

The Daily Era can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. BATES, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the Weekly Era.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1854.

PUBLIC OPINION.

We give place to-day to various expressions of Public Opinion, by the People in their primary assemblies, by the Press, secular and religious, conservative and radical, American and German. Members of Congress would do well to ponder them. The People are deeply moved, whatever the mere politicians may say.

THE PEOPLE.

Demagogues may try to stifle a fair expression of opinion, but the People will be heard. In pursuance of a call signed by ten of the most influential citizens of Columbus, Ohio—six of them Old Line Democrats, four Whigs—a mass meeting of the citizens of that place, composed to the Nebraska bill, was held on the evening of the 16th instant. Judge Swan (Democrat) presided. A committee, composed of men of mark, without distinction of party, reported resolutions of the most decisive character, which, after full discussion, were unanimously adopted. Among them are the following, one calling for a State Convention:

Resolved, That if this deep and intolerable wrong toward the North and West—toward every laborer in the United States, and his children's children—is to be persisted in by those who have it in charge, we recommend to our fellow-citizens throughout the State, to meet in their respective counties, and express their views upon this subject; and, further, that a Convention of the People of Ohio be held, to utter the voice of the State for or against the extension of Slavery over territory now free.

Resolved, That this subject rises above all party politics and politicians; that it involves questions touching God's faith, the solemnity of contracts, the integrity of public men; that the people, both North and South, are satisfied with the Missouri Compromise; not a voice has been raised against it, during the existence of more than one whole generation of men; that the attack now made upon it has not come from the people, but has been sprung upon the people. We make our first solemn appeal to the statesmen of the country to defeat this unjust bill; and, if they prove faithless, we recommend that an APPEAL be at once made to the people, not only upon this bill, but to reconsider the whole subject of compromises.

The 8th of March is suggested as the proper time for the Convention. The Daily Forest City says:

The Anti-Slavery Extension press of Columbus suggests Wednesday, the 8th of March, as the time, and Columbus as the place.

We cordially second the proposition, both as to time and place. The time named is short, but the exigency is pressing, and delays are dangerous. Broaders of the press, pass the word along the line. Let such a Convention of the People be held at Columbus, on the 8th of March, as will strike terror to the guilty souls of partisan traitors.

Action in the Legislature of the State is delayed by the Old Hunkers, who are determined to go with the Administration "through thick and thin." On the 15th, Mr. McKemie, a Democratic member from Putnam county, introduced resolutions into the House, severely denouncing the Bill and the conduct of the slaveholders. A motion, made by a Hunker, lay upon them upon the table, failed—yeas 35, nays 44. They were then ordered to be printed, by a vote of 46 to 33. It would seem, from this, that the Liberal Democrats, Whigs, and Independent Democrats, have a majority in the House.

New Hampshire, we observe from the reports in the newspapers, is agitated to its foundation. Meetings, without distinction of party, in opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, are being held at all its principal towns. Claremont, Exeter, Portsmouth, Keene, Nashua, Lebanon, Manchester, and Concord, have spoken.

We extract the following from a business letter, from a Democratic friend in Penn Yan, N. Y., dated 13th inst.

Your articles on the Nebraska Territorial bill can't be beat; they show up the whole scheme in its true light, and the question is exciting a deeper feeling of indignation than any I have before witnessed on the Slavery question. The Hards with few exceptions, Silver Greys, Softs, Barnburners, and people of all shades of political opinion, are up in arms against you. You may depend upon it, the suicidal course the friends of Slavery extension, in Congress and out of Congress, have seen fit to pursue on this question, has aroused a spirit amongst the people that will not down at their bidding. You will notice a call (a copy of which I sent you by mail) for a public meeting, this evening, at the Court-House in this place, signed by about two hundred of the substantial business men of this place, and its immediate neighborhood, to pass resolutions instructing the members from this district, (26th.) A. Oliver, to vote against the bill. A copy of the published call was also directed to each member of Congress from this State. I think this the best way of effectually operating upon members in Congress; and, moreover, it publicly commits men against the measure. And those who signed the call will defend the step they have taken. Acting heretofore with the liberal portion of the Democratic party, I am now prepared to go in for an independent organization, and stand up for all compromises and compromisers. S. B. A.

The following is an extract of a letter from Boston, Mass., dated February 10:

It was permitted last evening to listen to the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, in Park Street Church, Boston. Every nook and corner of the church was crowded; the aisle, and every other standing place, as viewed from the gallery, was a mass of human heads, and hundreds were unable to obtain admittance; and yet I am told that the Boston Post, of this morning, says that quite a number of men, boys, and women, went to Park Street church, and listened to Henry Ward Beecher in silence. As a Whig, who gave me this information, and who sat beside me last evening, and a Conservative Whig too, said a more infamous falsehood was never published. Well, let me tell you that the Boston Post and Gen. Pierce, with his whole Cabinet, are making themselves as odious to the North, and to men of all parties, as our bitterest enemies could desire to have them.

All parties are taking hold of this matter. I sit with three Whigs on my left, and two Whigs on my right, and two Democrats on either side of me, all of whom were listening so if their

existence depended upon every word; and who spontaneously said, when the speaker was through, "it was a speech worth going to the end of the world to hear." I cannot but believe the North is to be aroused as it has never been on the aggression of Slavery.

Indiana is beginning to be pervaded by the same spirit of resistance to Slavery aggression which is kindling in her sister States. A correspondent writes us an account of a meeting in Steuben county, of from 2,000 to 3,000 persons, to denounce the Fugitive Law. He adds—"Our community was never aroused to the same degree as now. To-morrow we hold a meeting, in which, for the first time, many of our citizens will hear of the attempt now on foot to open Nebraska to Slavery. They will all be with us, except some half dozen or so."

A citizen of Western Virginia, writing to the New York Evening Post, says that down in "the wilderness of Slavery, a large proportion of the laboring whites live in abject poverty and hopeless ignorance." They have not sufficient intelligence to understand their own interests. But in the border counties of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, the non-slaveholders are a very different set of men.

Strong in numbers, prosperous in circumstances, well, if not highly educated, they appreciate the dignity of free and honest labor, and are as much interested in the protection of Nebraska from the blight of Slavery as their brethren on the other side of that mysterious parallel of latitude. Reared where they could see at the same time the benefits of Liberty and the evils of Slavery, they desire that when they move westward in search of broader and more fertile possessions, that the slaves of no neighboring proprietor may degrade that labor which they hope that themselves and their children may live and thrive.

He adds—"It is the most ridiculous nonsense, to pretend that Gen. Pierce was elected in consequence of his devotion to Slavery. I voted for him, as I voted for Mr. Van Buren in 1840, for Mr. Polk in 1844, and for Gen. Cass in 1848, because in no voting was voting against the protective tariff, and other measures of the Whig party, being all the time, as now, a radical.

JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRAT.

The Defiance (O.) Democrat, an Administration paper, denounces the bill, let who will sanction it. It remarks—"Many of our Democratic contemporaries deem it their duty to defend the bill, to apologize for its objectionable features, and to explain it so that it may not seem so hideous—simply because it is not asserted that it is an Administration measure, and that President Pierce lends it countenance. We don't believe the President has had anything to do with this affair, neither one way or the other; but that it is simply a bid by Mr. Douglas for the support of the South at the next Presidential election. And indeed, if the Administration were lending it aid, and implicated in its conception, this would not render it the less odious, nor palliate in the least its enormities. The introduction of Slavery into Kansas and Nebraska is no part of any Democratic platform as adopted, or that ever will be. A party test of this kind will never be made, and if it is, never will be submitted to."

The Frantion (O.) Spirit of the Times, another Administration paper, is uncompromising in its opposition, and willing that parties should be broken to pieces, rather than the bill should pass. It says—"The Washington Union which professes to be the 'organ of the Administration,' advocates the Douglas bill, which abolishes the Missouri Compromise line, and says 'the Democratic party is entirely pledged to this policy, and that the Democratic Administration is pledged to carry it out to the hilt. It is to be regarded by the Administration as a test of Democratic orthodoxy. Surely this is a novel test of Democracy. It is with the deepest mortification and sorrow that we make the above extract from the accredited organ of the Administration. We exerted all the energies of our humble ability to place Gen. Pierce at the head of the Republic, on the full assurance that he was a 'man of the people.' The moment this bill becomes a law, all our land reform doctrines, so far as they relate to the territory, become worthless for Slavery's degradation, and freemen who live by their work will not, except by the direct necessity, permit themselves to be yoked together with negro slaves in the same pursuits."

The present project is in violation of compact made in good faith; and before the masses will permit Nebraska to be transferred to the domination of the Slave Power, there will be a fierce and mighty struggle in the land—a struggle that will rend into fragments the present political organizations, and reconstruct parties anew. Among our exchanges we notice extracts from more than thirty leading Democratic papers, denouncing in terms of terrible severity this perfidious scheme of iniquity, which the Washington Union says is the "test of Democratic orthodoxy." Verily there is no other test of Democracy incorporated into the Democratic creed, by which public men will be tried. The old test of danger to the Union can no longer be held up as a spectre with which to frighten men from the paths of justice."

The question is entering into the political concerns in Missouri. General Thomas L. Price, the Benton candidate for Congress from the fifth district, authorizes the Jefferson Inquirer to state, that he is in favor of the immediate organization of Nebraska, opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and in favor of the admission of Nebraska into the Union as a State, with or without Slavery, as the People may determine, when they come to form a State Constitution.

The American and Gazette of Philadelphia, a conservative Whig paper, says:—"Every mail brings us fresh evidences of the spread of a great excitement on the subject of this ill-advised measure. The newspapers teem with it, almost to the exclusion of everything else; and public meetings, resolutions, &c., give token that if the bill should become a law, there will be a grand renewal of the whole Slavery agitation. On this subject, the New York Courier and Enquirer lately remarked, with much truth, that the soundest conservative presses of the country are arrayed in opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and most of the papers thus referred to were the advocates and supporters of the Compromise Measures of 1850."

The Philadelphia Democrat, a German paper, "out and out Hunker," occupying about the same position in Philadelphia that the Staats-Zeitung does in New York, says:—"Nevs was an exciting measure introduced into Congress under circumstances which so little warranted it, as in the case of this bill of Senator Douglas. The largest portion of the American people turn away with disgust and contempt from this intrigue. A large portion of the American press condemn the motives which are at the bottom of this measure, blamable the bill itself, and lament, in particular, the fact that the Slavery agitators, who have obtained the bill, are all of whom were listening so if their

hand, that the German press of every political shade unite, like one man, against this uncalled for measure, with the single exception of Mr. Newman, of the New York Staats-Zeitung."

There is in Illinois, says the New York Evening Post, a German paper, called the Demokratische Presse, which hitherto has been a warm supporter of Douglas; but the Presse cannot swallow the Nebraska bill. It says, in its number of February 9:

"The Democrats of Illinois will never allow themselves to be driven from the defense of the clause which protects the North from Slavery, by the influence of great names, or an appeal to party discipline." Our voice," it adds, "against this attempt to overthrow the Missouri Compromise. We have carefully considered the question in all its bearings, and this is our well-grounded opinion, and our unalterable determination."

As to the course of certain Democratic papers at the North, in supporting the Bill, against public sentiment, our exchanges speak with great freedom. Take the following as a sample:

The Press and Nebraska.—The Democratic press of the North is pretty generally in favor of Mr. Douglas's bill in relation to Nebraska. Among the leading and influential papers which advocate Congressional non-intervention in that matter, we notice the Boston Post and Boston Times, the New Hampshire Patriot, the Hartford Times and New Haven Register, of Connecticut, the Philadelphia Pennsylvania, the Detroit Free Press, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Ohio Statesman, the Indiana State Sentinel, with others with scarcely less note and influence.—Cincinnati Enquirer.

The editor of the Boston Post is naval officer just now; and well it may be, in view of the audacious and startling attempt to open this fair domain to the blighting curse of Slavery. The address on the first page, from the Representatives of Ohio to their constituents—and which bears the unmistakable impress of the accurate and logical mind of Senator Chase—we commend to the earnest attention of our readers. Its facts and arguments must command the assent of every candid mind, while its exposure of the infamous project now on foot to extend the area of Slavery must excite the indignation of all not utterly lost to all sense of national or personal honor.

The address is confined mainly to the political view of the case. But there are other considerations of even still higher importance. The moral aspects of the question of Slavery are of the first moment. It is confessedly the embodiment of every element of hostility to the Gospel of Christ and the kingdom of righteousness, which he came to establish. The Gospel is LOVE—Slavery is Egyptian darkness. The Gospel is PURITY—Slavery is the incarnation of lust. The Gospel is JUSTICE—Slavery is the vilest injustice. The Gospel breathes peace and love, and is an earnest ear on the rights and happiness of its victims. Every element of the one is the direct opposite of the other. Before the Gospel can triumph, therefore, Slavery must die. Before the kingdoms of this world can become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, this foul embodiment of the spirit of hell must be swept from the earth.

The question, then, of its extension and perpetuation is one that eminently concerns the Christian.

We might add to these, extracts from other religious papers, especially from the New York Christian Advocate and Journal, the leading paper of the Methodist Episcopal Church, edited by Dr. Bond, formerly of Baltimore, Md.

Some of the Pro-Slavery journals denounce this opposition of the Religious Press, as fanatical and impertinent. They seem to think that Religion has nothing to do with the affairs of this world—that man here has no spiritual nature, and that all his interests are purely material. But they have no objection to receiving "aid and comfort" from the same Religious Press. When distinguished Divines in 1850 united in returning thanks to Daniel Webster for saving the Union, they were lauded to the skies, as sensible, sincere patriots, and the New York Observer became an authority the moment it assailed Mrs. Stowe as an essay to her country. Nothing do they hail with so much pleasure as an elaborate vindication by a religious paper, of the right to buy and sell men and women, and work them without paying them wages. The religious paper that advocates free labor is fanatical; that which defends slave labor is virtuous and God-fearing. Hear what the Richmond (Va.) Enquirer says of a leading journal of the South engaged in this pious work:

The Religious Press.—The Watchman and Observer, in this week supports the Nebraska bill in an article, which, for solid argument, is surpassed by nothing yet written on the subject. This journal never travels beyond its appropriate sphere, but under the influence of some great measure affecting the rights of Slavery; then it never fails to throw the weight of its ability and character on the side of the South. Its article on the Nebraska question is a timely and triumphant response to the earlier appeal of the Watchman and Observer, which signaled the first year of his career as journalist, by resistance to the restriction of 1820, and ever since he has been true to the interests of the South."

Significant.—The National Era, the organ of the Abolitionists, compliments Mr. Bond in extravagant terms on his Nebraska performance.—Richmond Enquirer.

CHARACTERISTIC.—The Richmond Enquirer, an organ of the Administration and the slave power, denounces Mr. Bond in extravagant terms because he has the manliness to esteem the pledged faith of his State as above all the advantages that fraud and tyranny can bring to it.

The Southern Era says, of our Minister to France, that "the Judge is at home in English, and in a short time he will, no doubt, be able to palaver with Napoleon in his own lingo." It is to be hoped so!

THE HUTCHINSON FAMILY.—Our friends will bear in mind that tonight will be the last opportunity they will have of hearing these charming vocalists during their present visit.

In the Ladies' Institute of the Penn Medical University of Philadelphia, the entire expenses of the session, exclusive of boarding and graduating fee, are only \$60, and not \$140, as stated in the advertisement, by mistake.

Martin Shaw killed John Murphy, in Baltimore, on Saturday night. The murderer and several companions seemed to be lying in wait at the Howard engine-house, to kill some unoffending wayfarer or other. The opinion is entertained by some, that, as at present organized, engine companies are great evils. Though the ruffians of Baltimore are very fierce, the people generally and their authorities are assuredly the gentlest of the gentle.

"The Nebraska Iniquity.—If the men who figure in support of the Pro-Slavery Nebraska bill had a reputation to lose, they would surely lose it— for nothing is more certain than that all who vote for that measure will take their places on the roll of infamy. Their worst enemies need not wish them more bankrupt in character than they will be when this act of willful, shameless treachery is consummated. The very attempt, whether successful or not, will soil the faces of those who make it. "Such unprincipled political aspirants may never hope to redeem themselves in the estimation of honest men. Having done what mischief they could in the brief hour of their authority, they will retire into as much obscurity as Providence allows to such as commit the highest crimes—that is, they will be known only to be despised."

So far as Slavery is concerned, the whole movement is sheer infatuation. The old maxim is about to have another verification, "whom the gods will to destroy, they first make fools." Let these political gamblers carry on their war against human rights in this scandalous manner, if they please. They will find in the long run that honesty is the best policy. Anti-Slavery men will not imitate their meanness in disregarding solemn compact. This gives the Slaveholders and their Northern allies will have to themselves. But if there is not a reciprocity of effort, wherever honorable effort can be made, we greatly mistake the temper of the nineteenth century. The prospect now is, that the bill will not be forced through Congress with the suddenness its projector designed."

And the Free Presbyterian, (February 8,) a paper published in Albany, has an article from which we make this extract:

"Nebraska.—This is the absorbing subject just now; and well it may be, in view of the audacious and startling attempt to open this fair domain to the blighting curse of Slavery. The address on the first page, from the Representatives of Ohio to their constituents—and which bears the unmistakable impress of the accurate and logical mind of Senator Chase—we commend to the earnest attention of our readers. Its facts and arguments must command the assent of every candid mind, while its exposure of the infamous project now on foot to extend the area of Slavery must excite the indignation of all not utterly lost to all sense of national or personal honor."

The address is confined mainly to the political view of the case. But there are other considerations of even still higher importance. The moral aspects of the question of Slavery are of the first moment. It is confessedly the embodiment of every element of hostility to the Gospel of Christ and the kingdom of righteousness, which he came to establish. The Gospel is LOVE—Slavery is Egyptian darkness. The Gospel is PURITY—Slavery is the incarnation of lust. The Gospel breathes peace and love, and is an earnest ear on the rights and happiness of its victims. Every element of the one is the direct opposite of the other. Before the Gospel can triumph, therefore, Slavery must die. Before the kingdoms of this world can become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, this foul embodiment of the spirit of hell must be swept from the earth.

The question, then, of its extension and perpetuation is one that eminently concerns the Christian.

We might add to these, extracts from other religious papers, especially from the New York Christian Advocate and Journal, the leading paper of the Methodist Episcopal Church, edited by Dr. Bond, formerly of Baltimore, Md.

Some of the Pro-Slavery journals denounce this opposition of the Religious Press, as fanatical and impertinent. They seem to think that Religion has nothing to do with the affairs of this world—that man here has no spiritual nature, and that all his interests are purely material. But they have no objection to receiving "aid and comfort" from the same Religious Press. When distinguished Divines in 1850 united in returning thanks to Daniel Webster for saving the Union, they were lauded to the skies, as sensible, sincere patriots, and the New York Observer became an authority the moment it assailed Mrs. Stowe as an essay to her country. Nothing do they hail with so much pleasure as an elaborate vindication by a religious paper, of the right to buy and sell men and women, and work them without paying them wages. The religious paper that advocates free labor is fanatical; that which defends slave labor is virtuous and God-fearing. Hear what the Richmond (Va.) Enquirer says of a leading journal of the South engaged in this pious work:

The Religious Press.—The Watchman and Observer, in this week supports the Nebraska bill in an article, which, for solid argument, is surpassed by nothing yet written on the subject. This journal never travels beyond its appropriate sphere, but under the influence of some great measure affecting the rights of Slavery; then it never fails to throw the weight of its ability and character on the side of the South. Its article on the Nebraska question is a timely and triumphant response to the earlier appeal of the Watchman and Observer, which signaled the first year of his career as journalist, by resistance to the restriction of 1820, and ever since he has been true to the interests of the South."

Significant.—The National Era, the organ of the Abolitionists, compliments Mr. Bond in extravagant terms on his Nebraska performance.—Richmond Enquirer.

CHARACTERISTIC.—The Richmond Enquirer, an organ of the Administration and the slave power, denounces Mr. Bond in extravagant terms because he has the manliness to esteem the pledged faith of his State as above all the advantages that fraud and tyranny can bring to it.

The Southern Era says, of our Minister to France, that "the Judge is at home in English, and in a short time he will, no doubt, be able to palaver with Napoleon in his own lingo." It is to be hoped so!

THE HUTCHINSON FAMILY.—Our friends will bear in mind that tonight will be the last opportunity they will have of hearing these charming vocalists during their present visit.

In the Ladies' Institute of the Penn Medical University of Philadelphia, the entire expenses of the session, exclusive of boarding and graduating fee, are only \$60, and not \$140, as stated in the advertisement, by mistake.

Martin Shaw killed John Murphy, in Baltimore, on Saturday night. The murderer and several companions seemed to be lying in wait at the Howard engine-house, to kill some unoffending wayfarer or other. The opinion is entertained by some, that, as at present organized, engine companies are great evils. Though the ruffians of Baltimore are very fierce, the people generally and their authorities are assuredly the gentlest of the gentle.

The Senate Chamber was crowded at an early hour with ladies and gentlemen, who had disregarded the unfavorable condition of the streets, and come forth to hear the eloquent Senator from Massachusetts in the cause of Freedom. Mr. Sumner spoke with fine effect to an audience who gave breathless attention to his words.

In the House, Mr. J. C. Allen, from the Free State of Illinois, spoke with earnestness and vehemence in support of the Nebraska bill. He paid a large instalment of his tribute to the dominant Slave Power. Mr. Dent, of Georgia, and Mr. Grov, of Pennsylvania, debated the Homestead Bill.

The snow continued to fall in this city from 8 A. M. yesterday, until the same hour to-day; and, although the weather was mild, it accumulated to the depth of about fourteen inches. But there is a bright warm sun to-day, and a general thaw.

SLIGHTING.—The snow is to-day rather soft for this purpose; but as high as twenty-five dollars has been paid for three hours' use of a sleigh and four horses.

No mails have been received in this city from the North since 11 A. M. yesterday.

A meeting at Cambridge, of gentlemen interested in astronomy and mathematics, has organized, under the name of the "Cambridge branch of the American Astronomical Association," it being contemplated to have a general society, with branches established in various parts of the United States. Professor Pierce is the President.

Several of the leading capitalists of New York, with Messrs. Corcoran of Washington, Mr. Vinton of Ohio, McLane of Baltimore, and other distinguished capitalists, are making application to the Wisconsin Legislature for the charter of the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad Company, with a capital of fifty millions, to build a railroad from any point on the valley of the lake, Mississippi, or Gulf of Mexico, to the Pacific Ocean.

An aged gentleman of Salem informs the Lynn Bay State, that a ship was launched in that place, on the 25th December, 1794, and that the weather was so warm on that day that numerous persons went into the water to bathe, as in the summer season. The weather was remarkably mild throughout the whole of that season.

A pigeon-roost, ten miles long by five broad, in Franklin county, Indiana, it is said, is now swarming with pigeons. The roar of their wings, on arriving and departing from the roost, is tremendous, and the flocks during the flight darken the heavens. The ground is covered to the depth of several inches with their excrement. Thousands are killed by casual fire from breaking limbs of trees, and hundreds of hogs live upon them.

Foster Bowditch, late postmaster at Troy, was arrested on the 13th instant, in that city, by Marshal Mott, charged with embezzlement of United States moneys, while in office, to the amount of more than \$8,000.

THE LANDMARK OF FREEDOM.

SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES SUMNER

AGAINST THE REPEAL OF THE PROHIBITION OF SLAVERY NORTH OF THIRTY-SIX DEGREES THIRTY MINUTES.

In Senate, February 21, 1854.

MR. PRESIDENT: I approach this discussion with awe. The mighty question, with untold issues, which it involves, oppresses me. Like a portentous cloud, surcharged with irresistible storm and ruin, it seems to fill the whole heavens, making me painfully conscious how unequal I am to the occasion—how unequal, also, is all that I can say, to all that feel.

In delivering my sentiments here to-day, I shall speak frankly—according to my convictions, without concealment or reserve. But if anything fell from the Senator from Illinois, which might seem to challenge a personal or national rebuke, I desire to say that I shall not enter upon it. Let not a word or a tone pass my lips to draw attention, for a moment, from the transcendent theme, by the side of which Senators and Presidents are but dwarfs. I would not forget those amenities which belong to this place, and are so well calculated to temper the antagonism of debate; nor can I desire to remember and to feel, that amidst all diversities of opinion, we are the representatives of thirty-six States, knit together by an indissoluble tie, and constituting that Pious Unit, which we all embrace by the endearing name of country.

The question presented for your consideration is not surpassed in grandeur by any which has occurred in our national history since the Declaration of Independence. In every aspect it assumes gigantic proportions, whether we simply consider the extent of territory concerned, or the public faith, or national policy which it affects, or that higher question—that Question of Questions, as far above others as Liberty is above the common things of life—which it opens anew for judgment.

It concerns an immense region, larger than the original thirteen States, lying in extent with all the existing Free States, stretching over prairie, field, and forest—interlined by silver streams, skirted by protecting mountains, and constituting the heart of the North American continent—only a little smaller, let me add, than three great European countries combined—Italy, Spain, and France, each of which, in succession, has dominated over the world. This territory has already been likened, on this floor, to the Garden of God. The simile is found, not merely in its present pure and virgin character, but in its actual geographical situation, occupying central space on this hemisphere, which, in its general relations, may well compare with that early Asiatic home. We are told that,

Southward through Eden went a river (large) so here we have a stream which is larger than the Euphrates. And here, too, amidst all the smiling products of nature, lavished by the hand of God, is the goodly tree of Liberty, planted by our fathers, which, without exaggeration, or even imagination, may be likened to

High amidst, blooming embosomed fruit, Of vegetable gold.

It is with regard to this territory, that you are now called to exercise the grandest function of the lawgiver, by establishing those rules of policy which will determine its future character. As the twig is bent the tree inclines; and the influence impressed upon the early days of an empire—like those upon a child—are of inconceivable importance to its future well or woe. The bill now before us, proposes to organize and equip two new territorial establishments, with governors, secretaries, legislative councils, legislators, judges, marshals, and the whole

machinery of civil society. Such a measure, at any time, would deserve the most careful attention. But, at the present moment, it justly excites a peculiar interest, from the effort made—on pretences unavailing by facts—in violation of solemn covenant, and of the early principles of our fathers—to open this immense region to Slavery.

According to existing law, this Territory is now guarded against Slavery by a positive prohibition, embodied in the Act of Congress, approved March 6th, 1820, preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, as a sister State, and in the following explicit words:

"SEC. 8. Be it further enacted, That in all that Territory ceded by Great Britain to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, SLAVERY AND VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, otherwise than as the punishment of crimes, SHALL BE, AND IS HEREBY, FOREVER PROHIBITED."

It is now proposed to set aside this prohibition; as to the way in which the deed shall be done. From the time of its first introduction, in the report of the Committee on Territories, the proposition has assumed different shapes; and it sometimes to assume as many as fifteen; now, one thing in form, and now another; now, like a river, and then like a flame; but, in every form and shape, identical in substance; with but one end and aim—their all-end-and-all—the overthrow of the Prohibition of Slavery.

At first, it proposed simply to declare, that the States formed out of this Territory should be admitted into the Union, with no restriction whatever upon the subject of Slavery. For some reason this was not satisfactory, and then it was precipitately proposed to declare, that the prohibition in the Missouri act "was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, and is hereby declared inoperative." But this would not do; and it is now proposed to declare, that the Prohibition, "being inconsistent with the principles of non-intervention by Congress, in Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void."

All this is to be done on pretences founded upon the Slavery enactments of 1850. Now, sir, I am not here to speak in behalf of those measures, or to lean in any way upon their support. Relating to different subject-matters contained in different acts, which have been successively, at different times, and by different votes—some persons voting for one measure, and some voting for another, and very few voting for all, they cannot be regarded as a unit, embodying conditions of compact, or compromise, if you please, adopted equally by all parties, and therefore, obligatory on all parties. But since this broken series of measures has been added as an apology for the proposition now before us, I desire to say, that such a course of non-intervention by Congress, in Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void."

On this head there are several points to which I would merely call attention, and then pass on. First: The Slavery enactments of 1850 did not pretend, in terms, to touch, much less to change, the condition of the Louisiana Territory, which was already fixed by Congress, and did not directly annul the "newly-acquired Territories," the condition of which was not already fixed by Congressional enactment. The two transactions related to different subject-matters. Secondly: The enactments do not directly touch the subject of Slavery, during the territorial existence of Utah and New Mexico; but they provide prospectively, that when admitted as States, they shall be received "with or without Slavery."

Here certainly can be no objection, of an act of Congress which directly concerns a Territory during its territorial existence. Thirdly: During all the discussion of these measures in Congress, and afterwards before the people, and through the public press, at the North and the South alike, no person was heard to intimate that the prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Act was in any way disturbed. And, fourthly: The acts themselves contain a formal provision, that "nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify anything in a certain article of the resolutions annexing Texas, wherein it is expressly declared, that in territory north of the Missouri Compromise line, "Slavery, or involuntary servitude, except for crime, shall be prohibited."

I do not dwell on these things. These pretences have been already amply refuted by Senators who have preceded me. It is clear, beyond all contradiction, that the prohibition of Slavery in this territory has not been superseded or in any way annulled by the Slavery Act of 1850. The proposition before you is, therefore, original in its character, without sanction from any former legislation; and it must, accordingly, be judged by its merits, as an original proposition.

Here let it be remembered, that the friends of Freedom are not open to any charge of aggression. They are now standing on the defensive, guarding the early intrenchments thrown up by our fathers. No proposition to abolish Slavery anywhere is before you; but, on the contrary, a proposition to abolish Freedom. The term Abolitionist, which is so often applied in reproach, justly belongs, on this occasion, to him who would overthrow this well-established landmark. He is, indeed, no Abolitionist of Slavery; let him be called, sir, an Abolitionist of Freedom. For myself, whether with many or few, my place is taken. Even if alone, my feeble arm shall not be wanting as a bar against this outrage.

On two distinct grounds, "both strong against the deed," I arraign this proposition: First, in the name of Public Faith; as an infraction of the solemn obligations announced beyond recall by the admission of Missouri into the Union as a Sister State; Secondly, I arraign it in the name of Freedom, as an unjustifiable departure from the original Anti-Slavery policy of our fathers. These two heads I propose to consider in their order, glancing upon the latter at the objections to the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories.

And here, sir, before I approach the argument, I indulge me with a few preliminary words on the character of this proposition. Slavery is the forcible subjection of one human being, in person, labor, or property, to the will of another. In this simple statement is involved its whole history. There is no offense against religion, against morals, against humanity, which may not stalk, in the license of this institution, "unwhipped of justice." For the husband and wife there is no marriage; for the mother there is no assurance that her infant child will not be ravished from her breast; for all who bear the name of Slave, there is nothing that they can call their own. Without a father, without a mother, almost without a God, he has nothing but a master. It would be contrary to the Rule of Right, which is ordained by God, if such a system, though mitigated even by a patriarchal kindness, and by a plausible physical comfort, could be otherwise than pernicious in its influences. It is confessed, that the master suffers not less than the slave. And this is not all. The whole social fabric is disorganized; labor loses its dignity; industry sickens; education loses its school, and all the land of Slavery is impoverished. And now, sir, when we consider of mankind is in any way benefited by these things, when, throughout the civilized world, a slaveholder is by word and deed, and as a nation, are about to open a new mar-

ket to the traffickers in flesh, that haunt the shambles of the South. Such an act, at this time, is removed from all reach of that palliation often vouchsafed to Slavery. This wrong, as it is explicitly told, by those who seek to defend it, is not our original sin. It was entailed upon us, so we are instructed, by our ancestors; and the responsibility is often, with exultation, thrown upon the mother country. Now, without stopping to inquire into the value of this apology, which is never adduced in behalf of other abuses, and which availed nothing against that kindly power, imposed by the mother country, and which our fathers overthrew, it is sufficient, for the present purpose, to know, that it is now proposed to make Slavery our original act. Here is a fresh case of actual transgression, which we cannot cast upon the shoulders of any progenitors, nor upon any mother country, distant in time or place. The Congress of the United States, the people of the United States, at this day, in this vaulted period of light, will be responsible for it, so that it shall be said hereafter, so long as the dismission of Slavery is read, in the year of Christ 1854, that the act of deliberate sin was passed, by which a vast territory was opened to its inroads.

Alone in the company of nations does our country assume this hateful championship. In despot Russia, the serfdom which constitutes the "peculiar institution" of that great empire, is never allowed to travel with