to the citadel of Liberty, nothing but a political revolution can save us from calamity.

The blood which has stained the free soil of Kansas and the floor of the Senate Chamber was needed as an atonement for the past servility of Northern men. If the sacrifice shall prove efficacious in exterminating the race of doughfaces, it is not too much.

The crisis is one of awful moment! Men of the free North, the interests of Freedom are confided to you! The welfare of the Republic depends upon your action! The destinies of a continent hang upon your decision! The hopes of unborn millions survive or perish by your votes! Action in such a case becomes godlike, and voting rises to the solemnity and dignity of prayer. Rear your defences, O freemen! Place upon all the watch-towers brave and *true men*—" men who know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain."

The day that witnesses the triumph of Liberty in this mighty struggle will be remembered in all coming history; and posterity will call those blessed who enlist for Freedom, as it always does those who, with brave hearts and true, battle for the right.

"Arise, arise, ye brave!
And let our war-cry be,
Free Speech, Free Press, Free Soil, Free Men,
FREMONT and VICTORY!"

CIRCULATE THE DOCUMENTS.

The Republican Association of Washin[...] City, in order to afford every facility for a [...] fuse distribution of documents during the ca[...] paign, have made extensive arrangements [...] publishing speeches and documents favor[...] the principles of the Republican Party, and [...] furnish them to individuals, or clubs, at [...] bare cost of publication.

The following is a list of those already p[...] lished; and, being stereotyped, we are enab[...] to supply any number of copies at short noti[...]

List of Documents already published, and wh[...] will be kept for sale till the end of the Ca[...] paign.

At 62 cents per 100 copies, free of posta[...]

Poor Whites of the South.—Weston.
Will the South Dissolve the Union?—Weston.
The Federal Union, it must be Preserved.—Weston.
Southern Slavery reduces Northern Wages.—Weston.
Who are Sectional?—Weston.
Review of the Kansas Minority Report.—Hon. J. S[...] man.
Reasons for Joining the Republican Party.—Judge F[...]
Kansas Contested Election.—Hon. J. A. Bingham.
Admission of Kansas.—Hon. G. A. Grow.
Collamer's Report and Speech in favor of Free S[...] Constitution for Kansas.
Kansas Affairs.—Hon. H. Waldron.
Defence of Kansas.—Rev. Henry Ward Beecher.
Defence of Massachusetts.—Hon. A. Burlingame.
Privilege of the Representative, Privilege of the Peop[...] Hon. J. R. Giddings.
Democratic Party as it Was and as it Is.—Hon. T. C. D[...]
The Humbug and the Reality.—Hon. T. C. Day.
Blair's Letter to the Republican Association.
The Slavery Question.—Hon. J. Allison.
Slavery Unconstitutional.—Hon. A. P. Granger.
The Platforms—Speech of Hon. John J. Perry.
Who Are and Who May Be Slaves in the United S[...] Weston.
Kansas and the Compromises.—Hon. Jesse O. Nort[...]
The Republican Party—Its Necessity and Its Mis[...] Hon. John Allison.
Mr. Fillmore's Political History and Position.—Ho[...] B. Morgan.
A Review of the President's Message.—Hon. Ca[...] Billinghurst.
Letter of Hon. James L. Orr, of South Carolina, in w[...] he gives the Northern Democracy credit for aiding [...] South in extending Slavery.
Speeches of William H. Seward on the Army Bill, [...] Extraordinary Session, delivered August 27 and [...] one pamphlet.

At $1.25 per 100 copies, free of postage.

Kansas in 1856: A complete History of the Outrag[...] Kansas not embraced in the Kansas Committee's R[...] port.—By an Officer of the Commission.
Immediate Admission of Kansas.—Hon. W. H. Sew[...]
Admission of Kansas, and the Political Effects of Sla[...] ry.—Hon. H. Bennett.
Affairs in Kansas.—Hon. L. Trumbull.
Wrongs of Kansas.—Hon. J. P. Hale.
Admission of Kansas.—Hon. B. F. Wade.
State of Affairs in Kansas.—Hon. H. Wilson.
Admission of Kansas.—Hon. James Harlan.
The "Laws" of Kansas.—Hon. Schuyler Colfax.
Organization of the Free State Government in Kans[...] and Inaugural Address of Governor Robinson.
Plymouth Oration.—Hon. W. H. Seward.
The Dangers of Extending Slavery, and The Contest a[...] the Crisis; two Speeches in one pamphlet.—Hon. W[...] H. Seward.
Politics of the Country.—Hon. Israel Washburn.
Complaints of the Extensionists; their Falsity.—Ho[...] Philemon Bliss.
The Slavery Question.—Hon. Edward Wade.
Extravagant Expenditures.—Hon. E. Ball.
Freedom National, Slavery Sectional.—Hon. J. J. Per[...]
The Army of the United States not to be Employed as Police to Enforce the Laws of the Conquerors of Ka[...] sas.—Hon. W. H. Seward.
Modern "Democracy" the Ally of Slavery.—Hon. M. W[...] Tappan.
Speech of Hon. Russell Sage on the Professions and Ac[...] of the President of the United States; the Repeal of [...] Missouri Compromise; the Outrages in Kansas; a[...] the Sectional Influence and Aggressions of the Sla[...] Power.
Jefferson vs. Douglas.—Hon. A. H. Cragin.

At $2.50 per 100 copies, free of postage.

Crime against Kansas.—Hon. Charles Sumner.
Report of the Kansas Investigating Committee.
Life of Fremont, illustrated.

The Nebraska Question, containing the Speeches of Do[...] las, Chase, Smith, Everett, Wade, Badger, Seward, a[...] Sumner, together with the History of the Misso[...] Compromise, &c. Price 20 cents, free of postage.
Political Map of the United States, designed to exhibit [...] comparative area of the Free and Slave States, and [...] Territory open to Slavery by the Repeal of the Misso[...] Compromise. With a comparison of the principal St[...] tistics of the Free and Slave States, from the Census [...] 1850. Highly Colored. Price 20 cents, free of postage.
Speech of Hon. Charles Sumner in the Welsh language. Price $2.50 per 100 copies.

In the German Language.

Crime against Kansas.—Hon. Charles Sumner. Pr[...] $2.50 per 100.
Life of Fremont, illustrated. Price $2.50 per 100.
The "Laws" of Kansas.—Hon. Schuyler Colfax. Pr[...] $1.25 per 100.
The Dangers of Extending Slavery.—Hon. W. H. Sewa[...] Price $1.25 per 100.
The Contest and the Crisis.—W. H. Seward. Price $1.[...]
The Immediate Admission of Kansas.—Hon. W. H. Sew[...] ard. Price $1.25 per 100.
Address of the National Republican Committee. Pr[...] $1.25 per 100.
Francis P. Blair's Letter to the Republican Associatio[...] Price 62 cents per 100.
Slavery Unconstitutional.—Hon. A. P. Granger. Pr[...] 62 cents per 100.
Poor Whites of the South.—G. M. Weston. Price 6[...] cents per 100.
Report of the Kansas Investigating Committee. Pr[...] $2.50 per 100.

☞ A liberal discount is made from the above prices, when ordered by the thousand copies. Address L. CLEPHANE, *Secretary, Washington, D. C.*

THE GREAT BOSTON SLAVE CASE.

ANTHONY BURNS:

A HISTORY,

BY CHARLES EMERY STEVENS.

Illustrated from original drawings made by an eye-witness. 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Contents.

CHAPTER I. The Arrest.
II. The Attack on the Court House.
III. The Writ of Personal Replevin.
IV. The Attempt to Purchase Burns.
V. The Examination.
VI. The Arguments.
VII. The Decision.
VIII. The Surrender.
IX. The Early Life of Burns.
X. The Trader's Jail.
XI. The Ransomed Freeman.
XII. The Trial of the Commissioner.

The volume gives the *secret history* of the case, together with personal sketches of the principal characters, including Judge Loring, Wendell Phillips, Richard H. Dana, jr., Theodore Parker, Gov. Gardner, Gen. Edmands, Mayor Smith, Hallett Freeman, the Suttle family, &c. In an Appendix will be found official documents, letters, and other matter, illustrative of the subject, together with a detailed account of the first slave case under the Constitution of 1780, in which the Supreme Court decided that Slavery no longer existed in Massachusetts.

"Byles," the well-known Boston correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, writes to that journal respecting the work as follows:

"It makes a small volume, beautifully printed, and excellently got up in every respect. It is a model of succinct and lucid narration, with no attempt to heighten the effect of the facts by rhetoric; and yet it is so managed as to stir the blood as no mere art could. * * * I recommend this book to the attention of every one who wishes to know how a slaveholder can command the entire National, State, and Municipal power, to catch and carry back his slave. It is a most instructive lesson, and can not be studied too carefully."

This day published by
JOHN P. JEWETT & CO.,
510 117 Washington street, Boston.

The greatest medical discovery of the age, is

AYER'S CATHARTIC PILLS!

THEY don't HELP complaints, but they CURE them.
One box has cured Dyspepsia.
Three boxes have cured the worst cases of Scrofula.
Two boxes have cured Erysipelas.
One box always cures the Jaundice.
Three boxes are sure to cleanse the system from Boils—often less than one does it.
Two boxes have completely cured the worst of Ulcers on the legs.
Small doses seldom fail to cure the Piles.
One dose cures the Headache, arising from a foul stomach.
Strong doses often repeated expel every worm from the body. They should be given to children, who are always more or less afflicted with this scourge.
As a gentle physic they have no equal.
One box cures derangement of the liver.
Half a box cures a cold.
They purify the blood, and thus strike at the foundation of every disease.
As a dinner pill there is not their equal in the world.
They are purely vegetable, and can do no harm, but do accomplish an unaccountable amount of good.
Prepared by Dr. J. C. AYER, Lowell, Massachusetts, and sold by Z. D. GILMAN, Washington, and all respectable Druggists. 506

DOCTOR HOOFLAND'S

CELEBRATED GERMAN BITTERS,

Prepared by

Dr. C. M. JACKSON, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,

Will effectually cure

LIVER COMPLAINT, DYSPEPSIA, JAUNDICE,

Chronic or Nervous Debility, Diseases of the Kidneys, and all Diseases arising from a disordered Liver or Stomach.

THE Proprietor, in calling the attention of the public to this preparation, does so with a feeling of the utmost confidence in its virtues, and adaptation to the diseases for which it is recommended.

It is no new and untried article, but one that has stood the test of a ten years' trial before the American people, and its reputation and sale is unrivalled by any similar preparations extant.

Principal Office and Manufactory, No. 96 Arch street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

MORGANTOWN, VA., *August* 1, 1855.

DEAR SIR: The sales of the Bitters are increasing, and what speaks volumes in their favor is, that all who have used them, speak highly of their effects. No medicine that I sell gives such general satisfaction, and the demand for it exceeds all precedent; and, I assure you, it affords me pleasure to sell such a remedy. Our physicians no longer scout at it, but are compelled to acknowledge its intrinsic value, and the greater part of them have had magnanimity sufficiently to lay aside their prejudices, and prescribe it in their practice.

Respectfully, yours, F. M. CHALFANT.
Dr. C. M. JACKSON.

For sale by Storekeepers and Druggists in every town and village in the United States.
Z. D. GILMAN, Washington, and JOHN L. KIDWELL, Georgetown, D. C., Agents. 490

PHILOSOPHICAL AND CHEMICAL APPARATUS,

MANUFACTURED BY C. B. WARRING, A. M., Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Catalogues gratis. 446