Alexandria Gazette.

VOL. LXII. MONDAY MORNING, JANUARY 14, 1861. NO. 11.

THIRTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

[REPORTED FOR THE ALEXANDRIA GAZETTE.]

In Senate, Saturday, Jan. 12.

A few private bills were taken up and disposed of.

The diplomatic corps were in attendance. At least a thousand ladies and twelve hundred gentlemen were in the galleries, and it was impossible for any more to obtain admission. After routine business,

Mr. GWIN moved that the Senate proceed to the special order, the consideration of the President's message. Agreed to.

Mr SEWARD being entitled to the floor, rose and said:—Mr. President, Congress adjourned last Summer amid auspices of national abundance, contentment, tranquility, and happiness. It was assembled this winter in the presence of derangement of business and disturbance of public as well as private credit, and in the face of seditious combinations to overthrow the Union. The alarm is appalling; for Union is not more the body than liberty is the soul of the nation. The American citizen has been accustomed to believe the Republic immortal. He shrinks from the sight of convulsions indicative of its sudden death. The report of our condition has gone over the seas, and we who have so long and with such complacency studied the endless agitations of society in the Old World, believing ourselves exempt from such disturbances, now, in our turn, seem to be falling into a momentous and disastrous revolution.

I know how difficult it is to decide, amid so many and so various counsels, what ought to be and even what can be done. Certainly, however, it is time for every Senator to declare himself. I therefore, following the example of the noble Senator from Tennessee, (Mr. Johnson,) avow my adherence to the Union in its integrity and with all its parts, with my friends, with my party, with my state, with my country, or without either, as they may determine, in every event, whether of peace or of war, with every consequence of honor or dishonor, of life or death. Although I lament the occasion, I hail with cheerfulness the duty of lifting up my voice among distracted debates, for my whole country and its inestimable Union.

Hitherto the exhibitions of spirit and resolution here, as elsewhere, have been chiefly made on the side of disunion. I do not regret this. Disunion is so unexpected and unnatural that it must plainly reveal itself before its presence can be realized. I like best, also, the courage that rises slowly under the pressure of severe provocation. If it be a Christian duty to forgive to the stranger even seventy times seven offenses, it is the highest patriotism to endure without complaint the passionate waywardness of political brethren so long as there is hope that they may come to a better mind.

I think it is easy to pronounce what measure or conduct will not save the Union. I agree with the honorable Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Clingman] that mere eulogiums will not save it. Yet I think that as prayer brings us nearer to God, though it cannot move Him towards us, so there is healing and saving virtue in every word of devotion to the Union that is spoken, and in every sigh that its danger draws forth. I know, at least, that, like virtue, it derives its strength from every irreverent act that is committed and every blasphemous phrase that is uttered against it.

The Union cannot be saved by mutual criminations concerning our respective share of responsibility for the present evils. He whose conscience acquits him will naturally be slow to accuse others whose cooperation he needs. History only can adjust the great account.

A continuance of the debate on the constitutional power of Congress over the subject of slavery in the territories will not save the Union. The opinions of parties and sections on that question have become dogmatical, and it is this circumstance that has produced the existing alienation. A truce, at least during the debate on the Union, is essential to reconciliation.

The Union cannot be saved by proving that secession is illegal or unconstitutional. Persons bent on that fearful step will not stand long enough on forms of law to be distodged; and loyal men do not need such narrow ground to stand upon.

I fear that little more will be gained from discussing the right of the federal government to coerce seceding states into obedience. If disunion is to go on, this question will give place to the more practical one, whether many seceding states have a right to coerce the remaining members to acquiesce in a dissolution.

I dread, as in my innermost soul I abhor, civil war. I do not know what the Union would be worth if saved by the use of the sword. Yet, for all this, I do not agree with those who, with a desire to avert that great calamity, advise a conventional or unopposed separation, with a view to what they call a reconstruction. It is enough for me, first, that in this plan, destruction goes before reconstruction; and secondly, that the strength of the vase in which the hopes of the nation are held consists chiefly in its remaining unbroken.

Congressional compromises are not likely to save the Union. I know, indeed, that tradition favors this form of remedy. But it is essential to its success, in any case, that there be found a preponderating mass of citizens, so far neutral on the issue which separates parties, that they can intervene, strike down clasping weapons, and compel an accommodation. Moderate concessions are not customarily asked by a force with its guns in battery; nor are liberal concessions apt to be given by an opposing force not less confident of its own right and its own strength. I think, also, that there is a prevailing conviction that legislative compromises which sacrificed honestly cherished principles, while they anticipate future exigencies, even if they do not assume extraconstitutional powers, are less sure to avert imminent evils than they are certain to produce ultimately even greater dangers.

Indeed, Mr. President, I think it will be wise to discard two prevalent ideas or prejudices, namely: first, that the Union is to be saved by somebody in particular; and secondly, that it is to be saved by some cunning and insincere compact of pacification. If I remember rightly, I said something like this so long ago as 1850, and afterwards in 1854.

The present danger discloses itself in this form. Discontented citizens have obtained political power in certain states, and they are using this authority to overthrow the federal government. They delude themselves with a belief that the state power they have acquired enables them to discharge themselves of allegiance to the whole Republic. The honorable Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) says we have a right to coerce a state, but we cannot. The President says that no state has a right to secede, but we have no constitutional power to make war against a state. The dilemma results from an assumption that those who, in such a case act against the federal government, act lawfully as a state; although manifestly they have perverted the power of the state to an unconstitutional purpose.

A class of politicians in New England set up this theory and attempted to practice upon it in our war with Great Britain. Mr. Jefferson did not hesitate to say that states must be kept within their constitutional sphere by impulsion, if they could not be held there by attraction. Secession was then held to be inadmissable in the face of a public enemy. But if it is untenable in one case, it is necessarily so in all others. I fully admit the originality, the sovereignty, and the independence of the several states within their sphere. But I hold the federal government to be equally original, sovereign, and independent within its sphere.

And the government of the state can no more absolve the people residing within its limits from allegiance to the Union, than the government of the Union can absolve them from allegiance to the state. The constitution of the United States, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are the supreme law of the land, paramount to all legislation of the states, whether made under the constitution, or by even their organic conventions. The Union can be desolved, not by secession, with or without armed force, but only by the voluntary consent of the people of the United States, collected in the manner prescribed by the constitution of the United States.

Congress in the present case, ought not to be impassive. It ought, if it can, to redress any real grievances of the offended states, and then it ought to supply the President with all the means necessary to maintain the Union in the full exhibition and discreet exercise of its authority. Beyond this, with the proper activity on the part of the Executive, the responsibility of saving the Union belongs to the people and they are abundantly competent to discharge it.

I propose, therefore, with great deference, to address myself to the country upon the momentous subject, asking a hearing, not less from the people within what are called the seceding, than from those who reside within the adhering states.

Union is an old, fixed, settled habit of the American people, resulting from convictions of its necessity, and therefore not likely to be hastily discarded. The early states, while existing as colonies, were combined, though imperfectly, through a common allegiance to the British crown. When that allegiance ceased, no one was so presumptuous as to suppose political existence compatible with disunion; and, therefore, on the same day that they declared themselves independent, they proclaimed themselves also confederated states. Experience in war and in peace from 1775 until 1787, only convinced them of the necessity of converting that loose confederacy into a more perfect and a perpetual Union.

They acted with a coolness very different from the intemperate conduct of those who now on one side threaten, and those who on the other rashly defy disunion. They considered the continuance of the Union as a subject comprehending nothing less than the safety and welfare of all the parts of which the country was composed, and the fate of an empire in many respects the most interesting in the world. I enter upon the subject of continuing the Union now, deeply impressed with the same generous and loyal conviction. How could it be otherwise, when, instead of only thirteen, the country is now composed of thirty-three parts; and the empire embraces, instead of only four millions, no less than thirty millions of inhabitants.

The founders of the constitution moreover regarded the Union as no mere national or American interest. On the contrary, they confessed with deep sensibility that it seemed to them to have been reserved for the people of this country to decide whether societies of men are really capable of establishing good government upon reflection and choice or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force. They feared, therefore, that their failure to continue and perfect the Union would be a misfortune to the nations. How much more, sir, would its overthrow now be a calamity to mankind!

Some form of government is indispensable, here as elsewhere. Whatever form, we have every individual citizen and every state must cede to it some natural rights, to invest the government with the requisite power. The simple question, therefore, for us now to decide, while laying aside all pique, passion, and prejudice is: whether it conduces more to the interests of the people of this country to remain for the general purposes of peace and war, commerce inland and foreign, postal communications at home and abroad, the care and disposition of the public domain, colonization, the organization and admission of new states, and generally, the enlargement of empire, one nation under our present constitution, than it would be to divide themselves into separate confederacies or states.

Our country remains now as it was in 1787—composed not of detached and distant territories, but of one whole well-connected and fertile region lying within the temperate zone, with climates and soils hardly more various than those of France or of Italy. This slight diversity quickens and amplifies manufactures and commerce. Our rivers and valleys, as improved by art, furnish us a system of highways unequalled in the world. The different forms of labor, if slavery were not perverted to purposes of political ambition, need not constitute an element of strife in the confederacy.

Notwithstanding recent vehement expressions and manifestations of intolerance in some quarters, produced by intense partisan excitement, we are, in fact a homogeneous people, chiefly of one stock, with accessions well assimilated. We have, practically, only one language, one religion, one system of government, and manners and customs common to all. Why, then shall we not remain henceforth as hitherto, one people?

The first object of every human society is safety or security, for which, if need be, they will, and they must, sacrifice every other. This security is of two kinds: one, exemption from foreign aggressions and influence; the other, exemption from domestic tyranny and sedition.

Foreign wars come from either violations of treaties or domestic violence. The Union has thus far, proved itself an almost perfect shield against such wars. The United States, continually enlarging their diplomatic acquaintance, have now treaties with France, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Sweden, Prussia, Spain, Russia, Denmark, Mexico, Brazil, Austria, Turkey, Chili, Siam, Muscat, Venezuela, Greece, Sardinia, Ecuador, Hanover, Portugal, New Granada, Hesse Cassel, Wurtemburg, China, Bavaria, Saxony, Nassau, Switzerland, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Guatemala, the Hawaiian islands, San Salvador, Borneo, Costa Rica, Peru, Bremen, the Argentine Confederation, Loo Choo, Japan, Brunswick, Persia, Baden, Belgium, and Paraguay.

Nevertheless, the United States, within their entire existence under the federal constitution, have had flagrant wars with only four states two of which were insignificant powers, on the coast of Barbary, and have had direct hostilities, amounting to reprisals, only two or three more, and they are now at peace with the whole world. If the Union should be divided into only two confederacies, each of them would need to make as many treaties as we have now; and, of course, would be liable to give as many causes of war as we now do. But we know from the sad experience of other nations, that disintegration once begun, inevitably continues until even the greatest empire crumbles into many parts.

Each confederation that shall untimately arise out of the ruins of the Union will have necessity for as many treaties as we now have, and will incur liabilities for war as often as we now do, by breaking them. It is the multiplication of treaties, and the want of confederation, that makes war the normal condition of society in Western Europe and in Spanish America. It is union that, notwithstanding our world-wide intercourse, makes peace the habit of American people

I will not descend so low as to ask whether new confederacies would be able or willing to bear the grievous expense of maintaining the diplomatic relations which cannot be dispensed with except by withdrawing from foreign commerce.

Our federal government is better able to avoid giving just causes of war than several confederacies, because it can conform the action of all the states to compacts. It can have only one construction and only one tribunal to pronounce that construction, of every treaty. Local and temporary interests and passions, or personal cupidity and ambition can drive small confederacies or states more easily than a great Republic into indiscreet violations of treaties.

The United States being a great and formidable power, can always secure favorable and satisfactory treaties. Indeed every treaty we have was voluntarily made. Small confederacies or states must take such treaties as they can get, and give whatever treaties are exacted. A humiliating, or even an unsatisfactory treaty, is a chronic cause of foreign war.

The chapter of wars resulting from unjustifiable causes would, in case of division, amplify itself in proportion to the number of new confederacies and their irritability. Our disputes with Great Britain about Oregon, the boundary of Maine, the patriot insurrection in Canada, and the island of San Juan; the border strifes between Texas and Mexico, the incursions of the late William Walker in Mexico and Central America, all these were cases in which war was prevented only by the imperturability of the federal government.

This government not only gives fewer causes of war, whether just or unjust, than smaller confederacies would; but it always has a greater ability to accommodate them by the exercise of more coolness and courage the use of mere various and more liberal means, and the display, if need be, of greater force. Every one knows how placable we ourselves are in controversies with Great Britain, France and Spain; and yet how exacting we have been in our intercourse with New Granada, Paraguay, and San Juan de Nicaragua.

Mr. President, no one will dispute our forefathers' maxim, that the common safety of all is the safety of each of the States.—While they remain united, the federal government combines all the materials and all the forces of the several States; organizes their defenses on one general principle; harmonizes and assimilates them with one system; watches for them with a single eye, which it turns in all directions, and moves all agents under the control of one executive head. A nation so constituted is safe against assault or even insult.

War produces always a speedy exhaustion of money and a severe strain upon credit. The treasuries and credits of small confederacies would often prove inadequate. Those of the Union are always ample.

I have thus far kept out of view the relations which must arise between the confederacies themselves. They would be small and inconsiderable nations bordering on each other, and therefore, according to all political philosophy, natural enemies. In addition to the many treaties which each must make with foreign powers, and the causes of war which they would give by violating them, each of the confederacies must also maintain treaties with all the others, and so be liable to give them frequent offence. They would necessarily have different interests resulting from their establishment of different policies of revenue, of mining, manufactures, and navigation, of immigration, and perhaps the slave trade. Each would stipulate with foreign nations for advantages peculiar to itself and injurious to its rivals.

If, indeed, it were necessary that the Union should be broken up, it would be in the last degree important that the new confederacies to be formed should be as nearly as possible equal in strength and power, that mutual fear and mutual respect might inspire them with caution against mutual offence. But such equality could not long be maintained; one confederacy would rise in the scale of political importance, and the others would view it thenceforward with envy and apprehension. Jealousies would bring on frequent and retaliatory wars, and all these wars, from the peculiar circumstances of the confederacies, would have the nature and character of civil war.

Dissolution, therefore, is, for the people of this country, perpetual civil war. To mitigate it, and obtain occasional rest, what else could they accept but the system of adjusting the balance of power which has obtained in Europe, in which the few strong nations dictate the very terms on which all the others shall be content to live. When this hateful system should fail at last, foreign nations would intervene, now in favor of one and then in aid of another; and thus our country, having expelled all European powers from the continent, would relapse into an aggregated form of its colonial experience, and, like Italy, Turkey, India, and China, become the theatre of transatlantic intervention and rapacity.

If, however, we grant to the new confederacies an exemption from complications among each other and with foreign states, still there is too much reason to believe that not one of them could long maintain a republican form of government. Universal suffrage and the absence of a standing army are essential to the republican system. The world has yet to see a single self-sustaining state of that kind, or even any confederation of such States, except our own. Canada leans on Great Britain not unwillingly, and Switzerland is guarantied by interested monarchical states.

Our own experiment has thus far been successful; because, by the continual additions of new States, the influence of each of the members of the Union is constantly restrained and reduced. No one, of course, can foretell the way and manner of travel; but history indicates with unerring certainty the end which the several confederacies would reach. Licentiousness would render life intolerable: and they would sooner or later purchase tranquility and domestic safety by the surrender of liberty, and yielding themselves up to the protection of military despotism.

Indulge me, sir, in one or two details under this head. First, it is only sixty days since this disunion movement began; already those who are engaged in it have canvassed with portentous freedom the possible recombinations of the States when dissevered, and the feasible alliances of those recombinations with European nations; alliances as unnatural, and which would prove ultimately as pestilential to society here as that of the Tlascalans with the Spaniard, who promised them revenge upon the ancient enemies the Aztecs.

Secondly.—The disunion movement arises partly out of a dispute over the common domain of the United States. Hitherto, the Union has confined this controversy within the bounds of political debate by referring it, with all other national ones, to the arbitrament of the ballot box. Does any one suppose that disunion would transfer the whole domain to either party, or that any other umpire than war would, after dissolution, be invoked?

Thirdly.—This movement arises, in another view, out of the relation of African slaves to the domestic population of the country. Freedom is to them, as to all mankind, the chief object of desire. Hitherto, under the operation of the Union, they have practically remained ignorant of the controversy, especially of its bearing on themselves. Can we hope that flagrant civil war shall rage among ourselves in their very presence, and yet that they will remain stupid and idle spectators? Does history furnish us any satisfactory instruction upon horrors of civil war among a people so brave, so skilled in arms, so earnest in conviction, and so intent in purpose, as we are? Is it a mere chimera which suggests an aggravation of those horrors beyond endurance, when, on either side, there shall occur the intervention of an uprising ferocious African slave population of four, or six, perhaps twenty millions?

The opinions of mankind change, and with them the policies of nations. One hundred years ago, all the commercial European States were engaged in transferring negro slaves from Africa to this hemisphere. To-day all those States are firmly set in hostility to the extension and even to the practice of slavery. Opposition to it takes two forms; one European, which is simple, direct abolition, effected, if need be, by compulsion; the other American, which seeks to arrest the African slave trade, and resist the entrance of domestic slavery into territories where it is yet unknown, while it leaves the disposition of existing slavery to the considerate action of the States by which it is retained.

It is the Union that restricts the opposition to slavery in this country within these limits. If dissolution prevail, what guarantee shall there be against the full development here of the fearful and uncompromising hostility to slavery which elsewhere pervades the world, and of which the recent invasion of Virginia was an illustration?

Mr. President, I have designedly dwelt so long on the probable effects of disunion upon the safety of the American people as to leave me little time to consider the other evils which must follow in its train. But, practically, the loss of safety involves every other form of public calamity. When once the guardian angel has taken flight, everything is lost.

Dissolution would not only arrest, but extinguish the greatness of our country. Even if separate Confederacies could exist and endure, they could severally preserve no share of the common *prestige* of the Union. If the constellation is to be broken up, the stars, whether scattered widely apart or grouped in smaller clusters, will thenceforth shed forth feeble, glimmering, and lurid lights. Nor will great achievements be possible for the new Confederacies. Dissolution would signalize its triumph by acts of wantonness which would shock and astound the world. It would provincialize Mount Vernon, and give this capital over to desolation at the very moment when the dome is rising over our heads that was to be crowned with the statue of Liberty.

After this, there would remain for disunion no act of stupendous infamy to be committed. No petty Confederacy that shall follow the United States can prolong, or even renew, the majestic drama of national progress. Perhaps it is to be arrested before its sublimity is incapable of continuance. Let it be so, if we have, indeed, become degenerate. After Washington, and the inflexible Adams, Henry, and the peerless Hamilton, Jefferson, and the majestic Clay, Webster, and the acute Calhoun, Jackson, the modest Taylor, and Scott, who rises in greatness under the burden of years, and Franklin, and Fulton, and Whitney, and Morse, have all performed their parts, let the curtain fall!

While listening to these debates, I have sometimes forgotten myself in marking their contrasted effects upon the page who customarily stands on the dais before me, and the venerable Secretary who sits behind him. The youth exhibits intense but pleased emotion in the excitement, while at every irreverent word that is uttered against the Union, the eyes of the aged man are suffused with tears. Let him weep no more. Rather rejoice, for yours has been a lot of rare felicity. You have seen and been a part of all the greatness of your country, the towering national greatness of all the world. Weep only you, and weep with all the bitterness of anguish, who are just stepping on the threshhold of life; for that greatness perishes prematurely, and exists not for you, nor for me, nor for any that shall come after us.

The public prosperity! how could it survive the storm? Its elements are industry in the culture of every fruit; mining of all the metals; commerce at home and on every sea; material improvement that knows no obstacle and has no end; invention that ranges throughout the domain of nature; increase of knowledge as broad as the human mind can explore; perfection of art as high as human genius can reach; and social refinement working for the renovation of the world.

How could our successors prosecute these noble objects in the midst of brutalizing civil conflict. What guarantees will capital invested for such purposes have, that will outweigh the premium offered by political and military ambition? What leisure will the citizen find for study, or invention, or art, under the reign of conscription; nay, what interest in them will society feel when fear and hate shall have taken possession of the national mind? Let the miner in California take heed; for its golden wealth will become the prize of the nation that can command the most iron. Let the borderer take care, for the Indian will again lurk around his dwelling. Let the pioneer come back into our denser settlements; for the railroad, the post road, and the telegraph, advance not one furlong farther into the wilderness.—With standing armies, consuming the substance of our people on the land, and our navy and our postal steamers withdrawn from the ocean, who will protect or respect, or who will even know by name our petty confederacies?

The American man-of-war is a noble spectacle. I have seen it enter an ancient port in the Mediterranean. All the world wondered at it, and talked of it. Salvos of artillery, from forts and shipping in the harbor, saluted its flag. Princes and princesses and merchants paid it homage, and all the people blessed it as a harbinger of hope for their own ultimate freedom. I imagine now the same noble vessel again entering the same haven. The flag of thirty-three stars and thirteen stripes has been hauled down, and in its place a signal is run up which flaunts the device of a lone star or a palmetto tree. Men ask, "Who is the stranger that thus steals into our waters." The answer contemptuously given is "She comes from one of the obscure republics of North America. Let her pass on."

Lastly, public liberty, our own peculiar liberty, must languish for a time, and then cease to live. And such a liberty! free movement everywhere through our own land and throughout the world; free speech, free press, free suffrage; the freedom of every subject to vote on every law, and for or against every agent who expounds, administers, or executes. Unstable and jealous confederacies, constantly apprehending assaults without and treason within, formidable only to each other and contemptible to all beside; how long will it be before, on the plea of public safety, they will surrender all this inestimable and unequalled liberty, and accept the hateful and intolerable espionage of military despotism?

And now Mr. President, what is the cause for this sudden and eternal sacrifice of so much safety, greatness, happiness, and freedom? Have foreign nations combined, and are they coming in rage upon us? No. So far from being enemies, there is not a nation on earth that is not an interested, admiring friend. Even the London Times, by no means partial to us, says:

"It is quite possible that the problem of a democratic republic may be solved by its overthrow in a few days in a spirit of folly, selfishness, and short-sightedness."

Has the federal government become tyrannical or oppressive, or even rigorous or unsound? Has the constitution lost its spirit, and all at once collapsed into a lifeless letter? No; the federal goverment smiles more benignantly, and works, and works today more beneficial than ever. The constitution is even the chosen model for the organization of the newly rising confederacies.

The occasion is the election of a President of the United States, who is unacceptable to a portion of the people. I state the case accurately. There was no movement of disunion before the ballots which expressed that choice were cast. Disunion began as soon as the result was announced. The justification assigned was that Abraham Lincoln had been elected, while the success of either one of the three other candidates would have been acquiesced in.

Was the election illegal? No; it is unimpeachable. Is the candidate personally offensive? No; he is a man of unblemished virtue and amiable manners. Is an election of President an unfrequent or extraordinary transaction! No; we never had a Chief Magistrate otherwise designated than by such election, and that form of choice is renewed every four years. Does any one even propose to change the mode of appointing the Chief Magistrate? No; election by universal suffrage, as modified by the constitution, is the one crowning franchise of the American people. To save it they would defy the world. Is it apprehended that the new President will usurp despotic power? No; while he is of all men the most unambitious, he is, by the partial success of those who opposed his election, subjected to such restraints that he cannot, without their consent, appoint a minister or even a police agent, negotiate a treaty, or procure the passage of a law, and can hardly draw a musket from the public arsenals to defend his own person.

What, then, is the ground of discontent? It is that the disunionists did not accept as conclusive the arguments which were urged in behalf of the successful candidate in the canvass. This is all. Were their own arguments against him more satisfactory to his supporters? Of course they were not; they could not be. Does the constitution, in letter or spirit, require or imply that the arguments of one party shall be satisfactory to the other? No; that is impossible. What is the constitutional remedy for this inevitable dissatisfaction. Renewed debate and ultimate rehearing in a subsequent election.—Have the now successful majority perverted power to purposes of oppression? No; they have never before held power.

Alas! how prone we are to undervalue privileges and blessings. How gladly, how proudly, would the people of any nation in Europe accept, on such terms as we enjoy it, the boon of electing a Chief Magistrate every four years by free, equal, and universal suffrage! How thankfully would they cast aside all their own systems of goverment, and accept this Republic of ours, with all its shortcomings and its disappointments, maintain it with their arms and cherish it in their hearts. Is it not the very boon for which they supplicate Godwithout ceasing, and even wage war, with intermissions only resulting from exhaustation?

How strange are the times in which we live! The coming Spring season, on one side of the Atlantic, will open on a general conflict, waged to obtain, through whatever indirection, just such a system as ours; and on this side of the Atlantic, within the same parallels of latitude, it will open on fraternal war, waged in a moment of frenzied discontent to overthrow and annihilate the same institutions. Do men, indeed, live only for themselves, to revenge their own wrongs, or to gratify their own ambition? Rather do not men live least of all for themselves, and chiefly for posterity and for their fellow-men? Have the American people, then, become all of a sudden unnatural, as well as unpatriotic and will they disinherit their children of the precious estate held only in trust for them, and deprive the world of the best hopes it has enjoyed since the human race began its slow and painful, yet needful and wisely-appointed progress?

Here I might close my plea for the American Union; but it is necessary, if not to exhaust the argument, at least to exhibit the whole case. The disunionists, consciously unable to stand on their mere disappointment in the recent election, have attempted to enlarge their ground. More than thirty years there has existed a considerable—though not heretofore a formidable—class of citizens in certain states situate near or around the delta of the Mississippi, who believe that the Union is less conducive to the welfare and greatness of those states than a smaller confederacy, embracing only slave states, would be. This class has availed itself of the discontents resulting from the election to put into operation the machinery of dissolution long ago prepared and waiting only for occasion.

In other states there is a soreness because of the want of sympathy in the free states with the efforts of slaveholders for the recapture of fugitives from service. In all the slave states there is a restiveness resulting from the resistance which has been so determinedly made within the last few years, in the free states, to the extension of slavery in the common territories of the United States. The Republican party, which cast its votes for the successful Presidential candidate on the ground of that policy, has been allowed, practically, no representation no utterance by speech, or through the press, in the slave states; while its policy, principles, and sentiments, and even its temper, have been so misrepresented as to excite apprehensions that it denies important constitutional obligations, and aims even at interference with slavery and its overthrow by state authorities or intervention of the federal government.

Considerable masses even in the free states, interested in the success of these misrepresentations as a means of partisan strategy, have lent their sympathy to the party claiming to be aggrieved. While the result of the election brings the Republican party necessarily into the foreground in resisting disunion, the prejudices against them which I have described have deprived them of the co-operation of many good and patriotic citizens. On a complex issue between the Republican party and the disunionists, although it involves the direst national calamities, the result might be doubtful; for the Republican party is weak in a large part of the Union. But on a direct issue, with all who cherish the Union on one side, and all who desire its dissolution by force on the other, the verdict would be prompt and almost unanimous. I desire thus to simplify the issue, and for that purpose to separate from it all collateral questions, and relieve it of all partizan passions and prejudices.

I consider the idea of the withdrawal of the Gulf states, and their permanent reorganization with or without others in a distinct confederacy as a means of advantage to themselves, so certainly unwise and so obviously impossible of execution, when the purpose is understood, that I dismiss it with the discussion I have already incidentally bestowed upon it.

The case is different, however, in regard to the other subjects which I have brought in this connection before the Senate.

Beyond a doubt, Union is vitally important to the Republican citizens of the United States; but it is just as important to the whole people. Republicanism and Union are, therefore, not convertible terms. Republicanism is subordinate to Union, as everything else is and ought to be—Republicanism, Democracy, every other political name and thing; all are subordinate—and they ought to disappear in the presence of the great question of Union. So far as I am concerned, it shall be so; it should be so if the question were sure to be tried as it ought only to be determined, by the peaceful ordeal of the ballot.

It shall be so all the more since there is on one side preparedness to refer it to the arbitrament of civil war. I have such faith in this republican system of ours, that there is no political good which I desire that I am not content to seek through its peaceful forms of administration without invoking revolutionary action. If others shall invoke that form of action to oppose and overthrow government, they shall not, so far as it depends on me have the excuse that I obstinately left myself to be misunderstood. In such a case I can afford to meet prejudice with conciliation, exaction with concession which surrenders no principle, and violence with the right hand of peace.

Therefore, sir, so far as the abstract question whether, by the constitution of the United States, the bondsman, who is made such by the laws of a state, is still a man or only property, I answer that, within that state, its laws on that subject are supreme; that when he has escaped from that state into another, the constitution regards him as a bondsman who may not, by any law or regulation of that state, be discharged from his service, but shall be delivered up, on claim to the party to whom his service is due.

While prudence and justice would combine in persuading you to modify the acts of Congress on that subject, so as not to oblige private persons to assist in their execution, and to protect freemen from being, by abuse of the laws, carried into slavery, I agree that all laws of the states, whether free states or slave states, which relate to this class of persons, or any others recently coming from or resident in other states, and which laws contravene the constitution of the United States, or any law of Congress passed in conformity thereto, ought to be repealed.

Secondly. Experience in public affairs has confirmed my opinion, that domestic slavery, existing in any state, is wisely left by the constitution of the United States exclusively to the care, management, and disposition of that state; and if it were in my power, I would not alter the constitution in that respect. If misapprehension of my position needs so strong a remedy, I am willing to vote for an amendment of the constitution, declaring that it shall not, by any future amendment, be so altered as to confer on Congress a power to abolish or interfere with slavery in any state.

Thirdly. While I think that Congress has exclusive and sovereign authority to legislate on all subjects whatever, in the common territories of the United States; and while I certainly shall never, directly or indirectly, give my vote to establish or sanction slavery in such territories, or anywhere else in the world, yet the question what constitutional laws shall at any time be passed in regard to the territories, is, like every other question, to be determined on practical grounds. I voted for enabling acts in the cases of Oregon, Minnesota, and Kansas, without being able to secure in them such provisions as I would have preferred; and yet I voted wisely.

So now, I am well satisfied that, under existing circumstances, a happy and satisfactory solution of the difficulties in the remaining territories would be obtained by similar laws, providing for their organization, if such organization were otherwise practicable. If, therefore, Kansas were admitted as a state, under the Wyandotte constitution, as I think she ought to be, and if the organic laws of all the other territories could be repealed, I could vote to authorize the organization and admission of two new states which should include them, reserving the right to effect subdivisions of them whenever necessary, into several convenient states; but I do not find that such reservations could be constitutionally made.

Without them, the ulterior embarrasments which would result from the hasty incorporation of states of such vast extent and various interests and character would outweigh all the immediate advantages of such a measure. But if the measure were practicable, I should prefer a different course, namely: when the eccentric movements of secession and disunion shall have ended, in whatever form that end may come, and the angry excitements of the hour shall have subsided, and calmness once more shall have resumed its accustomed sway over the public mind, then, and not till then—one, two, or three years hence—I should cheerfully advise a convention of the people, to be assembled in pursuance of the constitution, to consider and decide whether any and what amendments of the organic national law ought to be made.

A Republican now—as I have heretofore been a member of other parties existing in my day—I nevertheless hold and cherish, as I have always done, the principle that this government exists in its present form only by the consent of the governed, and that it is as necessary as it is wise, to resort to the people for revisions of the organic law when the troubles and dangers of the state certainly transcend the powers delegated by it to the public authorities. Nor ought the suggestion to excite surprise. Government in any form is a machine: this is the most complex one that the mind of man has ever invented, or the hand of man has ever framed. Perfect as it is, it ought to be expected that it will, at least as often as once in a century, require some modification to adapt it to the changes of society and alternations of empire.

Fourthly. I hold myself ready now, as always heretofore, to vote for any properly guarded laws which shall be deemed necessary to prevent mutual invasions of states by citizens of other states, and punish them who shall aid and abet them.

Fifthly. Notwithstanding the arguments of the gallant Senator from Oregon, (General Lane,) I remain of the opinion that physical bonds, such as highways, railroads, rivers, and canals, are vastly more powerful for holding civil communities together, than any mere covenants, though written on parchment or engraved upon iron. I remain, therefore, constant to my purpose to secure, if possible, the construction of two Pacific railways, one of which shall connect the ports around the mouths of the Mississippi, and the other, the towns on the Missouri and the lakes, with the harbors on our Western coast.

If, in the expression of these views, I have not proposed what is desired or expected by many others, they will do me the justice to believe that I am far from having suggested what in many respects would have been in harmony with cherished convictions of my own. I learned early from Jefferson, that in political affairs we cannot always do what seems to us absolutely best.—Those with whom we must necessarily act, entertaining different views, have the power and right of carrying them into practice. We must be content to lead when we can, and to follow when we cannot lead; and if we cannot at anytime do for our country all the good that we would wish, we must be satisfied with doing for her all the good that we can.

Having submitted my own opinions on this great crisis, it remains only to say that I shall cheerfully lend to the government my best support in whatever prudent yet energetic efforts it shall make to preserve the public peace, and to maintain and preserve the Union; advising, only, that it practice as far as possible, the utmost moderation, forbearance, and conciliation.

And now, Mr. President, what are the auspices of the country? I know that we are in the midst of alarms, and somewhat exposed to accidents unavoidable in season of tempestuous passions. We already have disorder; and violence has begun. I know not to what extent it may go. Still my faith in the constitution and in the Union abides, because my faith in the wisdom and virtue of the American people remains unshaken. Coolness, calmness, and resolution, are elements of their their character. They have been temporarily displaced; but they are re-appearing.

Soon enough, I trust, for safety, it will be seen that sedition and violence are only local and temporary, and that loyalty and affection to the Union are the natural sentiments of the whole country. Whatever dangers there shall be, there will be the determination to meet them; whatever sacrifices, private or public, shall be needful for the Union, they will be made. I feel sure that the hour has not come for this great nation to fall. This people, which has been studying to become wiser and better as it has grown older, is not perverse or wicked enough to deserve so dreadful and severe a punishment as dissolution.

This Union has not yet accomplished what good for mankind was manifestly designed by Him who appoints the seasons and prescribes the duties of states and empires. No, sir; if it were cast down by factions to-day, it would rise again and re-appear in all its majestic proportions to-morrow. It is the only government that can stand here. Woe! Woe! to the man that madly lifts his hand against it. It shall continue and endure; and men, in after times, shall declare that this generation, which saved the Union from such sudden and unlooked for dangers, surpassed in magnanimity even that one which laid its foundation on the eternal principles of liberty, justice, and humanity. The Senate then adjourned.

House of Representatives.

Mr. Clark, of Missouri, read a telegraphic despatch, as printed in the papers of this morning, relative to the taking of the military possession of the custom-house, post-office, and sub-treasury, in the city of St. Louis, by order of Lieutenant General Scott. He desired to make an explanation in order that the country might not be deceived by this intelligence. Everybody did not know that these public offices were in the same building. What condition of things existed in St. Louis to justify this course he knew not.—The people of that city, so far, have been quiet and loyal to the Union. The legislature of Missouri is now in session. Missouri makes no threats, while she is determined to take such steps as her honor and safety require for the redress of grievances, and she will do this in her own time and in her own way.

Mr. Fenton, and others, objected to the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Clark asked leave to introduce a resolution, requesting the Secretary of War to communicate to the House whether the post office, custom-house, and sub-treasury, situated in the city of St. Louis have been taken possession of by United States troops; if so, by whose orders, and whether there has been any attempt by the State or the city authorities to improperly interfere with said buildings or property, and whether they were threatened.

He said he did not believe the report, and wanted information from the proper source.

Mr. McPherson objected to the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. Clark inquired whether he could move a suspension of the rules, but was informed by

The Speaker that such a motion could be made only on Mondays.

Mr. Clark said surely the majority of the House would not inaugurate a military despotism.

The Speaker laid before the House the following letter, addressed to him, and bearing this day's date:

SIR: Having received official information that the State of Mississippi has passed an ordinance, through a convention representing the sovereignty of the State, bearing date the 9th of January, by which ordinance she has withdrawn from the Federal Government all the powers delegated to it at the time the Federal Union was formed, it becomes our duty to lay the facts before you, and to withdraw ourselves from the further deliberations of this body. While we regret this necessity of our State, we fully approbate it, and shall return to her bosom to share her fortunes through all its phases.

With sentiments of respect we are, sir, etc.,

OTHO R. SINGLETON,
WILLIAM BARKSDALE,
REUBEN DAVIS.
JOHN J. McRAE,
LUCIUS Q. C. LAMAR.

Mr. Jones, of Georgia, moved that the names of the Mississippi, as well as those of the late South Carolina members, be stricken from the roll, and not hereafter be called by the Clerk.

Mr. Ely, of New York, objected to the motion.

Mr. Burnett, of Kentucky, submitted that as these gentlemen have withdrawn from the House, and notified the Speaker of it, it certainly did not seem that they were members of the House.

Mr. Spinner, of New York. Does the gentleman consider that they have resigned their seats?

Mr. Burnett. I do; and not only this, but they are out of the Union by the action of their State.

Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, said the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky were out of order.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Naval appropriation bill.

Mr. Pryor, of Virginia, moved to strike out the following clause in the bill:

"For pay of the commission, warrant, and petty officers and seamen, including the engineer corps of the navy, $4,438,577."

Mr. Pryor was understood to say that he would sustain the navy so far as protection to the interests of commerce and enlarging the bounds of discovery were concerned; but he would not grant a farthing, and would sink the navy in the abyss of the ocean, before it should be used for hostile purposes against the citizens of our country. The use of this dread instrument of death and desolation in fraternal strife deserves a nation's scorn. The most unhappy aspect in the present unhappy condition of affairs is the prevalence of a military temper in the councils of the administration, and an imbecile Executive has fallen under the guidance of an aspiring soldier. The sword has been cast into the balance. Instead of messengers of conciliation to a discontented people, the Government despatches men and munitions of war to constrain them to abject obedience.

Mr. Sherman rose to a point of order,

Mr. Pryor said he would conclude in five minutes, and would rigorously confine himself to the rules. He was going to say,