ly-acquired territory to be finally settled. I wish to leave no fragments behind for demagogues and fanatics to fasten upon between this and the next election. Every day adds to the difficulty of a satisfactory adjustment of it. The debate that is carried on here is certainly not of a character to calm the public excitement. It has, with few exceptions, consisted entirely of vehement appeals to sectional prejudices, of mutual attacks and recriminations, of invidious comparisons between the North and the South; and gentlemen have exhausted all their powers of eloquence to magnify the greatness and glories of their own States at the expense of others. Even the triumphs of our arms have been made the subject of angry controversy, and every State has her champion here, prepared to vindicate her claims to superior valor.

Sir, who doubts the courage of any portion of the people of this country? We are one race—the same blood flows in our veins; and to question the courage of any would be to question the courage of all. Let us, on the field of battle, emulate each other in deeds of daring—that is a noble and generous rivalry—but when the battle has been fought and won, let us not engage in an ignoble strife for the division of the spoils and the glory. * * * *

SPEECH OF Mr. TURNEY,

OF TENNESSEE,

ON THE TERRITORIAL QUESTION.

In Senate, Tuesday, March 12, 1850.

The Senate having under consideration the Message of the President of the United States transmitting the Constitution of California—

Mr. TURNEY. The question involved in the resolutions which are now under consideration presents a variety of aspects. Ever since the constitution under which we are living was framed, the principle upon which this Government has been conducted is that of perfect equality among the States composing the Federal Union. Without that equality the constitution could never have been adopted by the Convention by which it was framed, and if it had been adopted by a majority of the members of that Convention, it never would have been ratified and approved by the respective States, when acting each in its sovereign capacity. In that constitution, sir, we find that there exists, for a political purpose and for the purpose of taxation, a property in the institution of slavery. We find that in apportioning representation an enumeration is made of that class of the population, and in apportioning direct taxation reference is had to the institution of slavery. Another provision of the constitution declares that slaves shall be regarded as property, and the enjoyment of that property is guarantied by the constitution of the United States to the owners and proprietors of it. I hold, then, under these various provisions of the constitution of the United States, that slavery exists in all the States and Territories of the United States, except in those States where it is prohibited expressly by the State constitution or by State sovereignty; and while I am prepared to concede that this Government has the power to prescribe a government and laws for the Territories, I am prepared to maintain that a government prepared by Congress for a Territory must be prepared under and in accordance with the constitution of the United States. It is immaterial for my purpose to inquire as to the source whence this power is derived, whether under the treaty making power or from any other source, or whether it be an expressed or implied power. Congress certainly derives its power from the constitution, and in forming a government for the Territories Congress is bound to legislate in accordance with the provisions of the constitution. If Congress be not bound to act in accordance with the provisions of the constitution in forming a government for the Territories, Congress might establish in the Territories an order of nobility, an aristocracy, a monarchy. What is there to prevent it? If the constitution does not control Congress in the formation of a Territorial Government, what would prevent the establishing of any possible form of government that might be conceived? If Congress is not bound by the constitution in giving government and law to the Territories, but has an unlimited and unrestrained power, then Congress in that view would have the power to establish a monarchical government, and when a majority should deem it expedient to perpetuate their power, they would repeal the laws admitting the States in the Union and remand the States into Territorial Governments, and thus, under this pretence of power and this mode of usurpation, they would establish upon the ruins of this republic one great consolidated despotic form of government, by which all the rights, immunities, and privileges secured by the constitution would be trampled under foot and lost to the people for ever.

Again, sir, if Congress is not bound by the constitution, or, in other words, if the power to enact in a Territorial bill, or incorporate in a Territorial Government the Wilmot proviso, in violation of the constitution, exists in Congress, where, let me ask, do you find protection for fugitive slaves which may find their way into the Territories? The provision of the constitution providing for the delivering up of fugitive slaves applies only as between the States, and not to the Territories. Hence Congress, by passing a Territorial bill, with the Wilmot proviso attached to exclude slavery from the Territory, does in reality pass a law to abolish slavery, so far as those slaves are concerned, who can escape into such Territory. The moment they can cross the line, and get into the Territory to which the proviso has been applied, they will be absolutely free. The framers of the constitution contemplated no such thing. On the contrary, the framers of the constitution intended to provide ample means of security for the enjoyment of this kind of property. If, then, the framers of the constitution had believed that Congress would possess any such power, if they had not intended that Congress should possess no power over the subject of slavery in the Territories, they would have made an express provision that fugitive slaves escaping into the Territories should always be delivered up as in the case of the States. But the error, in my judgment, consists in gentlemen supposing that the power to govern implies a power to abolish or destroy vested rights under the constitution of the country. I hold, sir, that under the constitution of the United States a man has a vested right in his slaves, as his property; that he has a legal title vested in him under and by virtue of the constitution and laws of the country; and that right can be carried into any portion of the United States where not prohibited by the local law; and the framers of the constitution never intended that Congress should have power to exclude slavery from the Territories or from the District in which the General Government shall be located, and for which Congress shall have power to legislate. The power to govern, then, is a power to protect the citizen in the enjoyment of his rights, in the enjoyment of his property, in the enjoyment of his life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness; and it is not a power to abolish or destroy vested rights; nor does Congress possess any greater power to destroy those rights in the Territories. Then, sir, in no state of the case, where slavery exists, would the Legislature of the State have such power. I presume it will not be contended by any one, that the States, whose constitutions recognise slavery, can, by their Legislatures, destroy slavery. It must be done by convention of the people. It is beyond the control of the legislative bodies of the country. Their action is entirely impotent as regards the annihilation of property of this description.

There is another argument that I have heard from some gentlemen, who contend that, although Congress does not possess the power to enforce the Wilmot proviso or to exclude slavery from the Territories, while they deny the power on the part of Congress—and thus far I agree with them—still they hold and maintain the doctrine that the people of the Territory possess the power of legislating for themselves, and that they have the power to legislate on the subject of slavery and to exclude it from the Territory. This, sir, to my mind, is a more absurd doctrine than to contend for the power in Congress itself.

Sir, it is conferring on the people of the Territory a much larger and greater power than is possessed by the State Governments or by the General Government itself; much larger and greater power than is possessed by both State and General Governments combined. This Government cannot exclude slavery from the Territories; neither can the State Government exclude it from the limits of the State, nor enforce any law evading the provisions of the constitution in relation to fugitive slaves. This Government can pass no law in violation of the provisions of the constitution; and yet, sir, it is contended by those gentlemen that the people of the Territories have ample power over this subject; that they may legislate upon it; that they, regardless of the constitution of the United States, which is extended over the Territories, can exclude it. It is contended that a handful of people in a Territory possess the power of manumitting fugitive slaves who may happen to get within the Territory.

Assuming, then, the principles of the constitution under which we live, and which are binding upon every citizen of the United States, the question recurs to us, who is producing all this excitement and disturbance of the harmony and quiet of the republic? Who is it that is responsible for the dangers which threaten the stability and integrity of the Union itself? Upon inquiring into the causes which have produced the state of things which now surrounds us, in the portion of the country of which I am the humble representative we are not conscious of any wrong on the part of the South, or that they have done any act, or applied to Congress for the enactment of any law, which is pronounced on the part of any of the citizens of the Northern States an encroachment upon their constitutional rights, or as depriving them of any privileges, or denying to them a perfect equality with the States and people in the Southern section of the Union. Nay, sir, on the other hand, when we look around and inquire into some of the causes of complaint which now exist, there is no dissenting opinion; all agree, North and South, with the exception, I believe, of the Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward)—who denies the existence of the constitution itself; who repudiates at least all its binding force—all agree that the North has failed to comply with the requirements of the constitution; nay, more, that she has violated the constitution, to the prejudice and great injury of the Southern States and the Southern people in relation to the recovery of fugitive slaves. I maintain by argument that what is now sought to be done in relation to the Territories is a violation of the rights of the Southern people, as plain and palpable to my mind as that in relation to fugitive slaves.

But, for the sake of argument, suppose I am in error in relation to the construction I put upon the constitution, and in claiming an equality of right to participate in the benefits resulting from the newly-acquired Territories of the United States, obtained by the joint blood and treasure of both sections of the Union. In the absence of any constitutional right, what would the great principles of equality and justice prescribe? Could it be said, on any principle of justice and equality, that one section of the Union should be entirely excluded, and that the whole domain should be appropriated to the exclusive use of another section, simply on the score of a numerical majority? Why, sir, this course of policy comes directly in contact with the advice and recommendation of the Father of his Country, upon taking his final leave of public station. I refer to the Farewell Address of Gen. Washington. In that address he urges reciprocity and equality of rights upon all, desiring the people to abstain from any thing that was calculated to produce sectional jealousies or heartburning bickerings. Aside from constitutional right, those feelings to which he refers would inevitably be the result of any attempt to exclude the Southern people from their rights. In the prosecution of this question, whether they possess a constitutional power or not, a large portion of the people of the Northern States seem to have been resolved upon carrying into practical operation and effect their plans to exclude the Southern people from any participation in the territory acquired. If parties are to be divided by sectional alliances, then, sir, in point of States as well as in numbers of people, the North has the majority. If, therefore, they can unite among themselves against the South, the uniform consequence will be the carrying out of their measures in the form of law. What, then, would be the inevitable consequence of carrying into practical operation this system of measures, denying to the entire Southern portion of the Confederacy the right which they believe to be constitutional, and guarantied to them by the sacred instrument; thus forcing upon them measures derogatory to their honor, and in violation of their equality as citizens of the same great Confederacy? What is it, sir, that will be forced upon them? I answer the dissolution of the Union. Such oppression on the part of the North will call forth that ancient spirit which animated the great leader of the revolution, and which also inspired the noble band who rallied around him, to resist oppression greater and more flagrant than was offered to the old colonies by the mother country. No, sir, the Southern States would be found resisting oppression, like true descendants of their revolutionary fathers; resolved upon maintaining their rights under the constitution inviolable. And who, Mr. President, would be responsible for the consequences? What is the Union? What creates it? What holds it together? It is, sir, the constitution of the United States; and without that sacred instrument there would be no Union. Violate and trample on that sacred instrument and you have broken the Union. All of our liberties are guarantied within the constitution, and one of them is the right of property. For the South to submit to usurpation, allowing themselves to be considered as inferior beings to the majority who deprive them of their constitutional rights, of their liberties, and of their privileges, is to say that they are prepared to become the slaves of one section of the Union, who may usurp power over them. But they are not thus prepared. The inevitable consequence would be resistance. Resistance would be equivalent to a dissolution of the Union; and whether that dissolution is to take place or not, depends, in my judgment, upon the union of the Northern States themselves in their action upon the great and momentous question now under consideration. Can that union be affected? It is sometimes said that there is no alarming difficulty; that the South will not resist, but will submit to all these outrages upon their rights constitutionally guarrantied? It was said by the Senator from Maine, the other day, that the South were not earnest in their declarations; that the Senators from Southern States labored here and elsewhere for objects and purposes manifestly at variance with the professions made in their speeches. He thus attributed to them dishonorable motives, if not dishonest motives. The Senator from New York gave us an argument of precisely the same character on yesterday. Politicians of this character, Mr. President, live upon this species of excitement, and not upon any peculiar merit or moral worth. For years gone by, when there was no danger of a dissolution, excitement of this character was fostered by these fanatics in the Northern States; and this has been the course of the leading men of both the whig and democratic parties there; they have both been vieing with each other to obtain the votes of the abolitionists at their several elections. This was the case when there was no danger of disturbance, when the country was quiet and easy; and if these gentlemen can mislead the minds of the people of the North, if they can conceal the dangers of dissolution on account of their own acts, and if they can progress and carry into practical operation the sermons which have been preached by them for years past with a view of acquiring political popularity, why then the Union would really be in danger.

But we have also heard the arguments of Senators earnestly desiring to effect a reasonable compromise on this great question. And these arguments have not underrated the importance of the present crisis. No, sir. We have heard the most distinguished and patriotic men of the nation—I am proud to say from both sections of the Union—who have scorned to attempt to acquire popularity by any such means as this. They have been warmed up to a sense of the existing danger. And the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts but the other day showed that he had become sensible that the Union was, in point of fact, in danger, by reason of the differences between the two sections; and, although he disagreed from me as to what the constitutional guaranties are, yet, for the sake of the Union, for the sake of harmony, and to perpetuate the liberties of a republic achieved by our forefathers, and sustained hitherto by his heart and hand, he has acquiesced in a reasonable mode of adjusting the question. Yes, sir, we find that there is patriotism in the North and patriotism in the South. This patriotism of the North and of the South will inevitably unite. Those gentlemen who contend that there is no danger, and are desirous of keeping up these fanatical feelings in the North, well know that there is a large portion of patriotism in the North; and the moment that the people of the North discover that they are false prophets, playing upon their credulity, and governed by selfish and ambitious motives alone, not motives of patriotism, and discover that the Union is in point of fact in danger, they will rally to the constitution, they will rally to the Union, casting out from among them forever those politicians who have thus misled them. These politicians will fall. From the evidence now before me—from the tenor of the speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and from the character of the speeches of other eminent Senators—I am fully of opinion that the North cannot entirely unite. If, however, the South generally would unite for self-defence, for self-preservation, then I would say that in any event there was no danger to be apprehended to the South. If the South could be made to rally and to unite upon the great principle of self-defence and self-preservation, no matter if there were no constitutional rights in jeopardy, there would be no fear. The very fact of her presenting such a united front would at once manifest to the entire North that disastrous consequences would inevitably result from any attempts at oppression. And, whenever that fact shall be demonstrated to the North, I have an abiding confidence that will prove the effectual settlement of the question, and preserve the Union, although it may be at the sacrifice of certain politicians.

But, Mr. President, unfortunately the South is not entirely united, though I rejoice that they are very nearly so, and I maintain a strong hope that it will be entirely so whenever the emergency for action shall arrive. But they are not sufficiently united at the present time to put an end to all cavil, and place the matter beyond doubt. I would like to see an unbroken phalanx—a unanimity of feeling among all the Southern States, and a determined and fixed resolution and purpose to maintain their rights; for, if that purpose were communicated, spoken, made public to all parts of the Union, the danger might be discovered, and the patriotism of the country of every section rallied to rescue the Union from destruction. I regret the want of entire unanimity among the Southern States. I regret that there are some (though very few, I am gratified to say) who concur in admitting the constitutional power of Congress to enforce the Wilmot proviso, and who do not think it a cause of offence to the South, although there is no equivalent made to the South for it. This class of Southern men, in my judgment, do more harm than all the fanatics of the North. Sir, you will find that these gentlemen of the North are catching at the declarations of this class of Southern men, and presenting them to the Northern section of the country as an evidence of Southern opinion, and that they would tamely and cowardly submit to any system of legislation which the North might think proper to enforce upon them; thus not only giving aid and comfort to the Northern fanatics, but, as it were, persuading them to go on and continue to perpetuate and perpetrate their outrages on the rights of the South. The perpetration of these outrages is, in my opinion, equivalent to a dissolution of the Union; it is either the dissolution of the Union, or it is the degradation, disgrace, and ruin of the Southern people. This class of population—I mean both the Southern men who hold these doctrines, and the Northern fanatics, abolitionists, free soilers, Wilmot provisoists, and all of that kindred stamp of population—I hold to be false to the constitution of the United States. They are false to the Union. They are false to the great mass of the American people. I will not say they are false to themselves, for they may desire the dissolution of the Union.

It is said, again, by the Senator from Maine—I do not use his precise language—that they had once in his section of the country a class of population desirous of dissolving the Union; and those who now entertain that policy must expect to be recorded in the same page of history with the members—I suppose he alluded to them—of the proposed Nashville Convention, to sit in June next; and he attempted, as I infer, to compare it to the Hartford Convention, held a number of years ago for the purpose of taking sides with the British Government, which was then engaged in a war with this Government, thus going against their own country. The avowed purpose of the Convention was to take sides with the British Government, and, perhaps, to effect a secession from the American Union. Sir, there is no such thing intended in the Nashville Convention. Has there any thing been intimated from which such an inference could be drawn? Why, twelve months ago it was predicated of a Southern meeting, called among the members of Congress, that it was a Hartford Convention meeting, and that charge was used to destroy whatever effect might be intended by the address. The cry of "mad dog," as it were, wassaised, and Hartford Convention, and other such hard, harsh names were used. What is the object and purport of the Nashville Convention? Why, the Southern members, in their address to the Southern people, represented the aggressions, real and proposed, of the Northern States, and gave a statement of the plans which they proposed to carry into operation. That address aroused the people of the Southern States. They have had their primary meetings, and they have spoken out through the legislative bodies of Mississippi, and suggested the propriety of calling a Southern Convention to sit at Nashville. For the purpose of dissolving the Union! No, sir. The man who pretends, who insinuates such an idea, desires to make the public believe a falsehood; for he cannot believe it himself. The object of this Convention has been revealed: it is to assemble for the purpose of mutual conciliation and advice, and to settle on some plan of operation—of resistance to the aggressions upon the rights secured to them by the constitution of the country. They do not meet for the purpose of dissolving this and forming another Confederacy. The farthest they would go at the conclusion of their deliberations, would be to submit a series of resolutions, or an address, to the Southern people; or frame a remonstrance to present to this body, setting forth what would be the inevitable consequences of certain acts threatened to be passed by Congress. They seek to destroy the merits of this Convention by asserting that it is a Convention gotten up for the purpose of dissolving the Union; making the charge in the absence of all proof; making it, indeed, against proof, and where they know it to be false.

The great object of this Convention is to devise ways and means for the preservation of this Union—as was the object of the great Southern meeting in this chamber some months ago—and preserve their constitutional rights, without which they care nothing for the Union. They will not submit to a union characterized by usurpation; they will only submit to a union based upon the provisions of the constitution. They cling to the Union given them by those who formed the constitution—the greatest among whom was General Washington. They stand by the Union. That I understand to be the position of the South, and it is resistance to usurped power that will alone produce a dissolution. Sir, if these usurpations are carried out, the great work is done—the bonds of the Union are broken down, violated, trampled under foot, by the people of the North by their aggressions. This agitation, sir, will have the effect of remodelling political parties, more especially in the North. It must inevitably rally as a party in the North all the patriotism of that section of the country, under one banner, the banner of the Union—whether they were heretofore Whigs or Democrats. The Union is now in danger from the operation of a particular party or class of politicians, and a knowledge of this fact must inevitably rally the friends of the constitution under the flag of the Union for the maintenance and the security of the country. It is in that direction, sir, that we are to look; for the South will stand forth as one man, prepared to co-operate with and act in favor of that party in the North which maintains the constitution. It stands up for the Union. It becomes a conservative and Union party in this country, and will therefore receive the support of the entire South. There will be another party in the North. That party now exists, with purposes and limits prescribed and its objects avowed and proclaimed. It is the Abolition party—the Free-Soil party—the Wilmot party—for all of that political stamp will unite in one party. These, as a matter of course, will unite all of those who do not prefer the Union to their heresy; they will rally under the flag of disunion, and with that party; those that prefer power and disunion will rally under the flag of the abolitionists—under Garrison and others who advocate the dissolution of the Union.

We find, Mr. President, looking at the publications, the pamphlets, and the reports issued from the Conventions held by these various parties in the North, that they avow their object, at least one grand object, to be that of disunion, and they assign reasons consistent with their own honesty. They say, sir, that the Constitution of the United States authorizes slavery throughout the entire land. They take the broad ground to which I have alluded, that, under the Constitution of the United States, slavery exists every where in the States, and that slavery is even in Massachusetts, under the clause in relation to fugitive slaves. They say they cannot co-operate with any part of the work under this constitution; they must go outside of it, and behind it. They would overthrow it, put it down and prostrate it; weaken it, ruin it, and dissolve the Union. Not like the Senator who yesterday argued that, although it is constitutional, and although the Supreme Court has recognised it to be constitutional, and although he has taken a solemn oath to support the constitution, yet, on account of a higher law, which he has received somehow from God, he is absolved from the obligations of his oath, to disregard the constitution itself, cast it aside, and violate and break the bonds which hold these States together. No, sir; he does not seem to possess that sense of moral propriety, that sense of moral responsibility to the Supreme Being that is possessed and advocated by Garrison and others of his political school. They say they cannot work under the constitution, while the Senator can take the constitution, acknowledge its provisions, and acknowledge that he has taken a solemn oath to support it to the letter, and yet he declares he is not bound by it.

Well, sir, in pursuing this question a little further, let us examine and see how parties stand at the North, and of whom they are composed. I have some few documents which I propose to read in relation to this subject. And, first of all, I propose to read the constitution of this party, for they have, it seems, adopted one. I will send it to the Secretary, and ask him to read it for me.

The Secretary read from the Constitution of the Abolition party, as follows:

"Preamble.—Whereas the Declaration of American Independence asserts that it is a self-evident truth "that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and whereas this political axiom is based upon the Holy Scriptures, which declare that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth;" and whereas nearly three millions of the people of this country are held in slavery by their fellow-countrymen; and whereas the practice of buying and selling human beings prevails to an alarming extent; and whereas every man, irrespective of color, is entitled to equality of rights on the soil of his birth and residence; and whereas the prejudice against color which exists in this country is sinful in the sight of God, and should be immediately repented of; and whereas no scheme of expatriation should be countenanced by any friend of man or God; and whereas we owe it to the oppressed, to oppressors, to our country, to the world, and to Gon, to do all that is right and lawfully in our power to bring about the extinction of slavery and the slave trade, we do hereby agree, with a prayerful reliance on the Divine aid, to form ourselves into a Society, to be governed by the following Constitution:

"Art. 1. The name of this Association shall be the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

"Art. 2. The objects of this Society shall be the entire extinction of slavery and the slave trade, and equal security, protection, and improvement of the people of color."

They have declared, we find by this constitution, that they intend to abolish slavery throughout the entire nation, and throughout the entire world. This Society is composed not merely of Americans, but of Americans and foreigners, as I shall be able to show before I have done; and it is the interference of foreign thrones, foreign crowned heads, in aiding in the organization of a party which is to become the disunion party in the Northern portions of the States.

We find there—what? They propose to abolish slavery, and to place the slaves on an equality with the whites in the States where they reside. They are to be confined to the Southern States after they have been emancipated, and slavery shall have been abolished. They are to be placed on an equality with the whites; to be eligible to all the offices of the country—eligible to seats in this chamber, to become the judges, governors, members of Congress of the States. And is it possible to suppose for a moment that the Southern people are to submit to such degradation and to such utter ruin? Why, sir, they would be forced to abandon their country; they would be forced to give it up entirely to the black population. First robbed of their property in slaves, they would then be robbed of their homes, and forced to flee; for the two races cannot harmoniously live together on a basis of equality. This, sir, never could and never would be submitted to on the part of the South. But, having read the constitution of this party, I propose now to read a part of the proceedings of their Convention:

"*Resolved*, That, while we would express our deep gratitude to all those earnest men and women who find time and strength, amid their labors in behalf of British reform, to study, understand, and protest against American slavery, to give us their sympathy and aid, by *munificent contributions*, and by holding our *Union up to the contempt of Europe*, we feel that it would not be invidious to mention William and Mary Howitt, Henry Vincent, and George Thompson, as those to whose untiring advocacy our cause is especially indebted in this country, as well as for the hold it has gained on the hearts of the *British* people.

"*Resolved*, That the discriminating sense of justice, the steadfast devotedness, the generous munificence, the untiring zeal, the industry, skill, taste, and genius with which British abolitionists have co-operated with us for the extinction of slavery, command our gratitude." * * * * *

"From the abolitionists of England, Scotland, and Ireland we have received renewed and increasing assurances and proofs of their constant and enlightened zeal in behalf of the American slave. * * *Liberal gifts of all these countries, falling behind none of the most bounteous of former years, helped to fill the scanty treasury of the slave.*

"Just at this point of time, and when affairs are in this posture, the Free-Soil party appears and claims the support of the abolitionists by virtue of its superior anti-slavery pretensions. Its pretensions are specious, and in fact include about all that a political party, intending to maintain good faith towards the constitution, should offer. It proposes to forbid the extension of slavery in the newly-stolen territories, to abolish it wherever the constitution will permit, and to confine it to its present constitutional and territorial limits. Time was when the abolitionists would have been thankful for thus much, and when, for maintaining thus much, they were mobbed and hunted, whipped and shot, a price set upon their heads, their name cast out as evil, and they persecuted into strange cities. But their long and hard experience has attained to "something of prophetic strain," and they now plainly perceive that what would have satisfied them in their days of ignorance falls very short of what the necessity of the case demands. They can take no part in a movement which contemplates the recognition of the legal relation of master and slave any where within the universe of God. They spurn and spit upon the doctrine that any compact can be binding which conditions for the return of a fugitive into the hell of slavery, and for the forcible suppression of an attempt on the part of the slaves to vindicate their rights by "an appeal to arms and the God of battles." Their sense of personal honor forbids them to swear to support such a compact, either personally or by proxy, for the purpose of exerting political power, even for the slave, with the intention of performing it, much more with the intention of breaking it."

Now, sir, this connects itself directly with foreign Governments, and with foreign Powers; and shows the alliance, not that the movement is on the part of a portion of the American people alone, for the purpose of governing and controlling the policy of the United States, but that there is a co-operation of foreigners with this class of people. In other words, this class of people have become the mere instruments in the hands of foreign Powers for the purpose of effecting—that which they themselves could never effect—a dissolution of this Union. Now, sir, in connexion with this matter, I propose to read a statement made by the honorable Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) and I do it merely for the purpose of showing still more clearly the connexion of this party of abolitionists with a foreign Power. It is as follows:

"Now, sir, I come to Texas. Perhaps no gentleman had had more to do with the acquisition of Texas than myself; and I aver that I would have been among the very last individuals in the United States to have made any movement at that time towards the acquisition of Texas; and I go further and say, if I know myself, I was incapable of acquiring any territory, simply on the ground that it was to be slave territory. No, sir, a very different motive actuated me. I knew at a very early period that the British Government had given encouragement to the abolitionists who were represented in the World's Convention. The question of abolition was agitated in that Convention; and one gentleman stated that Mr. Adams informed him that, if the British Government chose to abolish slavery in the United States, they must commence in Texas. A committee from the World's Convention was sent to the Secretary of State. It so happened that this very gentleman was present when the intercourse took place between Lord Aberdeen and that committee, and he gave him a full account of it shortly after that occurrence, stating that Lord Aberdeen fell into the project to give encouragement to the abolitionists."

Now, Mr. President, in this connexion, I propose to show, also, from their own declarations, how this party propose to organize and effect their object of disunion. I will therefore send a further portion of the proceedings of this society to the chair to be read:

"The day of prophecy is passed; that of fulfilment is come. For long years the abolitionists have been looking forward to the state of things which is now beginning to develop itself. They have always known that the effect of their labors would at last be seen in the disturbance of the political elements, and the reconstruction of the political parties. They have seen and said, for long time past, that there were no principles on which parties could divide at this day, in this country, excepting slavery and anti-slavery. * * * *

"A public sentiment has been slowly and with difficulty created by the operation of anti-slavery papers, meetings, and lectures, which reaches many who know not where the influences which they feel went forth, and which is now beginning to be seen in Congress, in State Legislatures, and above all, in the disorganization which is at work in the old political parties. These are things to make the *hearts of abolitionists rejoice*. It is not the end, but it is the beginning of the end. * * * * The party, yet to be, which is to be, which is to do this work, will be *technically a Northern, or free State party*. Its object will be, by the action of the free States alone, outside of the constitution, to free themselves and the slaves from their guilty support of the system of slavery, while acting under the constitution. This party will agitate within the free States for the formation of a new confederation of States that shall have no part nor lot in the support of slavery, and shall be free from its despotic sway. It will go for a new constitution, for a Union of freemen, free from the insidious element of tyranny, disguised in compromise. Its object will be the foundation and edifying of a true republic, where the people will choose their own magistrates, and make their own laws, and not merely register the edicts of a ruthless aristocracy, deriving its hereditary and prescriptive privileges from ownership in human beings.

"This will be a movement which can be carried on in good faith and above board, and one in which all can unite who hate slavery for the blacks and subserviency for themselves. We believe great multitudes are ready for this movement now, as soon as it takes a political shape. We are sure that the experience of the Free-Soil party will show multitudes more, that this is their only hope for a national existence and Government consistent with self-respect and their own rights."

Now it is certainly due to the honorable Senator from New York to concede to him the position of leader of this party, and in fact I think he has gone further than any other man on this subject. He disregards the constitution, and labors to accomplish his object in direct violation of it, to an extent which is not avowed or assumed by any of his friends outside of this hall. Here, sir, in order that I may not be charged with doing him injustice, I propose to read a short extract from one of his speeches. I asserted that he disregarded the binding force of the constitution, and considered it to be a dead letter; and what does he say in his speech? I will read:

Extract from a speech of Mr. Seward, of New York.

"Wherein do the strength and security of slavery lie? You answer, that they lie in the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution and laws of the slaveholding States. Not at all. It is in the erroneous sentiment of the American people. Constitutions and laws can no more rise above the virtue of the people than the limpid stream can rise above its native spring. Inculcate the love of freedom and equal rights of man under the *paternal* roof. See to it that they are taught in the schools and in the churches. Reform your own code. Extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and defend him as you would your paternal gods. Correct your own error, that slavery has any constitutional guaranty, which *may not* be released and ought not to be relinquished. Say to slavery, when it shows its bond and demands the pound of flesh, that if it draws one drop, its life shall pay the forfeit. Inculcate that free States can maintain the rights of hospitality and humanity; that Executive authority can forbear to favor slavery."

It will be remembered, in this connexion, that the Senator from New York was once Governor of that State, and that, while filling that station, a demand was made upon him for the delivering up of a fugitive from justice, charged with having stolen a slave from Virginia, and he refused to deliver him up upon the doctrine contained in this speech—that there could be no crime committed, no larceny perpetrated in the stealing of a slave. He practised on the doctrine held forth here; and I suppose he is ready also to carry out his other principle, that if a fugitive slave comes to his country pursued by his master, with the intent of seizing him as his slave, his life should pay the forfeit, and the Senator would be ready to follow him with a "riot" for the preservation of the slave, even at the cost of the life of the owner. These, sir, are the sentiments held by the Senator, and it is the sentiment of those who co-operate with England and other foreign Powers in their design to put down this Union. The Senator speaks of this Union—yes, sir, he professes to be fond of this Union—to be a Union man—and yet we see him avowing his disregard of every obligation contained in the constitution which creates this Union! Asking his people to disregard and to violate their solemn oaths to carry out their fanatical purposes and views, in the same breath he appeals to the Union!

Sir, this cry of Union, this glorification of the Union, was for the purpose of misleading his people. It would not do for the Senator to come forward and avow openly his ultimate object, and his willingness to dissolve the Union; for in that case the constituency who elected, and who were deceived and misled by him, would at once have left him. Doubtless there are many who are friends and supporters of his who would abandon him the moment they ascertained he was leading them to perfect the dissolution of the Union.

Such is the position of the Senator, and such are the circumstances under which he declares his devotion to the Union. In the course of this speech he goes on to insist that Congress has the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. If they have power to abolish it in the District, as I remarked before, they have power to abolish it in the States.

But what would be the result of such abolition? The District would at once become the harbor for all the fugitive slaves from Virginia and Maryland. The provision of the constitution in relation to the rendition of fugitive slaves has no operation in this District, and the moment slavery is abolished here, that moment does the fugitive slave from Virginia and Maryland become free when he reaches here. Now who believes the framers of this constitution intended any such thing? Who will not be satisfied from this fact, that they intended that under the constitution Congress should have no power to abolish slavery in this District, or to interfere at all in regard to it, except to protect it here.

The Senator contends also that Congress may abolish slavery in the Territories. Why, sir, if they can do that, why does he not oppose the admission of California until Congress has imposed a territorial government with the Wilmot proviso upon them?

The Senator assumed the doctrine in his speech yesterday that the great question now under discussion was the gradual abolition of slavery throughout the Union; or the perpetuation of slavery or a dissolution of the Union. Yes, sir, and he advocates and declares that his object is to attain the abolition of slavery by confining it to the States in which it is now limited, and by permitting it to go nowhere else, and thereby to enforce emancipation; and, if this should fail, he spoke of the sword accomplishing this great object. Now, I propose to read an extract from the Farewell Address of Washington, for I think he describes the Senator from New York far better than I can, and I desire to do him full justice:

"In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—*Northern* and *Southern*, Atlantic and Western—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart-burnings which spring from these misrepresentations. They tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection."

Again, he says, in another part:

"However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of Government; destroying, afterwards, the very engines which had lifted them to unjust dominion.

"Towards the preservation of your Government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. * * * *

"Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which, nevertheless, ought not to be entirely out of sight,) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

"It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments, occasionally, riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the Government itself, through the channels of party passion. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another."

Here we find the principle upon which the South acts—the determination to resist these invasions upon the constitution and upon our rights. And does any body doubt what General Washington meant by the term *resistance*—resistance to infractions of the constitution and our constitutional rights? Would any man in this day doubt what was meant by General Washington? He did not mean resistance by speeches and votes here alone. He meant the resistance to be effectual, that which will preserve and perpetuate those rights—in a word, he meant the resistance which he offered Great Britain, and to her oppression of the colonies. That is the species of resistance which he meant, and which is here referred to.

Again, sir, he addresses us:

"But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free Governments are destroyed."

Here, sir, he has cast a stigma upon the conduct of these very people to whom I have referred. He speaks of their co-operation with a foreign Power, of the baneful influences of these foreigners acting upon our Government, and predicts, as their result and consequence, if not guarded against, our downfall and overthrow. What now are the open declarations and avowals of the disunion party at the North? They bind themselves together for the very purposes against the influence of which we are warned by this address. And, what renders it more melancholy, is the fact that a man who was once the President of the United States has made the first move, and been the first candidate of that sectional party for the Presidency. Yes, sir, no other man than Mr. Van Buren is now fanning this flame, that is to dissolve this Union and rend its bonds asunder, in order to elevate himself into power. A man who was once honored by the American people, and who has filled the highest station in their gift, having been defeated in his hopes of a second election, and of a third nomination, because he was inimical to an important national measure, has united himself and his destinies with this party, governed by British abolitionists, by crowned heads abroad, and by avowed disunionists. He has placed himself at their head, sir, in order to get into power by producing the destruction and ruin of this nation. I sincerely hope every attempt of every demagogue, every hollow-hearted and unprincipled man, may meet the same fate that Martin Van Buren met at the last Presidential election. But for the fact that we are confederated, it would never be communicated to posterity that he ever was a candidate in 1848. Sir, he did not receive a single electoral vote, and I hope he did not receive a majority in any county, or even of any precinct in the United States. The fact, however, ought to be handed down to posterity. This Martin Van Buren was the successor of Andrew Jackson in the Presidency, and stood by his side when the old chief read his farewell address to the American people, embodying the sentiments contained in that of Washington, and hypocritically pretended to approve of every word and every sentiment it contained? So far as Martin Van Buren and his followers are concerned, I have no regret at parting with them; but, on the contrary, I am glad that he has unmasked himself to the American people in time for the Democracy whom he has so vilely swindled to be able to communicate to him before he leaves this world the opinion they entertain of him now. For myself I take back every vote I have given for him, and I hope God will forgive me and my country will forgive me for every word I have ever uttered in his praise and in his defence.

I propose to read another extract from the Address of Gen. Washington. This suggests to me the fact that yesterday morning the Senator from New York (Mr. Dickinson) offered a petition here praying Congress to have printed a large number of copies of the Constitution of the United States, together with Washington's Farewell Address, for distribution throughout the country. I think it is a very sensible move on the part of his constituents, and, sir, I hope Congress will carry out the idea, with a single addition, and that is, to include the Farewell Address of Gen. Jackson in the publication. To show, sir, with what importance Gen. Washington regarded a strict adherence to the constitution, I read the following from his Farewell Address:

"But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free Governments are destroyed."

"Let there be no change by usurpation, even though good may result from it." Yes, sir; and as such a usurpation would I regard the admission of California, as well as every other constitutional question involved in this debate.

Having gone through with Gen. Washington, I propose to read a few extracts now from Gen. Jackson, to show how these distinguished men agree in opinion on this subject:

"Appeals, too, are constantly made to sectional interests, in order to influence the election of the Chief Magistrate, as if it were desired that he should favor a particular quarter of the country, instead of fulfilling the duties of his station with impartial justice to all; and the possible dissolution of the Union has at length become an ordinary and familiar subject of discussion. Has the warning voice of Washington been forgotten? or have designs already been formed to sever the Union? * * * * * * Mutual suspicion and reproaches may in time create mutual hostility, and artful and designing men will always be found who are ready to foment these fatal divisions, and to inflame the natural jealousies of different sections of the country. The history of the world is full of such examples, and especially republics. * * *

Yes, sir, we find such designing men among us now—designing men who are willing to take advantage of sectional differences—and I am willing to extend the application of the address to the Senator from New York, and