National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors

VOL. X.---NO. 40. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1850. WHOLE NUMBER 508.

Published Weekly, BY THE AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY, At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

Terms, TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS, PRINTER

Selections.

SPEECH OF HON. HENRY CLAY,

Delivered in the United States Senate, Tuesday, February 5th, 1850 on his Resolutions for a Compromise on the Slavery question.

The resolutions having been read, Mr. Clay proceeded to address the Senate as follows:

Mr. President, never, on any former occasion, have I arisen under feelings of such varied solicitude. I have witnessed many periods of great anxiety, of peril, and of danger even to the country; but I have never before arisen to address any assembly so oppressed, so appalled, so anxious. And, sir, I hope it will not be out of place to do here what again and again I have done in my private chamber—to implore of Him who holds the destinies of nations and individuals in his hands to bestow upon our country His blessings—to bestow upon our people all His blessings—to calm the violence and rage of party—to still passion—to allow reason once more to resume its empire. And may I not ask of Him, sir to bestow upon his humble servant, now before Him, the blessing of his smiles, of strength, and ability to perform the work which lies before us?

Sir, I have said that I have witnessed other anxious periods in the history of our country; and if I were to venture to trace to their original source—the cause of all our present dangers and difficulties, I should ascribe them to the violence and intemperance of party spirit. We have had testimony of this in the progress of this session; and senators, however they may differ in other matters, concur in acknowledging the existence of that cause in originating the unhappy differences which prevail throughout the country upon this subject of the institution of Slavery. Parties, in their endeavors to obtain the one the ascendancy over the other, catch at every passing and floating plank, in order to add strength and power to themselves. We have been told by two honorable senators, [Mr. Hale and Mr. Phelps] that the parties at the North have each in its turn wooed and endeavored to obtain the assistance of a small party called Abolitionists, in order that the scale in its favor might preponderate over its adversaries. Let us look wherever we may, we see too many indications of the existence of the spirit and intemperance of party. I might go to other legislative bodies besides our own. I might draw from those legislatures all the melancholy truth upon which I am dwelling; but, sir, I need not pass out of this Capitol itself—I say it with all deference and respect to that portion of Congress assembled in the other wing of the Capitol. But what have we seen here during this very session? One whole week—I think it was an entire week—exhausted in the vain endeavor to elect a Doorkeeper of the House!

[Much confusion prevailed in the lobbies and the avenues leading to the Senate chamber.]

Mr. Cass. Will the honorable senator pause a few moments, until order is restored here?

The Vice President. The Sergeant-at-Arms will see that the avenues to the galleries and this chamber are closed, and that a sufficient number withdraw from them to give room for those who are in, and to restore order.

Mr. Foote. Let all the disorderly be taken out.

Mr. Badger. There are persons in the ante-rooms that, because they cannot hear themselves, will not let others hear. I would suggest the propriety of extending the order to their case also.

Mr. Cass. Is the Sergeant-at-Arms in the chamber?

The Vice President. He is discharging his duty in restoring order.

Mr. Badger. Let the ante-rooms be entirely closed.

Order having at length been restored.

Mr. Clay resumed. Mr. President, what was the question, in this struggle to elect a Doorkeeper? It was not as regarded the man, or the qualifications of the man, best adapted to the situation. It was whether the Doorkeeper entertained opinions upon certain great national measures coincident with those of this or that side of the house! That was the sole question that prevented the election of that officer for about the period of a week! I make no reproaches, sir—none to either portion of the House. I state the fact; and I state that fact to draw from it the conclusion, and to express the hope that there will be an endeavor to check this violence of party.

Sir, what vicissitudes do we not pass through in this short mortal existence of ours! Eight years ago, sir, I took my leave finally, and—as I supposed—forever of this body. At that time I did not conceive of the possibility of being again returned in it; and if my private wishes and particular inclinations, and the desire during the short remnant of my days to remain in repose and quiet, could have prevailed, you would never have seen me, sir, occupying the seat which I now do upon this floor. The legislature of the State to which I belong, unsolicited by me, chose to designate me to represent them in this session; and I have come here, in obedience to a sense of stern duty, with no personal objects—no private views now or hereafter to gratify. I know, sir, the jealousies, fears, and apprehensions which are engendered by the spirit of party to which I have referred; and if there be any in my hearing now—if there be in or out of this Capitol—any one who is using his efforts for honor, and for elevation—for higher honor, for higher elevation, than that which he may enjoy—I beg him to believe that I at least will never jostle him in the pursuit of these honors or that elevation. I beg him to be persuaded that if my wishes prevail, my name shall never be used in competition with his. I beg leave to assure him that when my services are terminated in this body, my mission, so far as respects the public affairs of this world and upon this earth, is closed, and closed, if my wishes prevail, forever.

But, sir, it is impossible for us to be blind to the facts which are daily transpiring before us. It is impossible for us not to perceive that party spirit and future elevation mix more or less in all our affairs in all our deliberations. At a moment, sir, when the White House is itself in danger of conflagration, instead of all hands uniting to extinguish the flames, we are contending about who shall be its next occupant. When a dreadful crevasse has occurred, which threatens inundation and destruction to all around it, we are contesting and disputing about the profits of the estate which is threatened with total submersion.

Mr. President, it is passion, passion—party, party—and intemperance: that is all I dread in the adjustment of the great questions which unhappily at this time divide our distracted country. Sir, at this moment, we have in the legislative bodies of this Capitol, and in the States, twenty odd furnaces in full blast in making heat, and passion, and intemperance, and diffusing them throughout the whole extent of this broad land. Two months ago, sir, all was calm in comparison with the present moment. All now is uproar, confusion, menace to the existence of the Union and to the happiness and safety of this people. I implore Senators—I entreat them by all that they expect hereafter, and by all that is dear to them here below—to repress the ardor of these passions—to look at their country at this crisis—to listen to the voice of reason, not as it shall be attempted to be uttered by me, sir, for I am not so presumptuous as to indulge the hope that anything I can say shall deserve the attention I have desired; but to listen to their own reason, their own judgment, their own good sense, in determining what is best to be done for our country in the actual posture in which we find it. Sir, to this great object have my efforts been directed during this whole session. I have cut myself off from all the usual enjoyment of social life. I have confined myself almost exclusively, with very few exceptions, to my own chamber; and from the beginning of the session up to this time, my thoughts have been anxiously directed to the object of finding some plan, of proposing some mode of accommodation, which should once more restore blessings of concord, harmony, and peace to this great country. I am not vain enough to suppose, sir, that I have been successful in the accomplishment of this object. But I have presented a scheme; and allow me to say to honorable senators that if they find in that plan any thing which is defective, if they find in it anything which is worthy of acceptance, but is susceptible of improvement by amendment, it seems to me that the true and patriotic course for them to pursue is, not to denounce it, but to improve it; not to reject, without examination, any project of accommodation, having for its object the restoration of harmony in this country, but to look at it, and see if it be susceptible of alteration or improvement, so as to accomplish the object which I indulge the hope is common to all and every one of us, to restore peace, and quiet, and harmony, and happiness to this country.

Sir, when I came to consider this subject, there were two or three general purposes which seemed to me most desirable, if possible to accomplish. The one was to settle all the controverted questions arising out of the subject of Slavery; and it seemed to me to be doing very little if we settled one question and left other destructive questions unadjusted. It seemed to me to be doing but little if we stopped one leak only in the ship of State, and left other leaks capable of producing danger, if not destruction to the vessel. I therefore turned my attention to every subject connected with the institution of Slavery, and out of which controverted questions have sprung, to see if it were possible or practicable to accommodate and adjust the whole of them.

Another principal object which attracted my attention was to endeavor to frame such a scheme of accommodation as that neither of the two classes of States into which our country is unhappily divided should make a sacrifice of any great principle. I believe, sir, that the series of resolutions which I have had the honor of presenting to the Senate accomplish that object.

Another purpose, sir, that I had in view was this: I was aware of the difference of opinion prevailing between these two classes of States. I was aware that while a portion of the Union was pushing matters, as it seemed to me, to a dangerous extremity, another portion of the Union was pushing them to an opposite, and perhaps to a no less dangerous extremity. It appeared to me, then, that if any arrangement, any satisfactory adjustment, could be made of the controverted questions between the two classes of the States, that adjustment, that arrangement, could only be successful and effectual by exacting from both parties some concession, not of principle—not of principle at all—but of feeling, of opinion, in relation to the matters in controversy between them. Sir, I believe that the resolutions which I have prepared fulfil that object. I believe, sir, that you will find that upon careful, rational, and attentive examination of them, neither party makes any concession of principle at all, in others the concessions of forbearance are mutual.

In the next place, in respect to the slaveholding States, there are resolutions making concessions to them by the opposite class of States, without any compensation whatever being rendered by them to the non-slaveholding States.

Sir, I think every one of these characteristics which I have assigned to the measures which I propose is susceptible of clear, satisfactory demonstration, by an attentive perusal and critical examination of the resolutions themselves. Let us take up the first, sir.

The first resolution, Mr. President, as you are aware, sir, relates to California; and it declares that California, with suitable limits, ought to be admitted as a member of this Union, without the imposition of any restriction, either to interdict or to introduce Slavery within her limits. Now, sir, is there any concession in this resolution by either party or the other? I know that gentlemen who come from the slaveholding States say that the North gets all that it desires. But by whom does it get it? Does it get it by any action of Congress? If Slavery be interdicted in California, is it done by Congress, by this government? No, sir; the interdiction is imposed by California herself. And has it not been the doctrine of all parties, that when a State is about to be admitted into the Union, that State has a right to decide for itself whether it will or will not have Slavery within its limits? The great principle, sir, which was in contest upon the memorable occasion of the introduction of Missouri into the Union was, whether it was competent or was not competent for Congress to impose any restriction which should exist after she became a member of the Union? We, who were in favor of the admission of Missouri, contended that no such restriction could be imposed. We contended that, whenever she was once admitted into the Union, she had all the rights and privileges of any pre-existing State of the Union: and that of these rights and privileges, one was to decide for herself whether Slavery should or should not exist within her limits; that she had as much a right to decide upon the introduction of Slavery, or upon its abolition, as New York had a right to decide upon the introduction or abolition of Slavery; and that she stood among her peers equal, and invested with all the privileges that any one of the original thirteen States, and those subsequently admitted, had a right to enjoy.

And so, sir, I thought that those who have been contending with so much earnestness and with so much perseverance for the Wilmot Proviso, ought to reflect that even if they could carry their object, and adopt the Wilmot Proviso, it would cease the moment any State to whose territory it was applicable came to be admitted as a member of the Union. Why, sir, no one contends now—no one believes—that with regard to the north-western States, to which the ordinance of 1787 was applied—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan—no one now believes that any one of those States, if they thought proper to do it, has not just as much a right to introduce Slavery within her borders as Virginia has a right to maintain the existence of Slavery within hers.

Then, sir, if in this struggle of power and empire between the two classes of States, a decision of California has taken place adverse to the wishes of the southern States, it is a decision not made by the general government; it is a decision respecting which they cannot complain to the general government. It is a decision made by California herself, and which California had incontestably a right to make under the constitution of the United States. There is, then, in that first resolution, according to the observation which I made some time ago, a case where neither party concedes; where the question of Slavery, either of its introduction or interdiction, is silent as respects the action of this government; and if it has been decided, it has been decided by a different body, by a different power, by California herself, who had a right to make that decision.

Mr. President, the next resolution of the series which I have offered, I beg gentlemen candidly now to look at. I was aware, perfectly aware, of the perseverance with which the Wilmot Proviso was insisted upon. I knew that every one of the free States of this Union—I believe without exception—had, by its legislative bodies, passed resolutions instructing its senators and requesting its representatives to get that restriction incorporated into any territorial bill that might be offered under the auspices of Congress. I knew how much—although I regretted how much—the free States had—if I may say so—put their hearts upon the adoption of this measure. In this second resolution I call upon them to waive persisting in it. I ask them, for the sake of peace, and in a spirit of mutual forbearance to the other members of the Union, to give it up, and no longer to insist upon it—to see, as they must see, if their eyes are open, the dangers which lie under it, if they persevere in insisting upon it.

Well, sir, when I called upon them in that resolution to do this, was I not bound to offer for the surrender of the favorite measure of theirs, some compensation—not an equivalent by any means, but some compensation—as that spirit of mutual forbearance which animates the one side, ought, at the same time, to animate the other side? What is it that is offered them? It is a declaration of what I characterize and must style, with great deference to all those who entertain the opposite opinion—I will not say incontestable, but to me clear, and I think they ought to be regarded as—indisputable truths. And what are they? The first is, that by law, Slavery no longer exists in any portion of the acquisition made by us from the republic of Mexico; and the other is, that in our opinion, according to all the probabilities of the case, Slavery never will be introduced into any portion of the territories so acquired from Mexico.

Now, sir, I have heard it said that this declaration of what I call those two truths is equivalent to the enactment of the Wilmot Proviso. I have heard this asserted, but is that the case? If the Wilmot Proviso were adopted in territorial governments established in these countries acquired from Mexico, it would be a positive enactment, a prohibition, an interdiction, as to the introduction of Slavery within them. But with regard to those opinions, I had hoped, and still indulge the hope, that those who represent the free States will be inclined not to insist that we shall give—and indeed it would be extremely difficult to give to these declarations—the form of a positive enactment. I had hoped that they would be satisfied with the simple expression of the opinion of Congress, leaving it upon the basis of that opinion, without asking for what seems to me almost impracticable, if not impossible—for any subsequent enactments to be introduced into the bill by which Territorial Governments shall be established. I can only say that that second resolution, even without the declaration of these two truths, would be more acceptable to me than with them. But I could not forget that I was proposing a scheme of arrangement and compromise; and I could not, therefore, depart from the duty which the preparation of the scheme seemed to me to impose, while we ask upon the one side a surrender of their favorite measure, of offering upon the other side some compensation for that surrender or sacrifice.

Mr. President, the first of these truths is, that by law Slavery does not exist within the Territories ceded to us by the republic of Mexico. It is a misfortune, sir, in the various weighty and important topics which are connected with the subject that I am now addressing you upon, that any one of the five or six embraced in these resolutions would of itself furnish a theme for a lengthened speech; and I am, therefore, reduced to the necessity, I think, at least in this stage of the discussion, of limiting myself rather to the expression of opinions than to going at any great length into the discussion of all these various topics. Now, sir, with respect to the opinion here asserted, that Slavery does not exist in the Territories ceded to the United States by Mexico, I can only refer, sir, to the fact of the passage of a law by the supreme government of Mexico abolishing it, I think in the year 1824, and the subsequent passage of a law by the legislative body of Mexico—I forget in what year—by which they propose—what, it is true, they never yet carried into full effect—a compensation to the owners of slaves for the property of which they were deprived by the act of abolition. I can only refer to the acquiescence of Mexico to the abolition of Slavery, from the time of this extinction down to the time of the treaty by which we acquired these countries. All Mexico, so far as I know, acquiesced in the non-existence of Slavery. Gentlemen, I am aware, talk about the irregularity of the acts by which Slavery was abolished; but does it become us, a foreign power, when she herself is satisfied with what is done, and when she, too, is exclusively the judge whether an object, local and municipal in Mexico has or has not been accomplished in conformity with her fundamental law? Why, sir, Mexico, upon this subject, showed to the last moment her anxiety. In the documents which were laid before the country upon the subject of the negotiation of the treaty by Mr. Trist, you will find this passage contained in one of his despatches:

"Among the points which came under discussion was the exclusion of Slavery from all territory which should pass from Mexico. In the course of their remarks on the subject, I was told that if it were proposed to the people of the United States to part with a portion of their territory, in order that the institution should be therein established, the proposal could not excite stronger feelings of abhorrence than those awakened in Mexico by the prospect of the introduction of Slavery in any territory parted with by her. Our conversation on this topic was perfectly frank, and no less friendly; and the more effective upon their minds, inasmuch as I was enabled to say, with perfect security, that although their impressions respecting the practical fact of Slavery, as it existed in the United States, were, I had no doubt, entirely erroneous, yet there was probably no difference between my individual views and sentiments on Slavery, considered in itself, and those which they entertained. I concluded by assuring them that the bare mention of the subject in any treaty to which the United States were a party was an absolute impossibility; that no President of the United States would dare to present any such treaty to the Senate; and that if it were in their power to offer me the whole territory described in our project, increased tenfold in value, and, in addition to that, covered a foot thick all over with pure gold, upon the single condition that Slavery should be excluded therefrom, I could not entertain the offer for a moment, nor think even of communicating it to Washington. The matter ended in their being fully satisfied that this topic was one not to be touched, and it was dropped, with good feeling on both sides."

Thus you find that, in the very act of negotiation by which the treaty was concluded, which ceded to us the country in question, the diplomatic representatives of the Mexican Republic urged the abhorrence with which Mexico would view the introduction of Slavery into any portion of the territory which she was about to cede to the United States. But a prohibition of its introduction was not asserted, in consequence of the firm ground taken by Mr Trist, and his declaration that it was an utter impossibility even to mention the subject. I take it, then, for granted, sir—availing myself of the benefit of the discussions which took place upon this topic at a former session, which I think have left the whole country under the impression of the non-existence of Slavery in the ceded Territories—I take it for granted that what I have said will satisfy the Senate of that first truth—that Slavery does not exist there by law, unless Slavery was carried there the moment the treaty was ratified by the two parties of the treaty, under the operation of the constitution of the United States.

Now, sir, really, I must say that the idea that *eo instanti* upon the consummation of the treaty, the constitution of the United States spread itself over the acquired country, and carried along with it the institution of Slavery, is so irreconcilable with any comprehension or any reason which I possess, that I hardly know how to meet it. Why, sir, these United States consist of thirty States. In fifteen of them, there was Slavery; in fifteen, Slavery did not exist. How can it be argued that the fifteen slave States, by the operation of the constitution of the United States, carried into the ceded country their institution of Slavery, any more than it can be argued upon the other side, that by the operation of the same constitution, the fifteen free States carried into the ceded Territories the principle of freedom, which they, from policy, have chosen to adopt within their limits? Let me suppose a case, sir. Let me imagine that Mexico had never abolished Slavery there at all. Let me suppose that it was existing there, by virtue of law, from the shores of the Pacific to those of North Mexico, at the moment of the cession of those countries to us by the treaty in question. With what patience would gentlemen, coming from the slaveholding States, listen to an argument which should be urged by the free States, that notwithstanding the existence of Slavery within these Territories, the constitution of the United States, the moment it operated upon and took effect within the ceded territories, abolished Slavery, and rendered them free? Well, is there not just as much ground to contend, where a moiety of the States are free, and the other moiety are slaveholding States, that the principle of freedom which prevails in the one class shall operate, as the principle of Slavery which prevails in the other class of States shall operate? Can you, amidst this conflict of interests, of principles, and of legislation, which prevail in the two parts of the Union—can you come to any other conclusion than that which I understand to be the conclusion of the public law of the world, of reason, and of justice, that the *status* of law, as it existed at the moment of the conquest or acquisition, remains until altered by the sovereign authority of the conquering or acquiring power? That is a great principle, and you can scarcely turn over a page of the public law where you will not find it recognized. The laws of Mexico, as they existed at the moment of the cession of the ceded Territories to this country, became their laws still, unless they were altered by that new sovereign power which this people and these Territories came under, in consequence of the treaty of cession to the United States. I think, then, Mr. President—without trespassing further, or exhausting the little stock of strength I have, and for which I shall have ample occasion in the progress of the argument—that I may leave that part of the subject with two or three observations only upon the general power which, I think, appertains to this government upon the subject of Slavery within those Territories.

But, sir, before I approach that subject, allow me to say that, in my humble judgment, the institution of Slavery presents two questions totally distinct, and resting upon entirely different grounds: Slavery within the States, and Slavery without the States. Congress, the general government, has no power, under the constitution of the United States, to touch Slavery within the States, except in the three specified particulars in that instrument: to adjust the subject of representation, to impose taxes when a system of direct taxation is made, and to perform the duty of surrendering, or causing to be delivered up, fugitive slaves when they escape from the service which they owe in the slave States, and take refuge in the free States. And, sir, I am ready to say that if Congress were to attack within the States the institution of Slavery, with the purpose of the overthrow or the extinction of Slavery, then, Mr. President, "my voice would be for war." Then would be made a case which would justify in the sight of God, and in the presence of the nations of the earth, resistance on the part of the slave States to such an unconstitutional, usurped attempt as would be made under the supposition I have stated. Then, sir, we should be acting in defence of our rights, of our domiciles, of our property, of our safety, of our lifes. Then I think would be furnished a case in which the slave States would be justified by all the considerations which appertain to the happiness or security of man, to employ every instrument which God or nature has placed in our hands, to resist such an attempt upon the part of the government. Then, sir, if, unfortunately, civil war should break out, we should present to the nations of the earth the spectacle of one portion of this Union endeavoring to subvert an institution of another portion, in violation of the constitution and the most sacred obligations. We should present a spectacle in which we should have the sympathy and good wishes, and desire for our success, of all men who love justice and truth.

Far different would, I fear, be our case, if unhappily, we should be led into war, into civil war, if the two parts of this country should be placed in a hostile position towards each other, in order to carry Slavery into new territories acquired from Mexico. Mr. President, we have heard—all of us read—of the efforts of France to propagate—what, on the continent of Europe? Not Slavery, sir, not Slavery, but the rights of man; and we know the fate of her efforts of propagandism of that kind. But if, unhappily, we should be involved in war, in civil war, between the two parties of this confederacy, in which the effort upon the one side should be to restrain the introduction of Slavery into the new territories, and upon the the other side to force its introduction there, what a spectacle should we present to the astonishment of mankind, in an effort, not to propagate rights, but—I must say it, sir, though I trust it will be understood to be said with no design to excite feelings—a war to propagate wrongs in the territories thus acquired from Mexico. It would be a war in which we should have no sympathies, no good wishes; in which all mankind would be against us; in which our own history itself would be against us; for from the commencement of the revolution down to the present time, we have constantly reproached our British ancesters for the introduction of Slavery into this country. And allow me to say, that in my opinion, it is one of the best defences which can be made to preserve the institution of Slavery in this country, that it was forced upon us against the wishes of our ancestors—of our own American colonial ancestors—and by the cupidity of our British commercial ancestors.

The power, then, Mr. President, in my opinion—and I extend it to the introduction as well as to the prohibition of Slavery in the new territories—does exist in Congress and I think there is this important distinction between Slavery outside of the States and Slavery inside of the States; that all outside of the States is debatable, and all inside of the States is not debatable. The government has no right to attack the institution within the States; but whether she has and to what extent she has or has not, the right to attack Slavery outside of the States, is a question debateable, upon which men may honorably and fairly differ; and however it may be decided, furnishes, I trust, no just occasion for breaking up this glorious Union of ours.

I am not going to take up that part of the subject which relates to the power of Congress to legislate. I shall have occasion to make some observations upon that subject in the course of my remarks—whether in this District of Columbia or in the Territories; but I must say in a few words that I think those two sources of power, either of which is sufficient, in my judgment, to authorize the exercise of the power, either to introduce or keep out Slavery, outside of the States and within the Territories, exist. Mr. President, I shall not take up time, of which so much has been consumed already, to show that the clause which gives to Congress the power to make needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States, conveys the power to legislate for the Territories. I cannot concur with my worthy friend—and I use the term in its best and most emphatic sense—my friend from Michigan—for I believe we have known each other, longer than I have known, and longer than he has known, any other Senator in this hall—I say I cannot concur with that honorable senator, though I entertain the most profound respect for the opinions which he has advanced adverse to my own; but I must say, sir, that when a point is settled by all the elementary authorities, and by the uniform interpretation and action of every department of our government—legislative, executive, and judicial—and when that point has been settled during a period of fifty years, and never was seriously disturbed until recently, I think that if we are to regard anything as fixed and settled under the administration of this constitution of ours, it is the question which has been thus invariably and uniformly settled. Or, sir, we are to come to the conclusion that nothing—nothing upon earth is settled under this constitution, and that everything is unsettled?

Mr. President, we are to recollect that it is very possible—that it is, indeed, quite likely—that when that constitution was formed, the application of it to such Territories as Louisiana, Florida, California, and New Mexico, was never within the contemplation of the framers of that instrument. It will be recollected that, when that constitution was formed, the whole country northwest of the Ohio was unpeopled; and it must be recollected, also, that the exercise of the power to make governments for Territories in their infant state is in the nature of the power temporary, and such as must terminate whenever they have acquired a population competent to self-government. Sixty thousand is the number specified in the ordinance of 1787. Now, sir, recollect that, when this constitution was adopted, that territory was unpeopled; and how was it possible that Congress, to whom it had been ceded, for the common benefit of the ceding States and the other States of the Union, had no power whatever to declare what description of settlers should occupy the public lands? Suppose that Congress had taken up the notion that Slavery would enhance the value of the land, and, with a view to replenish the public treasury and augment the revenue from that source, that the introduction of Slavery there would be more advantageous than its exclusion, would they not have had the right, under that clause which authorizes Congress to make the necessary "rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States"—would they have no right, discretion or authority—whatever you may choose to call it—to say that anybody who chose to bring his slaves and settle upon the land and improve it should do so? It might be said that it would enhance the value of the property; it would give importance to the country; it would build up towns and villages: and in fine we may suppose that Congress might think that a greater amount of revenue might be derived from the waste lands by the introduction of Slavery than could be secured by its exclusion; and will it be contended, if they so thought, that they would have no right to make such a rule? Why, sir, remember how those settlements were made. They began with very few persons. Marietta was, I think, the first place settled in the Northwest Territory. My friend now before me [Mr. Corwin] will correct me if I am wrong. It was a small settlement, made by some two or three hundred persons from England. Cincinnati was the next, and was settled by a hundred persons from New Jersey, perhaps, or some other of the States. Now, sir, had those few settlers the right, from the moment they arrived there—a mere handful of men, who may have planted themselves at Marietta or Cincinnati—to govern and dispose of the territories, or to govern themselves as a sovereign community? or was it not in the mean time right and proper, and within the contemplation of the constitution, that Congress, who owned the soil, acting under the authority therein contained, should regulate the settlement of the soil, and govern the settlers in those infant colonies until they should reach a sufficient degree of consideration, in respect of numbers and capacity for self-government, to be constituted into more regular municipal organizations, and be allowed to govern themselves?

Sir, I will not further dwell upon this point of the subject. But I have said there is another source of power equally satisfactory in my mind—equally conclusive as that which relates specifically to the Territories. This is the treaty-making power—the acquiring power. Now, I put it to gentlemen, is there not at this moment a power somewhere existing either to admit or exclude Slavery from the Territories? It is not an annihilated power. That is impossible. It is a substantive, actual, existing power. And where does it exist? It existed—no one, I presume, denies—in Mexico prior to the cession of those Territories. Mexico could have abolished Slavery or have introduced Slavery either in California or New Mexico. Now, that power must have been ceded. Who will deny that? Mexico has parted with the territory, and with the sovereigty of the territory; and to whom did she transfer it? She transferred the territory and the sovereignty over the territory to the government of the United States. The government of the United States then acquired all the territory and all the sovereignty over that territory which Mexico held in California and New Mexico prior to the cession of these Territories. Sir, dispute that who can.—The power exists, or it does not exist. It existed in Mexico. No one, I think, can deny that Mexico alienated her sovereignty over the territory to the government of the U. States, which, therefore, possess all the powers which Mexico possessed over the Territories; and the government of the United States can do with reference to them—within, I admit, certain limits of the constitution—whatever Mexico could have done. There are prohibitions upon the power of Congress within the constitution, which prohibitions, I admit, must apply to Congress whenever it legislates, whether for the old States or the new Territories; but within the scope of those prohibitions, the powers of Congress are coëxtensive and coëqual with the powers of Mexico prior to the cession.

Sir, with regard to the treaty-making power, all who have had any occasion to examine into its character, and into the possible extent to which it may be carried, know that it is unlimited in its nature, except in so far as any limitations may be found within the constitution of the United States; but upon this subject there is no limitation which prescribes the extent to which the power shall be exercised.

I know, sir, that it is argued that there is no grant of power, in express terms, in the constitution over the subject of Slavery. But there is no grant in the constitution, specifically, over a vast variety of subjects upon which the power of Congress are unquestionable. The major includes the minor. The general grant of power comprehends all the particulars of which that power consists. The power of acquisition by treaty draws with it the power to govern all the territory acquired. If there be a power to acquire, there must be a power to govern; and I think, therefore, sir, without at present dwelling further upon this part of the subject, that from the two sources of authority in Congress to which I have referred may be traced the power of the government of the United States to act upon the Territories in general.

And, sir, I come now to the question of the extent of the power. I think it is a power adequate either to introduce or to exclude Slavery. I admit the argument in both its forms of application. I admit that, if the power exists of excluding, the power must also exist of introducing or tolerating Slavery within the Territories. But, sir, I have been drawn off so far from the second resolution, which I have now under consideration, that I have almost lost it out of view. In order therefore, that we may come back understandingly to the subject, I will again read it:

Resolved, That as Slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any of the territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law either for its introduction into, or exclusion from, any part of the said territory; and that appropriate territorial governments ought to be established by Congress in all of the said territory not assigned as the boundaries of the proposed State of California, without the adoption of any restriction or condition on the subject of Slavery.

The other truth, as I respectfully and with great deference submit, is this: The Resolution announces that Slavery is not likely to be introduced into any of those Territories. Well, sir, is not that the fact? Is there a member of this body who doubts it? What has occurred within the last three months? In California more than in any other portion of the ceded Territories, was it most probable, if Slavery was adapted to the industrial habits of the people, that Slavery would be introduced; yet, within the last three months, Slavery has been excluded by the vote—the unanimous vote—of the convention against its introduction—a vote, as I observed on a former occasion, not confined to men from the non-slaveholding States. There were men from the slaveholding States as well, who concurred in that declaration; and that declaration has been responded to by the people of California of all classes, and from all parts of the United States, and from foreign countries. Well, sir, if we come down to those mountainous ridges which abound in Mexico, the nature of its soil, its barrenness, its unproductive character, everything that we know, everything that we hear of it, must necessarily lead to the conclusion, which I have mentioned, that Slavery is not likely to be introduced there.

Well, sir, if it be true that by law Slavery does not now exist in the Territories—if it is not likely to be introduced into the Territories—if you senators here, or a majority of you, believe these truths, as I am persuaded a large majority of you do—where is the difficulty in your announcing it to the whole world! Why hesitate or falter in the declaration of these indisputable truths? On the other hand, with regard to the senators from the free States, allow me to make a reference to California in one or two other observations. When this feeling within the limits of your States was gotten up—when the Wilmot Proviso was disseminated through them—did you not fear, whatever may have been the state of the facts—did you not at that time apprehend the introduction of Slavery? You did not know much in relation to the country or its inhabitants. They were far distant from you, and you were truly apprehensive that Slavery might be introduced there, and you felt that the Wilmot Proviso was a necessary measure of prevention. It was in this state of information that the whole North blazed up in behalf of this Wilmot Proviso. It was in the apprehension that Slavery might be introduced there that you left your constituents when you came here; for at the time you left your respective residences, you did not know the fact, which has reached us since the commencement of the session of Congress—you did not know the fact that a constitution had been unanimously adopted by the people of California excluding Slavery.

Well, now, let me suppose that two years ago it had been known in the free States that such a constitution would be adopted; let me suppose that, in relation to this whole subject—the solicitude in relation to Slavery—the people of the North had supposed that there was no danger; let me also suppose that they had forseen the excitement, the danger, the irritation, the resolutions which have been adopted by the Southern Legislatures, and the manifestations of the people of the slave States: let me suppose all this had been known at the North at the time the agitation was being excited upon the subject of this Wilmot Proviso, do you believe that it would ever have reached the height to which it has since risen? Do any of you believe it? And if, prior to your departure from your respective homes, you had had the opportunity of conversing with your constituents upon this great, pleasing, and important fact of the adoption of a constitution excluding Slavery from California, do you not believe, senators and representatives coming from the free States, that if you had had the aid of the fact in a calm, serious, fireside conversation, your constituents would not have told you to come here and settle all these questions without danger to the Union? What do you want?—what do you want?—you who reside in the free States. Do you want that there should be no Slavery introduced into the Territories acquired by the war with Mexico! Have you not your desire in California? And in all human probability you will have it in New Mexico also. What more do you want? You have got what is worth more than a thousand Wilmot Provisos. You have nature on your side—facts upon your side—and this truth starring you in the face that there is no Slavery in those Territories. If you are not mad, if you can elevate yourselves from the struggles of party to the height of patriots in every sense, what will you do! Look at the fact as it it exists. You will see that this fact was unknown to the great majority of the people: you will see that they acted upon one set of facts, while we have another set of facts before us: and we will act as patriots—as responsible men, and as lovers of liberty, and lovers, of this Union. We will act upon this set of facts that were unknown to our constituents, and appeal to their justice and magnanimity to concur with us in this action for peace, concord, and harmony.

I think, entertaining these views, that there is nothing extravagant in the hope which I indulged at the time these resolutions were proposed—nothing extravagant in the hope that the North might content itself even with striking out these two declarations. They are unnecessary for any purpose which the free States have in view. At all events, if they should insist upon Congress expressing the opinions which are here asserted, they might even limit their wishes to the simple assertion of that, without insisting on their being incorporated in any territorial governments which might be devised for the Territories in question.

I pass from the second resolution to the third and fourth, which relate to the Texas question. But allow me to say, Mr. President, that I approach the subject with a full knowledge of all its difficulties; and of all the questions connected with or growing out of this institution of Slavery, which Congress is called upon to pass upon at this time, there are none so difficult and troublesome as this which relates to Texas; because Texas, sir, has the question of boundary to settle. The question of Slavery, or the feeling connected with the institution of Slavery, runs into the question of Texas. The North are, perhaps, anxious to contract Texas within the narrowest possible limits, in order to exclude all beyond them, and to make it free territory. The South, on the contrary, are anxious to extend their limits to the source of the Rio Grade, for the purpose of obtaining an additional theatre for Slavery; and it is this question of the limits of Texas, and the settlement of her boundaries, which precedes all others. You will perceive that these difficulties of the boundary question meet us at every step we take, in which there is a third question also adding to the difficulty. By the resolution of annexation, all territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. was interdicted from Slavery. But of New Mexico, all that which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min. embraces about one-third of the whole of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande; so that free and slave territory, Slavery and non-Slavery, may encounter each other. All these difficulties are to be met. And allow me to say, sir, that among the considerations which induced me to think that it was necessary to settle all these questions, was the state of things that now exists in New Mexico, and a state of things to be apprehended both here and in the Territories. Why, sir, at this moment—and I think I shall have the concurrence of the two Senators from that State, when I mention the fact—there is a feeling approximating to abhorrence, on the part of the people of New Mexico, of any union with Texas.

Mr. Rusk. Only on the part of office-holders, office-seekers, and those they could influence.

Mr. Clay. Well, sir, that may be, and I am afraid that New Mexico is not the only place where office-holders and office-seekers compose the majority of the population of the country. [Laughter.] They are a terribly large class, I assure you, sir. Now, if the questions are settled which relate to Texas, her boundaries, etc., and which relate to the territory not claimed by Texas, and included in New Mexico, all these questions will but tend to agitation, confusion, disorder and anarchy there, and agitation here. There will be, I have no doubt, parties at the North crying out that if the question is not settled by the Wilmot Proviso or some other restrictions upon them, we absolutely do nothing. And in my opinion we absolutely do nothing if we do not provide against those difficulties, and the recurrence of these dangers. With respect to the state of things in New Mexico, allow me to call the attention of the Senate to what I consider as the highest authority I could offer, as to the state of things there existing—I mean the act of their convention, unless that convention happened to be composed of office-seekers and office-holders, etc. Now, sir, I call your attention to what they say of their situation, if my colleague will be so kind as to read for me.

Mr. Underwood read as follows:

"We, the people of New Mexico, in convention assembled, having elected a delegate to represent this Territory in the Congress of the United States, and to urge upon a supreme government a redress of our grievances, and the protection due to us as citizens of our common country, under the constitution, instruct him as follows: That whereas for the last three years, we have suffered under the paralyzing effects of a government undefined and doubtful in its character, inefficient to protect the rights of the people, or to discharge the high and absolute duty of every government, the enforcement and regular administration of its own laws, in consequence of which industry and enterprise are paralyzed, and discontent and confusion prevail throughout the land; the want of proper protection against the various barbarous tribes of Indians that surround us on every side, has prevented the extension of settlements upon our valuable public domain, and rendered utterly futile

every attempt to explore or develope the great resources of the Territory. Surrounded by the Utahs, Camanches, and Apaches, on the north, east, and south, by the Navajos on the west, with Jicarillas within our limits, and without any force to protect us against their hostile inroads, our flocks and herds are driven off by thousands; our fellow citizens—men, women, and children—are murdered or carried into captivity; many of our citizens, of all ages and sexes, are at this moment suffering all the horrors of barbarian bondage, and it is utterly out of our power to obtain their release from a condition to which death would be preferable. The wealth of our Territory is being diminished. We have no means or any adequate plan by government for the education of rising generation. In fine, with a government temporary, doubtful, uncertain, and inefficient in character and in operation, surrounded and despoiled by barbarous foes, ruin appears inevitably before us, unless speedy and effectual protection be extended to us by the Congress of the United States."

Mr. Clay. Now, sir, there is a set of resolutions indicative of the state of things here, and of the country on the Rio Grande, to that part not claimed by Texas, we find no better state of things. In fact, I cannot for a moment believe that it is my sense of duty as a Congress to adjourn without an effort at least being made to extend the benefits and blessings of government to those people who have recently been acquired by us. With regard to that portion of New Mexico which lies east of the Rio Grande, undoubtedly if it were conceded to Texas, there would be two parties dividing, disliking each other as much as the office-seekers and office-holders in New Mexico and the Texans would disliking each other if they were thrown together. That, however, might be a remedy, as relates to New Mexico. But all beyond Texas, and all west of the Nueces, would be still open to all the consequences of disorder, confusion, and anarchy, without some stable government emanating from the authority of the country of which they form now a part, and with which they are but little acquainted. I think, therefore, that the question, difficult and troublesome as they may be, ought to be met in a spirit of candor and calmness, and decided upon the merits of the case. There are questions which I have immediately under consideration propose a decision of those questions. I have said that there is scarcely a resolution in the series of which I offered that did not contain some mutual concession, or evidence of mutual forbearance; that the concession was not altogether from the non-slaveholding states to the slaveholding States. These resolutions propose a boundary to Texas. What is it? I will be frank. There is of opinion which exists in this country upon the subject of boundaries. We know that a very large portion of the people of the United States entertained that the Western limit of Texas was the Nueces—that it did not extend to the Rio Grande. We know that the question of what is the Western limit of the Northern limit of Texas was an open question—has been all along an open question; was an open question when the boundary was run in which we find it in 1838, marking the boundary between the United States and Texas. Sir, at that time, the boundary mutually by the act of 1838 was to begin at the mouth of the Sabine, run up to its head, to the Red river, and thence westwardly, to the Rio Bravo. Sir, in the 1838 line, I have said, that did not go as far as Texas now claims, and why? Because it was an open question. War was waging between Texas and Mexico, and we were not at that time authorized to say what would be ultimately the ultimate limits. But, sir, when we come to the question of what was done at the time of the annexation, the whole resolution which relates to boundaries, from beginning to end, assumes an open, unascertained, and unsettled boundary to Texas on the West. Why, sir, what is the first part of the resolution? It is "that Congress consents that Texas may be formed, included within and rightfully belonging to Texas, may be erected into a new State." "Properly included"—"rightfully belonging." I ask what is the meaning—it could specify no boundary. It assumes the state of uncertainty which in point of fact we know exists. Now, sir, the latter part of it—"Said State to be formed subject to the adjustment of all questions of boundary that may arise with other Governments, under the constitution thereof," &c. That is to say, she is assured with her rightful and proper boundaries, without a question of doubt; but in order that it be well known that these boundaries at the west and the north were unsettled, the Government of the United States retained to itself the power of settling with any foreign nation what the boundary should be.

Now, sir, it is impossible for me to go into the whole question. I mean to express rather my opinion than to go into the whole extent of the argument. The western boundary of Texas being unsettled, and those retaining to itself the power to settle it, I ask: supposes that power had been exercised, and that no cession of territory to the United States had taken place, the United States and Mexico conjointly? Suppose that a treaty of the limits of Texas had been concluded between the United States and Mexico, establishing the Nueces as the boundary, would not Texas have been bound by it? Or suppose it had been the Rio Grande, Nueces, or any other point, whatever limit had been fixed upon by the joint act of the two powers, would it not have been obligatory upon Texas, by the express terms of the resolution by which it was annexed?

Well, now, sir, if Mexico and the United States conjointly by treaty might have fixed upon the Western and Northern limits of Texas, and if the United States have acquired that power by treaty, what is the power upon which the limits of Texas must have depended is now invested in the United States solely and exclusively—and which Mexico and the United States conjointly possessed prior to the old treaty with Mexico. It seems to me, sir, that the conclusion and reasoning are perfectly irresistible. If Mexico and the United States could have fixed upon any Western limits for Texas, and did not do it, and if the United States have acquired the power by the treaty so to do, and have not invested solely and exclusively in the United States, and must be fixed, it seems to me that the conclusion is the logical conclusion that the United States now has the power to do what the United States and Mexico conjointly could have done. I admit that in a civilized power—an extremely delicate power. I admit that it ought to be exercised with a spirit of justice, generosity, and liberality towards this youngest member of the great American family.

Upon that question I offer no positive opinion—but possibly if the United States fixes the line very contrary to the desire and rights of Texas, she might bring it before the Supreme Court of the United States, and have the question again decided. I say possibly, because I am not of that class of politicians who believe that every question is a proper question for the Supreme Court of the United States. There are questions too large for any tribunal of that kind to decide—great political, national, and international questions, that transcend their limits, and to which they are utterly incompetent. Whether this is one or not, I will not decide, but I will maintain that the United States are now invested solely and exclusively with the power that was in both nations to fix, ascertain, and settle the Western and Northern limits of Texas.

Sir, the other day my honourable friend who represents so well the State of Texas (Mr. Thomas) said we had no more right to touch the limits of Texas than we have to touch the limits of Kentucky; that the State is one and indivisible, and that the Federal government had no right to separate it. I agree with him that, when the limits are certain and ascertained, they are unalienable and indivisible. The Federal government has no right or power to interfere with the limits of a State whose boundaries are fixed, known, ascertained, and recognized—no power to interfere with it voluntarily. An extreme case may be put—one which I trust is never to occur—that the Union—not a conquered nation and of a constitution adapting itself to the state of subjugation and conquest to which it has been reduced—but the Union of whole States, as well as parts of the State, in order to save what remains from the conquering arm of the successful invader. I say under such circumstances I exist for a case of extremity such as this; and I admit that short of such an extremity, voluntarily, the general government has no right to separate, or to take any portion of its territory from it, or to regard it otherwise than an integer—and indivisible.

But then I answer—what does not exist in the State of Texas—that this boundary was known, ascertained, and unquestionable. On the contrary, it was unknown, was unfixed, and remains unfixed to this moment, with respect to her limits west and north of the Nueces. Why, sir, we paid fifteen millions of dollars for Territories that we bought, and God knows what's mostly bargain to this country that we bought. We paid seven millions of dollars for the Territories ceded by Mexico to us. Can Texas justly, fairly, and honorably come to claim she has never had a right to, without paying her portion of that fifteen millions of dollars? She talks, indeed, about the United States being her agent—her trustee. Why, sir, the United States is her agent or trustee than she was the agent or trustee of any other part of the United States.

Texas involved her in a war which Mexico: I make no reproaches—none, none. Texas brought her into the war; but when she got into it, it was a war between Texas and Mexico—it was a war of the whole thirty States with Mexico—a war in which the government of the United States contributed the boldness, and was as much the trustee and agent of the twenty-nine other States composing this Union, as she was the trustee and agent of Texas. Sir, with respect to all these circumstances—such, for example, as a map annexed to the recent treaty with Mexico: these are the opinions of individuals, highly respectable and eminently elevated individuals, as was the lamented Mr. Polk, late President of the United States. It was his individual opinion, that he had no right, as President of the United States, or in any other character, otherwise than as negotiating with Mexico, and with Texas, and as an act in concurrence with him, to fix a boundary. In respect to that map, which is attached to the treaty, it is sufficient to say that the treaty itself is silent, from beginning to end, upon the limits of Texas, and the adjusting of the map to the treaty no more confirms the truth of anything delineated upon that map in relation to the boundary, than it does to any other geographical subject which composes the map.

Mr. President, I have said that I thought the power has been conferred upon the United States to fix upon the limits of Texas. I have said that this power ought to be exercised in a spirit of great liberality and justice; and I put it to you, sir, to say, upon this second resolution of mine, whether that liberality and justice have not been displayed in the resolution.

Sir, I have said, I will be explicit. No, sir. To extend it from the Sabine to the mouth of the Rio Grande—and to extend it up the Rio Grande to the boundary of New Mexico, and thence with that limit, to the boundary between the United States and Spain, as it was under the treaty of 1819. Sir, I say, that is a vast country. I have made no estimate about it, but I believe it is equal in amount of acres—in extent—to two, three, or four States. I have said that the boundary of the United States, when the condition and number of the population may render it expedient, will be entitled to a State. Well, sir, is not that concession, liberality and justice?

But, sir, it is not all that we propose to give them. There is another consideration which I propose to them a certain amount of the debt of Texas. A blank is left, because I have not hitherto been able to ascertain the amount. But, if I can, I will before the Senator allow me to make a motion that we now go into executive session, in order to enable me to bring the matter before you. If I can, I will; if I can not think it will be possible for me to conclude to-day, although I wished to go through as I have commenced.

Mr. Foote. I will make the motion at any time the Senator may feel disposed to give way.

Mr. Clay. If the Senator will do it, I will merely conclude what I have to say in relation to Texas, and then I will give way. If the Senate please.

Mr. President, I have made a remark, independent of the most liberal and generous boundary rendered to Texas, we propose to give her a certain amount of the debt of Texas. Is not that worthy Senator from Texas, in my view, thinks will not be less than about three millions of dollars, and which I understand to be the sum of the principal the requisite materials to ascertain. Well, sir, you get this large boundary and three millions of your debt to be paid by the United States, which I regard as a former occasion, as to the obligation of the United States to pay that debt; but I was struck upon the occasion of the treaty of 1819 with the fact that the United States and Mexico, then the treaty of limits between the United States and Texas, is the first and only instance in which the United States recognition of the principles out of which, I think, sprung our obligations, to pay the debt of Texas. Those principles and compacts were pledged while Texas was an independent State.

The principle asserted in the treaty of limits with Mexico is, that whereas, by the treaty of 1819 between Spain and the United States, a limit was fixed between Mexico and the United States, Mexico composing then a portion of the possessions of Spain, and the United States in Union; at the date of that treaty, severed from the crown of Spain, yet she was bound, as having been a part of the dominions of Spain, the treaty of 1819 was made—she was bound by that treaty as much as it was made with herself instead of Spain. It other words, the principle is, that the mere circumstance of any part of a common empire cannot encumbrance or impair the obligations of those portions which are created when the empire is entire and unsevered. So the same principle is asserted in the treaty of 1838 between Texas and the United States, the principle asserted being that the treaty of 1838 between Mexico and the United States having been made when Texas was a part of Mexico, that Texas, by her separation from Mexico, she nevertheless remains bound by that treaty, as if no severance had taken place. Well, sir, the principle is, that when an independent power creates an obligation or a duty, no subsequent political misfortune—no political dismemberment—no loss of the power of that power—can exonerate from the obligations which were created while it was an independent power. Well, sir, I think that this principle apply it to this specific case, Texas being an independent power, and having a right to take loans, and to make pledges, and to make a debt, and to pledge for the specific imports, arising from the customs, to the public creditor, the public creditor became possessed of a right to the pledge. If the union or merging of Texas in the United States, the creditor, being no party to the treaty by which the union was effected, Texas, by the union, lost her rights, but retained his rights to demand the fulfilment of the pledge and the payment of the fund, just as much as if the union never been any annexation of Texas to the United States.

That was the foundation upon which I arrived at the conclusion that Texas, in her union with the United States, having appropriated to themselves the duties arising from imports which have been pledged to the creditor by Texas, the United States, by the principle, ought now to pay the debt for which those duties were solemnly pledged by a power independent and competent to make the pledge.

Well, sir, I think that were you to give to Texas the large boundary which she claims, and to pay her three millions of dollars, could it have been said that you were acting upon political connexion with Texas, and when you take into view the large amount of money, liberating and emancipating Texas from a portion of her debt, bearing equal to that amount; when you take all these circumstances into consideration, I think they present a case, in my regard to which, I confess, I should be greatly surprised, if the people of Texas themselves, when they come to deliberate upon this seriously, should hesitate a moment to decide.

I have finished my remarks upon this resolution, and if the Senator wishes it, I will give way to an adjournment.

In Senate, Wednesday, Feb. 6.

Mr. Clay resumed and concluded his speech as follows:

Mr. President, if there be in this vast assemblage of beauty, grace, elegance, and intelligence, any who have not been present at the commencement of the speech of the individual who now addresses you means to attempt any display, or to use any ambitious flourishes, or any of those ordinary ornaments and decorations of speech, they will be utterly disappointed. This season of the year, and the duty to address the Senate, prevent me from the use of any such ornaments; but above all, Mr. President, the woful subject upon which it is my duty to address the Senate, forbids the attempt to shield saying anything but what appertains strictly to that subject; and my sole desire is to make myself, with so humble an instrument as I possess, understood by you and by those who think proper to listen to me.

When, sir, yesterday, the adjournment of the Senate took place, I was in the discussion of the resolutions which I have submitted, which related to Texas and her boundary. I had, in the course of that whole subject; but I was reminded by a friend that perhaps I was not sufficiently explicit upon a single point; and that point was, my view of the legislative assent of the United States, in regard to that portion of the debts of Texas for which I think a responsibility rests upon the United States, independently of the United States. Sir, it was said that it might perhaps be understood that in the proposed grant of the boundary to whatever extent it may be ascertained, to Texas, in consideration of the surrender of her title to New Mexico, as a portion of the United States, that great country discharge the obligations which exist upon the part of the government of the United States, in consequence of the appropriation of the imports receivable in the ports of Texas, while she was an independent power. But that is not my understanding. I do not think that there is any such duty imposed on the United States. The obligation on the part of Texas to pay the portion of the debt referred to, is complete and unconditional. I do not think that there is any such no obligation on the part of the United States to discharge one dollar of the debt of Texas, or to do so, by any express declaration in the resolution of admission, it is declared and provided that in no event are the United States to be liable to or charged with any portion of the debt or liabilities of Texas. It is not, therefore, from the part of the government of the United States that I think that a responsibility is to be made for that debt. No such thing. As between these two parties, the responsibility upon the part of the United States to pay such debt, and there is a responsibility upon the part of the United States to pay one cent of it.

But then there is a third party, no party to the annexation whatever, that is to say, the creditor of Texas, who advanced his money upon the credit and faith of a solemn pledge made by Texas to reimburse the loan, and by the appropriation of duties upon foreign imports, of the United States, and I have been asked, in reading to the view I presented upon the subject. Nor, sir, can the other creditors with Texas complain that a provision is made for a particular portion of the debt, leaving the residue unprovided for by the government of the United States; because in so far as we may extinguish any portion of the debt of Texas, under which the is now bound, in so far we shall contribute to the benefit of the resident creditors of Texas by leaving the funds of the public lands held by Texas, and what other sources she may have applicable to the payment of the residue of her debt. Now, sir, I think that the debt, including the pledged portion of it, as well as the unpledged, was obligatory upon her, and she stood bound by it.

Nor can those creditors complain for another reason. Texas has all the resources which she had when an independent power. Sir, with the exception of the duties receivable in her ports upon foreign imports; and she is exempted from certain charges, expenditures, and expenditures, which would have to be encountered if she had remained a separate and independent power. For example, she would have had to encounter the expenditure of a navy here, in order to protect herself against Mexico or against any foreign enemy whatever; but by the annexation, the United States, whenever liberated from all these charges, and of course those entire revenues may be applied to the payment of her debts, except so far as they may be applicable to the support and payment of the incidental debts of the government of Texas. With this explanation of that part of the subject, I will now proceed to the resolutions in the series which I hold the honor to submit. It relates, if I am not mistaken, to the Indians.

Mr. President, That it is inexpedient to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, whilst that institution continues to exist in the State of Maryland, without the consent of the State of Maryland, without the consent of the people of the District, and without just compensation to the owners of property in the District.

Mr. President, an objection was made to this resolution by some honorable Senators upon the other side of the chamber, that it did not contain a recognition of the constitutionality of the exercise of the power of abolition upon the part of Congress, with regard to the District. Sir, I have never entertained a doubt upon this body, as I contended in 1838, and ever have done, that the power to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, was conceded and vested in Congress by language too clear and explicit to admit, in my judgment, of any rational reply to the contrary.

Sir, what is the language of the Constitution? Congress shall have power—

"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district, not exceeding ten miles square, as may, by session of particular State, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States."

Now, sir, Congress, by this granting of power, is invested with the exclusive legislation over the District. Not only is it here invested, but it is exclusively invested with all legislation whatsoever over the District—"in all cases whatsoever." Sir, nothing more explicit or comprehensive than that which invests a legislative body with exclusive power in all cases whatsoever, over a district of territory or country? Let me ask, sir, is there any power to abolish Slavery in that District? Sir, I have already stated, and I have suggested the other day, that Slavery had been abolished in Maryland and Virginia; let me add, that it continues to exist in the District of Columbia, as it does in Union: is there any power, then, to abolish Slavery within the District of Columbia, or in Maryland and Virginia? Sir, I contend that the Constitution of the United States to pay that debt; but I was struck upon the occasion of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Mexico, then the treaty of limits between the United States and Texas, is the first and only instance in which the United States recognition of the principles out of which, I think, sprung our obligations, to pay the debt of Texas. Those principles and compacts were pledged while Texas was an independent State.

The principle asserted in the treaty of limits with Mexico is, that whereas, by the treaty of 1819 between Spain and the United States, a limit was fixed between Mexico and the United States, Mexico composing then a portion of the possessions of Spain, and the United States in Union; at the date of that treaty, severed from the crown of Spain, yet she was bound, as having been a part of the dominions of Spain, the treaty of 1819 was made—she was bound by that treaty as much as it was made with herself instead of Spain. In other words, the principle is, that the mere circumstance of any part of a common empire cannot encumbrance or impair the obligations of those portions which are created when the empire is entire and unsevered. So the same principle is asserted in the treaty of 1838 between Texas and the United States, the principle asserted being that the treaty of 1838 between Mexico and the United States having been made when Texas was a part of Mexico, that Texas, by her separation from Mexico, she nevertheless remains bound by that treaty, as if no severance had taken place. Well, sir, the principle is, that when an independent power creates an obligation or a duty, no subsequent political misfortune—no political dismemberment—no loss of the power of that power—can exonerate from the obligations which were created while it was an independent power. Well, sir, I think that if we apply it to this specific case, Texas being an independent power, and having a right to take loans, and to make pledges, and to make a debt, and to pledge for the specific imports, arising from the customs, to the public creditor, the public creditor became possessed of a right to the pledge. If the union or merging of Texas in the United States, the creditor, being no party to the treaty by which the union was effected, Texas, by the union, lost her rights, but retained his rights to demand the fulfilment of the pledge and the payment of the fund, just as much as if the union never been any annexation of Texas to the United States.

That was the foundation upon which I arrived at the conclusion that Texas, in her union with the United States, having appropriated to themselves the duties arising from imports which have been pledged to the creditor by Texas, the United States, by the principle, ought now to pay the debt for which those duties were solemnly pledged by a power independent and competent to make the pledge.

Well, sir, I think that were you to give to Texas the large boundary which she claims, and to pay her three millions of dollars, could it have been said that you were acting upon political connexion with Texas, and when you take into view the large amount of money, liberating and emancipating Texas from a portion of her debt, bearing equal to that amount; when you take all these circumstances into consideration, I think they present a case, in my regard to which, I confess, I should be greatly surprised, if the people of Texas themselves, when they come to deliberate upon this seriously, should hesitate a moment to decide.

I have finished my remarks upon this resolution, and if the Senator wishes it, I will give way to an adjournment.

In Senate, Wednesday, Feb. 6.

Mr. Clay resumed and concluded his speech as follows:

Mr. President, if there be in this vast assemblage of beauty, grace, elegance, and intelligence, any who have not been present at the commencement of the speech of the individual who now addresses you means to attempt any display, or to use any ambitious flourishes, or any of those ordinary ornaments and decorations of speech, they will be utterly disappointed. This season of the year, and the duty to address the Senate, prevent me from the use of any such ornaments; but above all, Mr. President, the woful subject upon which it is my duty to address the Senate forbids the attempt to shield saying anything but what appertains strictly to that subject; and my sole desire is to make myself, with so humble an instrument as I possess, understood by you and by those who think proper to listen to me.

When, sir, yesterday, the adjournment of the Senate took place, I was in the discussion of the resolutions which I have submitted, which related to Texas and her boundary. I had, in the course of that whole subject; but I was reminded by a friend that perhaps I was not sufficiently explicit upon a single point; and that point was, my view of the legislative assent of the United States, in regard to that portion of the debts of Texas for which I think a responsibility rests upon the United States, independently of the United States. Sir, it was said that it might perhaps be understood that in the proposed grant of the boundary to whatever extent it may be ascertained, to Texas, in consideration of the surrender of her title to New Mexico, as a portion of the United States, that great country discharge the obligations which exist upon the part of the government of the United States, in consequence of the appropriation of the imports receivable in the ports of Texas, while she was an independent power. But that is not my understanding. I do not think that there is any such duty imposed on the United States. The obligation on the part of Texas to pay the portion of the debt referred to, is complete and unconditional. I do not think that there is any such no obligation on the part of the United States to discharge one dollar of the debt of Texas, or to do so, by any express declaration in the resolution of admission, it is declared and provided that in no event are the United States to be liable to or charged with any portion of the debt or liabilities of Texas. It is not, therefore, from the part of the government of the United States that I think that a responsibility is to be made for that debt. No such thing. As between these two parties, the responsibility upon the part of the United States to pay such debt, and there is a responsibility upon the part of the United States to pay one cent of it.

But then there is a third party, no party to the annexation whatever, that is to say, the creditor of Texas, who advanced his money upon the credit and faith of a solemn pledge made by Texas to reimburse the loan, and by the appropriation of duties upon foreign imports, of the United States, and I have been asked, in reading to the view I presented upon the subject. Nor, sir, can the other creditors with Texas complain that a provision is made for a particular portion of the debt, leaving the residue unprovided for by the government of the United States; because in so far as we may extinguish any portion of the debt of Texas, under which the is now bound, in so far we shall contribute to the benefit of the resident creditors of Texas by leaving the funds of the public lands held by Texas, and what other sources she may have applicable to the payment of the residue of her debt. Now, sir, I think that the debt, including the pledged portion of it, as well as the

Now, sir, the officers of the General Government are bound to take an oath to support the constitution of the United States. All State officers are required by the United States. All State officers are required by the constitution to take an oath to support the constitution of the State in which they reside, and are obedient to its laws, who love their country, and are obedient to its laws, are bound to assist the execution of those laws in the performance of their duties. I do not, sir, at the bar, their fundamental or derivative. I do not, sir, at the bar, a private individual is obliged to make the tour of his State, in order to assist the owner of a slave, to recover his property; but I do think, if he is present when an attempt is about to assert his rights, he ought to assist the owner of a slave, to recover his property. Sir, I do not think that every man present, whether an agent of the State or a private individual, is bound to assist in the execution of the laws of their country. Sir, I do not think that the provision "shall be delivered up" is a provision for any to whom such service or labour may be due. I have no doubt, sir, that in the course of the Union, it will which is now possible that the terms used in regard to fugitives from criminal offences and fugitives from labor are precisely the same. The fugitive from justice is to be delivered up and removed to the State having jurisdiction. The fugitive from labor is to be delivered up dition. The fugitive from which such service is due. Well, sir, has it ever been contended by any State that is be not bound to assist in the execution of the laws upon the demand of the State from which he has fled? I think there have been some exceptions to the performance of this duty, but I think, under the constitution, but they are not disposed to carry the doctrine to the extent of the general right; and if they have resisted in many instances to give up the fugitive from justice, they have been fused in any instance to give up the fugitive from labor, or legal ground, not at all questioning the general right to have the fugitive surrendered on the application to deliver up, as enjoined by the constitution.

I think, Mr. President, that with regard to the object of this provision there can be no doubt. It is not an obligation upon the State or slaveholdings—it is an obligation upon the officers of government, upon the State or federal—and I add upon the State or federal—and I add upon the State or federal, in the recovery and surrender of fugitive slaves from their masters. There has been a great difference of opinion upon this subject, in consequence of a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I think that decision has been most misapprehended. There is a vast difference between imposing impediments, and affording facilities to the recovering the fugitive. The Supreme Court of the United States have only decided that the laws of impediment are unconstitutional. I do not, sir, in this opinion to which I have referred, and that the general government had no right to impose obligations upon the State officers, to carry into effect the laws of the United States, by the authority of their own constitutional laws. Why, it is impossible the decision should have been otherwise. Sir, I understand, sir, the judicial. The court had no right to decide otherwise. The State facility were or were not unconstitutional. The State authorities have a right to pass laws of impediment passed by the legislature of Pennsylvania, granting facilities to the recovery of the fugitive slave, they have gone beyond the case before them. The court only had before them the question of the constitutionality of such laws. Well, sir, I think, sir, almost every slaveholding State in the Union, in the case before the court, the introduction of slaves as merchandise, slaves within its own limits? Why, sir, almost every slaveholding State in the Union, the introduction of slaves as merchandise. It is in the constitution of my own State; and other slaveholding States have prohibited the introduction of Slavery which has existed in the State of Kentucky during the last year, the same principle in the constitution of Mississippi, the same in the constitution, I know, of Mississippi also. That State prohibits the introduction of slaves within its limits, and the constitution of Ohio, I know, is in the constitution or laws of Maryland and Virginia, and in the laws of most of the slaveholding States. It is true that the policy of the slaveholding States has been, I contended from time to time upon this subject—sometimes including and sometimes excluding the District of Columbia, and I have never, sir, been the slightest diversity of opinion as to the right—no departure from the great principle that every State has a right to make laws to prevent the introduction of Slavery within their respective limits, if they choose to exercise it.

Well, then, sir, I think, I have shown that this resolution, which purposes to abolish that trade, ought to be considered as a concession by either class of States to the other class of States. Sir, I think it is a measure perfectly acceptable to both, confirmable to the wishes and feelings of both; and yet, sir, in these times when every night that I go sleep, and every morning when I awake, I hear of the aggravation of the feelings and the gathering tidings upon this agitating subject—I have seen, sir, that in one of the neighboring States, amongst the various resolutions and proceedings of a meeting, that the opening of any one of which delegates are to be sent to a famous convention to assemble in Nashville in June next, and which convention is to consider the rights of the States are to be sent to the convention to which I refer, one is if Congress abolishes Slavery within the District of Columbia, that the State of Ohio should be represented in the convention—in other words, cause for considering whether the Union ought to be dissolved. Sir, I ask, at no time in my public life—in which statement I concur with what was said the other day by the honorable senator from Louisiana (Mr. Porter)—I have seen a day of my public life that I was not willing, for one, to cooperate in any steps for the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. Sir, I have seen, sir, while the other portion of the District south of the Potomac remained attached, I have seen a much less ground for agitation, and that larger portion of the District has been retroceded to Virginia, and when the slave trade in the remaining portion of the District is to be abolished, I think it is a measure which, if it is not to be carried into effect, I think, sir, it is lessens by one the causes of irritation and discontent which are connected with this subject.

Well, sir, the slave trade within the District of Columbia, reasoned the doctrine of the resolution of 1838 that by an implied obligation, on the part of Congress, to carry into effect the laws of Maryland and Virginia in Columbia, so long as it remains in the State of Maryland—reasoned the principle of that resolution, and I think, sir, it is a measure which, if it is not carried into some other similar measures—for I am not attached to anything as the production of my own mind, and I am willing to adopt any other measure—the adoption of anybody else—about these or similar measures, and I think, sir, if we do that, many of the distractions and anxieties which now prevail, we shall have passed and quiet for thirty years hereafter, such as followed the compromise of the constitution and unhappy subject after Missouri compromise.

Sir, that, sir, is, as follows:

7th. Resolved, That the provisions of the provisions ought to be made by law, according to the requirement of the constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor who may escape into any other State or Territory of the Union.

Well, Mr. President, I do not know I go with him who goes furthestin the interpretation of the clause in the constitution which relates to this subject. In my opinion, the clause in the constitution of the two constitution of the United States which is not limited to an operation to the Congress of the United States, but extends to the State Legislatures, and to the State officers of every State in the Union. And I go one step further. It extends to every man in the Union, and I maintain it, sir, that it is a duty imposed on the recovery of a fugitive slave from labor, who takes refuge in a State where he is not a slave. Sir, I maintain all this by a fair interpretation of the constitution. The clause is as follows:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It will be observed, Mr. President, that this clause in the constitution is not amongst the enumerated powers granted to Congress—where, if it had been placed, it might have been argued that Congress should have legislate and carry it into effect—but it is one of the general powers, or one of the general rights secured by this constitution to citizens of the slaveholding States, and to those who are bound by the constitution of the United States.

Now, sir, the officers of the General Government are bound to take an oath to support the constitution of the United States. All State officers are required by the constitution to take an oath to support the constitution of the State in which they reside, and are obedient to its laws, who love their country, and are obedient to its laws, are bound to assist the execution of those laws in the performance of their duties. I do not, sir, at the bar, their fundamental or derivative. I do not, sir, at the bar, a private individual is obliged to make the tour of his State, in order to assist the owner of a slave, to recover his property; but I do think, if he is present when an attempt is about to assert his rights he ought to assist the owner of a slave, to recover his property. Sir, I do not think that every man present, whether an agent of the State or a private individual, is bound to assist in the execution of the laws of their country. Sir, I do not think that the provision "shall be delivered up" is a provision for any to whom such service or labour may be due. I have no doubt, sir, that in the course of the Union, it will which is now possible that the terms used in regard to fugitives from criminal offences and fugitives from labor are precisely the same. The fugitive from justice is to be delivered up and removed to the State having jurisdiction. The fugitive from labor is to be delivered up dition. The fugitive from which such service is due. Well, sir, has it ever been contended by any State that is be not bound to assist in the execution of the laws upon the demand of the State from which he has fled? I think there have been some exceptions to the performance of this duty, but I think, under the constitution, but they are not disposed to carry the doctrine to the extent of the general right; and if they have resisted in many instances to give up the fugitive from justice, they have been fused in any instance to give up the fugitive from labor, or legal ground, not at all questioning the general right to have the fugitive surrendered on the application to deliver up, as enjoined by the constitution.

I think, Mr. President, that with regard to the object of this provision there can be no doubt. It is not an obligation upon the State or slaveholdings—it is an obligation upon the officers of government, upon the State or federal—and I add upon the State or federal, in the recovery and surrender of fugitive slaves from their masters. There has been a great difference of opinion upon this subject, in consequence of a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I think that decision has been most misapprehended. There is a vast difference between imposing impediments, and affording facilities to the recovering the fugitive. The Supreme Court of the United States have only decided that the laws of impediment are unconstitutional. I do not, sir, in this opinion to which I have referred, and that the general government had no right to impose obligations upon the State officers, to carry into effect the laws of the United States, by the authority of their own constitutional laws. Why, it is impossible the decision should have been otherwise. Sir, I understand, sir, the judicial. The court had no right to decide otherwise. The State facility were or were not unconstitutional. The State authorities have a right to pass laws of impediment passed by the legislature of Pennsylvania, granting facilities to the recovery of the fugitive slave, they have gone beyond the case before them. The court only had before them the question of the constitutionality of such laws. Well, sir, I think, sir, almost every slaveholding State in the Union, in the case before the court, the introduction of slaves as merchandise, slaves within its own limits? Why, sir, almost every slaveholding State in the Union, the introduction of slaves as merchandise. It is in the constitution of my own State; and other slaveholding States have prohibited the introduction of Slavery which has existed in the State of Kentucky during the last year, the same principle in the constitution of Mississippi, the same in the constitution, I know, of Mississippi also. That State prohibits the introduction of slaves within its limits, and the constitution of Ohio, I know, is in the constitution or laws of Maryland and Virginia, and in the laws of most of the slaveholding States. It is true that the policy of the slaveholding States has been, I contended from time to time upon this subject—sometimes including and sometimes excluding the District of Columbia, and I have never, sir, been the slightest diversity of opinion as to the right—no departure from the great principle that every State has a right to make laws to prevent the introduction of Slavery within their respective limits, if they choose to exercise it.

Well, then, sir, I think, I have shown that this resolution, which purposes to abolish that trade, ought to be considered as a concession by either class of States to the other class of States. Sir, I think it is a measure perfectly acceptable to both, confirmable to the wishes and feelings of both; and yet, sir, in these times when every night that I go sleep, and every morning when I awake, I hear of the aggravation of the feelings and the gathering tidings upon this agitating subject—I have seen, sir, that in one of the neighboring States, amongst the various resolutions and proceedings of a meeting, that the opening of any one of which delegates are to be sent to a famous convention to assemble in Nashville in June next, and which convention is to consider the rights of the States are to be sent to the convention to which I refer, one is if Congress abolishes Slavery within the District of Columbia, that the State of Ohio should be represented in the convention—in other words, cause for considering whether the Union ought to be dissolved. Sir, I ask, at no time in my public life—in which statement I concur with what was said the other day by the honorable senator from Louisiana (Mr. Porter)—I have seen a day of my public life that I was not willing, for one, to cooperate in any steps for the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. Sir, I have seen, sir, while the other portion of the District south of the Potomac remained attached, I have seen a much less ground for agitation, and that larger portion of the District has been retroceded to Virginia, and when the slave trade in the remaining portion of the District is to be abolished, I think it is a measure which, if it is not to be carried into some other similar measures—for I am not attached to anything as the production of my own mind, and I am willing to adopt any other measure—the adoption of anybody else—about these or similar measures, and I think, sir, if we do that, many of the distractions and anxieties which now prevail, we shall have passed and quiet for thirty years hereafter, such as followed the compromise of the constitution and unhappy subject after Missouri compromise.

Sir, that, sir, is, as follows:

7th. Resolved, That the provisions ought to be made by law, according to the requirement of the constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor who may escape into any other State or Territory of the Union.

Well, Mr. President, I do not know I go with him who goes furthestin the interpretation of the clause in the constitution which relates to this subject. In my opinion, the clause in the constitution of the two constitution of the United States which is not limited to an operation to the Congress of the United States, but extends to the State Legislatures, and to the State officers of every State in the Union. And I go one step further. It extends to every man in the Union, and I maintain it, sir, that it is a duty imposed on the recovery of a fugitive slave from labor, who takes refuge in a State where he is not a slave. Sir, I maintain all this by a fair interpretation of the constitution. The clause is as follows:

"No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It will be observed, Mr. President, that this clause in the constitution is not amongst the enumerated powers granted to Congress—where, if it had been placed, it might have been argued that Congress should have legislate and carry it into effect—but it is one of the general powers, or one of the general rights secured by this constitution to citizens of the slaveholding States, and to those who are bound by the constitution of the United States.

the sedution of family ties from the sacred rights of their owner. The slave in a family are treated with the kindness that the children of the family receive. Everything which they want for their comfort is given them with the most liberal indulgence; and, sir, I have more instances than one where, by the sedution of the sedution of family servants from the owners, they have become wretched and miserable in the free States; and in my opinion, the slave who had been seduced away, addressed her master, and begging back from the state of freedom to slavery, and been seduced, to the state of slavery in which she was treated with kindness, and I have no doubt, sir, that have referred the means were afforded her, she would retreated to the State of Kentucky to her mistress, and begging back from the state of freedom to slavery, and the restoration and delivering of them up to the owner, sir, I think, is a duty imposed on the State, incumbent on Congress—and I hope hereafter, in better state of feeling, when more harmony and good feeling shall prevail between the two sections, that it will be regarded by the free States themselves as part of their duty, sir, to assist in slaying this duty, sir, and to assist in slaying the fugitive slave, but, sir, all events, whether they do it or not, it is a duty to do it. I say it is a duty to make the law effective, and I shall go with the Senator from Texas, who goes farthest in making penal laws and imposing the heaviest penalties on the violation of the rights of property, and the restoration of them to their owners. Mr. President, upon this part of the subject, how sir, slave trade in the District of Columbia, I say, sir, the States, as States, ought to be responsible for all the misconduct of particular individuals who there may be in the States, and I think they are responsible when they act in their sovereign capacity. If there are a few persons, indiscreet, or even criminal, who violate the laws of the land, they who are for dissolving this connexion which exists between the free and slaveholding States, I do not think, sir, that the States, as States, are responsible for what they do, and I think, sir, that the States, as they are to be found, ought to be held responsible for the mischief they propagate, unless the State itself adopts the offence.

Sir, there have been, perhaps, mutual causes complaint; and, sir, know, at least I have heard, I have understood, sir, that a great difference of opinion on the subject of the recovery of fugitive slaves, urges as motive for the passage of those laws the treaty of Ghent, and the restoration of property taken from, some years ago. Mr. Hoar, I think, is the man of the individual who was sent to South Carolina, and who, sir, I think, sir, was most grossly treated, and might pass to Charleston in the vessels of Massachusetts. I think it was a mission that it was hardly wise to have entrusted to any man. Sir, I think, sir, he committed to send Mr. Hoar upon any such mission; but thought it right to send him, and he went there for the purpose of trying the right of a citizen of one of the free people of color before the courts of justice, and of testing the validity of certain laws in South Carolina, sir, and I understand, sir, that he was prevented from coming into her ports. I believe that was purpose of his mission. I understand, sir, that there is great difference, as I understand, sir, between the rights those rights and privileges, in the course in which Massachusetts and South Carol

with pleasure, and will accept it without the slightest feeling of regret that my own was abandoned. Sir, while I was engaged in anxious consideration upon this subject, the idea of the Missouri compromise, as it has been termed, came under my review, was considered by me, and finally rejected as in my judgment less worthy of the common acceptance of both parts of this Union than the project which I have offered for your consideration.

Before I enter into a particular examination, however, of that Missouri compromise, I beg to be allowed to correct a great error which is prevailing, not merely in this Senate but throughout the whole country, in respect to my agency in the Missouri compromise, or rather in respect to the line of 36 deg. 30 min., which was established in 1820 by an act of Congress. I do not know whether any thing has excited more surprise in my mind, as to the rapidity with which important historical transactions are obliterated and pass from the mind, than when I understood everywhere that I had been the author of the line of 36 deg. 30 min., which was established upon the occasion of the admission of Missouri into the Union. It would take too much time to go over the whole of that important era in the public affairs of the country. I shall not do it, although I have got ample materials before me, derived from a careful examination of the journals of both houses. I will not occupy your time by going in detail through the whole transaction, but I will content myself with saying that so far from my having presented as a proposition this line of 36 deg. 30 min., upon the occasion of the consideration whether Missouri should be admitted into the Union or not, it did not originate in the house of which I was a member.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1850.

Mr. Mann and Disunion.

It is at once the advantage and the proof of an absolutely right position that everything,—"yea, even that which mischief means most harm,"—confirms and fortifies it.—The craftiness of the wicked, the mistakes of the good and the follies of the wise cannot prevail against it. Round shot rebounds from it, bombs fall short of it, rockets pass over it, mining parties blow themselves up, and storming parties tumble themselves down. All attempts to turn, to parry, or to destroy it only prove its impregnable strength and redound to the confusion of its assailants. They that hold it may be few and feeble in themselves, but the advantage of their position makes them an overmatch for a world in arms. Such a stronghold is that garrisoned by the Abolitionists of the Regular Army. Not all the onslaughts of the proclaimed enemy, not all the devices of false allies, not all the blunders of hearty but undisciplined and irregular Volunteers, can outflank them, carry them by assault, or throw them into confusion. Apparent defeat is only Victory in disguise for them, and when their enemies think they have obtained an advantage over them, they soon discover that it is only themselves that they have discomfited. The whole history of the country for the last twenty years is full of proofs of this, and no part of it more than that which is now passing before our eyes.

For instance, it being the policy of the Taylor Whigs, now that the President (or the Master Peters who pulls the strings of that redoubtable Puppet) has shown his hand, to disencumber themselves of the Wilmot Proviso, the Taylor Members of Congress from the North apply themselves with all diligence to alarming the fears of their several Buncombes as to the integrity of our Glorious Union. The Non-extension of Slavery, and the prohibition of it by law, having been made part and parcel of Whiggery, and the Whig candidates having done their best to outbid the Free Soilers in their offers of devotion to the principles of No More Slavery, some sort of dust has to be raised in order to cover their retreat. Accordingly, the North is addressed over the heads of the South, and rebukes are administered to the Dissolution Slaveholders for the purpose of making the Northern constituencies believe that there is a reality in the gasconades of the Southern Bobadils, and that there is something more than sound and fury in the tale they tell. So Mr. Webster can leave the Supreme Court Room long enough to express his fealty to the Union, and Mr. Horace Mann finds voice to utter at once his contempt of the Disunionists of the North and his testimony to the sole efficiency of their means for their ends. This gentleman having now ended his state of *betweenity* and passed through the purgatorial intermediacy essential to the attainment of the joys of political Paradise, has at last appeared every inch a Whig. The coquetry in which he indulged so long with the two charmers wooed him on either side, like Comedy and Tragedy on the right and left hand of Garrick, with a tolerable equality of attractions, being now over, he has espoused for better, for worse, the Whig Party, in the presence of Mr Speaker Winthrop and a cloud of witnesses.

Now, this is none of our business. It is for the disconsolate damsel of Free Soil to vindicate the injury of her slighted charms,—"*spretæ injuria formæ*,"—according to the sense she has of it. We always told her how it would be, and if she finds herself jilted, it is none of our fault or of our affair. All we are concerned with is the frequent admissions which he made in our favor in his speech of the 15th inst., we believe, on the admission of California. Mr. Mann is, in our eyes, as any other member of Congress and is not responsible to us for any of his flirtations or love-passages of former times. If Free Soil is content to leave it so, we are not knights-errant enough to run a tilt against any enchanter, giant or dragon in behalf of a distressed damsel who is so very easily comforted. But whatever tribute we can extort from such unwilling hands for our own exchequer we conceive we are fully entitled to. It is fair prize of war, and we may lawfully add it to our trophy or convert it to our use. And we have this great advantage in dealing with one like Mr. Mann, that nobody will deny his sufficiency. The coin he carries will not be questioned. Whatever various opinions people have had of Mr. Mann at different periods of his career, nobody ever thought him *a fool*. He knows whereof he affirms, and when he does make an admission it must pass current. His endorsement is good and we are ready to discount his paper without a commission. We do not believe that he will ever become a bankrupt in such a sense as to damage us for our confidence in his solvency. We are satisfied that he will meet his engagement on the face of the piece of paper now lying before us.

Mr. Mann's Speech is not reported in full, but the material parts we think are before the public. We apprehend that the Reporter, like the self-complacent hero of Mother Goose, has "put in his thumb, and pulled out the plumbs" from this Christmas pie, as he sat in his corner. After virtually disclaiming the technical character of a Free Soiler by a Negative Pregnant, he goes on to say that though the word Abolitionist is used as a term of reproach, he is willing to accept it if it imply one who desires the Abolition of what ought to be abolished. But as to those who desired the Abolition of this Union "he was content that there it should be applied as a term of reproach." Whether he be content to accept it if it mean one who wishes the abolition of Slavery, at all events, he does not say, although it is not hard to gather his opinion as to this, from the context of his discourse. For he goes on to say that this term of just reproach was "applicable to persons at the North; but they were few in number and feeble in power." We are not disposed to brag of the numbers or the strength of that class of persons. But if they be as few as those that lapped water at the Wall of Harod and as feeble as a folk as the conies of the rock, they have been at least many enough and strong enough to drag up Mr. Mann and his party by the hair of their head to such Anti-Slavery ground as they have to stand on, and, though we admit with infinite pains and difficulty, to hold them up on either side as straight as it seems possible for men to stand in such slippery places. But whatever Mr. Mann may think of our numerical or moral force, he surely cannot deny to us the credit of logical severity of reasoning. Our power may be feeble, but he must admit that Sampson himself was not stronger than our Syllogism.

After a glowing account of the horrors that would ensue from a Dissolution of the Union, and of the multitude of Curtiuses that would be found rolling in the gulf that would be left in the place where the crack would be, he asks,—

> "How could we stand before posterity and say that the event came to pass because it was determined to carry Slavery to a country where it does not now exist, and to retrograde to the dark ages, while all the world is looking on; but this was to take place at any and every hazard."

The evils of Dissolution being thus set forth, he seems to have proceeded to an argument for the continuance of the Union which, surely may quite as well astonish Posterity, and looks as if we could be in small danger of *retrograding* to the dark ages. This is an argument *ad homines*, showing the slaveholders (what they know perfectly well without Mr. Mann's assistance) that their hold on their slaves depends on the continuance of the Union.

> "He then proceeded to show that *the slaves could escape with more facility than they now do into the free States*, having only a frontier of 1000 miles on the north, and a maritime frontier of 1800 miles south and east. Where would the new territory fall? If a party secedes, he leaves the territory behind. . . . If there were a separation, the South would lose that power which it enjoys in the Federal Government. Slaves would be lost, unless slaves be carried there by force. *Slaves would be instigated to escape; and even if a Northern army should invade the South, the slaves would not turn against those who have most sympathy with them.*
>
> It is said that there are three millions of slaves—let the adults escape, and the old and young would soon melt away. Let such a state of things come to pass, and the slaves would find a star in the East, which they would worship with Chaldean homage. Great Britain would not be found more friendly to the South than the North are. There are more emancipationists, ten to one, there, than here.

—This is all perfectly true, but does Mr. Mann wish it otherwise? Would not this be a good state of things, a blessed state, compared with our present disgrace and degradation? There was never a stronger argument presented for the very thing Mr. Mann is deprecating than this. He is content that Northern Disunionists should bear a name of reproach for attempting to do what he himself affirms would produce the Abolition of Slavery! What else in Heaven's name should persons holding Slavery to be one of those things which ought to be abolished, do than this? This may be the morality and the logic inculcated by Mr. Mann when at the head of the Education of Massachusetts, but it is not that the Abolitionists have learned or by which they walk. They summon Mr. Mann as a witness to the correctness of their Method. By that Method they are content to abide, as long as it is held up by such authority to the warning of their enemies.

Mr. Mann, however, is not absolutely impeccable. He can make a mistake. We recollect he did once when Secretary of Education, when he affirmed, substantially, that every child in Massachusetts had equal rights of education; forgetting that the colored children of the Metropolis, at least, were slight exceptions to this general rule of glorification. And in this speech it seems he had affirmed that slaves were not subjected so often to capital punishment as the whites, because of their money value. On being called to account for this by Mr. Burt, of South Carolina, who denied the soft impeachment, and affirmed that they were executed for offences which were venial in white men, Mr. Mann expressed himself *most happy* to be corrected, if he had inadvertently fallen into a mistake. This happiness of finding that there are more *niggers* hanged than he had thought for, was certainly no more than a due reward to Mr. Mann for his excellent advice to their masters. We think he need not fear but that they will take it. The Union will never be dissolved by the South, not even if all the dough-faces of the North could by some miraculous interposition be changed into faces of flint. But as it is the nose of wax will turn as easily to the South, as the Needle to the North.—E. Q.

Union Meetings.

If the Union is not preserved it will not be the fault of Northern politicians. But truly is the danger of Dissolution more imminent than ever before, that Union Meetings such as were never before held, are now convened in the larger cities? Or is it that the political physician, with his finger on the public pulse, counts now no "raging gallop" from trepidation, or any other cause, but finds the patient calm and resigned under the impending stroke, and would administer therefore such wholesome medicaments as may seem most fitting to arouse the body politic to a sense of its danger? The time, at any rate, is big with events, and it behooves us all to watch well its signs.

On this point we mean to have our say more at length,—should we continue in the humor of thinking it worth our while to try to interpret these signs, not precisely as they seem to be understood by many good people; and the Union Meeting held at Castle Garden in this city, on Monday night, may furnish us next week, when we have more time and space, with a fitting text. In the meantime, however, we copy below for the consideration of the thoughtful, two articles as specimen-bricks of a house that the (Philadelphia) *Pennsylvanian* has been busy in building, within the past two weeks, for the residence of our friends there. What private ends the poor creature who edits it—Forney, late Democratic candidate for Congressional clerkship, candidate now evidently for any broken victuals that his master may throw to him in common with their other dogs—what ends, we say, he may have, matters nothing, though his object, it is plain enough to see, is the destruction of the Anti-Slavery office. And is it not a note-worthy fact that that hitherto most ready instrument of Slavery, a Philadelphia mob, has remained deaf to appeals like these which we now copy:

ANOTHER PLEA FOR DISSOLUTION.

The truly reliable Democratic Senator in Congress, Hon Daniel Sturgeon, forwards in reply to a paragraph in our paper a day or two ago, the following petition in favor of a peaceful dissolution of the Union, purporting to be signed by certain citizens of Pennsylvania and Delaware. It was presented to the United States' Senate, a few days ago, by Mr Hale, of New Hampshire, and was then denounced in strong terms by Dr. Sturgeon. We publish the petition and the names. There is a deliberation in these disunion movements, and a coolness in the request of the signers—that shows how far they feel the encouraging movements of the free soil leaders and how eager they are to respond to them. Pennsylvania has been honored by two of these movements within the last month. Should not the masses now speak out and relieve themselves of the shame of being misrepresented by fanatics?

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We the undersigned inhabitants of Pennsylvania and Delaware, believing that the Federal Constitution in pledging the strength of the whole nation to the support of Slavery, violates the divine law, makes war upon human rights, and is grossly inconsistent with republican principles; that its attempt to unite freedom with Slavery in one body politic, has already brought upon the country great and manifold evils and has fully proved that no such Union can exist, but by the sacrifice of freedom to the supremacy of Slavery; respectfully ask you to devise and propose, without delay, some plan for the immediate peaceful dissolution of the American Union.

John J. Woodward,	Joseph Nicholson
George P. Davis,	Thomas Miller,
Morton Pennock,	John D. Smith,
John Cox,	David Biss,
Vincent Barnard,	David Painter,
Hannah Cox,	Joseph Nicholas,
Hannah Pennock,	Peter Harris,
Mebell Pyle,	Eliza Harris,
Benjamin Pyle,	R. Baldwin,
Dinah Mendenhall,	John Nelson,
Anne Mendenhall,	W. Royer,
Samuel Pennock,	Benjamin Smith,
Isaac Mendenhall,	H. Thomas,
H. H. Barnard,	Thomas Mitchell,
Sarah J. Pearson,	M. Hogan,
James W. Hood,	Isaac Jackson,
Isaac P. McFarlan,	John Wright,
John G. Johnson,	Greer Poulson,
Pierce Cloud,	Thomas Harman,
John Smith,	Richard Brown,
Isaac Lee,	John Reed,
Jacob Perris,	Elizabeth Mitchell,

Cyrus Chamber,

A number of the above names were procured at public meetings and were written by myself, by direction of the persons. This plan was adopted to save time and trouble. GEORGE P. DAVIS.

Another article is as follows: We copy both with the black lines which enclosed the originals:

THE "DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION" PARTY.

The following are the names attached to the Petition, now at 31 North Fifth street, in this city, published in our yesterday's paper, calling for "a peaceful dissolution of the Union." We give the petition and the names. Very many have supposed that this movement was a mere farce, and that there would be none base enough to dishonor their manhood by affixing their names to such a paper. But the signatures given below are genuine, and number, we believe, both white and black persons. A petition to abolish the Christian Religion, or to overthrow the institution of matrimony, would not be less infamous than an appeal in favor of the dissolution of the persons represented by these names, is ready to give plenty of reasons why the Union should be broken up; and doubtless each has a sort of interest in the success of the shameless petition. At all events, they have secured to themselves an immortality of ignominy. The curses of an indignant people will ring in their ears, while living, and execrate their memories when dead. Men will point them out as those, who, more fortunate millions of others—happy under the blessed institutions of our country—and protected by our laws—have openly raised their hands to destroy a fabric unequalled in the history of the human race. This is no excuse for such infamy. The act is not the act of fanaticism, but of treason; and the names of these PARRICIDES, and their petition, should be enclosed in black, whenever they are held up before the people:

> "Though we break our father's promise, we have nobler duties first,
> The traitor to humanity is the traitor most accurst;
> Man is more than Constitutions. Better rot beneath the sod,
> Than be true to Church and State, while we are doubly false to God."

A memorial, of which the following is a copy, is now at the Anti-Slavery Office, 31 N. Fifth st., for signatures. All citizens so disposed are invited to call and attach to it their names:

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled:

The undersigned, inhabitants of Philadelphia, on behalf of themselves of a large and rapidly increasing portion of the people of Pennsylvania and other Northern States, respectfully represent, that the Union, at present subsisting between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding portions of this confederacy, is a source of grievances so numerous and oppressive, as to call for immediate measures on the part of those who have the power, for their redress. Among these grievances, they would respectfully enumerate the following, as the most pressing in their demand for correction.

I. Despite the article of the Federal Constitution, which declares that "the citizens of each State shall enjoy all the principles and immunities of citizens of the several States," a portion of the citizens of the North, solely on account of their complexion, on visiting Southern States are seized, thrust into prison, fined, condemned to work with felons in the chain gang, and frequently sold on the auction block as slaves.

II. Perfectly legal measures to bring these outrages to the notice of the Federal Courts are forbidden, by severe penal enactments, as in the case of the Hon. Samuel Hoar, and Hon. Henry Hubbard, who were appointed for this special purpose by the Legislature of Massachusetts, but who were driven back with insult and violence from the States to which they were sent.

III. The most sacred of all rights, that of freedom of speech and of the press, without which there can be no true liberty under any form of government, has been practically denied in a large portion of this country, and to thousands of its most respectable as well as some of its most distinguished inhabitants. It is a notorious fact, that there are but few places south of Mason and Dixon's Line, where the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created equal and endowed with an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," can be publicly avowed and appropriately applied without imminent personal hazard.

IV. The Union, between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, and the alleged necessity of its perpetuation, is made the pretext for exorbitant and unjust demands on the part of the former, and the most degrading concessions and humiliating self-abasement on the part of the latter, begetting a spirit on the one hand of overbearing tyranny, and on the other of slavish and grovelling submission; both alike inconsistent with our theory of republican equality, at variance with the best interests of a majority of the people, and injurious to the cause of freedom and free institutions throughout the world.

V. The Compromises of the Federal Constitution are felt to be especially burdensome, because by them the people of the North are obliged: 1st to aid the slaveholder, directly or indirectly, in recapturing his fugitive slaves: 2d. to assist, if in the judgment of the Executive, it should become necessary, to repress by force any uprising on the part of the slaves for their liberty; and 3d., to concede to the slave holder extraordinary political power, in the privilege of representing three-fifths of his slaves in the Electoral College and in Congress; thus furnishing him at the same moment the motives and ability to perpetuate his system. By these compromises the people of the North are involved as partners in the support of Slavery, and made to share with the South in all the evils and responsibilities of its continuance.

To these facts, as constituting grievances no longer tolerable, the undersigned invite the attention of your honorable body, and respectfully ask that, if in your judgment there be no other speedy means for their redress you will take immediate measures for the peaceful Dissolution of the Union.

John W. Heins,	Seth Lukens,
John Lawton,	Elisha Davis,
John M. McKim,	James Mott.
Benjamin Bacon.	

Of such a character was the preparation for a great Union Meeting held in Philadelphia on Friday evening last, which the *Pennsylvanian* hoped would be lighted by incendiary fires as a fit sign of loyalty to the Institution of the country and its Union, but which desire the dull "killers" and their like, usually so ready for mischief, baffled by their stolid indifference to the enormity of the sin of these Disunionists. There was nothing for it but the passage of the following Resolutions which should satisfy all reasonable men; but unfortunately slaveholders are not reasonable. Forney, at least, they will think, might have got a "nigger" or two, or a woman—say Lucretia Mott—hanged, and so he, poor man, will have but a small share, or none at all, of the crumbs for which he is enhungered. These are the Resolutions:

Resolved, That the Constitution of the of United States vests in Congress no power to make laws for the people of the Territories acquired by or annexed to the Union, but only to dispose of and make needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Resolved, That by virtue of a natural and inalienable right of self-government, the people of the separate Territories, when politically organized, have the power of making their own laws, and of executing them so far as they do not conflict with the Constitution and laws of the United States; and therefore have then exclusively the right to prohibit or allow Slavery in such Territories.

Resolved, That the principle of the Wilmot Proviso is not a harmless political speculation or abstraction, excused, if erroneous, by its alleged philanthropic intent, but is the same ancient, aristocratic, pernicious and pestilent political heresy, (ever repudiated and denounced by the Democratic party of the Union,) which seeks, by means of an implication of power of Congress, gradually to undermine State sovereignty, destroy legislation in the respective States, consolidate the Union, and establish on the ruins of State Rights a central sovereignty, easily controlled or managed by the few at the expense of the many.

Resolved, That it is contrary to the spirit in which the Constitution of the Union was framed, and by which alone it can be perpetuated, to abolish, by act of Congress, the institution of Slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the people thereof, and the consent of the States which ceded the District for the use of the Government of the United States.

Resolved, That we call upon our State legislature to repeal all laws conflicting with that section of the Constitution of the United States in regard to the restitution of runaway slaves, so that the fundamental obligation binding upon every citizen of the Union, and the law of Congress passed to carry it into effect, may no longer be set at defiance, and the rights of our Southern brethren trampled under foot.

Resolved, That we rejoice at the votes in the National House of Representatives, laying the Wilmot Proviso upon the table, as an appropriate disposition of a measure which did so much to procrastinate the War with Mexico, and to embarrass the late illustrious Administration; and which events have sufficiently proved to be without any practical importance, except for purposes of irritation and insult; and we rejoice also that Messrs. Gilmore, Mann, Robbins, McLanahan, Ross and Dimmick, six of the eight Democrats of this State in Congress, voted to extinguish the firebrand which has been productive of so much disaster and dissension.

Resolved, That we heartily approve and endorse the votes of such of the Democratic members from this county in the Legislature as voted against the consideration of certain Abolition instructing resolutions, offered by a Whig member from Crawford; and that we earnestly invoke them and their political associates in both branches to adopt such measures as may be worthy of the key that binds the noble arch, and to resist all attempts to give aid and comfort to the agitators who would undermine this glorious fabric of Freedom.

Georgia on Disunion.

On the 6th inst. the Legislature of Georgia by a vote of 31 to 8 passed the following Act as a preparatory movement to that which is to result in the Dissolution of our Federal relations. The proposed Convention *ought* to stand a great chance of being called, at least, under the proviso of the prohibition of Slavery in some of the Territories.

AN ACT to be entitled an act to authorize and require the Governor of the State of Georgia to call a Convention of the people of this State.

Whereas, For a series of years there has been displayed a manifest disposition on the part of the non-slaveholding States of the Union, to interfere with the Institution of Slavery at the South, by such aggressive measures of intolerance as to render it no longer a question of doubt that the Federal Legislature will soon adopt such restrictive measures against the Institution of Slavery as to trammel, fetter, and confine it within certain Territorial limits, never contemplated by the original parties to the Constitutional compact. And whereas, Georgia in her sovereign capacity as a State, has delegated no other powers to the Federal Government than those found in the Constitution of the United States. And believing that her best interests and her honor as a sovereign and Independent Government requires that she should meet all encroachments in a calm and manly spirit of resistance—

Sec. 1. *Be it therefore enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Georgia in General Assembly met*, That should the Congress of the United States pass any law prohibiting Slavery or involuntary servitude in any Territory of the United States, or any law abolishing Slavery in the district of Columbia, or any law prohibiting the slave trade between the States where Slavery may exist, or admit into the United States as a State of this Confederacy the sparsely peopled Territory of California and New Mexico, or should the Governor of this State receive at any time satisfactory evidence that any slaves having escaped from this State to a non-slaveholding State, and that such slave is or are refused to be given up to the proper owner by the authorities of the State in which such fugitive or fugitives may be found, then, or in either of the foregoing events, it shall be and it is hereby made the duty of the Governor of this State, within sixty days thereafter, to issue his proclamation ordering an election to be held in each and every county to a Convention of the people of this State to convene at the Seat of Government within twenty days after such election.

Sec 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the counties now entitled to two Representatives in the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of this State, shall each be entitled and shall elect four Delegates to said Convention, and the counties which are entitled to one Representative shall each elect two Delegates to said Convention.

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That said election for Delegates shall be conducted and held in the same manner as elections for Members of the Legislature are now held in this State. And that all returns of elections shall be forwarded to the Governor of this State, who shall upon application furnish each Delegate elected with a certificate of election.

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, That said Convention shall elect all officers necessary to their organization.

Sec. 5 And be it further enacted, That the sum of thirty thousand dollars be and the same is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury for the purpose of defraying the expense of said Convention; and that the members of said Convention shall by vote regulate their per diem and mileage.

The District Delegates to the Nashville Convention are to be elected by the people on the proclamation of the Governor, two Delegates being drawn from each District.—The following are the Delegates at large:

Ex-Gov. Charles J. McDonald of Cobb; Hon. M. Hall McAllister, of Chatham; Hon. William Law, of do.; Hon. Charles J. Dougherty of Clerk.

Congress.—We are compelled to omit this week our usual summary of the proceedings of Congress. We are happy to say, however, the Anti-Slavery session still continues, and that veritable prophet, Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, has pronounced the dismemberment of the American Confederacy to be appointed for this day week night.

An interesting debate has ensued in the House, in which Mr. Winthrop participated. We must crowd in the brief report of his speech, that our readers may hear the funeral wail of the man who, according to our Boston correspondent, had the rare privilege of assisting at his own obsequies. It is as follows:

Mr. Winthrop had refrained from entering into the discussion of a question so much debated, preferring to wait until some practicable plan should be proposed. The President was at the helm, and, by the blessing of God, he trusted that he would be hailed as the pilot who had weathered the storm. He then referred to the unmannerly and gross attacks which had been made upon him by Mr. John son, of Tennessee, and Messrs. Root, Giddings, and others, one side saying that he had, while Speaker so formed the committees as to injure the interests of the South, and on the other side that he had betrayed the North, and had recently dodged the Wilmot proviso. Ten years ago, when he was a candidate for Congress, he said that if it was his fortune to be elected he would deem it to be his duty not to agitate the subject of Slavery; that he had no sympathy with any fanatics, and that whenever the interests of the North were assailed he would defend them—a plague on both houses! has been his constant exclamation. He thanked his God that he was incapacitated from countenancing ultraism in any way. If he had the approval of the ultraists he should inquire in the language of one of old, "What evil thing have I done, that they should speak well of me?" As to Mr. Root's resolution, instructing the Committee on Territories to bring in territorial bills, with the Slavery restriction, he regarded it as fraught with the greatest mischief—hence he voted to lay it on the table; and came to the conclusion that the honorable member, Mr. Root, for the sake of a miserable notoriety, put in peril a cause of which he professed to be the prondest advocate. If the resolution had been pressed on the House, all hope of legislation would have been at an end, and California not admitted during this session. If the Wilmot proviso was dead, its death lies at the door of Mr. Root; and the epitaph on the tomb ought to be, "Here lies the victim of restless vanity and the headstrong rashness of the gentleman from Ohio, who held it up deliberately to receive its death blow!" It was a fatal blunder—that resolution—but Mr. Winthrop had sought the favor to say to his constituents and his country, that these gentlemen are not the proper judges of his votes. There has never been a party under the cloak of philanthropy that has been so vituperative and abusive as the free soil sect. He did not believe that there was ever witnessed, in the history of this or any other country, such audacity and false statements as the presses of their party have exhibited;—he had his share of it, and more than his share, here and home. There was a nest of vipers in this district, who had been biting a file, and having broken their own teeth, they want to use the teeth of honorable members of this House. He produced proof to show that the charge of Mr. Giddings, that he went into a whig caucus in 1846, and made a war speech, was false. He regarded the admission of California as a State, as the first measure to be accomplished by Congress, and he would do all in his power to effect that without the sanction of positive law, and that he did not intend to give to this his aid. He believed that the plan proposed in the special message of the President, was the best, if not the only, plan which can be adopted. He spoke of no abstract plans; we must aim at something practical—what we can accomplish, and not what we wish to accomplish. He believed in his own soul that peace can be preserved, and the Union maintained, and the northern principles sufficiently vindicated by adopting the course recommended by the President. He spoke the sentiments of Faneuil Hall—not those who there met in the Anti-Slavery Convention, declaring war on everybody—but the sentiments of intelligent, patriotic freemen, who will be remembered for generations to come, when he said the Union must, at all hazards, be preserved. Although he had been abused for the expression there made by myself, he repeated, "Our country—whether bounded by the Sabine or the St. Johns, or however otherwise bounded, be the measurement more or less—our country is to be cherished in all our hearts, and defended by all our power." During the delivery of the above remarks he was several times applauded, and members gathered round him to hear the better.

Mr. Root said that he never took any pains to escape a vote, as had been charged by the gentleman from Massachusetts. To use a plain phrase, he never dodged—he might have paired off. As a swell-head genius, he did the best he could—the best he knew how. He congratulated the country that the doughfaces had found a voice, and got it to talking.

Friends.—Since the Quakers elected General Taylor they have grown greatly into favor among the world's people of all sorts—of all sorts, that is, who approved either on general or particular grounds of their going into that "mixture." Just now they are the favorites at Washington, where several of them have been lately as a deputation to Congress to beseech that body to take some measures for the suppression of the Slave Trade—*African* Slave Trade, be it understood,—not the Washington Slave Trade; —*that* Friends would not stir up strife by saying anything about. The petition was presented by Mr. Dayton, as Senator from New Jersey, who assured the Senate that "the delegates had inquired very anxiously about the disunion petition, and desired to disclaim in the most distinct manner any disposition in their Society to favor disunion projects." Mr. King of *Alabama* responded to Mr. Dayton, and paid, as the penny-a-liners say, a deserved tribute to the benevolence and excellence of the Friends—Mr. King of Alabama! and the Foreign Slave Trade!

We were somewhat surprised to observe that in the report from which we learn these facts, the name of *Lindley Coates* is the only one mentioned of the deputation.

"However Bounded."—Mr. R. C. Winthrop can never lose the distinction of having originated, in Faneuil Hall, the "however bounded" sentiment; but Mr. H. B. Stanton, State Senator from Seneca County, having, to start with, something the advantage of past Anti-Slavery position, is not far behind the ex-Speaker in proving his title to a large share of such honor as may be due the "patriotic" thought. He has met with better success than usually falls to the lot of imitators, as witness the following toast given by him at a public dinner at Troy on the 22d instant:

"Wilmot Proviso, or no Wilmot Proviso—Slavery Prohibition, or Slavery Extension—I go for the Union, the whole Union, and nothing but the Union."

Clay's Speech.—We occupy the larger portion of this week's paper with Clay's Compromise Speech, as an event, whatever may be its result, of too much importance not to be fully recorded in our columns. We regret that we cannot find room for the whole of it in a single number, but its great length obliges us to defer the publication of its conclusion till next week.

Union Meeting at Castle Garden.—So large a portion of this week's paper is occupied with Mr. Clay's Speech that we have no room for any report of the meeting which was called to respond to it in this city, and which was held at Castle Garden on Monday evening. We shall give our reading of it next week.

☞ The Resident Editor of the *Standard* resumes, this week, the duties of his office, which an absence from home, of several weeks, has partially suspended.

Communications.

Free Produce....Final Reply to "Alpha."

Friend Gay:—I have just read and considered "Alpha's" article, "Slave Labor Products, No. VI." This discussion must terminate sometime, and my judgment is, that I may as well close my part of it with the present communication. I entered into it with reluctance, as one which would probably do little to change the opinions of either party, or to enlighten the public. I presume "Alpha" is satisfied with his efforts to maintain his positions, and that he considers the *accused* fully convicted of the charges laid against them. I am equally satisfied of the contrary, and that no farther defence is necessary. Therefore, we may as well let the case go to judgment. With that view I will sum up and close.

Respected readers, you severally occupy the judgment seat, and must decide in this case for yourselves, respectively. Has "Alpha" sustained his charges against the members of the American Anti-Slavery Society, or not? What are those charges, and the main positions contended for? They are set forth in the following words: ☞ "*The daily acts of its members, its public fairs, its avoidance of this subject, rise up in mockery of such an inference*"; [i. e. the inference from its *professions* that it would have devotedly carried out the doctrine of total abstinence from *slave-labor products*.] "*No higher aid can be furnished to the slaveholder than to accomplish the motives which he has for slaveholding. This motive is to make something from the labor of his slaves for sale. 'I will steal a man,' says the slaveholder, 'if I can sell the products of his labor.' 'Steal him then,' says the buyer, in the expressive language of his conduct, 'here is your money.'*" "*The slaveholder finding in the Abolitionist a ready buyer of his coerced produce, his moral sense becomes thereby encased in a coat of impenetrable mail against the shafts of the latter. God's truth may indeed pierce into his heart, but not the arrow wafted by man, the* ACCOMPLICE AND MOTIVE-GIVER OF HIS CRIME." "*To our view, the slaveholder is comparatively an* INNOCENT MAN." "*The inducement to his actions comes from abroad.*" "*Men professing an exalted morality, betray him into the commission of those actions.*"

Such is the wickedness of all Abolitionists, according to "Alpha's" notions, who buy or use any article, the least portion of which is a product of slave labor. It is as truly a *malum in se* to use such articles, as to steal a man, or hold a stolen man in Slavery. Against whom have these accusations been made? Have they been laid at the door of people unscrupulously engaged in trade with slaveholders,—merchant princes, manufacturing nabobs, great cotton, rice, sugar and tobacco speculators, &c.? Against people who thrive by dealing in slave-labor products, who are looking for gain to such quarters; who with mealymonths are carrying on a lucrative commerce in slave-grown produce, and are dumb in respect to the iniquity of slaveholding? Against people who are intermarrying, banking, legislating, voting, and continually fraternizing with slaveholders as christians, republicans and orderly members of civil society? No; but against people for the most part in humble pecuniary circumstances, who only incidentally buy and use the goods execrated as *stolen*; whose lives are largely devoted to the abolition of Slavery; whom the slaveholders hate and would instantly hang up by the neck, or otherwise lynch if they could get hold of them; who have been repeatedly mobbed by pro-slavery gentry, and their tools, the rabble; who have renounced their right to vote and hold civil office, because they could not pledge allegiance to a pro-slavery government; who, though possessing a full share of intelligence and moral worth, prefer to be of no reputation—to be sneered at as *fools, fanatics*, and *traitors* to their country, rather than be traitors to God, their own consciences, and human rights. These are the *accomplices, motive-givers* to crime, and receivers of stolen goods, to whom slaveholders are comparatively innocent men! These are the people denounced from the high places of Free Produce, as recreant to their professions, as inducing the slaveholders' vile deeds, and as betraying them into their sins! Has "Alpha" sustained his accusations against them? In his plea so truthful, clear, cogent, consistent and conclusive, that the judges must pronounce sentence against them? Let his proofs and reasonings be well weighed before the decision is given.

Let the true position of the accused be also understood. Do they hold it right ever to buy or consume the goods in question, unless they can do so with a full, unrestricted, outspoken testimony against the sins committed in producing them? No. If they did, they would be guilty. Do they hold it right to buy such goods without paying a fair equivalent for them, and leaving guilt wherever the real crime is? No. Do they *intentionally* furnish the slaveholder with money to carry on slaveholding? Is this any part of their design or motive, when they buy food or raiment of the kind objected to? No. Do they deny the duty to patronize and encourage the productions of Anti-Slavery people, and other real reformers, in preference to those of slaveholders and other notoriously wicked men? No. Are they unwilling to pay extra prices, or even to give money, in the way of encouraging what they believe to be *bona fide* free produce? No. Do they ridicule or denounce the practice of total abstinence from slave-labor products, or any other sinfully produced goods, by conscientious persons, who feel that they thereby awaken others to a tenderer sense of great abominations? No. Do they object to a whole nation or continent combining to supersede slave-labor products by promoting the home production of cotton, or other raw material? Not at all. What then is their great crime? Their intolerable heresy?—What is it? Simply this,—they do not believe it to be a sin *per se* for a devoted Abolitionist to buy or use, for right purposes, articles *partly* the product of slave labor. But if such articles are otherwise honestly and honorably come by, they consider it innocent to use them, and especially if less exceptionable goods cannot be had. This is their enormous sin. This is what makes the slaveholder comparatively *innocent* by the side of them! Hence nothing but the doctrine and practice of total abstinence from slave-labor products will save them!

But if they should embrace the saving doctrine commended to them, and join the Free Producers, what then?—What are they then to be and do? Of course, they are to become wonderfully pure and consistent Anti-Slavery people. Of course, they are to accomplish great results. The Hon. Isaac E. Morse is to be shut up under irresistible conviction. The slaveholders are no longer to be betrayed into crime "by men professing an exalted morality." The pro-slavery public generally are to be converted. Cotton, rice, sugar, &c. are to beg in vain for a market, excepting such as is free grown. The slaveocracy, reached at last in the vulnerable part, and fairly pricked in their consciences through their pockets, must soon surrender at discretion. Thus the Free Produce movement will be demonstrated the *only staff of Anti-Slavery accomplishment*!

Meantime consistency is to flourish. A broad principle having been fairly acknowledged, that all who make use of goods very sinfully produced, are necessarily the *accomplices* and *motive-givers* to those who produce them, the work of moral reform is to be consummated. All this is to flow out from so small a beginning, as the trading of a few persons in that sort of Free Produce, which is furnished by men who have no conscience against voting, holding office and &c. in a pro-slavery government, nor against endorsing slaveholders as most excellent Christians! Thus by the mighty power of a principle, neither blind in one eye nor lame in one leg, the reign of evil is to be brought to a speedy termination. Well, be it so, if this is the divinely ordained means. If through such *consistency* of theory and practice, and such only, Slavery and all its kindred abominations must be abolished, why should I complain? I will *not* complain. Believe it ye who can.—Practice it ye who have faith. Let all, whom "Alpha" has convinced of the soundness of his Anti-Slavery orthodoxy, be true to their light. And if some of us still remain heretical in doctrine, and impenitent sinners in practice, respecting such a use of slave labor products as we are indulging, let the righteous continue to "reprove and rebuke with all long suffering and doctrine." Let them, however, not be "ignorant of this mystery, that blindness in part has happened unto Israel, till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so all Israel shall be saved."

Without further argument, plea or suggestion, the case is now submitted, on my part, to the judges who are to determine it.

Rather weary of what appears to me an unprofitable controversy, but in Christian love and good will toward all parties and persons concerned, I subscribe myself fraternally yours in every good work,

ADIN BALLOU.

The "Sons of Temperance."

S. H. Gay, Esq:—Although a stranger to you personally, (yet not a stranger to your valuable paper,) I venture to send you, for publication, the following copy of a letter addressed to "Po'keepsie Division No. 9 Sons of Temperance." When initiated, I was told by the "W. P." that "it would not interfere with my *religious* or *political opinions*, be they what they may." That obligation has been violated by the "Order," therefore I am no longer bound by my obligation with it. If, after a perusal, you think proper not to publish this, please forward it to Mr. S. R. Ward, of the *Impartial Citizen*, Syracuse.

Wappinger's Falls, January 14, 1850.

To Po'keepsie Division No. 9 Sons of Temperance:

Gentlemen:—Having for a long time been associated with you, (7 years, if I mistake not,) many of whom I have held in the highest respect and esteem; and having to the best of my judgment and ability, acted the part of an honest and devoted member of the "Order of the Sons of Temperance," it is with surprise and mortification that I have lately found a sin, connected with the Association, so great as to induce me to resolve to leave it. True, in times of sickness, I have received kind aid from you, for which I am thankful; nevertheless, I have contributed more to your fund than I have ever drawn from it. Therefore, up to this time, at least *pecuniarily*, your society is no loser for my having been a member. I shall not take the "*honorable*" method prescribed by your society to leave it, (i. e. by "Card,") but I take that course which to me seems most in accordance with Honesty and Right. My taking a "*Card*" would be positive evidence that I approved of the "Order;" which I now do not.

For light on this subject. I am indebted to the circumstance of taking up a Southern Paper, containing a *favorable* notice of the "Sons of Temperance," side by side with advertisements for the sale of men, women, and children, our common brethren, and I asked myself the question—*What have we done, that those who* rob Humanity of every Right, *should speak of us in terms of commendation?* I soon saw what we had done. We had taken men to our bosom, guilty of deeds of the darkest dye; and that, too, without a single effort on our part to make them honest and upright in regard to the Rights of our downtrodden fellow-men toiling in chains and Slavery! We had taken them, without repentance, into our arms, without a single rebuke! We had said, as plainly at least as actions can speak—*Slavery is right!*" We had "*hand in hand*," *bid them go on in the accursed traffic in Human Flesh and Blood!*"

I have also with sorrow learned, that the Grand Division of N. Y. has refused to grant a Charter for Colored Men, solely because they were

"Guilty of a skin not colored like our own!"

It has also given *positive proof*, by its *very acts*, that it will annihilate a Subordinate Division for admitting a colored member! Let any one deny this that dares. Therefore, upon mature consideration, I renounce totally, entirely, and eternally, all friendly connection with the "Order" now known as the "Sons of Temperance." However benevolent, charitable, and humane, the society was when first instituted, I now charge it with sanctioning, sustaining, and perpetuating Slavery; and this charge I hold myself in readiness to maintain. The "Sons of Temperance," for the sake of popularity, and power, have connected themselves with the verriest robbers and tyrants that ever existed, under pretence of promoting the cause of *Temperance*, and in such a manner as to become equally guilty with them of this most detestable of all symptoms of Slavery, the Chattel Slavery of the United States—which under a government harping on its "*Liberty*" and the "*Inalienable Rights of all men*." ROBS MEN OF EVERY RIGHT, and reduces them to the condition of mere "*Chattels Personal*"—a system which tears asunder parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, and dooms them to a life of hopeless Slavery, in a country boasting to the world of being "*the asylum of the oppressed!*"

No wonder, then, I was called "to order" in your Division on Friday evening, the 4th instant, for asking a simple question containing the word "*slaveholder*," as soon as I uttered that *tyrant name!* and that, too, *by a member of the Grand Division!* How delicate the subject must be, that a member cannot, without interruption, ask a simple question like that! This same person has more than once said that "*he cared nothing for the niggers!*" I blush for him, because he has not sense enough to blush for himself.

Gentleman, a few short years will make you heartily ashamed of your present position,—Consider, I entreat, you, the cause of oppressed Humanity! "Remember those in bonds, as bound with them;" and do as you would that others should do to you.

> If fiends should come this night and steal from you a sister dear,
> Or take a brother bound away, would you not shed a tear?
> Then shed a tear for those enslaved, and ever may you be
> The constant foes of *tyranny*—the friends of Liberty?

In "Love, Purity, and Fidelity,"

To the cause of Humanity,
MATTHEW FARRINGTON.

Mr. Editor: I have here given a true copy. I desire that it may be published, that those who have Humanity at heart may no longer be deceived, as I have been. I also wish to continue the subject a little while, to expose fully the acts of this pro-Slavery "Order." I know the curses I shall receive for this; but I have "counted the cost," and will sooner die of starvation on the highway, than cringe or truckle to the spirit of Slavery.

In truth your's,
MATTHEW FARRINGTON.

Wappinger's Falls, Feb. 20, 1850.

A Correspondent of the *Philadelphia Pennsylvanian* (Loco) writes from Washington, Feb. 23, as follows:

It is rumored that, availing themselves of the parliamentary law provision to that end, the majority will proceed to vote Speaker Cobb out of the Chair, unless he alters his decisions on the next resolution days, so as to prevent incessant calling of the yeas and nays, if the Resolution of Mr Doty be again offered. Some such scheme has, doubtless, been thought over, by gentlemen believing in the right of the majority to rule, even where the Constitution provides that it shall not have power to force its purpose upon the minority.

As a motion to displace that officer, with the view to replacing him, with some individual willing to "rule," that the provision of the Constitution guaranteeing to one-fifth of the members present the right to demand the yeas and nays on all questions, should not be strictly observed, would, in the estimation of all the Southern Representatives be a direct and palpable motion to revolutionize the Government, subjecting the will of the majority for the restrictions of its power solemnly pledged in the Constitution.

Take it for granted that the North would not sustain any such proposition; as if revolution must come they would prefer that the South should at least seem to take the initiative. Were it triumphantly attempted, (so far as voting in a new Speaker is concerned,) I mistake the Southern Members much, if they fail to treat the new occupant of the Chair as an usurper, and the vote placing him there as a deliberate resolving that hereafter the government over these States shall be a naked despotism of a majority.

Died.

In Rochester, N. Y. Feb. 5, Col. Wm. H. Noble, aged 62. He was a member of Congress during the administration of President Van Buren.

In Boston, Feb. 14, Elizabeth W. Oliver, 27 years 11 days.

In Detroit, Mich. Feb. 6, Martha Reed, wife of James F. Joy, Esq and daughter of the Hon. John Reed, Lieut. Governor of Massachusetts.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of this Society will be held in CONCORD, in the Vestry of the Unitarian Meeting-house, on Tuesday, March 5, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M., and continue through the day and evening. Parker Pillsbury, Lucy Stone, Samuel May, Jr. and other advocates of the Anti-Slavery cause, will be present. The members and friends of the Society are requested to give a full and punctual attendance.

WILLIAM WHITING, President.

Levi D. Smith, Secretary.

ESSEX COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

A QUARTERLY meeting of the Essex-County A. S. Society will be held at Lynn on Saturday and Sunday, March the 23d and 24th, to commence at 3 o'clock, P. M. The Board of Managers are desirous that this meeting should be one of the most spirited and profitable meetings ever held in the County. While Congress is almost wholly employed in discussing the questions, whether this curse of Slavery shall be extended over new regions of territory or be annihilated in the old—while the whole South are excited to action, and are calling Conventions to take measures to strengthen Slavery—surely the friends of Freedom ought to be equally vigilant and active. Come, then, one and all, and take counsel together, and devise means for the overthrow of this giant sin. Wm. L. Garrison, Lucy Stone, with other eloquent speakers, have engaged to be present. Rev. Samuel Johnson, of Salem, will address the friends at the close of the meeting, Sunday evening, upon the present aspect of the cause, and the duty of the Abolitionists. Per order of the Board of Managers

RUTH BUFFUM, Rec. Sec.

Publications.

Publications on hand and for sale at the Office of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 142 Nassau street, New York.

Address to the Presbyterians of Kentucky, 08
Amusing Tales, 06
Authentic anecdotes of American Slavery, 06
Anti-Slavery Catechism by Mrs. Child, 06
Address of S. J. May, at Syracuse, 10
Appeal to the Women of the nominally Free States, 10
Alton Riots, bound, 25
Anti-Slavery Record, vol. 2. 31
Africans taken in the Amistad—Congressional Documents, 10
Adams's (J. Q.) Speech in Congress, 1838, on the Right of Petition, and relating to the annexation of Texas. 12½
A Review of the Causes and Consequences of the Mexican War, by Wm Jay 75
American Whites and Blacks, by E S Abdy, 09
A Collection of Valuable Documents on Slavery, &c 15
Amanda—A Tale for the Times, by W. H. Brisbane 12½
Autobiography of Henry C Wright, 10
Birney on Colonization, 06
Brotherhood of Thieves, by S. S. Foster 15
Can Abolitionists vote, &c, under the United States Constitution? 25
Chattelized Humanity, by Jonathan Walker 10
Christmas, and poems on Slavery, 08
Considerations on the use of the productions of Slavery. 06
Correspondence of Cox and Douglass 03
Channing on Slavery, 20
Channing's Letter to Abolitionists, 06
Disunion—Address of the American Anti Slavery Society and Francis Jackson's Letter, 12½
Discussion of Thompson and Breckenridge, with notes by Mr. Garrison 25
Emancipation, by Dr. Channing 06¼
Evils and Cure of Slavery, by L. Maria Child 06¼
Emancipation in the West Indies, by Thome & Kimball 20
Eulogium on Clarkson, by Rev. A. Crummel
Facts in the life of Gen. Taylor, by Charles Stearns 12½
Garrison's Address on 1st of August, 1838, at the Tabernacle, New York, 06¼
Guardian Genius of the Federal Union, 12½
Influence, Rights and Appeal of Women, 12½
Jay's Letter to Bishop Ives, 10
Liberty Cap, by Mrs. E. L. Follen 08
Life of Granville Sharpe, 25
Letters of George Thompson 37½
Legion of Liberty, 18¾
Life and adventures of Peter Wheeler, 25
Lucretia Mott's Sermon to Medical Students, 10
Letter of James Boyle to W. L. Garrison, 06
Memoir of Chloe Spear, 15
Memoir of Lovejoy, 25
Memoir of Archy Moore, 25
Narrative of Thomas Cooper, 06
Narrative of Frederick Douglass, bound, with Likeness, 37½
do. do. in paper do. 25
Narrative of Benj. Lay, by Mrs. Child, 06¼
Narrative of Amos Dresser, 06¼
New England Quakerism, illustrated, 12½
Naboth's Vineyard, by David L. Child 09
Narrative of Henry Bibb, illustrated, 50
Narrative of Wm. W. Brown, 37½
Oration by J. Q. Adams, at Newburyport, 10
Pinda—a True Tale, by Mrs. Chapman 08
Proceedings of Friends' New York Yearly Meeting, vs. I. T. Hopper, 10
Progress and Results of West India Emancipation, by Wm. Jay, 12½
Picture of Slavery, by Jonathan Walker 08
Reproof of the American Churches, by the Bishop of Oxford, 10
Rankin's Letters, 25
Republicanism of Christianity—A Discourse, by J. Floy, 10
Review of L. Spooner, on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery, by Wendell Phillips,—A capital work, and cheap, 25
Right and Wrong, in the Anti-Slavery Societies, 10
Right and Wrong in Massachusetts, by Maria W. Chapman, 12½
Slavery and the Slaveholder's Religion, by S. Brooke 12½
Slaveholding weighed in the ballance of Truth, 06
Slavery—Its Unconstitutionality, by G. W. Mellen 75
Slavery as it is—by a Thousand Witnesses 25
Slavery and the North, by C. C. Burleigh 03
Speech of Thomas Morris, in reply to Henry Clay, 08
Speech of Horace Mann on the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia, 12½
Self-justification, Self-condemned—A Dialogue, by David Irish 16
Things for Northern Men to Do, 12½
The American Churches, the Bulwarks of Slavery, 08
The Bible Argument on Slavery, condensed. By a Virginian 20
The Young Man, or Leaves for the Times, by Wm. W. Patton 50
The Branded Hand, by Jonathan Walker 37½
The Monthly offering, 1840, 18¾
The Derby Lecture —— by W. H. Furnace 08
The Church as it is, by Parker Pillsbury 15
The Sabbath, by Henry Grew 04
The Sin of Covetousness, by D. Peabody 04
The Black Code of the District of Columbia—in force, Sept. 1, 1848, by G. W. Snethan 25
Lewis's Free Soil, Slavery, and Territorial Map, 12½
Portrait of Ellen Crafts, the fugitive slave, (on Steel) 25

All orders for Anti-Slavery Books, if post paid, and accompanied with the cash, will be promptly attended to.

Poetry.

From the Nottingham Review.

THE GENIUS OF MAN.

PART I.

Long after the Deluge was past, and Babel's Tower was piled,
I roamed a wanderer thro' the woods, a savage thro' the wild;
A mighty hunter, there I lived, upon the beasts I slew,
The chase was all I practised then, and war was all I knew.
A shepherd ages afterward, I watched my roving store
Encamping with the patriarchs on Syria's fertile shore.
A tiller of the ground become, I raised upon the soil
The corn that was to feast mankind, and drank the vineyard's spoil.
Expanding into empire slow, on Asia's plain,
I reared the mighty cities then whose ruins yet remain;
A germ of deathless knowledge bare to Egypt's narrow strand,
And hundred-gated Thebes arose beneath my forming hand,
In piling up the Pyramids I tasked my infant power,
And reared the walls which strike the world with wonder at this hour.
To life immortal science sprang born of my teaming brain,
And the sacred fire whose light shall not be quenched again;
The world's old empires waxed and waned before time's stormy blast,
But undismayed I others reared as war's wild roar went past.
I founded Tyre, and from her ports, the sales of commerce flew,
To gather wealth from climes unknown, and garner knowledge too.
I stood upon the shores of Greece, when liberty was born,
Prometheus-like evoking there the fire of freedom's morn;
I generalized on the glorious hand that Persia's pride o'erthrew,
And at Thermopylæ I smiled on Sparta's deathless few.
I built the graceful shrines of Greece—still beautiful to-day,
Around my Phœnix-temple I have grouped unrivalled in decay:
With Praxiteles' hand my chisel sculptured forms divine,
Protogen painting, Zeuxian art, Appellean skill were mine.
I with the Macedonian marched to farthest India's stream,
I walked with Socrates, and with the gentle sides of his dream;
Old Homer fired, Demosthenes, and Herodotus' pen,
I guided, and through Plato, taught philosophy to men.
Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, the sages, bards of old
Were trained to wisdom in my schools, to glory in my fold;
Till from the generous Grecian mind, arose the mental morn,
Whence the day that cheers the world, and lights mankind, was born.
In world controlling Rome I reigned, 'twas I who gave its strength,
Beneath the march of ages slowly was to sink at length;
When Rome with mighty Carthage strove I held with trembling hand,
The balance of the destiny which should the world command.
When freedom 'gainst the Cæsars strove I fought on Pharsalia's side,
Lamented over Cato's fall, and wept as Brutus died;
At length the yoke that fettered man away from man I hurled,
And led the free-born northern nations on to rule the world.
Long time war's restless rage the weary earth appalled,
But from the chaos noblest States by destiny were called;
Long time like volcanoes they stood each belching blast-ing flame,
Rolling the lava tides of war against each other's frame.
But yesterday that era past, my modern empires rose
Like Alps that from the earth to heaven lift up their crowning snows;
Another enthusiasm shakes them now and tempests round them play,
That era too shall pass, and man a gentler one survey.
Whatever empire flourish now, whatever empire fall,
Imperishable one exists amidst the crash of all!
The sovereignty I have achieved o'er nature's vast domain,
But dies when man shall chose to live, when mind shall cease to reign. E. HIND.

Nottingham, December, 1849.

PART II.

Lo! from the coming future time what hope all cheering springs!
My soul's unclouding like a sun that through the tempest breaks;
What book shall hold the record vast of all that I have done,
What eloquence shall tell the story of my triumphs won!
Yet in the future's veiled breast what treasures yet remain,
What truths shall hurst upon mankind from many an unhurn brain.
I stod by the Italian's side when he his sails unfurl'd,
My hand the pilot needle formed which found the western world.
In airy cars above the clouds I climb creation's steep,
My ships, 'gainst winds, and tides, and storms, go rushing through the deep;
Man in a moment speaks to man, though empires intervene;
He makes the sun portray himself—engraves with morning's sheen.
Constructs the glass eye which glares on suns before unknown,
The glass that scans the atom systems living in his own.
One mind proves how Heaven's wondrous laws each atom control and weld,—
One mind reveals another world all eyes could not survey;
My soul-inspired printing-press gives truth to all man-kind;
To it the oracles of old were deaf, and dumb, and blind.
I cut the limb that is diseased from man without a pang,—
I make the paralytic walk—the blind see Heaven again;
With spider-skill I weave the webs that grace gay beauty's form,
I gather raiment from a tree, and vesture from a worm;
I draw the lightning from the sky, and thunder from the earth,
Evoke sweet music from a string to cheer the feast of mirth;
I dive into the deep to look upon the wonders there,
I count the rain-drops with my gauge, and weigh the gossiples air;
I pass a cylinder across sea to rise in myriad streams,
I dissipate the city's gloom with light that wickles beams;
I poise my bridges o'er the tides, I scoop earth's solid bed,
And march along in triumph where a river rolls o'er head,
Through rocks, o'er plains and streams I rush, upon the car borne,
Which mocks the fleetness of the deer and leaves the wind behind;
I shod the tempest out by what now lights my loftiest halls,—
The storm-lash harness strikes the guard I hold above my walls.
Behold the empires I have planned, the tempests I have piled,
Contrast man now with what he was when roving through the wild,
And realize, if able, then the blights he may attain,
Till future ages look on him as I the past Biblain.
For, onward! ever, onward! lo! I lead the march of mind,—
And see the future's strength afar arise fresh truths to find.
If mighty be the mental power of but your nation's brain,
Think how much power shall twenty ages of the world contain,—
What thoughts shall bud—what truths shall blossom "neath the march of time,
Till Wisdom bloom in every land and flower in every clime.
Mankind shall speak one language, yet speak in a simpler tongue
Than any now the nations speak—than any bard hath sung;
For while each nation shall retain the tongue it speaks to-day,
One general language shall to all the voice of each convey.
The jarring principles that now ascendency contend,
Into one sovereign principle—the law of love—shall blend.
Before the wide advancing faith shall fall each pagan shrine,
God, love, and immortality around the world shall shine,
To strike the fetters from the slave—to light with joy the blind—
Emancipate a universe—regenerate mankind!
To banish doubt, and strife, and fear, as Spring melts Winter's snows—
To trample down beneath their feet, like reeds, their feeble foes;
Though fired as death appear their strength—though sway to Heaven their pride,
The genius of man, the pest shall all their ill decide.
Arrest avalanches roll with spider-thread! go, make the stars be still!
Ere man can stay man's onward course, or curb God's mighty will!
Raise error all your ramparts high! your barriers shall be riven,
And shaded to dust before a power which bears the strength of Heaven.
Arise! Oh nations! follow me where softest dews distil,
And crown with plenty every plain, with pleasure every hill
I'll lead you on to regions fair your fathers never trod;
I'll lead you on to peace, to truth, to happiness, to God.
The clime of love, from whose sweet skies divinest airs shall roll,
To charm the sisters from the heart, the wrinkles from the soul.
Oh! how my spirit yearns to hask in Love's celestial ed again;
Oh! how my soul is pining now to taste the time unborn.
Ah! by the ages' bones bestrewn upon the ginsedy ore,
To walk not on this earth again, to feel its day no more;
Ah! by the strife which has deluged the earth with murder's flood
Cease man to kill! your brother's heart! to shed your brother's blood!
Live! live to bless, and not to curse! for what is strife to man?
And peace is Heaven! then on to heaven with heavenly peace to dwell.
Go! win a world without a tear—a life without a sigh,
And greatly he resolved to live; and grandly dare to die!

Nottingham, December, 1849. E. HIND.

Miscellany.

MY JOURNAL:

The Events of 1815, *by Louis Philippe of Orleans.*

THIS is the title of a book in two volumes, recently published in Paris, of which, a writer in the Journal des Debats (Cuvillier Fleury,) gives the following history.—*Boston Advertiser.*

It was a work published without the permission of its author. The reason is very simple; the author has been King of the French, he is no longer King. Everything was in his favor in the prepared in the generous country of France, even to the publication of his manuscripts without his consent. This is called hospitality. It is not "now" what right the editors had to the Journal of King Louis Philippe—whatever it was, worse things have been done since the February revolution. It is better, after all, to publish books than to burn them.

The Journal of 1815 had been printed, but had never been edited. Its history consists in "the fall of Orleans, building himself for the first time at Twickenham, formed the design of writing an exposé of his conduct before and during the Hundred Days. It is generally known that the Duke of Orleans had succeeded the ephemeral triumph of Napoleon had not spared the Duke of Orleans. There was a disposition to place in his account some of the grievances which were felt against the whole liberal party. The coolness of the prince when he might have resisted Bonaparte, was spoken of and his difidences, which he might have resisted, after an invasion. He was almost accused of treason. The Duke of Orleans endeavored to defend himself. The defence of his person was a very common topic in London, even in his own eyes. The who' edition was put up in a trunk, to be published in France, if his honor demanded it, or to remain secret, if circumstances rendered it inflexibly necessary, which in fact happened. The Duke of Orleans returned to France, and the journal of 1815 did not leave in hiding place. The hand and the pen of Louis Philippe, the first of Bourbon, in all chose to live, when mind shall cease to reign. E. HIND.

Nottingham, December, 1849.

PART II.

Lo! from the coming future time what hope all cheering springs!
My soul's unclouding like a sun that through the tempest breaks;
What book shall hold the record vast of all that I have done.
What eloquence shall tell the story of my triumphs won!
Yet in the future's veiled breast what treasures yet remain,
What truths shall hurst upon mankind from many an unhurn brain.
I stod by the Italian's side when he his sails unfurl'd,
My hand the pilot needle formed which found the western world.
In airy cars above the clouds I climb creation's steep,
My ships, 'gainst winds, and tides, and storms, go rushing through the deep;
Man in a moment speaks to man, though empires intervene;
He makes the sun portray himself—engraves with morning's sheen.
Constructs the glass eye which glares on suns before unknown,
The glass that scans the atom systems living in his own.
One mind proves how Heaven's wondrous laws each atom control and weld,—
One mind reveals another world all eyes could not survey;
My soul-inspired printing-press gives truth to all man-kind;
To it the oracles of old were deaf, and dumb, and blind.
I cut the limb that is diseased from man without a pang,—
I make the paralytic walk—the blind see Heaven again;
With spider-skill I weave the webs that grace gay beauty's form,
I gather raiment from a tree, and vesture from a worm;
I draw the lightning from the sky, and thunder from the earth,
Evoke sweet music from a string to cheer the feast of mirth;
I dive into the deep to look upon the wonders there,
I count the rain-drops with my gauge, and weigh the gossiples air;
I pass a cylinder across sea to rise in myriad streams,
I dissipate the city's gloom with light that wickles beams;
I poise my bridges o'er the tides, I scoop earth's solid bed,
And march along in triumph where a river rolls o'er head,
Through rocks, o'er plains and streams I rush, upon the car borne,
Which mocks the fleetness of the deer and leaves the wind behind;
I shod the tempest out by what now lights my loftiest halls,—
The storm-lash harness strikes the guard I hold above my walls.
Behold the empires I have planned, the tempests I have piled,
Contrast man now with what he was when roving through the wild,
And realize, if able, then the blights he may attain,
Till future ages look on him as I the past Biblain.
For, onward! ever, onward! lo! I lead the march of mind,—
And see the future's strength afar arise fresh truths to find.
If mighty be the mental power of but your nation's brain,
Think how much power shall twenty ages of the world contain,—
What thoughts shall bud—what truths shall blossom "neath the march of time,
Till Wisdom bloom in every land and flower in every clime.
Mankind shall speak one language, yet speak in a simpler tongue
Than any now the nations speak—than any bard hath sung;
For while each nation shall retain the tongue it speaks to-day,
One general language shall to all the voice of each convey.
The jarring principles that now ascendency contend,
Into one sovereign principle—the law of love—shall blend.
Before the wide advancing faith shall fall each pagan shrine,
God, love, and immortality around the world shall shine,
To strike the fetters from the slave—to light with joy the blind—
Emancipate a universe—regenerate mankind!
To banish doubt, and strife, and fear, as Spring melts Winter's snows—
To trample down beneath their feet, like reeds, their feeble foes;

The best room was never opened but for company; except now and then on a fine day to be aired and dusted, if dust could be detected there. In the other parlor I was allowed sometimes to read, and there she wrote her letters, for she had many correspondent's; and we sat there sometimes in Summer, when a fire was not needed, for fire produced ashes, and ashes occasioned dust, and dust, visible or invisible, was the plague of her life. I have seen her order the tea-kettle to be emptied and re-filled, because some one had passed across the hearth while it was on the fire preparing for her breakfast. She had indulged these humors till she had formed for herself notions of unchangeable order, and expected all her servants and those of the Hindoos. She had a cup once buried for six weeks, to purify it from the lips of one whom she accounted unclean; and it was not for a month or two afterwards, in that class. A chair, in which an unclean person had sat, was put out into the garden to be aired; and I never saw her sit down in it herself, or any other person, when a man, who called upon business, seated himself in her own chair; how the cushion was ever again to be rendered fit for use, she knew not! On such occasions her fine features assumed a character either fierce or tragic; her expressions were otherwise—to irreverence; and her gesticulations those of deep hatred and wilded distress—hands and eyes uplifted, as if she was in hopeless misery, or in a paroxysm of mental anguish.

William Eyre, the second brother, was a remarkable person. Owing to some defect in his faculties, so anomalous in its kind that I never heard of a similar instance, he was incapable of learning; the letters he could tell separately, but was utterly incapable of combining them, and taking in their meaning by the eye. He could write, and copy; he could read anything that was written, whether in writing or in print, but it was done letter by letter, without understanding a single word. As to self-government, he was entirely uncontrollable; so much so that I think he could hardly be considered responsible as a moral being for his action;—yet he hath an excellent memory, accompanied by a very great share of that sagacity which would have qualified him, had he been born two centuries earlier, to have worn medley, and figured with a cap and bells and bauble in the scene of Lear's distress. I have seen him at a loss for a word, and I have heard him, when he was at a loss, supply the deficiency by a phrase, or a sentence, which was quite pertinent to the subject. I meet with any man so stored with old saws and anecdotes gathered up in the narrow sphere in which he moved. I will pledge myself, that in the Hundred Days, he has been dead more than thirty years. The motto to Kehama, as the Greek reference, when the abbreviations are slightly made, is one of my uncle's favorite and ready sayings. When it was found impossible to make anything of him by education, he was left to himself, and passed more time in the fields than in the school; he was seldom stood in fear of his step-father.—There he learnt to chew tobacco and drink.

Strange creature as he was, I think of him very often, after the lapse of thirty years of his odd, apt sayings, and have that sort of feeling for his memory, that he is one of the persons whom I should wish to see in the Elysian Fields.

The man of whom he learnt the use, or rather the abuse, of tobacco, was a scottish servant, as ignorant as a savage of anything he ought to have known;—and he was as ignorant of everything which ought to have been taught him. My mother, when a very little girl, reproved him once for swearing. "For shame, Mister Davie, said, "you should not say such naughty words! for shame! say your prayers, Theuse!" "No, Missey," said the poor wretch, "I shan't;" "Davie, why will you not pray? you pray prayers to all my life, Missey, and I shan't begin now." My uncle William (the squire, he was called in the family) provoked him dangerously once, by a trick which made the fellow, with his mouth full of tobacco, in the custom among the peasantry, (here in Cumberland, at least,) he always wore in the house.

You perhaps are not enough acquainted with the mode of chewing tobacco to know that in vulgar life a quid commonly goes through two editions; and that after the first edition, it is taken out of the mouth and reserved for a second regale. My uncle William, who had learned the whole process from Thomas, and always faithfully observed it, once, in his fun, had a tobacco-quid in his "ordinary soldier." A sailor deposits, or if there should be such a word (and if there is not there ought to be) re-deposits it in the hollow of his cheek, and I have heard him say that this practice occasioned a great dislike in the navy to one or two pound notes, for when the men were paid in them, they could not reserve them for pipes or pocket-book, in lack of anything better, and notes were often rendered illegible by the deep stain of wet quids. Thomas's place for an old soldier was two campaigns, while he was pulling and enjoying the narcotic effects of the first musication, was the brim of his hat; from whence he has spoken, the quid was taken out of the veteran quid, and substituted in its place a dead mouse, just taken from the trap.

Presently the sleeper, half wakened without unclosing his eyes, and half-stupefied, put up his hand, and, taking the mouse with a finger and thumb, in which the discriminating sense of touch had been lulled to sleep, conveyed it to the place of tobacco, his mouth to receive it, and with a slow, sleepy tongue, endeavored to accommodate it to its small proportions, and to make it lie easy in the cheek. Happening to put it in head foremost, the hind legs and tail hung out, and a minute or more was spent in vain endeavors to lick these appendages in, before he perceived that he had mistaken the nature of the served; something altogether unlike tobacco. Roused at the same time by a laugh which could be no longer he suppressed, and by the outcry of the boys, who had been played, he started up in a furious rage, and, seizing the poker, would have demolished the Squire for this trick, (I think it was the Squire who played it, by having the doors open, and taking shelter where Thomas could not, or dared not, follow him.—*Life of Robert Southey.*

A TEXT WORTHY OF COMMENT.

"GEORGE RUBY, a boy aged fourteen, was put into the box to be sworn, and the Testament was put into his hand. He looked quite astonished on taking up the book.

"*Ald. Humphrey.* Well do you know what you are about? Do you know what an oath is?

"*Boy.* No, Sir.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know what a Testament is?

"*Boy.* No.

"*Ald. H.* Can you read?

"*Boy.* Yes.

"*Ald. H.* Did you ever say your prayers?

"*Boy.* No, never.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know what prayers are?

"*Boy.* No.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know what the Devil is?

"*Boy.* I've heard of the Devil, but don't know him.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know your mother?

"*Boy.* I knows how to sweep the crossing.

"*Ald. H.* And thats all?

"*Boy.* Yes, I knows how to sweep the crossing.

"The Aldermen said he, of course, could not take the evidence of a creature who knew nothing, whatever if he knew, was to tell the truth."—*Yale Times.*

Police Report of Wednesday, Jan. 9.

So, says the lawyer, which the Alderman has to administer. But suppose these a conversation and a matter worth noting, goes popular with the fashionable time of Railways, Ragged Schools, Model Lodgings-houses, Soup-kitchens, Model Prisons, and other excellent creations for bettering the condition of poor ours, which stumbles somehow, most sadly, in spite of them?

Here is the raw material of a citizen—a boy well half way to manhood, who knows neither oath, nor book, nor prayer, nor God; has but heard of the the Devil even—and whose sum and substance of knowledge is "how to sweep the crossing—that's all." A crossing sweeping-machine this, with a superfluous soul in it apparently,—that no man, or set of men, has thought it worth while to waken—a tongue that the law ties—a sort of brute biped in the eyes of all—who, introduced to a worthy Alderman and a public prosecutor, knows not the oddest things, oaths, and books, and prayer, and God, and knows ideas which had not developed themselves in crossing-sweeping.

But though Society leave this lump of Man to his beseam abd his blank ignorance of right and wrong, and the powers thereof,—and though Law, when he ever so to try, is not ready to "know what he speak—says to him, "No! Be dumb, brute, how should a thou lift up thy voice among *men?*—this same Society and Law would be very different tone, if one one brute biped should begin to disclaim, and self brute fashion—if he should strike or bite, or kick, or take to satisfy hunger—to prey, in short, wildbeast-like on the world in which he is a wild beast. Then Society would be alert with its policemen, and committing magistrates and cells—and Law with its judges and juries, and learned barristers, all arranged to deal justice upon this poor neglected brute, as if he were a man.

A strange sight and one worthy of being weighed in these times above all others. Our blunt ancestors went roundly to work. If they saw without concern brute men gathering and growing about them, they flogged, and imprisoned, and ironed and racked and flogged, and imprisoned, and ironed and racked and flogged, with right royal brutality of punishment.—Some one had passed across the hearth while it was on the fire preparing for her breakfast. She had indulged these humors till she had formed for herself notions of unchangeable order, and expected all her servants and those of the Hindoos. She had a cup once buried for six weeks, to purify it from the lips of one whom she accounted unclean; and it was not for a month or two afterwards, in that class. A chair, in which an unclean person had sat, was put out into the garden to be aired; and I never saw her sit down in it herself, or any other person, when a man, who called upon business, seated himself in her own chair; how the cushion was ever again to be rendered fit for use, she knew not! On such occasions her fine features assumed a character either fierce or tragic; her expressions were otherwise—to irreverence; and her gesticulations those of deep hatred and wilded distress—hands and eyes uplifted, as if she was in hopeless misery, or in a paroxysm of mental anguish.

William Eyre, the second brother, was a remarkable person. Owing to some defect in his faculties, so anomalous in its kind that I never heard of a similar instance, he was incapable of learning; the letters he could tell separately, but was utterly incapable of combining them, and taking in their meaning by the eye. He could write, and copy; he could read anything that was written, whether in writing or in print, but it was done letter by letter, without understanding a single word. As to self-government, he was entirely uncontrollable; so much so that I think he could hardly be considered responsible as a moral being for his action;—yet he hath an excellent memory, accompanied by a very great share of that sagacity which would have qualified him, had he been born two centuries earlier, to have worn medley, and figured with a cap and bells and bauble in the scene of Lear's distress. I have seen him at a loss for a word, and I have heard him, when he was at a loss, supply the deficiency by a phrase, or a sentence, which was quite pertinent to the subject. I meet with any man so stored with old saws and anecdotes gathered up in the narrow sphere in which he moved. I will pledge myself, that in the Hundred Days, he has been dead more than thirty years. The motto to Kehama, as the Greek reference, when the abbreviations are slightly made, is one of my uncle's favorite and ready sayings. When it was found impossible to make anything of him by education, he was left to himself, and passed more time in the fields than in the school; he was seldom stood in fear of his step-father.—There he learnt to chew tobacco and drink.

Strange creature as he was, I think of him very often, after the lapse of thirty years of his odd, apt sayings, and have that sort of feeling for his memory, that he is one of the persons whom I should wish to see in the Elysian Fields.

The man of whom he learnt the use, or rather the abuse, of tobacco, was a scottish servant, as ignorant as a savage of anything he ought to have known;—and he was as ignorant of everything which ought to have been taught him. My mother, when a very little girl, reproved him once for swearing. "For shame, Mister Davie said, "you should not say such naughty words! for shame! say your prayers, Theuse!" "No, Missey," said the poor wretch, "I shan't;" "Davie, why will you not pray? you pray prayers to all my life, Missey, and I shan't begin now." My uncle William (the squire, he was called in the family) provoked him dangerously once, by a trick which made the fellow, with his mouth full of tobacco, in the custom among the peasantry, (here in Cumberland, at least,) he always wore in the house.

You perhaps are not enough acquainted with the mode of chewing tobacco to know that in vulgar life a quid commonly goes through two editions; and that after the first edition, it is taken out of the mouth and reserved for a second regale. My uncle William, who had learned the whole process from Thomas, and always faithfully observed it, once, in his fun, had a tobacco-quid in his "ordinary soldier." A sailor deposits, or if there should be such a word (and if there is not there ought to be) re-deposits it in the hollow of his cheek, and I have heard him say that this practice occasioned a great dislike in the navy to one or two pound notes, for when the men were paid in them, they could not reserve them for pipes or pocket-book, in lack of anything better, and notes were often rendered illegible by the deep stain of wet quids. Thomas's place for an old soldier was two campaigns, while he was pulling and enjoying the narcotic effects of the first musication, was the brim of his hat; from whence he has spoken, the quid was taken out of the veteran quid, and substituted in its place a dead mouse, just taken from the trap.

Presently the sleeper, half wakened without unclosing his eyes, and half-stupefied, put up his hand, and, taking the mouse with a finger and thumb, in which the discriminating sense of touch had been lulled to sleep, conveyed it to the place of tobacco, his mouth to receive it, and with a slow, sleepy tongue, endeavored to accommodate it to its small proportions, and to make it lie easy in the cheek. Happening to put it in head foremost, the hind legs and tail hung out, and a minute or more was spent in vain endeavors to lick these appendages in, before he perceived that he had mistaken the nature of the served; something altogether unlike tobacco. Roused at the same time by a laugh which could be no longer he suppressed, and by the outcry of the boys, who had been played, he started up in a furious rage, and, seizing the poker, would have demolished the Squire for this trick, (I think it was the Squire who played it, by having the doors open, and taking shelter where Thomas could not, or dared not, follow him.—*Life of Robert Southey.*

A TEXT WORTHY OF COMMENT.

"GEORGE RUBY, a boy aged fourteen, was put into the box to be sworn, and the Testament was put into his hand. He looked quite astonished on taking up the book.

"*Ald. Humphrey.* Well do you know what you are about? Do you know what an oath is?

"*Boy.* No, Sir.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know what a Testament is?

"*Boy.* No.

"*Ald. H.* Can you read?

"*Boy.* Yes.

"*Ald. H.* Did you ever say your prayers?

"*Boy.* No, never.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know what prayers are?

"*Boy.* No.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know what the Devil is?

"*Boy.* I've heard of the Devil, but don't know him.

"*Ald. H.* Do you know your mother?

"*Boy.* I knows how to sweep the crossing.

"*Ald. H.* And thats all?

"*Boy.* Yes, I knows how to sweep the crossing.

"The Aldermen said he, of course, could not take the evidence of a creature who knew nothing, whatever if he knew, was to tell the truth."—*Yale Times.*

Police Report of Wednesday, Jan. 9.

So, says the law, which the Alderman has to administer. But suppose these a conversation and a matter worth noting, goes popular with the fashionable time of Railways, Ragged Soods, Model Lodgings-houses, Soup-kitchens, Model Prisons, and other excellent creations for bettering the condition of poor ours, which stumbles somehow, most sadly, in spite of them?

Here is the raw material of a citizen—a boy well half way to manhood, who knows neither oath, nor book, nor prayer, nor God; has but heard of the the Devil even—and whose sum and substance of knowledge is "how to sweep the crossing—that's all." A crossing sweeping-machine this, with a superfluous soul in it apparently,—that no man, or set of men, has thought it worth while to waken—a tongue that the law ties—a sort of brute biped in the eyes of all—who, introduced to a worthy Alderman and a public prosecutor, knows not the oddest things, oaths, and books, and prayer, and God, and knows ideas which had not developed themselves in crossing-sweeping.

But though Society leave this lump of Man to his beseam abd his blank ignorance of right and wrong, and the powers thereof,—and though Law, when he ever so to try, is not ready to "know what he speak—says to him, "No! Be dumb, brute, how should a thou lift up thy voice among *men?*—this same Society and Law would be very different tone, if one one brute biped should begin to disclaim, and self brute fashion—if he should strike or bite, or kick, or take to satisfy hunger—to prey, in short, wild-beast-like on the world in which he is a wild beast. Then Society would be alert with its policemen, and committing magistrates and cells—and Law with its judges and juries, and learned barristers, all arranged to deal justice upon this poor neglected brute, as if he were a man.

A strange sight and one worthy of being weighed in these times above all others. Our blunt ancestors went roundly to work. If they saw without concern

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

The autograph of Milton was sold the other day, in London, for £440. 10s.; and the first edition of the plays of Shakspere was knocked down for £35. 10s.

—MADAME KOSSUTH—We are happy to announce that Madame Kossuth's wife has escaped from Hungary, and has arrived at Belgrade, on her way to join her illustrious husband at Shumla.—*Jewish Chronicle.*

—A DOG lately escaped at Madrid between two passing ladies. One was ultimately shot in the leg; and the combat ceased *pro tem.* Finally a reconciliation was effected by the gallant senor whose charms had evoked the apple of discord.

—"QUICKER or I'LL HOOK ON BY CROOK."—Persons entitled to fuel-wood at the king's forest were only authorised to take it of the dead wood or branches of trees in the forest, "with a cart, a hook, and a crook."—*Notes and Queries.*

—THERE is reason to believe that the auspicious event mentioned elsewhere as likely to increase the royal family, may be expected about the middle of April next.—*Leeds Mercury.*

—AT a marriage ceremony celebrated on Christmas day not far from Cambridge, a correspondent says the following persons were present—bridegroom: Pally o'Bill's o'Dan's; bride: Maria o'Great Nan's; groom's father: Dick o'Bills o'Dans; Jack o'Jacks Mary's, Tom o'John's, Bob o'Bobs o'Dans, Sam o'Sam's o'Dan's.

—HOW MANY MILES A PRINTER'S HAND TRAVELS.—Although a printer may be setting all day, yet in his own way he is a great traveller, or his hand is, as we shall prove. A good printer will set 2000 ems per hour, and 10 hours is his day's work. The distance travelled over by his hand will average one foot per letter, going to the boxes in which they are contained, and back, of course, returning to place of every letter he sets. The world make a distance each day of 48,000 feet, or a little more than nine miles; and, in the course of a year, leaving out Sundays, the number reaches 3,000,000 miles.

—The national debt at this time is about £800,000,000 sterling, and one cubic foot of standard gold weighs 1306.76 lbs. troy weight. Consequently by a lump of gold equal in bulk to 10,000,000 cubic feet, we could discharge the national debt, and the side of such a cubic will be found to be 223.57 feet, and will weigh 6848.39 tons.

—THE RUSSIAN LOAN.—A meeting to protest against this loan was held at the City of London Tavern, on Friday last. The great room was densely crowded; hundreds were turned back, and the number of applications for admittance is 40 or 50 more than were admitted. Lord Dudley Stuart was unable to attend from illness, but sent a letter expressing his entire sympathy with the movement. Mr. Charles Gilpin took the chair. He denounced the strong attempt to raise a loan by the Emperor of Russia in this country. Mr. Cobden was the chief speaker.—*Weekly Times.*

PARENTAGE OF EBENEZER ELLIOTT.

Of my birth no public registry exists. My father being a Dissenter, baptised me himself, or employed his friend, and neighbor Barnes, Tommy Wright, the Barnsley tinker, to baptise me. But I was born in the New Foundry, Masbro', in the parish of Rotherham, on the 17th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1781; and I narrate the fact thus particularly, that about an event of such importance there may be no contentious ink shed by historians in times to come. Robert Bellick, my father's father, was a constable in the Sheffield Liberty, and, in his circumstances, or he could not have given to his son first class commercial education, and put him apprentice to Landell and Chambers, of that great firm of Sheffield merchants, who received with him a premium of £50. His wife, who occupied in the parlour name of "Sheepshanks," was a Scotch woman, and, speaking metaphorically, wore breeches: a circumstance which does not seem to have lessened the love her husband bore her,—for he married her, with tears long after she had been laid in the grave, the young daughter of his death—especially when he lost, I have been told—and have the honor to believe, ed on the cattle they stole from both. That my grandmother Sheepshanks had ancestors is probable; but of what they were neither record nor tradition hath reached me,—which is the more pity, because my great difficulty in writing this narrative is want of materials. Famous men are fated to have some, but not by yourselves, ye Famous! who could write your histories, if all the children of want were famous! After my father left Landell and Chambers, he became one of the clerks of the "Sheffield Iron Foundery," where he lodged with a surgeon called Robinson; under whose roof he first saw my mother,—one of the daughters of a yeoman, at Ouzins, near Pontefract, where his ancestors had lived, for fifty or sixty acres of freehold time out of mind! Unlike them, I have made out my descent, if not from very fine folks, certainly from respectables, as (gosting every day comparatively scarcer) they are called in these days of "ten dogs to one bone." If famous men are fated to have some, so are they to have misfortunes, like such—and some of mine were born before me; for the whole life of my mother was a disease—a tale of pain, terminated by death—one long sigh. I was the fourth of her children, and breed sights of them to adult age. From her I have derived my nervous irritability, my bashful awkwardness, my miserable promptness to antipathy evil, that make me a sad misanthrope. I will remember her coming me to a dame's school, kept by Nanny Sykes, the beautiful and brave wife of a drunken husband, where I learned my A B C. I see her seated by the hearth, school over her head; then presided over by Joseph Ramsbotham, who taught me to write,—and little more. In those days the science of penmanship was undiscovered; and it was seldom fewer perhaps than 100 scholars—of course none but the naturally clever made much progress. About this time, my poor mother, who was of the strait-laced persuasion, and a true believer in dreams, related to me one of her visions. "I had placed under my pillow," she said, "a shank bone of mutton to dream upon, and I dreamed that I saw a little brown dog, short, ill-favored man, with black hair, black eyes, thick stob nose and tup-shins; it was thy father."—*Autobiography in the Athenæum.*

THE FATHER OF EBENEZER ELLIOTT.—And a special original he was: a man of great virtue, and not without faults: of the latter had its origin, perhaps, in some superstitious reverences for the cabalistic number "three." I allude to his bad habit of ducking his children thrice, and keeping them the longer, the more boisterously they cried when he bathed as in the canal; which produced in me a horror of suffocation that seems to increase with my years.—To avoid this cruel kindness, I was obliged to show him that I could do without his assistance, by painting voluntarily; a consequence of which was, that on one occasion I narrowly escaped drowning;—the more fortunate for me, I have been often said since. I never knew a man who possessed the tythe of my father's satiric and humorous power; he would have made a great comic actor. He also possessed uncommon politeness, which shrewd observers gained for him the title of "Devil Elliott;"—a title which is still applied to him, I am told, by the descendants of persons who knew him in the prime of his vigour. He left the Messrs. Walker to serve Clay and Co. of the New Foundry, Masbro', for a salary of sixty or seventy pounds a year, with house, candle, and coal! Will the reader imagine the fame of those days of elbows and pit-coal fire,—for glorious fires we had; no fear of coal bills in those days. There, at the New Foundry, my brother Jim and I were born, in a little parlor like the cabin of a ship, yearly painted green, and blessed with a beautiful thoroughfare of light—for there was no window-tax in those days—he used to amuse us, when we were little, by persons who came from distances of twelve and fourteen miles to hear his tremendous doctrines of ultra-Calvinism (he called himself a Sandemanian) and hell hung round with spanking children! On other days pointing to the aquatint pictures on the walls, he delighted to declaim on the virtues of slandered Cromwell and of Washington, and of the glorious Revolution of Seventeen hundred and eighty-eight, and of the Hebrew Lawgiver, explained the glories of "The glorious victory of his Majesty's forces over the Rebels at Bunker's Hill," and the glorious victory of Clay and Co. which all manufacture politics. If ever there was a man who knew not fear, that man was the father of the Corn Law Rhymer. From his birth to his last gasp I doubt whether he knew what it was to be afraid, except of poverty; about which he had and forebodings,—ultimately realized, after he had nominally become the proprietor of the Foundry of Clay and Co.—the part there having sold his share shortly after.—*Ibid.*

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

DR. DAVID DAVIS, Woodstown, N. J.
CHARLES ATKINSON, Montana, Grant co., Ia.
J. MILLER M'KIM, Philadelphia, Pa.
AMABANCY PAINE, Providence R. I.
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, N. Y.,
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario co., N Y
THOMAS M'CLINTOCK, Waterloo, "
S. HOLLAND, Sheepscot Lower Corners, Lincoln co., Me.
S. STAMFORD ASHLEY, Oberlin, Ohio.
ROBERT F. WALLCUT, Boston, Mass.
JESSE HOLMES, New Lisbon, Columbiana co., Ohio.
K. G. THOMAS, Marlborough, Stark, co., "
ISAAC LEWIS, Short Creek, Harrison co., "
E. H. BURGESS, Springfield, Mass.
AMES A. BURR, Ludlowville, N. Y.
ROBERT C. MARSHALL, Hiram, Portage co. "
WILLIAM CRONK, Buffalo, "
GEORGE W. EASTON, Bridgewater, Mass.
DAVID K. COOK, Johnson's Creek, Niagara co., N. Y
A. H. FOULDS, Concord Mass.
L. G. THOMAS, West Winfield, N. Y.
JOHN W. LYON, Hastings, Oswego co. N. Y
CHARLES DOUGLASS, Caughenwa, "
ALEX. FOREMAN, Pulaski, "
JOHN P. DICKINSON, Cleveland "
SOLOMON PECK, Mendonville, "
JOHN WILBUR, Sag Harbor, North Eastern Washington co
JONATHAN WILDE, Quaker Springs, Saratoga co. "
SAMUEL MAY, Jr. Leicester, "