

## MR. WELLER CALIFORNIA,

IN THE SENATE, FEBRUARY 13, 1854,

## ON THE NEBRASKA AND KANSAS BILL.

The Senate having under consideration the bill to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas—

Mr. WELLER said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: If any person came here to-day with the expectation that I intended to make any reply to the very extraordinary speech which was concluded on Friday last, he will find himself very much deceived. There are personal considerations which alone would prevent me from having any controversy upon this floor with the Senator who delivered that speech. I only intend to-day, so far as the condition of my health and my voice will permit, to discuss some of the various questions which have been alluded to in the course of this debate.

I do not intend to go into a lengthy argument for the purpose of showing the necessity there is for the organization of a government in the section of country where it is proposed to establish the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. There are a very few plain facts, which, in my judgment, ought to be sufficient to satisfy any one that the organization of one or more territorial governments in that region is indispensable.

You have within a few years past acquired an immense territory lying on the shores of the Pacific ocean. You have organized there a State government, which, ere long is destined to be one of the mightiest States of the Union. You have, in addition to this, organized two territorial governments. There is an immense tide of emigration flowing rapidly into that section of the Union. The overland emigration to that portion passes directly through that region of country which it is now proposed to organize into territorial governments. This is now occupied by a large number of hostile Indians. In order to give protection, then, to the emigrants against these Indians; in order to afford them the facilities to which they are entitled; in order to enable them to reach that distant portion of the Confederacy in safety, the organization of a territorial government is, in my judgment, indispensable. Besides that, there are yearly three hundred thousand emigrants who are coming to

your shores from the Old World. The convulsions and revolutions in Europe will, in all probability increase rather than diminish the number. Driven by the persecutions of the Old World, they come here for the enjoyment of religious and political liberty. They desire, under our liberal policy, to sit down with us under our vine and fig tree, where there are none to molest or make them afraid. Besides, there are many in the different States of the Union who desire to emigrate to that region. There are many, sir, in the older States who are compelled to labor from day to day, and from year to year, and yet are unable to procure more than the ordinary necessities of life. They desire to go, with no bank bills in their pockets, perhaps, but with honest hearts, and strong arms, to build up for themselves a home in this district of country. They will settle down upon the rich and productive valleys of Kansas and Nebraska; the Indian lodge will soon be broken up; their council fires will be extinguished, and the wilderness of to-day will bloom and blossom as the rose. With their energy, their industry, and their enterprise, they will soon surround themselves with all the necessaries, and all the comforts of civilized life. By making them the owners of the soil they cultivate, you lay the permanent foundation of your Government broad and deep in the affections of the people. The best security for the maintenance of the Republic will be found in making the great body of the people land-holders. As each is a part of the sovereignty, so he should be the owner of a portion of the soil.

The only difficulty which has presented itself to my mind has grown out of the fact that there are located upon a portion of this Territory of Kansas a large number of Indians who have been removed from the older States, upon the solemn pledge of the Government that they should not be disturbed. I desire, Mr. President, above all things, to maintain the plighted faith of this Government, whether it be given to the powerful or the weak—whether it be a pledge given to a civilized nation or to the unfortunate aborigines of America.

I desire to do no act here, as a public officer, which shall violate, in the slightest degree, the plighted honor of this Government to the unfortunate Indians; and therefore it was, Mr. President, that I was exceedingly anxious in the organization of these territorial governments that every care should be taken to protect the rights of the Indians. I believe that they are secured under the provisions of the bill and proposed amendments. We have been compelled, in times past, to treat these Indians with great hardship. We have prevailed upon them to leave the homes of their ancestors, the graves of their fathers, their old familiar hunting grounds; upon the pledge that there, in that distant West, the white man should never disturb them. Little did we think then that in a few years the wants and necessities of our own people would demand the lands upon which they were located.

Sir, it is a melancholy reflection that these Indians must, in the end, be entirely destroyed. There is no human hand that can stay the onward progress of the white population. You might as well attempt "to arrest the rolling current or chain the deep" as to stop that onward progress. Humanity, therefore, dictates that we should do all in our power to alleviate their sufferings, and to soften the blow which stern necessity may require us to inflict. I know too, sir, that it is very common for us to exaggerate the inhumanity and the cruelties of the Indian population. I know that these charges are often concocted by the white man. I know there are thousands of unrecorded wrongs which have been committed upon this unfortunate population. They have no historian, they have no newspapers to chronicle the wrongs that the white man may perpetrate upon them. Tribes that numbered their warriors by thousands a few years ago have entirely disappeared from the face of the earth. They have faded away before the resistless march of the white man. They are now between the upper and the nether millstone, and extermination seems to be inevitable. I know of no policy which can prolong their existence for any considerable period. I trust, therefore, that if provision is not already made in the bill—I do not pretend to be very familiar with its details—that the Committee on Indian Affairs, who are especially charged with this subject, will make it their duty go to protect them. I would to Heaven they were as happy and contented this day, as well provided for in sickness and in health, as the black population of the South, over whom misguided philanthropists and wild fanatics are now shedding their crocodile tears.

This bill requires, before it operates on these Indians, that a treaty shall have been made with the President of the United States, ceding to this Government their possessions. I hope that treaty will be executed in good faith. I trust that no improper means will be used for the purpose of inducing them thus to give their assent. With a full and abiding confidence in the integrity, as well as the humanity, of the present Chief Magistrate, I doubt not that it will be faithfully executed. If this section requires additional guards to protect the rights of the Indians, I trust the committee will see that it is done. Above all things, let us deal justly and fairly with the remnant of these once mighty tribes.

Mr. President, there has been much said, in the

course of this discussion, upon the effect of the Ordinance of 1787. I shall not attempt to-day to discuss the question, whether that ordinance resulted in the exclusion of slavery from the territory upon which it operated. I know the fact that the Territories of Illinois and Indiana were constantly making applications to the Federal Government for a suspension of that restriction. The Senator from Ohio, [Mr. CHASE,] the other day, undertook to claim that that was considered by Congress as an irrevocable act; and therefore it was, that when these constant applications were made to Congress, they were uniformly rejected. In order to establish that fact, he quoted from a report made by the celebrated John Randolph, in the House of Representatives. Now, I submit to the Senator from Ohio, whether it was very fair, in quoting from that report of Mr. Randolph, to commence in the middle of a sentence, and publish that to the Senate and the world as the whole of what he said? Now I find, upon examination, that that portion of the report which the Senator has studiously avoided quoting, assigns the reasons why the eighth article in the ordinance of 1787 ought not to be suspended. I will read that portion of the sentence which the Senator from Ohio has omitted:

"That the rapid population of the State of Ohio, sufficiently evinces, in the opinion of your committee, that the labor of slaves is not necessary to promote the growth and settlement of colonies in that region. That this labor, demonstrably the dearest of any, can only be employed to advantage in the cultivation of products more valuable than any known to that quarter of the United States."

This is immediately followed by what the Senator from Ohio quoted the other day. Now this report assigns the reason; and that reason was found in the character of the soil, and in the productions of that region of country. I think that when the Senator undertakes to quote a report, he is not justifiable in commencing in the middle of a sentence, especially when the first portion of it assigns the reason for the opinion given. Now, sir, slavery existed in both of those Territories. By the census of 1810 there were one hundred and sixty-eight slaves in Illinois; and in 1820 there were nine hundred and seventeen, showing very clearly that slaves must have been taken to that country between 1810 and 1820. These slaves were taken there in defiance of your ordinance of 1787. When the people came to form their State constitution and ask for admission into the Union, they thought proper, in the exercise of an undeniable right, to exclude slavery. If that ordinance had never been passed, I do not believe that slavery would have existed in any of the States carved out of that territory. The productions and climate of that region would have rendered slave labor unprofitable, and hence I infer it would have been excluded. So that, in my judgment, slavery was excluded by a higher law than the ordinance of 1787—the law of nature—the same law which expelled it from the New England States at the close of the last century; the same law will, in my opinion, exclude it from the Territories which you now propose organizing.

Now, with regard to the compromise of 1820, as it has been called, and the compromise of 1850, I have a very few remarks to make. I was no party to what is alleged to be the compromise of 1820. So far as I have been able to discover, it was an ordinary act of legislation, passed, I grant you,

under extraordinary circumstances. It was supposed by many at that day that the Union was in danger; and in order to obtain a majority in Congress for the admission of Maine and Missouri into the Union, what was called the Missouri compromise was passed. How many laws have found their way to the statute-book by a compromise of conflicting opinions? Upon every question affecting local or sectional interests a contrariety of opinions is found to exist, and these can only be reconciled by concession, by conciliation, by compromise. I see nothing in the act of 1820 which makes it more of a compact than a hundred other laws passed by Congress. And even if it were a compromise, as I was no party to it, I am under no obligations to support it. I cannot recognize the right of my predecessors to settle questions for me, especially when they transcend the limits prescribed by the Constitution. They had no more power then than I have now. They acted upon their judgments, as I propose to act upon mine now. Nor do I consider myself bound, as a legislator here, by the compromise of 1850. So far as the legislation of that Congress touched the question of slavery, it undoubtedly abrogated the act of 1820. The one established a geographical line beyond which slavery should not exist; the other recognized no lines, but left the whole question to the free and unbiased judgment of the people.

The act of 1820 imposed unconstitutional restrictions upon the sovereignty of the people. The organization of New Mexico and Utah in 1850, virtually repealed this restriction, and transmitted the whole question to the people. I grant you the law of 1820, and the series of acts passed in 1850, were enacted under extraordinary circumstances. On both occasions, it is said, the Union was in danger. That danger must have been much more imminent in 1850 than in 1820. At the latter period the population of the United States was nine millions; at the former twenty-three millions. In the mean while the country was filled with political anti-slavery agitators, who were constantly engaged in infuriating the popular mind against that institution. Then, indeed, the wisest men in the country began to despair of the Republic. Reckless fanaticism seemed to be standing, with a torch, ready to burn down that beautiful temple of liberty erected by the patriotism of our revolutionary fathers. The storm which had been gathering for years was about to burst upon our heads, carrying desolation and ruin throughout the land. Sectional prejudices had been aroused, and the foul spirit of disunion stalked abroad in the open day. It was under such circumstances that the acts of 1850 were passed.

Now, to which one of these "compromises" am I bound, if either? I have said before that I do not recognize either of them as binding upon me. If, however, I were called upon to respect either the one or the other, the last one, passed under the most extraordinary circumstances, having been subsequently indorsed by the great body of the American people, in the election of 1852, would be the one that would demand the sanction of my judgment. Both cannot be maintained, as there is a direct conflict between them. If I stand by the solemn decision of the people, I must repudiate the act of 1820.

But, sir, those Senators who discourse so eloquently about the sacredness of "compromises," were the very first men at the last session of Congress to introduce propositions to disturb it. Here were these two Senators, sitting immediately on my right, (Messrs. SUMNER and CHASE,) aided by two others on the other side of the Chamber, (Messrs. HALE and WADE,) who were ready to demand a repeal of the fugitive slave law. What would be the inevitable effect of such a repeal? Is it not manifest to all that it must be the dissolution of this Union? Think you, sir, that the South would remain a portion of this Confederacy, after a distinct declaration upon the part of the North that they did not intend to give to the South any security for their property? Sir, if the time shall ever come when the North uses its power for the purpose of oppressing the South—if the time shall come when the North declares to the South that the citizens of the latter shall not pursue their property and recapture it in the territory of the former—the time for dissolution will have arrived, and ought to arrive.

Mr. DODGE, of Iowa. Yes, sir; ought to arrive.

Mr. WELLER. This shows the respect which those Senators have for compromises—for the sacredness of compacts! Sir, I am a native of a free State, as it is called; I was educated in a free State; I never resided in a slave State; but I have no prejudices against anything that is constitutional. I have been taught, from my infancy, to regard the Constitution of the United States as the palladium of our liberties. I have been taught to believe that that Constitution can be preserved only by securing to every section of the Union the undisturbed enjoyment of its political rights. I have, therefore, no prejudices to overcome; but, at the same time, you will allow me to say, that I am no advocate for slavery. I am not responsible for its introduction into these States; and its continuance must depend upon the voluntary action of the people in the exercise of their sovereign power. They are better judges of what local institutions will conduce to their happiness and prosperity than I am. However much I may deplore its existence, it is beyond my control.

Sir, there are many sickly philanthropists here who tell us a great deal about the Declaration of Independence, and that all men are created "free and equal." If this be an argument with them, why do they not extend political rights to the negroes within the limits of the free States? Why not suffer them to sit on juries? Why not elect them to the State Legislatures? Why not suffer them to go to the ballot-box? If they are equal with themselves, why not extend to them the same political liberties which they themselves exercise? If they are their equals, why not admit them to social privileges? Why not invite them to their hospitalities, and make them a part of their domestic circles? Why suffer the foolish prejudices of education to prevent their intermarrying?

Sir, while I deprecate the existence of slavery, you will allow me to say that I have not yet seen the demoralizing effects of that institution, to which we are so often referred. Will any Senator tell me the South will not compare with the North? Will you undertake to tell me that your

southern females have less honor, less chastity, less of those high virtues which adorn the female character, than is to be found in the North? They may not usurp the political rights nor the garb of manhood; they may not enter the political arena, and sharpen their intellects amidst the passions and the conflicts of men; but contenting themselves within their appropriate sphere, they teach the law of kindness and affection, and hush up the discords of life.

Will you undertake to tell me, that amongst her men there is less patriotism, less devotion to the national honor, less morality, or less religion than is to be found in the North? There is no man who has the moral courage to answer these questions in the affirmative. Allow me, then, to say, that the demoralizing influence of this institution, which has been so often referred to, has escaped my observation.

At the beginning of this Government, slavery existed in all of the thirteen States. As late as 1790, when the first census was taken, there were 40,272 slaves in the States which are now free. In 1800, there were 35,000 slaves in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Vermont. I do not believe, upon my conscience, that it would ever have been obliterated in that section of the Union, if they had not found that their soil and their productions made it unprofitable.

Mr. President, there are only two modes by which these United States can be held together. They are force and affection. I trust there is no one here who desires that force should be resorted to, in order to maintain this Union. I know that there can be no affection subsisting between the States of the Confederacy unless you secure to each section of it equal rights. This Government is based upon an equality of political rights. Whenever you attempt to discriminate, whenever you say to one portion of the Union, "You shall enjoy certain rights which we will exclude from another portion," you have destroyed the very principle upon which the Government is based. If you desire, therefore, to maintain that degree of affection which is necessary to the permanency of this Government, you must take care to do justice to each, and in doing that you will have laid a broad foundation in the hearts of the people. Extend full and ample protection to all, but exclusive privileges to none.

Mr. President, the admission of California into the Union destroyed the balance of political power here. Anterior to the admission of that State, whence I came, the political power on this floor was equally divided. But now the power has passed into the hands of the free States, and must continue to remain there. In the House of Representatives the free States have now a majority of fifty-four. But suppose that this were otherwise; suppose that California had chosen to come into the Union as a slaveholding State; and suppose that there was a majority of Representatives from the slaveholding States in the other branch of Congress, and then suppose, sir, that some friend of the South should be unjust and ungenerous enough to seek to use that political power, that numerical strength, to oppress us of the North; suppose they should introduce a proposition that slavery should never be excluded from the territory north of 36° 30'; should we, the men of the

North, submit to that? Suppose they had the power, and should attempt now to declare that slavery should never be excluded from any territory that might hereafter be organized into State governments, would northern men acquiesce in that? Would not the cry of disunion be rung upon the hill-tops and in the valleys of New England, and would it not be found retching upon the shores of the Pacific? Sir, we could not submit to that. In my judgment you have just as much power to do the one as the other, and it would be equally just and equitable in the one case as in the other. I undertake to say that this Union would not exist a day if the slaveholding States had the ascendancy here and should thus abuse their power.

Mr. President, we ought to observe the golden rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." If it would be unfair and unjust, if it would be dishonorable in us to acquiesce in such a provision as that, it would be equally dishonorable, in my judgment, to the southern section of the Union. Any proposition which denies to one portion of the Confederacy an equal participation with another in our common rights, is dishonorable. Establish as a settled policy the doctrine for which we contend, of non-intervention by the Federal Government, and it is a matter of little importance whether the North or the South has a majority in Congress. Why is it that one portion of the Union should be denied an equal participation in the settlement of the Territories? Why is it that you cannot leave this question where all other questions are left, to the free and voluntary decision of the people who may emigrate to that region? Has the South ever failed to discharge her duty? In the hour of trial and of danger, have they not stood by you? Sir, I have seen many of these southern men, standing shoulder to shoulder with northern men, upon the field of battle; I have seen them stricken down by the balls of the enemy, lying side by side, their blood intermingling and moistening the earth on which they fell. They raised themselves up as the lamp of life was about to be extinguished, and saw their comrades rushing on and on; they saw their glorious flag, the emblem of our common Union, planted upon the walls of the enemy, and they fell back and expired, with a smile of joy upon their lips—a smile of joy because that flag, around which all the warmest affections of their hearts had been gathered, proudly waved in triumph. And why is it that those men who have aided us in the acquisition of the territory, those men who have contributed their money and their blood, shall be refused an equal participation in the benefits resulting from it?

Mr. President, I know not what may be the feelings of others, but I only desire that that portion of the Union from whence I come should be allowed to participate in the common benefits of this Government. We ask no exclusive privileges, and we are unwilling to discriminate between the different sections of the Union. We are willing to extend to others that justice which we demand for ourselves.

Sir, the Father of his Country, in his Farewell Address, foresaw that the formation of parties in this country, upon geographical grounds—northern and southern, eastern and western—was

calculated in itself to engender a feeling which must ultimately undermine the foundations of this Government; and I hold now that no man who truly loves his country, and who desires to perpetuate the blessings of civil liberty, will give his aid and encouragement to the organization or support of a party whose design is to perpetuate these geographical distinctions. The illustrious man to whom I referred said:

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

I would that these sentiments could sink deep into the hearts of the men who are constantly agitating sectional questions.

It has been said with great solemnity that this is a question between slavery and freedom. Is there a Senator on this floor who proposes to increase the number of slaves in the United States? Is there any man here who desires to put the bonds upon a single individual now free? Is it proposed to increase this evil—and it is a political evil, to say the least of it? Is it proposed, I ask, to increase the number of those who are held in bondage? If it be, then it is a question between slavery and freedom. But, sir, this argument, which has been used by Senators on the other side, is fully answered in the reports which were made in favor of the suspension of the ordinance of 1787, in Indiana and Illinois. I read from a report, made in the House of Representatives in 1806, by Mr. Garnett:

"That having attentively considered the facts stated in the said petitions and memorials, they are of opinion that a qualified suspension, for a limited time, of the sixth article of compact between the original States, and the people and States west of the river Ohio, would be beneficial to the people of the Indiana Territory. The suspension of this article is an object almost universally desired in that Territory. It appears to your committee to be a question entirely different from that between slavery and freedom, inasmuch as it would merely occasion the removal of persons, already slaves, from one part of the country to another. The good effects of this suspension, in the present instance, would be to accelerate the population of that Territory, hitherto retarded by the operation of that article of compact, as slaveholders emigrating into the western country, might then indulge any preference which they might feel for a settlement in Indiana Territory, instead of seeking, as they are now compelled to do, settlements in other States or countries, permitting the introduction of slaves. The condition of the slaves themselves would be much ameliorated by it, as it is evident, from experience, that the more they are separated and diffused, the more care and attention are bestowed on them by their masters, each proprietor having it in his power to increase their comforts and conveniences in proportion to the smallness of their numbers."

A report, basing their action upon similar grounds, was made in 1807 by the committee to whom this subject was referred, who use this language:

"The suspension of the said article would operate an immediate and essential benefit to the Territory, as emigration to it will be inconsiderable for many years, except from those States where slavery is tolerated; and although it is not considered expedient to force the population of the Territory, yet it is desirable to connect its scattered settlements, and, in regard to political rights, to place it on an equal footing with the different States. From the interior situation of the

Territory, it is not believed that slaves would ever become so numerous as to endanger the internal peace or future prosperity of the country. The current of emigration flowing to the western country, the Territories ought all to be opened to their introduction. The abstract question of liberty and slavery is not involved in the proposed measure, as slavery now exists to a considerable extent in different parts of the Union; it would not augment the number of slaves, but merely authorize the removal to Indiana of such as are held in bondage in the United States. If slavery is an evil, means ought to be devised to render it least dangerous to the community, and by which the hapless situation of the slaves would be most ameliorated; and to accomplish these objects, no measure would be so effectual as the one proposed."

A proposition that a citizen of Texas shall be allowed to take his slave and go into the Territory of Kansas, is construed by Senators upon the other side as a question between slavery and freedom! The simple proposition is, whether the slaves who are now held in bondage, and who now are in populous communities, and are thus deprived of many of the comforts of life, shall be allowed to be taken into a territory where the sparseness of the population, and the increased facilities for obtaining the necessaries of life, will enable them to live much more comfortably than they do now. But, sir, if this be a question between slavery and freedom, then the friends of this measure hold the freedom side of the question. We propose that the people, the original source of all power, those who spoke this Government into existence, and whose agents we are, shall be allowed to decide for themselves what local institutions shall exist among them. On the other hand, the opponents of the measure advocate slavery. They contend that the American people shall not exercise this right; that their minds shall be enslaved; that their hands shall be tied up, and they prevented from a free decision whether slavery shall exist there or not. We occupy the broad ground of freedom. We have an abiding confidence in the honesty and in the intelligence of the people. We are not afraid to trust them with the decision of this question. How stands it with you? I had supposed that you were the agents and the representatives of the people; but it seems that the servant has become wiser than the master. You who are invested with political power are claiming now that you are better judges of what sort of government the people should have than the people themselves. Is this so? Is there that vast amount of intelligence and of patriotism in the American Congress which makes us far better judges of what the people should have than the people themselves? Our whole system is based upon the principle that man is capable of self-government. The moment you violate this principle, that moment you transcend your authority and destroy the vital element of the Republic.

We propose that this, like all other questions, shall be left to the free decision of the people. The opponents of the measure concede to the people the right, when they form a State constitution, to decide for themselves whether slavery shall exist or not; but, in the mean time, while it is a Territory, they say slavery ought to be excluded. This is like tying a man's hands and legs, and telling him to go where he pleases. If you concede to the people, when they form a State constitution, the right to decide for themselves whether slavery shall exist or not, how can they exercise that right untrammelled, unless you allow them, during the existence of the territorial government,

to go there with that species of property? If you exclude slavery under the territorial government, as a consequence, there will be no slaveholders there when they come to form a constitution and ask for admission into the Union. It would be mockery; therefore, to concede to them the power when they form a constitution, and to deny to them the exercise of this right while they exist as a territorial government.

You will allow me to say, Mr. President, that I do not believe that slavery can ever exist in either of these Territories; and to this extent it may be regarded as an abstract question. A great many of the difficulties which have sprung up in the administration of this Government, have grown out of the fact that we attach too much importance to mere abstractions. Allow me to say, further, that another prolific cause of difficulty in this country is, that we are very much disposed to intermeddle with the affairs of our neighbors. In the social relations of life, how much quarreling and wrangling would be avoided if each one would attend to his own business and let his neighbor's alone. It is just so in political affairs. We have thirty-one States in this Union happily confederated together. They have different local laws and different local institutions. You can only preserve the peace and the harmony of the whole, by taking care that each State manages its own affairs, and abstains from intermeddling with its neighbors. There, after all, in my judgment, is the secret of the permanence of the Union. You may go on and increase the number of States, until you have covered the whole continent of America, and the Government will be stronger than it is now, if you take care that each one of the States shall abstain from intermeddling with the affairs of its neighbors. Let the Federal Government rigidly adhere to the principle so wisely recognized in 1850 of non-intervention, and let each State treat its neighbor with kindness and affection, and the Union may exist forever.

The two Senators from Ohio, in my judgment, do not represent the views of the great body of the people of that State. I have some right to speak of that State, for it is my native land; and I undertake to say that the great body of both parties there are not only willing to abide by the compromises of the Constitution, so far as slavery is concerned, but they are willing to leave it hereafter to the free decision of the people themselves. I feel some interest in the honor of that State, because there are many there who are bound to me by the closest ties of friendship—a friendship which has not been lessened or diminished by an absence of many years; and although that

"Divinity that shapes our ends,  
Rough-hew them how we will,"

has united my fortunes with the people of the Pacific, yet I shall never cease to feel a lively interest in the honor and glory of my native State. My last aspiration, as my spirit takes its flight to another world, will be for the peace and prosperity of that, the land of my birth. That she has committed a most egregious blunder in sending two Abolitionists here to represent her in this branch of Congress is undeniable; but,

"With all thy faults, I love thee still."

One of these Senators from Ohio [Mr. WADE] went so far as to utter this sentiment:

"Sir, in the days of the Revolution Major André was hung by the neck until he was dead for accepting a proposition not more base than this, which is a gross betrayal of the rights of the whole North."

What an Egyptian darkness must have pervaded the mind of that Senator before he could have arrived at that conclusion! What sad ravages the foul spirit of fanaticism must have made upon his heart before he could have uttered that sentiment! The simple proposition to leave the people of Kansas and Nebraska free and untrammelled to decide on all their local institutions for themselves, is, in his judgment, a more dishonorable proposition than that for which Major André was hung! I pray that God may enlighten the benighted mind of that Senator, and soften his heart, and that ere long he will be restored to a proper degree of judgment and reason—I had almost said of decency.

I know that the discussion of this question is producing some agitation in the country. I have no objection to that. I rejoice, at all times, to see the attention of the people directed to the action of their representatives here. I know there are professional agitators; there are men who are constitutionally fond of attending to everybody's business except their own; who are now agitating this question, ultimately, as I believe, for the purpose of dissolving this Union. Show me an active Abolitionist—one who is professionally an agitator—and I will show you a man who, in the social relations of life, is constantly intermeddling with the affairs of his neighbors. It seems to be a part of the constitutional organization of some men, and it is impossible to avoid it. During the last ten years I have directed my particular attention to that point; and whenever I come across an Abolitionist, I have endeavored to find out his social character; and in nine cases out of ten I have discovered that he was an intermeddler in the affairs of others.

Sir, they will not succeed in dissolving this Union. I know that extraordinary efforts are made to influence the public mind. I know that efforts are now being made in the North for the purpose of impressing upon the minds of our children prejudices against the southern section of the Confederacy. I know they have taken possession of the press; they have taken possession of a large portion of the light literature of the day. They have even taken possession of the theater. If you go now into many of the free States of the Union you will find, by day as well as by night, plays enacted which have been gotten up for no other purpose than to excite the prejudices of our youth against the southern portion of the Union and their institutions. Sir, you cannot break down this Government now; it is safe with this generation; but whether it will be safe when the present youthful generation has grown up, with all these prejudices and impressions made upon their minds, I cannot pretend to decide. Sir, we never forget the impressions made upon our minds in the days of our youth. They generally direct and control our actions during life. Even in the extremity of tottering age, when reason fails and memory is impaired, and more recent events are swept from the tablets of the mind, the impressions made in our youth still stand like lonely columns amidst the fallen ruins of prostrate intellect.

Sir, you may not be able to dissolve this Union

at this time; but with all the influences now exerted through the newspaper press, the light literature of the day, and with the influence of the theater more than all, you may be able to prepare the minds of the next generation for a dissolution of the Union; and in some future generation, when this Union is dissevered and torn by intestine factions and civil wars, your children will rise up with the flanking, galling chains of the oppressor upon their limbs, and curse the memory of those by whom it was brought about—ay, sir, with curses foul and deep.

I know, Mr. President, that I owe an apology to the Senate for the warmth which I have manifested in the discussion of this subject to-day. Those who know my constitutional organization and temperament need no excuse. They know that it was utterly impossible for me to speak coolly and deliberately, under the circumstances which now surround me. But a few words more, and I have done.

I am standing here to-day with no previous obligations growing out of the Missouri compromise, and with no identification with that of 1850. I am standing here to-day as an American Senator, called upon to aid in the organization of two territorial governments. As the men of 1820, and the men of 1850 exercised their judgment and their reason, so I intend to exercise mine when I am called upon to act. Let no man say that I am a "northern man with southern principles." I scorn the imputation. I am an American with constitutional principles. I am an American who can see no prosperity, no happiness for any section of the Union except in the maintenance of that sacred instrument. I am an American making no invidious distinctions among the States, entertaining no prejudices against any section, but claiming the Union as my country. If, in sustaining these principles, I am, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Chase] said, "kindling a fire which will consume me," I am ready for the sacrifice. Better, far better, that I should terminate my political existence now, than have to reproach myself in old age for having been instrumental in destroying the liberties of my country.

Mr. President, the old party issues that have divided the country have been measurably oblit-

erated. The great body of the Whigs and Democrats in this country are devoted to the principles incorporated in this bill. However widely we may differ as to the best means of promoting the public good—however much we may wrangle as to the manner in which the Government shall be administered—however madly we may dispute in our contests for power—we have sworn upon the altar of our common country that this Union shall be preserved. This is the sentiment, sir, of the great body of both parties. It is not in the name of either Whig or Democrat that we can hope for happiness or respect. It is in the name of united Americans alone that we can hope to attain or maintain true national greatness. The spirits of your illustrious fathers are looking down and rejoicing at the progress you are making in all that tends to ennoble human nature. I invoke you, then, by the proud character which your country has assumed among the nations of the earth—by the sacred memories of the past and the brilliant hopes of the future—to discountenance every effort which is made to array one section of the Union against the other. I trust in God, also, the time will come when the down-trodden and oppressed of the Old World, following the example so gloriously set by America, will establish political systems based on the principle of the capacity of man for self-government. Then

"Prone to the dust Oppression shall be hurled,  
Her name, her nature withered from the world."

Mr. President, still another word. I have no claims upon either the North or the South. My days, whether they be few or many, must be spent upon the shores of the Pacific. Whenever I can no longer be useful in the national councils to that section of the Confederacy, I will cheerfully return to the peaceful walks of private life. At my own fireside, in the calm quietude of the domestic circle, surrounded by those who are bound to me by the ties of kindred and affection, I may obtain that happiness which I have not been able to find in public station. If I were now about to take my departure from this world, I would ask to have no prouder epitaph inscribed upon my tomb than this: "Here lies a man who cherished no sectional prejudices, but whose whole life was devoted to the maintenance of the union of the States."