...tablished this Republic upon the plain and simple Declaration of Independence. They found, however, that the broad principle they had asserted, that all men are born free and equal, could not, without great danger to some of the communities in which involuntary servitude had been tolerated by circumstances beyond their control, be carried out in its full application without the slow process of time and the teachings of experience. It was, therefore, agreed in forming the Federal Constitution that the subject of Slavery in the respective States should be controlled by the care of the Governments of those several States; but all were agreed, almost without a dissenting voice, that the time should come when full effect should be given to the principle of the Declaration of Independence, and that a Republican Government should exist on this Continent on the broad basis of civil freedom. The time only when this consummation should be reached was left to the wisdom, sagacity and determination of the several State Governments. In two States, at that time, Slavery did not exist—Massachusetts and New-Hampshire. In the others it existed to a greater or less degree. These men, however, who had gone into the work of establishing this great Government, set themselves earnestly and resolutely to work within their respective States to eradicate this evil from the country. In the States of New-York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New-Jersey and Rhode Island the work was, in time, completed; and the patriotic statesmen of those days and States handed down to their descendants the State Governments and States free from this evil, and for that act, as a citizen of New-York, I feel profoundly, immeasurably grateful to those who preceded us. [Great applause.] Under the Constitution, by which compact we all bound ourselves, the Government of the United States undertook and agreed that, in case of insurrection or rebellion in any State or States of the Union, upon application of the Executive of that State to the President of the United States, the forces of the Confederacy should be employed to restore and preserve tranquility, and that pledge no State, no portion of a State, no part of the great country, from the commencement of its Government to this time, has broken, nor for a moment faltered in yielding full obedience to that article of the Constitution. [Applause.] The northern part of the country felt the possibility of insurrection at some time. They knew that at the South there lay a mine rich in evils, fruitful in all the elements of passion, disaffection, and rebellion; and therefore, while they were content to leave entire jurisdiction to the State Government, they agreed to insure tranquillity, as one of the greatest blessings of civilized life; and to that pledge I repeat, the northern part of the country has proved eminently faithful. And I say, here in the North, that there is no cause in which I would more willingly bear a musket than to restore tranquillity in case of an insurrection in a sister State. I would feel as fully justified in wielding a sword in such a case as I would in putting down a disorderly mob, in case of its resisting the authority of the law, in our own City. At the time of the Revolution, when we were at war with Great Britain, a large territory lay beyond the Allegany Mountains to which many States lay claim, while there was, in fact, no real ground for any claim except that such territory was acquired by the united army of the whole Confederacy. With the exception of the claims of Georgia and South Carolina, these claims were all ceded to the United States before the adoption of the Federal Constitution. New-York, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Virginia laid claim to the territory northwest of the Ohio. New-York though having the best claim, led the way, made the first sacrifice, and voluntarily surrendered her claim to the United States. The other States, in time, followed her example, and the territory became public territory, a part of the U. States. The North-west Ordinance for the government of the territory, thus granted by these States, prohibited Slavery forever north west of the Ohio. Rufus King and Thomas Jefferson leading the way. Involuntary servitude north west of the Ohio was prohibited forever! [Great applause.] Looking at the States which occupy that position, their rapid growth, their wealth, all their institutions, may we not well say that the people of those States owe an immeasurable debt of gratitude to the men who laid the basis of their government, the men who proposed and carried out the North West Ordinance? [Great applause.] In process of time Louisiana was acquired, and in Louisiana proper, what was then called the province of New Orleans, Slavery prevailed to such a degree that it was not deemed advisable to disturb it. When Missouri asked admission into our Confederation it was deemed proper to apply the principle of the North West Ordinance to her case, and then sprung up a great contest whether or not the application of that principle should be made a condition of admitting Missouri into the Union. Finally, however, it was agreed that, in consideration of her being admitted without the application of the North-west principle, involuntary servitude should be forever prohibited north of 36 deg. 30 min. of northern latitude. This Compromise received the unwilling assent of the North, though it was strongly urged by almost every Southern representative. I recollect that, on the Sabbath morning when the news came to this City, it caused a gloom equal to that produced by any public intelligence I had witnessed for 40 years; and, on that day, many an anxious and humble Christian offered his prayers to the Throne of Grace, that the generation might be forgiven for listening on the new State the mischief which had already caused so much evil in the States south west of the Ohio, and so grievously retarded their progress. However, the deed was done, and Arkansas came into the Union, the North remaining true to the principles of the Compromise, as the North has ever done. A few years later action was to be taken, with respect to the territory acquired from Mexico; and without adverting to the principles upon which that Compromise was made, without saying it was a Compromise that I heartily and sincerely concur in, I may however, say that its principles have been adhered to by the people of the North; but, how far they may adhere to them when the principles of the Compromise are repudiated by citizens of other parts of the country, time must determine. [Applause.] But I object to this measure now sprung upon us, not because I think it is desired by the Southern people. Let me do them full justice. I do not think this agitation concerning Slavery has, in any degree or measure, sprung from the bosom of the people in the Southern States. It has arisen among the agitators in the Congress of their Representatives assembled at Washington, in their fierce desire for political power. They have, ever since 1834, sought to use the natural anxiety their constituents feel for the preservation of civil tranquility and the safety of their property, as a political lever to promote objects of personal ambition; and in making that assertion I mean to adhere to facts to prove it. I must do justice to the men, the citizens, the people, of the Southern States, and say that, while on all occasions, they must have felt the most intense anxiety for the preservation of order within their borders, they have never entered into this feeling which disgraces the men who represent them at Washington. [Applause.] In 1834 an insurrection, springing out of religious fanaticism, appeared at Southampton, in Virginia—the first that excited any great alarm in that portion of the country. What was the conduct of the people of the North, the leaders of both political parties? In Boston, Philadelphia, New-York, Albany, Troy, Utica, and elsewhere, they united; meetings of the most respectable and influential citizens in all the cities were held, exhorting to tranquillity, and prohibiting all interference with the condition of the slave population at the South; and to such an extent did this feeling go that when the representatives from this part of the country went to Washington, they asked what they could do to secure tranquillity. The reply which they received may be seen on the records of the Senate of the United States. In relation to our own State legislation, the demand was that we should pass laws prohibiting any expression of opinion of Slavery by the press, or in public meetings; that on that topic we should be bound to a silence as strict as any that the despotism of Russia could attempt to enforce. Neither printing, nor writing, nor speaking was to be allowed. But the men who made this demand knew very well when they made it that no State could pass such a law without violating the Constitution of that State, and the Federal Constitution. They also asked a law prohibiting the transmission by the mails of any letter, pamphlet or newspaper in which Slavery was discussed. Could such a law be enacted? On the very face of their request appears the insincerity of Southern members; they knew these things were not feasible, and they suggested nothing to put an end to a subject which they always found convenient as a means of preserving their personal popularity, and thus as a lever to their political ambition. Nay, more! When, afterward, the subject of saving the Union was got up, and Representatives from Mississippi and Virginia informed Congress that the Union would be put an end to week after next unless their demands were acceded to when such language was held by men in such a position, where was the response by the Southern States? What response arose from any—from jury presentment or militia muster, south of Mason and Dixon's Line? Had sounds so portentous, and action of such dreadful moment ensued there, would we not have heard of them here? But there was nothing of the kind. On the contrary, the Southern Representatives, when they went home and got up a Convention at Nashville, were treated—how? Why, in a manner almost equivalent to being turned out of the borders of the town. Yes, fellow citizens, the people of the South are faithful to the Union; and this cry which has startled your consciences and awakened your fears, but at the same time aroused your resolution, comes not from them, the people of the South, your fellow-citizens of the Southern States, but from men who make their living by fawning round the feet of executive power, and who maintain their interest in the Capital and at home by an eternal agitation of this question of Slavery. [Loud applause.] But while I feel detestation of the conduct of these men, I must say I feel deeper indignation and detestation of the Northern representatives who are false to the principles of freedom which they drew [illegible] their birth; false to the sentiment of the community [illegible] they were reared, among which they have [illegible] which they represent, or should represent. [Loud applause.] Recreant to those principles, they [illegible] own [illegible] eat dirt at the feet and from the hands of their [illegible] masters and loaf-givers. [Tremendous applause.] [illegible] we now before us a question of deep importance [illegible] country; a question the expression of public opinion [illegible] to which those men have endeavored to shirk [illegible] trying it through Congress. They have sought to [illegible] public opinion by telling you that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. It is very strange indeed that 34 years should have passed away since that Compromise was concluded without anybody but Stephen Douglas of Illinois being able to discover this very remarkable fact. There it stood on the Statute Book, and all the astute lawyers who have examined it for more than a third of a century never found out what Stephen Douglas has hit upon. How strange that the Cabinet of Monroe, a Cabinet of which there has hardly been the superior since the days of Washington, determined, when the measure was presented to them, that the law was constitutional! Who composed that Cabinet? I know [illegible], with the exception of Wm. H. Crawford, [illegible] South, [illegible] gifted, noble and eloquent, [illegible]

had not then discovered that Slavery is the corner stone of a republic. Wm. Wirt, a profound jurist, an eloquent lawyer, as ardent a patriot as Virginia ever sent to the public councils; Smith Thompson, a jurist of our own State, by whom the spotless ermine of justice was worn for nearly half a century; John Quincy Adams, [great applause] who never assented to any public act without deeply feeling his responsibility to his country and his God [applause]—these men, when that measure was produced to them, came to the determination that it was constitutional; and now, at this day, a man hardly known except as a politician, not known to the legal world, not known among men of the highest order of mind in the country, jumps up, and with sparrow twitterings announces that it is unconstitutional! At the last meeting held in this room one gentleman thought it necessary to show that Senator Douglas, on a previous occasion, had held a different opinion; though it needful to point out his inconsistency. The inconsistency of Stephen Douglas! Why, were he anything else than inconsistent the result would be a most unexpected one indeed to all who have witnessed his public career. Inconsistency is part of the character of such men; and I shall not now attempt to strengthen the opinions of the authorities whom I have cited by appealing to the inconsistency of Senator Douglas as an additional argument. There is another observation which I think it proper to make on this occasion. There has been a great deal said to the effect that we ought to commit to the people of the territories the legislation on this subject, as would be done to the people of a State; and inasmuch as the people of a State must, in their own case, have charge of the whole subject, that therefore it is proper and right to hand it over to the people of the territory. Should Congress act in accordance with this doctrine, it would therein shrink from one of its high duties, for to it, by the Constitution, is committed jurisdiction over this territory. By that instrument Congress has a right to make all needful regulations for the government of territories. The question, therefore, now comes up, and the people of the United States have the deepest interest in it; they must determine now, when the territory is in its infant state, when it is about to start into social existence, whether it shall take the character of a free, prosperous and vigorous State, or be weakened, paralyzed by now having infused into it an evil which will go on increasing in virulence, diffusing still more its enervating influence, as the State grows older. North west of the Ohio we see the beneficial effect of freedom incorporated in social institutions. We look at the South-west, and behold the melancholy reverse of the picture. Kentucky and Ohio sprung into existence as States nearly at the same time. Where are they now? Kentucky has hardly half the population of Ohio. Tennessee and Indiana present a similar contrast. Michigan assumed the form of an independent State seventeen years after Missouri. The soil, the climate, the location and position of Missouri are all superior; but where are they now? Missouri looks on with the enfeebled air of a Slave State and sees Michigan fast advancing to the first rank of the confederacy. On us, then, it devolves to say whether Nebraska shall be a Free or a Slave State; whether it shall take the feeble stand of those States which have not rooted out from their soil that baneful growth, or whether it shall take such a position as our own. And as we prefer our own condition of freedom, and as history and experience combine to sanction our choice in attesting its wisdom, let us, with one voice, insist that when Congress legislates for these new communities it shall do so wisely, with a tender, nay, just care for the future, as any one among you would do for his own children in their state of infancy; in undertaking to govern those incapable of governing themselves, we should not allow them privileges which may be used for mischief. In this case Congress should exercise its functions, and, according to the act of 1820, put Slavery under a perpetual prohibition so long as the territory remains under the jurisdiction of Congress. There is a legal position on which I plant myself, satisfied that no legal casuistry, no subtle sophistry of argument, can drive me from it. If we were to legislate merely for this generation—if this life of thirty or fifty years were to be the "end and end all here"—if life were to be regarded merely as a scene of present enjoyment—if, like the people before Noah, we were to say, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die"—if, like the vile courtesan of Louis XV., we considered that after us the deluge might come—why, then we might say, "Let "posterity take care of itself; sufficient for us is the evil "of the present moment." But if we have any duties other than what are prompted by regard to self—if we have to pay to posterity the debt of gratitude due to our ancestors—if the future has any claim upon us—if there is anything in right and honor, and sound policy, and state-manlike expediency—if the principles of our Government and the Declaration of our Independence are to be regarded as anything more than an empty sound—then all those high and holy considerations call upon us to agitate and to act; to see that this new community, helpless unless we help her—just springing into existence—shall not have her youthful limbs loaded with the shackles of the slave; but, untrammeled and unfettered, that she shall advance bravely, strongly and hopefully, in her due course—that race of freedom which we ourselves have run. Mr. Blunt concluded his address amid the most deafening applause, which was renewed over and over again. Silence being at length restored, he read the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That we, the mechanics and working men of New-York, heartily concur in the stern protest recently uttered in this place by the great meeting called by the leading merchants and bankers of this city against the threatened repeal of the Missouri Compromise; that we cordially agree with the sentiment uttered by the presiding officer on that occasion, that "a bargain is a bargain," and that we do not understand, and will not tolerate the doctrine of "repudiation;" and with the declaration of Mr. Gerard, that "the common and honorable sentiment of all mankind will condemn it," and that we deem it proper to express our surprise and regret that the respectful Resolutions adopted by that meeting, when presented by Senator Fish to the Senate, were refused a reading.

2. *Resolved*, That the pretense that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise is a legitimate consequence of the acts of 1850, has been well shown to be without foundation in fact by several Senators, and especially by Senator Houston, whose manly utterances we tender the honor we warmly appreciate; that the doctrine broached in some quarters, that the Compromise was unconstitutional, and therefore ought to be repealed, is alike novel and startling, involving a denial of our constitutional rights conflicting with the views of our greatest statesmen and the repeated action of our Government; that until the Territories are organized into States and admitted to the Union, the people thereof have no right to make rules and regulations for the government of the same, but that such right by the Constitution belongs absolutely and exclusively to the people of the United States in Congress assembled.

3. *Resolved*, That a decent respect on the part of our Representatives for the rights, opinions and feelings of the people, demands that no great change in our settled national policy—no change permanently affecting the mutual interests and relations of the various sections of the Union—should be suddenly adopted by Congress until a fair opportunity has been afforded for an expression of the views of their constituents, from whom alone all just power is derived; that any attempt to hurry this bill through the Senate or to force its passage through the House, in order to forestall the judgment of the people, would be an act treacherous and treasonable, and that we appeal to both Senators and Representatives by their oaths of office, and by the confidence which has been generously reposed in them, not to be persuaded by any inducements into so great wrong. That, speaking in the name of the people, we respectfully but frankly remind them that they are our servants and not our masters.

4. *Resolved*, That the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, in order to introduce slavery into our free territory of Nebraska and Kansas, would be in every point a crime, a breach of plighted faith, a violation not only of our just rights but of the rights of man, in defiance of Republican principles and Christian duty.

5. *Resolved*, That the intimation by Senator Badger that all the Southern Whig Senators will vote for the bill, has aroused equally our sorrow and our indignation. That we of the North repeat the warning already given them by the merchants of our City,—that with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise harmony and confidence are at an end for ever, and every existing compromise other than those embodied in the Federal Constitution between the slave masters of the South and the free laborers of the North and West, will be violated by their own want of faith.

6. *Resolved*, That in regard to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the Free States, if such there be, who are disposed to abet this scheme and surrender the territories secured to us by that compact, we warn the Government and the country that they do not truly represent the people, whose most cherished rights, principles and interests they are betraying for the promotion of their personal ambition, or at the dictation of party leaders. And we warn all our public servants who may be tempted to falter in their allegiance to the rights of free labor, that a day of reckoning is at hand.

7. *Resolved*, That the agitation and alarm already excited throughout the free States at the proposed violation of our ancient rights, and the popular indignation, not only of our native, but also of our adopted citizens at the scheme of depriving them of homesteads in Kansas and Nebraska, unless they will consent to work side by side with slaves, indicates the bitter curse that awaits those who shall dare to trample on compacts and remove the landmarks of Freedom. That we call upon the free laborers of the North to forget all difference of party and to stand shoulder to shoulder in defense of our common rights, and that we call upon all the ministers of religion, by the high duties of their holy office, to invoke the Ruler of Nations to turn the hearts of those who are contemplating this stupendous wrong.

8. *Resolved*, That we call upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to resist unflinchingly, in such manner as they shall deem meet, all attempts, from whatever quarter, to repeal, abrogate or render inoperative directly or indirectly, the eighth section of the Missouri Act; and that we call upon the President of the United States, in case of the passage of such a bill by Congress, to secure that compact from violation by interposing his constitutional veto.

9. *Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives of the State of New-York, in Congress, for presentation to those bodies, to the Governor of each State of the Union, and to the President of the United States.

Having read the resolutions which elicited frequent and enthusiastic applause from the audience, Mr. Blunt said: In presenting these resolutions, which expresses the opinions of this meeting, as the hearty concurrence it has expressed sufficiently proves, I must say that I hope they will awake a kindred feeling throughout the North; and that the expression of this indignant feeling will roll in tones of thunder to their Representatives at Washington, warning them what they may expect, if they falter in the discharge of their high duties. [Great applause.]

JOHN P. HALE now presented himself to the audience, and was received with a perfect tempest of applause, which was renewed again and again for several minutes. Order being restored, he spoke in these words:

MY FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: I chanced yesterday afternoon to be in the Senate Chamber of the United States when Gov. Seward, one of your Representatives, presented to that body—[applause]—I say when Gov. Seward presented to that body the resolutions of the Legislature of this State remonstrating against the passage of the bill to which allusion has been made this evening. The resolutions were received respectfully, quietly read, ordered to be printed, and laid upon the table, producing no more impression than was produced a moment after when the Clerk of the House came in and announced that the House had passed a certain bill upon some very trivial subject, upon which they asked the concurrence of the Senate—the one produced as much excitement, as much emotion, as the other. I could but go back with my mind's eye some three quarters of a century, and call to mind the occasion when some other resolutions were presented by a certain other body, prior to the American Revolution. When the Stamp Act was passed by the British Parliament, and was sent over to these colonies to be enforced, there was a town meeting held in a town in New England, then not comprising over twenty thousand inhabitants—the town of Boston—and at it the people resolved that the Stamp Act should not be enforced in the town of Boston, and they sent their resolutions to the British Parliament. They were not read and laid upon the table; but the Stamp Act was repealed. [Applause.] Why was it that the voice of three millions of people, speaking through their Legislature organ, the Legislature, of their State, and presenting those resolutions to the National Legislature, did not produce one thousandth part of the effect that the resolutions and town meeting in Boston produced upon the British Parliament? The answer is plain. The men of Boston were in earnest, and meant what they said; and the British Parliament knew, when they received those resolutions that the men who passed them had the resolution to live up to them. The Senate did not believe that of yours. If they had they would not have been laid upon the table. [Applause.] Now, my friends, I never rose to address an audience when I felt so inadequate to the task as I do to-night, because I think I appreciate something of the importance and something of the magnitude of this question. If I were to stand before you to-night to argue the case of one solitary individual, and upon the determination to which you might come rested his fate for the future of his life, and by the determination to which you came his fate hereafter was to be freedom or slavery, I should find the responsibility too overwhelming for my poor capacity. But how does such a question as that sink into utter insignificance in comparison with the question you come here to-night to consider? Look on it for a moment. Look at that map—[pointing to the large map suspended in front of the organ]—important as is the position it gives the territory, it is not quite geographically correct. That territory, I say, lying in the center of the United States, with the waters from its mountain peaks running now into the Atlantic, now into the Gulf of Mexico, and then into the northern lakes. That territory comprises an area of 485,000 miles, more than ten times the size of the State of New-York, and fifty times the size of the State of Massachusetts. It occupies a position in relation to the rest of the country which the Chinese claims for his country in relation to the rest of the world. It is the Central Kingdom; and if the reports of those who have explored it be true, it only needs the hand of civilization to make it also the Flowery Land. Well, the question is how shall it be governed? and, oh God! that it should be a question, when for thirty-four years we have slumbered in the security that it was ours—ours beyond peradventure. [Applause.] Why, Daniel Webster on the 7th of March, 1850, in his celebrated speech which won him so much of fame and so much of obloquy, declared that the position of that Territory as to Slavery was fixed by an irrepealable law. But now we are awakened to the fact that what we supposed for more than the time of a generation to be settled is safe and secure no longer. The question which we supposed our fathers settled more than a third of a century ago has come up to be settled again. What is it—what shall that great land be? Let me tell you; it is for you to say; it is for the mechanics and the workingmen—the strong hands, the honest hearts and clear heads—the voters of this City to say. [Applause.] The honorable gentleman who preceded me says he has a contempt for those Southern men who are continually agitating this subject, but he has more for the Northern men who are treacherous to their trust! But let me tell you that there would be no Northern doughfaces to vote for that Territory to be given up to Slavery unless they did it knowing that they represented doughface constituencies. [Loud applause.] Let the people of this City take hold of this question, and let it be known that they are in earnest. Let the laborers of New-York stand up, in the conscious pride of their labor, and determine that they will reckon at the polls with the men who vote to give up this fair inheritance to Slavery, and I tell you it will not be done. There will be no treachery at Washington unless there be treachery in New-York to precede it; but let New-York speak out and that land is safe. That country will soon be settled; the wars and oppressions of the Old World are turning out hundreds and thousands annually to people it. Soon another tide will come from the East across the Pacific, as now it pours across the Atlantic, and the tides will meet and settle there in the central land, and the Chinese will find that he has left one central kingdom to find another on another continent. And what shall be its institutions of government? Shall they be such as made New York and New England what they are? Shall the hum of busy industry be heard on its hills and in its valleys—shall churches and school houses and academies dot its hills? [Loud cries of "Yes, yes," applause.] Shall spires of Christian churches point from grateful hearts to a beneficent God? ["Yes," "yes"—applause.] And when the laborer goes home at night, wearied with his toil, shall he look in the face of a wife that is his, and on the children of his love, secured to him by the laws not only of God, but of man also? [Applause.] Shall the grateful song of thanksgiving go up to the Giver of every good, from free hearts and happy homes; or instead of that, shall the clank of the chain and the wail of the bondman go up, filling the ear of Him who has revealed it as His peculiar glory that He is the God of the oppressed? [Applause.] That is what you have to settle; not for this year—not for this generation—not for this century, but for all coming time, so long as the institutions of human government shall influence the condition of man. And, my friends, let the wings of your imagination take flight, and see if you can scan the magnitude, the importance, the immensity and infinity of this question. Let me ask you my friends—my political friends—if this is one of those minor questions which you are willing to trade off at the polls for a place in the Custom House? ["No, no," laughter.] Are there not some things that are a little higher and holier than to be put in the political shambles for the market, and is not this one of those questions? Now it is proposed to do all this; it is proposed to throw down the barrier which you see marked on that map, not to let freedom come down below it, but to let Slavery march up above it; and that is the issue—Freedom or Slavery. Well, now, I want to deal with this thing fairly—I want to argue the question that has been presented. It is said that the measure is to be passed for two reasons—the first is because the restrictions of the Missouri Compromise are "unconstitutional," and the second, because they are "inconsistent with the legislation of 1850." I will argue it briefly. You may think it strange that I should propose to argue a constitutional question in a mixed assembly like this. It is the very sort of an assembly in which I would like to argue it. Some people affect to think that common people cannot understand a constitutional question. They think that a man must be as stupid as an over-fed Alderman, or corrupt as a member of Congress, before he is fit to appreciate a constitutional question. [Laughter and cheers.] I propose to put it to you, my friends, in the confidence that you can understand it. Let us first examine the question as to the constitutionality of prohibiting Slavery in the Territories. Let us suppose in the first place, there was no provision or precedent about it, taking it as a mere question of abstract reasoning. The United States own territory; suppose then, there is no precedent or provision in the Constitution, but the simple fact that they own it. Through whom do the United States speak? Why, through their Government—through Congress. Then, if the United States own the territories, excluding all other title, and the only mode through which they can speak is through Congress, would it not seem to follow in the absence of any express provision, that Congress had the right and power to legislate? That seems too plain to admit of question. Well, then, the next question I put is, how the early fathers of the republic understood this question. Did they understand that Congress had the right to legislate for the exclusion of Slavery from the Territories? We can best answer it by history. The Constitution was adopted in 1789. In 1787 the Continental Congress passed an ordinance excluding Slavery from every inch of the territory that the United States then owned. Two years after the first Congress under the Federal Constitution met, and one of the very first acts which that Congress performed was to pass unanimously an act, the preamble of which declares that it was meant to render the ordinance of 1787 compatible with the Constitution of the United States: "Whereas," says the act, which was passed on the 7th of August, 1789, and may be found in the first volume of the United States laws—"whereas, in order that the ordinance of the United States in Congress assembled, for "the government of the territory north-west of the Ohio "River, may continue to have full effect, it is requisite that "certain provisions should be made so as to adapt the "same to the present Constitution of the United States," &c., &c. I have the entire of the act in my hand. Well, then, Congress thought there were some things in that ordinance that should be amended so as to make it perfectly in accordance with the Constitution; and the only alteration or amendment the first Congress made to render that ordinance compatible with the Constitution was in reference to certain things that were required to be done by the old Continental Congress, and which under the new Constitution were required to be done by the President and Senate, leaving all that part of the ordinance excluding Slavery in full force and existence. But perhaps they did not know what they were about—they had not the aid of the new lights that have shone on a later day. Now, I will read you some of the names of those who were members both of the Continental Congress and of the first Congress held under the Federal Constitution. I find, in looking over the records of those bodies, that there were seventeen gentlemen who were members of both, and men who in their day were supposed to know something about the Constitution. [Laughter.] There was John Langdon of New-Hampshire, a name well known. Also of New-Hampshire, Nicholas Gilman; he was a member of the old Congress and also of the United States Constitutional Convention, and also of the new Congress, and was the first President *pro tem.* who presided over the United States Senate; from Massachusetts, there were Elbridge Gerry, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention and of the new Congress; from Connecticut, Wm. S. Johnson, Oliver Ellsworth, and Roger Sherman; from Pennsylvania, Robert Morris, Geo. Clymer, Thomas Fitzsimmons; from South Carolina, Pierce Butler; from Georgia, Wm. Few, Abraham Baldwin; from Maryland, Daniel Carroll; from Virginia, a person somewhat known, James Madison, &c. Well, seventeen members, who participated in the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, assembled in the first Congress under it. [Mr. Blunt here observed that Rufus King, of New-York, was in the Senate and in the Convention.] In addition to that, there was another gentleman who, if he did not understand this subject so well as his successors at the present day, may be supposed to have had some feeling upon it. George Washington presided — [enthusiastic cheering] — over the Convention which framed the Federal Constitution, and of course listened to all the debates upon it; was the first President of the United States, and signed the act which, in his opinion, rendered the ordinance of 1787 consistent with the Federal Constitution. [Applause.] Well now, the most that I will claim for those gentlemen is, that in their day they were supposed to be men who understood what the Federal Constitution meant. [Laughter.] You have their judgment—their deliberate judgment—the judgment of George Washington, of James Madison, of Elbridge Gerry, of Roger Sherman, of Ellsworth, and others, of the whole Congress—for the act passed unanimously, that it was consistent with the Federal Constitution—not only that it was constitutional to legislate for the Territories in regard to Slavery, but to exclude Slavery from every inch of territory we then owned. [illegible] be true that one act has a spirit which is inconsistent with some other act, and therefore it must be made to conform to the spirit of the first act, I ask you if an act which bears the immortal names of Washington, Madison and others, ought not to have a spirit of equal sanction to-day with those new lights who have made this new discovery in constitutional law? [Applause.] If it be found that one is inconsistent with the other, which ought to give way? That which we inherited from our fathers; that to which they gave utterance when the wounds of the Revolution were not yet healed; when their garments had not been yet washed from the blood of the wounds that they had received in the great contest, and their decks were heavy with the frosts that fell with the night dews of heaven as they stood sentinels round about the posts of liberty? [Applause.] I think I might be safe, my friends, I might at least not be called arrogant, if I were to leave the constitutional question there; and if I might appeal to those gentlemen who have made this late discovery, and set them to argue this question with those authorities, and leave us alone. But we do not stop there. From that day down to the time of James K. Polk, Congress has uniformly legislated upon the express position that they have power to exclude Slavery from the Territories. How was it in 1845, when Texas was admitted into the Union? Did not men—every Southern man in Congress, and every Democrat North and South, with a solitary exception—vote to exclude Slavery from the Territory in Texas north of 36 30? Did they think of this unconstitutionality then? How was it that in 1848 when that great Territory of Oregon and Washington got a government, Slavery was excluded, and James K. Polk signed the act? Go back to every one of the acts organizing territory in Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and you will find that they contain a provision prohibiting Slavery, and do not rest alone on the ordinance of 1787. Yet in the face of this continued practice of the Government, it is now found out, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and fifty-four, that these men were all mistaken—[laughter]—all mistaken, and a new light has risen from the White Mountains of New Hampshire, and from the Green Mountains of Vermont, that is to put out those little taper flashes to which we have been accustomed to look for light before. [Cheers and laughter.] What shall we have next? I should not be surprised if on this voyage of discovery in which they found out that those acts were unconstitutional, that they should find that the constitution itself was an unconstitutional measure—[renewed laughter]—and they might say that the men who framed it had no power to frame such a Constitution and therefore it was unauthorized, and I am not sure that in this age of progress we may not reach that point. Then there is but a step further to go. It is very clear that the Declaration of Independence was not an authorized act; there was no provision in the British Constitution that was the law of the land for it. [Great cheering.] It was wholly unauthorized; and after a while, if we follow our new leaders, we will find out that the Revolution was an unjustifiable rebellion. [Renewed applause and laughter.] Does there need to be any more light on this question?—is all history and experience to go for nothing?—is the light of the past to afford no light?—is the experience of those to whom we have trusted so long to be thrown aside?—are we to start off at this late day to follow this *ignis fatuus*, which tells us that it is the only true light, and that we have, all our lives, been following false lights? I trust not. I hope for a little time longer (not long, if light dashes on us so fast) we may be allowed to tumble on after Washington, Madison, and the rest. Besides all that, my friends, if you be not convinced by this, let me put it in another point of view. Have there not been some very astute men in both Houses of Congress since 1820, whose whole lives have been the embodiment of perpetuating human Slavery? I wonder that the keen-eyed casuistry of John C. Calhoun never stumbled upon this truth, which has been so lately brought to light. I wonder that in his metaphysical speculation upon the divine origin of Slavery, he did not discover this act to be unconstitutional. I wonder that Governor Hammond of South Carolina, who in his letter to Thomas Clarkson said that Slavery was "an institution "ordained by God and sanctified of Christ," did not make the discovery. But there is another fact: it was never, until a very short time since, suggested that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. And those very gentlemen—as the records of Congress show—who are now going to repeal the Missouri Compromise on the ground of unconstitutionality, were day after day, in 1848 and 1850, moving to extend the line from the territory that we acquired from France west to the Pacific. This question does not stop at Nebraska, immense as it is. If this Missouri Compromise is unconstitutional—if it has no force, validity or binding obligation—then the prohibition which excludes Slavery from Minnesota, Oregon and Washington, is unconstitutional; every barrier is thrown down, and every safeguard which we supposed the patriotism and wisdom of our fathers left us is gone, and Slavery may march triumphant over the whole of it. It will not be long before it is discovered that there is nothing in the Constitution sacred but Slavery, and nothing worth extending except the empire of the chain. [Applause.] Well, now let me come to the other branch of the subject; but I find I am trespassing upon the time I know will be better occupied in listening to others. [Cries of "No, no; go on."] Well, then, it is said that this legislation is "inconsistent"—I believe that is the word—is "inconsistent" with the legislation of 1850. I take issue upon that. What was it? To leave the existing laws of the Territory just as we found them. If you look at the records of Congress you will see that repeated attempts were made to induce it to repeal the Mexican laws, to abolish Slavery in Texas. Now, it was said, when we acquired that territory, we acquired it with the existing laws, and that Slavery could not go into it until those laws were repealed. But Congress refused to repeal them; it said, "No, whatever the law is, it "must remain as we find it; if the Mexican law abolishes "Slavery, then it is abolished." And that was the first report that was published by the Committee on Territories, and it took the true ground. If this is to be made consistent with the legislation of 1850, it must be based upon non-intervention. That is the principle and that is the very nature of that legislation—it was to leave the country as it was; if it was a free territory, it was to remain so; and if a slave territory, no attempts were to be made to change it. But the spirit of 1850, as it is baptised in 1854, is to introduce Slavery into it, and that no attempt shall be made to repeal it. That is the spirit we are called upon so lovingly to embrace, instead of the spirit of our fathers, which excluded Slavery from every inch of territory. So, if I have stated the position fairly, the attempt to repeal this Compromise is based upon a mistake, a misapprehension, because it is not inconsistent with the Constitution to abolish Slavery or perpetuate it, and it is not consistent with the legislation of 1850 to interfere with the existing laws and repeal them. Now let us look a little further. It is said we are to have non-intervention, that Congress is not to interfere, and at the same time they are not to interfere because it is unconstitutional; and yet it is proposed to organize territorial governments, and to give them the right and power to determine for themselves whether they will have Slavery. I recollect a fine comment made upon the story of the temptation of our Savior, which I will relate to you as particularly applicable here. When the devil took the Savior to the top of a high mountain and showed him the kingdoms of the world, and said, "All this will I give to you if you will fall down and "worship me," the clergyman here said, "Poor devil, he "promised what he had not got to give." Let me ask, if Congress has not got the power to legislate, how can it give it to a territorial Legislature? Territorial Legislatures are the creations of Congress, and they have no power but what Congress gives them: it may repeal the whole act giving them any sort of territorial legislation. Here is Congress having all power, and yet not power to legislate upon the subject of Slavery; but it may create an inferior tribunal, and confer upon that a power which the Constitution does not confer upon itself. But, my friends, this matter does not rest even on the ground which I have stated. The framers of our Constitution were wiser men than to leave things open to doubtful argument, conjecture, speculation, inference: they foresaw this; they foresaw that from the immense territory they owned, new States and communities would spring up; they foresaw that immense interests would be involved, and that there must be a power resting somewhere—plenary, full, supreme—within the Constitution, to legislate for them. And so they left it to no doubtful construction—no, thanks to their memory and to Almighty God for that memory, they settled this question upon the very page of the Constitution, so plain, so clear, that he who runs may read. [Applause.] And if you will turn to the fourth article and third section of that Constitution, you will find these very words written; but I know it is not fashionable to read the Constitution of the United States now a days. [Laughter.] What is it to the Baltimore Platform? [Renewed laughter and applause.] You will excuse me, my friends, therefore, for quoting from these very old-fashioned men, and for reading from such an old fashioned paper. [More laughter.]

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Now, let me ask you, my friends, can language be plainer? "Needful." Who is to judge what is "needful?" Why, clearly they themselves, subject to this, as in all other questions, to the supervisory power of the Supreme Judiciary to say whether the provisions are consonant with the Constitution or not. If this argument is not closed—if it is necessary to go further and adduce authority to prove that the Constitution confers upon Congress this power, and it ought to be exercised, as evinced by our whole history, then, what question is settled? Why, they will tell you the doctrine of non-intervention is settled. But if they break off this old Compromise of 1820, what will the new one be worth? Let us look at the possible future. Suppose the torch of discord should blaze in our midst, and angry passions be aroused; suppose that sectional jealousies should be brought into vivid life, suppose the passions of one section or party should be arrayed against those of another, where within this broad land is to be found the man with temerity or absurdity enough to stand up and boldly propose another compromise? No, the word will be a hissing and a by-word, as it ought to be. [Applause.] Let the men of this Congress repeal that Compromise and I tell them they will do more to repeal everything which binds this Union together than all else they could do. [Renewed applause.] What would a community be that did not observe public faith? A community of thieves could not live together without it. Why, Fisher Ames says that if there were to be to-night a resurrection from the foot of the gallows of all those who have expiated their crimes with their lives, and the felons of past ages should be assembled into one community, the very first necessity that would be imposed upon such a community, would be the preservation of the public faith, for they could not exist without it. Let this Compromise of 1820 be repealed, and where is public faith, and what is it? Thirty four years it has existed in unbroken supremacy; thirty four years the slaveholding portion of the States have enjoyed all the profits of it while we have had nothing but [illegible] corners has been our portion; the savage and the wild beast have roamed unchecked over it, and the birds have built their nests in safety there, for the foot of civilized man has not trod upon it. But now, in these latter days, when the advancing tide of emigration is about to people it—now, when something like two hundred white families have gone there to settle, this spirit of Slavery, that has got three States out of it, are determined to seize upon this last foothold of freedom, and make it pasturing ground for slaves. Let them do it. But I do the South wrong. They have not demanded it. It is not the demand of Southern arrogance. [Applause.] It is the tender of Northern servility. I have heard in private and public—I have heard upon the floor of Congress, and out of it remarks like this: Said one gentleman from the South who voted for the measure: "I don't know a man in the State that I represent who wanted this Compromise repealed, but when it "is offered to us by the North, how can we go home and "maintain ourselves before our constituents if we refuse "to take what is tendered to us." There is force in it. Said Mr. Benton to me, in company, and not privately, "Sir, if a Southern man had introduced this measure "I would have denounced it as infamous; I would "have black-balled it, Sir; it would not have had "time to sit down in the hall; but, Sir, if the North "have made a bargain, a bargain that was imposed "upon them, and have lived by it thirty four years, "and now want to give up their half, have I any "right to complain?" I think, my friends, in discussing this measure, we ought to do justice to the South; for I do not believe if it was proposed to the people of the South—I say the people of the South—there would not be one voice in ten thousand for it; their sense of honor, their chivalry, their magnanimity—for they have it—would have repelled them from making the demand. But they say, and say with reason, if the North tender it how can we refuse it? This question is with you, my friends, and I would rather argue this question for effect to-night before this audience than before either House of Congress. I tell you if the workingmen of New-York, whose children will go out and people that land, and if the foreign population of New-York and all who have an interest in free farms and free homes, will look to this inheritance, the most magnificent that a beneficent God ever gave to any people, and are determined that it shall be what their fathers more than a third of a century ago voted it should be, it will remain so. [Great applause.] It lies with you, my friends, and you ought to make these sentiments known, and to make it known that you are in earnest about it. Here is a great question; it spreads over all time; it belongs to everything that is dear to the human heart; it relates to generations away down in the future as far as hope can penetrate; it belongs to all time—to the countless generations that are to people this vast Continent till the last trump shall announce that time shall be no more. [Applause.] We must wake up to the immense importance of this question. One of your resolutions tells you to call upon the ministers to be up and praying, and if they are faithful they can do much; they will tell you that they can pray, and that is something; but you can vote, and that is a great deal more. Take this question and look at it—it is one that is of more than local importance; it is a question that rises above politicians, and they have no right to touch it—a question that belongs to progress, to humanity, to the destinies of the race in all coming time—yea, even to the destinies of eternity. Tell politicians to stand one side, that you will give them the Custom House, the Post Office, and everything but this fair inheritance, which God intended for the abode of freedom, which you intend by your vote, purpose, resolution, and determination, to leave for your children and children's children—a place where the honest laborer may labor in the dignity of his own manhood, and labor shall not be degraded by working side by side with the slave. [Applause.] Tell them the working men of New-York are awake to this subject, and, God helping them, this fair inheritance of freedom shall not be drenched by the sweat of the unpaid toil of Slavery, nor its virgin life burned out by the fevered foot of the unpaid slave. [Three cheers for Hale, three groans for Douglas, and long and oft renewed applause, when Mr. Hale retired.]

The Rev. HENRY WARD BEECHER now came forward, and his appearance was the signal for another burst of enthusiastic applause. He spoke as follows:

FELLOW CITIZENS: I am a native of the good old State of Connecticut, a State which, among many peculiarities, had this, that she used to begin her Sabbath day on Saturday night; to make all her calculations so that, by the time the sun went down, secular matters were put aside, and matters of religious and moral moment began. I am glad to see that in New York we are beginning to follow this good old plan. [Applause.] I was glad to be included in the business of this meeting, and I was glad to hear an invitation extended to the clergy to pray on the subject which occupies our attention this evening; but, when I heard it, I thought that, as the language of our blessed Savior, prayer is almost never spoken of alone, it is always "watch and pray." And there never was a time (though ministers' voices are no stronger winged, and reach no nearer to heaven than laymen's) when there was more argument for prayer than now; for I do not regard this enormity which we protest against as an accident; I do not think the great current of events for the last 30 years has had a jog made in it to admit this subject. This is but a blossom springing from the tree that was then planted, and which we would not believe was poisoned, so we compromised it; yes, root and stem, branch after branch, and twig after twig, and leaf after leaf it was compromised. It was compromised in the Constitution; it was compromised in 1820; it was compromised in the admission of Texas; it was compromised in the Mexican war; it was compromised in 1850, and still we [illegible] it was not poison. But this is only the blossom of that very tree. It is poison! [Great applause.] Poison, as God ever made oppression to be; and nothing can a man take into his blood so deadly to his body, as taken into the system, Slavery is deadly to humanity. [Great applause.] I cannot argue this question on a selfish or political basis; I go back to the beginning, and show, by the very framers of the Constitution that Slavery is an evil, prolific in noxious weeds, and full of the seeds of unnumbered others, that the two great principles must come into collision and fight till one or the other is dead. It is like a battle between a vulture and an eagle. Slavery is a vulture, of base talons and polluted beak; and liberty is, according to our symbol, (though I should prefer something else, but never [illegible] it is on the national record,) an eagle. They must fight till there is a declaration of victory on one side or the other, and it lies with you whether it shall be on that of Slavery or Liberty. We have had meetings heretofore of old line Abolitionists and Free Soilers, or, as they are called in the commercial dialect, "free silers;" we have had meetings of various kinds, and the cry always has been "agitators! agitators!" and there was a great complaint that the North would not let the South alone; poor child, darling child! the North was always poking fun at her; so that, at last, in 1850, it really came to be felt that we must have peace; and so we sucked down our conscience, and got peace, and *this*. [Great laughter.] Where did it come from? It is said from the North, because it came through a Northern medium, because they, or he, lives, or rather exists, [great laughter] in Illinois, it is said to be a Northern measure. Let me speak to two points. I love to agree with my friend who preceded me, and I do, in a great measure. But not when he apologizes for the South, because, in the words of Mr. Benton, the South says, "it is infamous, but when offered, can we refuse to receive?" If a thief comes to my door, rings, shows me an armful of clothes, and offers me the whole for a dollar, why, as he brought them to my door, and offered them, should I refuse? [Laughter and applause.] But there is no knowing what chivalry may find out. [Laughter.] If there had been agitation of this question, which there was not, for it was sprung, as a trap on a deer or a dog going through a wood—had it been talked of, debated, stumped, agitated in the North, then there would have been an opportunity for the North to say: "Will we give up this solemn compact?" Did not Douglas hurry it up, and the Administration, lest Douglas should make too much capital out of it? [Great applause and laughter.] Was it not introduced into the Senate cut and dry? They knew if it were discussed, what its fate would be, and they put it through so quickly that there should not be time, when passing through the House of Representatives, for the ground swell here to reach Washington. It makes me ashamed to think that men like Thomas Benton should speak of it in such terms; should so speak of the act of a renegade man, bringing the house which he should defend within the range of a catapult. Yet I do not blame him. I take it back; for we at the North have schools, and public sentiment, and discussion, while gentlemen of the South have not these; no wonder, then, if they thought that a few renegades from the North expressed the public opinion of the North. Oh! If the North had nothing better than what they export to Washington, God pity the North! [Laughter and applause.] No, it will never be the will of the North, and every Southern Senator who accepts it becomes *particeps criminis*, sharer in the crime, or worse, because the receiver is worse than the thief. Yes, he is worse than the North, because, he has had his share, and now, under a pitiful pretext, he steps in and wants to deprive us of what we were to have by the very agreement. I am glad my friend (Hale) preceded me on the constitutional question, because I have no constitutional knowledge; although that, perhaps, should make no difference, as now a days knowledge of the matter seems no requisite in discussing constitutional topics. But I will look at the matter in this way: Suppose I wake up about 2 in the night, go down, and find a fellow walking off with my spoons—the few I have. [Laughter.] I lay hold of him, but he says, "Stop, stop, we will argue the matter." I say, "Argue! It's 2 o'clock in the night, and you are stealing away with my spoons; there is no argument about it." "Oh! but stay," he returns; "don't be rash, or unreasonable; let us argue the matter, because there are very good reasons on my side." And so he might, for there are a great many new ideas which would teach us something better about the old-fashioned ones of the undisturbed tenure of property. [Laughter.] But I would not mind them. I would call a constable, and have him off to prison. Now, here is the South itself saying that it could not be disturbed except by the law; and it has protested to argue this on constitutional grounds, and on the ground of the infamous Compromises of 1850. [Great applause, and a few hisses.] Let me say to those gentlemen who are speaking in their own tongue, [laughter] I am reminded of a story of a blacksmith not considered very skillful, who undertook to make a broad ax; so he hammered and hammered away on his metal, till he hammered it out of all shape. He looked at it for a moment, and said, "If I can't make a "broad ax, why I can make a chopping ax," and hammered away again, until he had quite spoilt it for a chopping ax. He next tried to make it a hatchet, but kept hammering until it was spoilt for that too. At last he said, "Well, I know what I can make any how, I can make a [illegible]" [Shouts of laughter and applause.] [illegible] gentlemen will excuse the allusion, because there are a great many laboring men here. I have a [illegible] no place in the matter [illegible], because my grandfather was a blacksmith; but it was not he who spoilt the ax. [Laughter.] I cannot help thinking of the extravagance of a reply made by a man in jail for stealing. When asked why he was there, "Well," he said, "I stole the mill, and next day I came for the dam, and they caught me." Now in 1850 they stole the mill; now they are coming back for the dam, and we ought to catch them. At that time the odium of a requisition on the North was thought unnecessary, though the demand made on Northern conscience and feeling was extreme; and there is no difference between that case and this, except that this goes a great way beyond that. I was diverted from the line of remarks I was pursuing; but I love to see good nature and cheerful feeling. Now this question cannot be settled on the ground of enthusiasm; I love enthusiasm, but there is something deeper; this is the feeling which I have in my heart in what I am about to say, and on this hangs the question I have to propose. Suppose any of you were left guardians of a large estate in behalf of orphans; if you be dishonorable men we know what you will do; but, if honorable, how sedulously will you take care of it—watch it on the right and on the left—see its stores of treasure augmented, that, when come of age, the heirs may take their own with good usury! Now, with respect to all that territory between the Alleghany and Rocky Mountains, God has made us of the East, and especially of the free States of the East, the guardians for future generations. The question is not whether this age is to give up its rights; whether Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire or New York is to give up its rights, for we are what we are by the force of our own habits and institutions. But we are trustees not for a few dollars, but for a nation yet unborn; thousands, nay millions of men await your dispensation of the great property put in your hands; and, as you have taken the privileges of citizenship in this land, you cannot shirk its duties. We all know one thing, if the North says—"This shall not be done," it cannot be done. The simple question is will the North say, in respect to this great trust, "It shall "not be diverted now profaned to the purposes of "Slavery?" Suppose a bill introduced into Congress to set apart this territory into States as large as South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia; suppose the soil run down to the minimum of fertility, and brought into the condition in which the seaboard Slave States are. What is the condition of the soil of Virginia? And what of the soil of Massachusetts, where it had to be made out of granite and ice? In Massachusetts it is worth $50 an acre all through, while in Virginia you can buy it for 25 cents to $1 or $1 50 an acre; yet the sun never shone on better land, but it is exhausted by slave tillage, as slave tillage always exhausts the soil it touches. But will you turn this blighting thing westward; will you send it out upon the prairies of this broad and magnificent region? As well may you send fire upon them, before which its forests of flowers and of verdure, while behind it there is nothing but the blackness and smoldering of desolation. Be sure of it, and know it well, for it is true, that wherever Slavery puts its foot, it will burn out the soil. But, oh! how willingly I would give the soil, if we could redeem its subjects! Who are they? First, the poor African, for he is wholly demoralized; but it is not he only, for his master comes under the same curse; both are sufferers under one compact of oppression. Now the question is in the administration of that trust given to you, freemen of the North, mechanics, laborers, professional men, christians, will you roll this baleful institution westward on those virgin acres, and curse them with Slavery? There is something in magnitude that takes away the deepest feelings of sympathy. If I said a million of men were murdered, you would be little affected in comparison with what you would feel if I brought here a man nearly as white as any of you, who had suffered the most cruel things that man can suffer. Not long after I went to Brooklyn, a minister there, in security or payment of a debt, had a slave transferred to him, a pious, Christian man, a minister whose new owner felt odd about it, and did not know what to do with his walking gospel. The slave would be put up for sale, examined, his bodily qualities all tested, the soundness of his ribs, the depth of his chest, the strength of his muscles. Then his Christian qualities would be held up to view, and the grace of God in his heart would certainly make him worth at least two or three hundred dollars more. Religion is worth something when it is to be sold. He would tell his fellow slaves of their duty, first, to their masters, next to God, being sound in faith, an orthodox minister, with no taint of heresy, no disposition to run away. But, put that man on the block here, and, kind as you are, auctioneer, master and buyer would never go out of that door with a whole skin. [Great applause.] But, suppose instead of the man it were proposed to sell his wife and his child; or not only the minister, but the minister's wife and child also; how would you endure that? It is notorious now that in hundreds and thousands of cases this sin takes place. And will you roll such an institution as that over your Western territories? There is nothing we feel more proud of than this; that there is no poor boy in the North who may not read if he will. But, send this institution to your territories and let any one there teach a boy to read, and he goes to the same place to which Mrs. Douglass is now sent in Virginia. It is a penitentiary offense to teach him to read even his catechism and his Bible! I believe in foreign missions, home missions, tract work, and distribution of the Bible, but I ask any man how, with any pretense of reason and religion and consistency, he can send the Bible abroad to China and Japan, and the Sandwich Islands, and everywhere, yet allow territory after territory to have it excluded, or given to its inhabitants with the strained interpretations put on it by their masters. That gospel is yet designed to break up empires and destroy kingdoms; but what have you to do against these while you have an evil here with which, though the gospel is hand to hand, it cannot curb? If we do not resist the ingress of these slave institutions, there will have been no battle fought; the question will be ended for I do not know how many years, and Slavery, with all its blights, and banes, and curses, will be set upright, until, in far distant days, God works out some other power to destroy it. But it shall not be so; there is a rising in the North greater than was ever seen at any other time; there is a religious feeling arising. Even the antagonists of anti Slavery doctrines are now here with us eye to eye, and hand to hand; men who denounced me as a fanatic his question has changed into men who agree with me. Even the men who went to Castle Garden, a few years ago, now stand by us. Truly "misery makes strange bedfellows." If you will now stand with us, all together, we will never remind you of the past; we will all stand up and together for this one thing—a free North, a free West, and a free country.

Mr. Beecher concluded amid the most deafening applause. The Chair then announced that the meeting was adjourned.

MEXICO.

From The New-Orleans Picayune, Feb. 12.

We have intelligence from the City of Mexico to the 3d inst., and from Vera Cruz to the day on which she left.

The Walker expedition still occupied a large share of the attention of the press. There had been nothing later received in the City of Mexico, however, than that which has already been published here. A dispatch from Negrete is given, in which the account does not vary materially from that obtained from the expedition. The *Orden* of the 4th inst. published a long account of the proceedings from the commencement, written, we may say with certainty, by Rebolledo. A cursory perusal of those shows us nothing to induce us to translate either of them, for to-day. Rebolledo's account shows that himself and fellow prisoner Espinosa were well treated, on declining to accept liberty under parole not to take arms against the expedition. Rebolledo's assistant, however, being caught making signs to some men in a boat, while an attack was being made on the Caroline, was shot and died the following day, in spite of all efforts to save him. At Cape St. Lucas Rebolledo says they offered to make him Governor of Sonora if he would join them, but that he refused that and other similar offers. He complains of the haughtiness and domination of the captain of the boat, but speaks well of Walker's conduct to him. It appears that it was not the captain of the vessel which took her off and liberated the two Governors, but the boatswain (*contramaestre*) or mate, rather, who had been badly treated on board. Negrete's account reaches to the 8th of December, and reports the expeditionists surrounded in a house in which they had taken refuge, unable to procure water or provisions.

Letters and papers received from Durango announce the defeat of a party of Indians, and the recovery of nearly a thousand head of stock from them, at a place called Llanos de las Palmas, on the 10th ult. Capt. Alvarez, who accomplished this feat, is said to have had a body of seventy or eighty men under him, and the number of Indians who took part in the contest somewhat exceeded forty. Five of the latter were killed and several wounded. The heads of four of the killed were sent the next day to Gov. Heredia.

Senor Don Ignacio Serra y Rosso has retired from the Treasury, and is succeeded by Senor Don Parres.

On the 20th ult., a decree was promulgated fixing who were to be considered, in legal effect, as foreigners, and who as Mexicans, regulating companies of one or the other, and the validity of contracts made in foreign countries, and pointing out the mode of procedure in suits between foreigners and natives. Mexicans putting themselves under the flag of a foreign country, on an invasion, are to be expelled as dangerous foreigners. Armed men are not to be allowed to penetrate into the country, even though naturalized. Persons desiring to be naturalized must have a responsible means of livelihood, and must not have been judicially declared pirates, slave dealers, incendiaries, counterfeiters, forgers, parricides or poisoners. A Mexican may be sued for obligations contracted in a foreign country, security for costs being given by the plaintiff. When three fourths of a company are foreigners, the body is to be so considered. Political rights, ecclesiastical benefices, rights to fishing on Mexican coasts, or to engage in the coasting trade, or to hold State employments, cannot be held by foreigners. Contracts between foreigners in the Republic may be enforced and suits prosecuted. Contracts made abroad and duly registered may be enforced, and other similar provisions are made.

The *Eco del Comercio* of the 4th says that the Prince of Nassau had arrived at Vera Cruz, and was to embark on the Texas.

Senor Ignacio Fuentes has been granted the privilege of constructing a railroad from Mexico to Ixtlahuaca.

The right to explore the guano islands in the Pacific has been granted to Senores Carlos and Muelo Valdovinos, Manuel Lizardi, F. Mora and Juan Garruste.

The tobacco revenues will be put up for farm in August, and sold to those making the best offer for them. No offer for less than $100,000 per month will be received.

Troops were being marched on Sonora. Gen. Blancarte was to take the command in the Pacific departments.

A decree imposing a tax of 2 per cent. on every pecuniary transaction in the shape of a loan or accommodation has been issued, provisions being made to enforce their being effected before public officers. Another decree imposes a tax on doors, balconies and windows. In houses in the best situation of the city, doors are to pay $4, and windows 3rs. per month. In Indian huts doors are to pay 1r, and windows 1r; intermediate dwellings in proportion.