

F

685

W 16

Nebraska and Kansas.
Speech of Hon. Edward Wade
of Ohio.
1854.



Class F685

Book W16

NEBRASKA AND KANSAS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD WADE, OF OHIO.

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 27, 1854

WASHINGTON :
BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.
1854.

S P E E C H

OF

EDWARD WADE, OF OHIO.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. WADE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The bill under consideration has given rise to much discussion, in which certain Southern gentlemen, particularly the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. PRESTON,] and the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. PHILLIPS,] have kindly volunteered to advise the few Independent Democrats in Congress that no Abolitionist had yet been so fortunate as to be entitled to the rank of statesman. This bill I suppose, must be considered as owing its paternity and nursing, to gentlemen now in Congress, who, if their own claims shall be allowed, will of course be installed as statesmen. Well sir, this bit of modern statesmanship, proposes to set aside the whole course of territorial legislation practiced for sixty years—from the very organization of the Government—legislation devised by the framers of the Constitution, the very fathers of the Republic, under which, free Governments have been organized for at least nine Territories, viz: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Oregon, and Washington, of which six have already become members of the Union; and in the working of which territorial system, I boldly defy these reckless innovators, to show a single act of hardship or injustice. Yes sir, this long-tried and faultless system, under which there have been nurtured and reared to political manhood, six free States, in which a degree of prosperity, happiness, and progress, has been realized without a parallel in the history of the human race, is now to give way to this unlicked whelp, the joint progeny of a foul connection between Northern demagogism and Southern Slavery. The object, the sole object, of this iniquitous innovation is, to plant Slavery in the great Nebraska Territory—twelve times larger than the State of Ohio, larger than all the free States east of the Mississippi.

To this end, the "statesmen" whose progeny his vile scheme is, have nicknamed it a "popu-

lar sovereignty," "congressional non-intervention," and the "right of the people to regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way," "Government"—a sort of old puritanical "*If Christ had not died, you would have been damned Barebone*" name—having about it all the cant, but none of the sincerity of the old puritanical fanaticism.

This Nebraska and Kansas bill is put forth as the model of this newly-invented system of Territorial Government, for which, if the inventor has not yet taken out a patent, nor entered a caveat, I advise him to give himself no trouble about the matter, as no one will be likely to attempt a piracy upon it.

But inasmuch as this bill is a sample of "popular sovereignty," "congressional non-intervention," &c., &c.—I propose to analyze and show it up in its details as it is. And sir, if I do not call, I will still prove it to be, an impudent and insulting violation, in every material provision of it, of the most simple notion of "popular sovereignty," as well as of "congressional non-intervention." Sir, I will show it to be a bold attempt to impose on the credulity, a daring experiment on the supposed ignorance or the besotted prejudices of the people; in each of which however, I entertain an abiding confidence, that the authors of this iniquity, not the people, will prove the dupes.

Congressional non-intervention with the government of the Territories, would be, to let the people of the Territories alone—to leave them—"hands off"—in the organization, administration, or change of their Government.

Self-government and popular sovereignty imply the rights of the people to organize, administer, and to change their Government; and the right to "regulate domestic institutions," is implied in the right of "self-government," as the right of self-government, is implied in the duty of non-intervention.

This bill however, stultifies these pretended Democratic doctrines, and gives the *lie direct*, to

each and all of them, in the following particulars :

1. Congress—NOT THE PEOPLE of Kansas, or Nebraska—creates a *temporary* government for the people of the Territories.

2. Establishes an Executive Department; the *President*, not the people, appoints their Governor for four years, and may dismiss him *at any time*, however satisfactory he may be to the people.

3. Creates, and the *President*, not the people, appoints a Secretary for *five* years, and may remove him at his pleasure.

4. Vests the legislative power of the Territories in the *President's* Governor and the people's Legislative Assembly—giving the *President's Governor* a veto on the *people's* legislation.

5. Limits the right of suffrage to the free white male citizens of the Territory.

6. Establishes the judicial power, and prescribes the number of judges, and the jurisdiction of the courts; the judges of which, the *President*, (not the people) appoints, and may remove at pleasure; thus stripping the judiciary of its independence, and actually ingrafting on the Governments of these Territories, precisely the tyrannical feature of colonial oppression, which contributed most to the outbreak of the revolutionary war.

7. Subjects the people to the odious and unconstitutional fugitive slave act.

8. Provides for a territorial attorney and marshal, whom the *President* (not the people) appoints, and may remove at his pleasure.

9. Pays the Governor, Secretary, Judges, and Legislative Assembly, out of the United States Treasury, without the consent of the people; placing thus *every* department of the Territorial Governments *above*, and *independent* of, the people; thereby, in the name of "popular sovereignty," degrading them to the most abject state of colonial vassalage.

10. Provides "that the Constitution, and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska as elsewhere within the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6, 1820; which being inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognised by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

This section requires the people of the Territories to consider Slavery a "domestic institution," although each one and all of them may deem it a crime deserving the gibbet. It also permits each one of the people to practice Slavery on his own hook, upon whom he pleases, and as many as he can.

The Territorial Legislature having, by this bill, no jurisdiction in the matter of Slavery at all. Such is Senator BUTLER's opinion of it, and such

is the true construction of it, if that "can shape be called which shape hath none." I refer to that Senator's language as reported :

"Under this bill the South obtains some rights. Under the Missouri compromise they had none. He was of opinion that the operation of the bill would be that the Territorial Legislature would take no action on the subject, but would leave it to the American citizens who resided in the Territory, to act as they pleased in regard to the introduction of slaves."

In the same way it legislates the "domestic institution" of polygamy into the Territory; for Senator BUTLER's reasoning applies with equal force to polygamy; or to *promiscuous concubinage*, as to Slavery.

Now Mr. Chairman, in view of this great achievement, one is constrained to exclaim, All hail! Pro-Slavery Democracy—Compromise Democracy—Prince of Shams and Humbugs! Slavery, Polygamy, and Concubinage, these are thy JEWELS! Well, thou hast touched bottom at last, as is clear by the mud brought up on their fouled garments.

Mr. Chairman, I claim to be a Democrat—I am a Democrat—a friend of justice and of liberty—of justice to the native and the alien—of liberty and justice to the white, to the black, and to the red man; and whenever I may use the word democrat or democracy in an odious sense, I mean by it your Pro-Slavery, your Compromise Democracy—precisely that sham—that cheat—that hypocrisy, which comes, in the abused name of Democracy, to the support of this iniquitous bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, the "popular sovereignty" folks ask, with a sort of "now we have got you, sir" air, "Cannot the people of the Territories judge for themselves as well as we can, what sort of 'domestic institutions,' will be best suited to their condition? Must we arrogate to ourselves here, the ability to understand and judge for the people of these Territories in these matters, better than they can judge for themselves? Will a man going from New England, New York, &c., or from Virginia or Kentucky, after arriving in the Territories, be less able to judge of the 'domestic institutions' best suited to his new condition, than he was before he left the State of his nativity?" Well sir, let me say to gentlemen who put forth these insidious questions—"physician, heal thyself." Answer me these questions, and then I will endeavor to answer yours: Are not the people of Kansas and Nebraska, as competent to nominate and elect their Governor, judges, secretary, territorial attorney, and marshal; and to determine how long these officers shall hold their offices, as is the President of the United States? Is it a more aggravated violation of the new doctrine of "congressional non-intervention and popular sovereignty," to exclude domestic Slavery from these Territories, than it is to exclude the people from electing these officers, and giving to the President the power to appoint and remove them at his pleasure; and in defiance of the will and wishes of the people?

Is a citizen of Ohio, of New York, or Massachusetts, or of Virginia, Tennessee, or Louisiana, if competent to vote for a Governor, a secretary, an attorney, a judge, or a marshal, in the State

domestic institutions." Yes sir, it is to license the slave Democracy, to shoot such women as flee from the brute who attempts to chastise them by whipping for a "trifling" offence, that the nation has been set in a blaze of excitement, and the business of Congress brought up with a "dead-lock." The kind of "domestic institution" which this lying and knavish bill is designed to "regulate" into these Territories, will be perfectly understood by the foregoing masterly exposition of an upright slaveholding judge. It is not to be overlooked, that the judge in that case, acknowledges the wickedness, the atrocity of the decision he pronounced; and it would be well for slaveholders of the present day, to imitate his candor, instead of flying in the face of a scoffing and contemptuous world, by excusing or justifying Slavery, which they know, and which they know that all mankind know, to be utterly unrighteous and indefensible. I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the striking fact, that Judge Ruffin in the case I have cited, could reconcile his own conscience to the most unrighteous judgment which he pronounced, only on the plea of the absolute necessity of it, in order to maintain the relation of master and slave WHERE IT ACTUALLY EXISTED.

What think you then, Mr. Chairman, would have been the judgment of that apparently humane-judge—nay, rather, what must be the judgment of that final Judge whose command is, "That which is altogether just shalt thou follow, that thou mayest live"—on this infernal scheme, which prostrates every barrier to the entry of Slavery into these territories, now untainted with that crime and curse? Sir, what think the *real* Democracy of the free States, (if the existence of such be not fabulous?) What think the honest, intelligent freemen of the whole country, of this device of wicked ambition which, for the naked chance of a four years' occupancy of the White House, would impose this devilish institution on these Territories? Sir, I call the institution of Slavery devilish: I do the Devil wrong, for even the Devil himself is *free* to do right if HE WILL; but this infernal machinery of man's devising, having its origin in *man-stealing*, carries with it, as I have shown from Judge Ruffin, the self-imposed necessity of committing the most atrocious crimes; of whipping and then shooting women; of stealing and trafficking in children; and in short, of doing to unoffending human nature, all the injustice and outrage, embodied in those words of terror, HUMAN SLAVERY.

But to smuggle this element of wrong and ruin into these Territories, constitutes what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] calls the "Whig doctrine of the Revolution," the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] the "truly American doctrine," and what the other advocates of the bill call the truly "Democratic doctrine of 'popular sovereignty,' non-intervention, and self-government," and is, withal, the "domestic institution" which all the free State advocates of this vile cheat and swindle—Pro-Slavery Democrats—Compromise Democrats all of them—are endeavoring to fasten upon the Territories, in spite of the people, and to prohibit the people of the Territories from expelling therefrom,

if so disposed. Besides, we are confidently assured by the gentleman "in the lion's skin," who does the printing for this House, that this is the scheme which, of all others, is the *pet* measure, lying nearest the heart of the Northern Democratic President; until the accomplishment of which, he and his Cabinet feel as woe-begone as did Haman while Mordecai was clothed in purple, and riding on the King's mule.

Mr. Chairman, among the multiplied sophisms put forth to cloak the real design of this iniquitous measure, is that of the gentleman from Kentucky—not original with him it is true, but confidently repeated by him; that the power of Congress to prohibit Slavery in the Territories is an arbitrary, a tyrannical power, and implies the right to regulate the relations of husband wife, parent and child, &c. I give the argument in his own language:

"The germ of congressional despotism is to be found in this Missouri prohibition; for if the question of Slavery may be determined for the Territories by Congress, every other social and political question may in like manner be settled for them by the same authority, and this would reduce them to the most abject colonial vassal-*age*."

Why sir, is the gentleman from Kentucky—the slaveholders all—stark mad, to babble in this wise, and call it argument? Is this flagitious bill, this iniquitous larceny of freedom's birth-right, to be justified on reasons which would consign a schoolboy irretrievably to the dunce-block? Why, look at it, sir, and then say if I am not justified in branding it as twaddle, and poor at that? "The power in Congress to *prohibit* Slavery in the Territories a germ of despotism!" If this be true, then the converse of the proposition must be true also; and so a power in Congress to prohibit liberty—as it is in this bill—why that would be, "popular sovereignty," doubtless. Alas, Mr. Chairman, if this be so; and the power to PROHIBIT SLAVERY—the power to do that which, if a human Government, either *cannot* or *will not* do, only proves it in theory and practice, a despotism, ripe and fitted for destruction, be a "germ of despotism," or a despotic element at all; and the discovery of this profound secret, be one of the trophies of the statesmanship of the gentleman, it is well they have advised us of the fact; for without THEIR testimony, nothing like *statesmanship* would have been suspected as lurking in it. Sir, if this wisdom of our self-lauding statesmen, bring us no gem from profounder depths than this, well may we exclaim with the WISE MAN of old, "What profit hath wisdom over folly!"

But, let us probe the gentlemen's statesmanship a little deeper, and see what will come of it. The power to prohibit Slavery is a "germ of despotism;" so the power to prohibit piracy, murder, robbery, arson, rape, burglary, larceny, and so on through the criminal code, are also "germs of despotism." Alas! Mr. Chairman, if this be sound logic, and it must be since it comes from "statesmen," then there must be "germs of despotism" enough in the free States to seed with oppression all the nations of the earth. The gentleman's reasoning produces another result equally astounding; that is, that the only States truly free

are those where Slavery exists, and where the constitutions are purged of so "despotic a germ" as the power to abolish it. In this wise, sir, a "statesman," with a logical handspike, turns human institutions topsy-turvy.

But, seriously, never until I listened to this debate, could I realize how profound the obscurity, how total the eclipse of the moral and intellectual vision on this great truth, of the sacredness of human liberty, caused by perpetual contact with the gigantic wrong and wickedness of Slavery. Sir, the slaveholders denounce, with merciless severity, despotic Governments, seem horrified at the bare idea that Congress should exercise a power in which may lurk the minutest "germ of despotism," and nevertheless seem utterly unconscious that the system of Slavery, to which they cling with a desperation bordering on madness, is the most odious, insulting, and cruel "despotism" which now curses God's footstool; or that this inconsistency and mental blindness (to characterize them by no harsher epithets) exhibit the slaveholders of the United States as a laughing-stock to the civilized world. Nay, sir, such is the obliquity of moral and intellectual vision, produced among Southern statesmen, (so they style themselves,) that civil society and government are only seen by them up-side down, like the reflection of a landscape from the calm surface of the lake; and hence, on perceiving in the organization of a Government a power to prohibit slavery, the fellest of all the forms of despotism, this feature of it is presented to them as the very perfection of despotic power—one to which the gentleman from Kentucky declares the South "never will submit," when applied to the organization of the Territories. That I may not be suspected of caricature, I give the gentleman's own language:

"But again: cannot the North, with her overwhelming numbers, compete with us on these new theatres in the race of settlement and civilization—and must she not only violate the Constitution by shutting out half the States, common property-holders with her—but in the name of liberty outrage liberty by erecting a despotism over the Territories? Sir, we never will submit to it—we will resist it to the last."

Yes, sir, such is the threat of insubordination and disloyalty to the Union, and such the cause of it. This abridgment of the liberty of the oppressed slaveholder, and the dealers in human flesh and blood, this oppressive tariff on the business of huckstering in husbands and wives, mothers and their children, will never be submitted to. Well, sir, in reply to all this kind of bluster, I would respectfully ask, what kind of *unsubmissiveness*, in the premises, do the slaveholders intend to manifest? Is the old cry of wolf to be raised to frighten the doughfaces, which has, on so many occasions, and so successfully, been resorted to by Southern politicians—the cry of dissolution of the Union? Let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky, that we of the free States have grown too familiar with this hysterical ill humor of the South. It has ceased to carry with it any terrors, but, on the contrary, there are multitudes now at the North, and their number is rapidly in-

creasing, who speak in no smothered tones of a separation as necessary, not only to the honor, but the interests of the free States. And, sir, the mark of Cain, the brand of traitor, is in store for that son of the North, either in this House or wherever else, by whom or whose aid or counsel, this deed of shame may be consummated. Sir, morally, and ultimately politically, it will have been "better for that man that he had never been born."

The gentleman from Kentucky, it seems, would set off against the popular outbreak on Boston Common, and the multitudinous other demonstrations at the North of intense hostility to this atrocious bill, the approving resolutions of a minority of the Legislature of Illinois, and so thankful is he for so small a favor, that he breaks out in a bitter taunt against the East and North, and perpetrates a towering compliment to, and a glowing prediction of, the growing power of the West. This is his language.

"Did you hear of the infuriated mob that 'basely hung the author of this bill in effigy, on 'Boston Common? But did you note soon after 'the cheering tones of approval the west wind 'brought from his prairie State? Remember 'gentlemen, in the midst of your exultation, that 'the political power of this country is now climbing 'the summits of the Alleghany mountains, 'and before this decade closes, will have pursued 'its unreturning course far into the valley of the 'Mississippi—that vast region richer than the 'delta of the Nile, and whose millions, and ever-increasing millions, are destined to a political 'unity as lasting as civilization and commerce, 'bound forever together by the double tie of interest and affection."

It is all so, Mr. Chairman; but, alas, for poor old Kentucky, unless she devise some means by which to cast from her bending shoulders this "Old Man of the Sea," this eating cancer, this consuming curse of Slavery, she dooms herself to a premature old age, and in her youth and young manhood, to fall the lowest, and become the least, in the bright galaxy of States which is to form this stupendous central power. Yes, sir, the political power of this nation is pursuing its unobstructed way to its resting place in the great valley of the Mississippi; but let the gentleman from Kentucky remember, let every slaveholder on this floor mark my words—I utter them in all kindness, but with a solemn conviction of their truth—the pathway of this march of power will not be moistened by a single tear of the cuffed slave. Onward, sir, and still onward, is the remorseless tread of empire to her rightful home; but no crack of the overseer's bloody lash, no shriek of the lacerated slave, no groan of the despairing mother, torn from the child she has borne in sorrow, is mingled with, or mars the shouts and anthems of, the free. No, sir; no! The plow, the anvil, and the loom, the ax, the scythe, and the reaper, the chisel, the saw, and the trowel, with all the multitudinous equipments of civil liberty—these, sir, with songs of praise and thanksgiving to the Great Emancipator for the priceless gem of personal freedom—these, these! are the accompaniments, the music of that march of empire, the majestic tread of whose goings forth, is destined to "crush out" human

bondage, giving deliverance to both master and slave.

But the question is tauntingly asked by the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE,] "Cannot you of the free States, on this theory of 'popular sovereignty,' compete successfully with us of the slave States for supremacy in the Territories—you who have some fifteen millions of free population, while we of the slave States have less than one half that number? If you cannot, then what becomes of your boasted superiority of free, over slave institutions?" To this boastful interrogation my answer is, *No!* We cannot transplant our higher order of civilization, from the old free States into the new Territories, with the celerity which you of the slave States, can transfer your rude and slipshod institutions from the old, worn-out, and dilapidated slave States, to those Territories. And this you know very well; and hence, and hence only, your ready appropriation of the eant phrase of "popular sovereignty." This, however, is the result of no superiority of slave over free institutions, but the reverse—from their actual inferiority. As in the animal economy, the fecundity is inversely as the lowness of organization, so in social and political organizations, their powers of reproduction are exactly in the same inverse ratio; that is, the lower the organization, the more rapidly may they be multiplied. A moment's examination of the nature of free and slave institutions, will confirm this theory. The slaveholder, from a double necessity, is a propagandist of his system. Continued slave cultivation smites the soil with the curse of barrenness; Slavery must therefore, expand or perish.

The multiplication of slave States clothes the slaveholder with political honors, confers on him political power, "puts money in his purse," and opens up for him, new and virgin soil in exchange for that which had become worthless from slave cultivation. Hence the slaveholder's rampant propagandism. Slavery also impoverishes and debases the non-slaveholder. It makes labor dishonorable, and thus deprives the laborer of even moderate wealth, without which, he can neither be respected, nor worthy of respect, in a slaveholding community. He forms no local attachments, and the poor "sand-hiller" may, at a moment's notice, pack his few traps, and his wife and baby, on his old horse or mule, while he and the children, squalid, ignorant, and reckless, follow behind on foot, to any place where the slaveholder may have pointed or led the way. Having but little to dispose of, and less to carry with him, comparatively destitute of mental, moral, and social cultivation, his local attachments are few and feeble—constituting the connecting link between the slave and slaveholder—inheriting the pride of race of the one, and the ignorance and poverty of the other, he is a necessary instrument and accompaniment of the slaveholder's migrations. Governed by the *smile*, as implicitly as the slave by the *frown* of the slaveholder, the "poor white folks," the slave and the master, constitute, as it were, a military force of the Slavery propagandists, moving to the new Territories with a celerity which cannot be approached by emigrants from the free States. On the principle of the popular saying, that "falsehood will travel a

hundred miles, while truth is pulling on its boots," the slaveholders will have entered and taken possession of the new Territories; and from the natural and necessary repulsion between the two systems, will expel the free State emigrant from the territories, thus preoccupied by the natural enemies of free labor.

A glance at the motives and the process of free State emigration, will illustrate this argument. The spirit of propagandism does not enter into free State emigration at all. This proceeds on a calculation of the chances of increasing the prospective blessings of domestic comfort and civil society in the far-off home, by enduring the privations necessarily incident to removal to a wild and unsettled country. And what are these privations? The school-house for the children, the meeting-house for himself and young family; the old homestead, clustered around with the memories of many generations, and still genial with the untold comforts and conveniences of a freeman's home. There, also, are the fathers' sepulchres, enclosing the consecrated dust of many generations; and there are the intertwined affections of the aged and the young; the hoary grandsire tottering on his staff, now living only to recount the bright memories of childhood and youth—he cannot go, nor can he be left behind. There the fair-haired youth and bright-eyed maiden—the strong affections of their young hearts must be rudely torn asunder; the "new country" must be explored by some strong man, of nerve to endure, and judgment to choose wisely. The "old homestead," with its surplus and untransportable implements, must be disposed of; neighbors and friends summoned in counsel, that on arrival in the "new country," the *sine qua non* of free State civilization, the school-house and "meeting-house," may appear simultaneously with the humble dwelling. Every screw must be tightened, that "no step backward" in the progress of society be taken by this exodus from the sacred associations of "home." This business is the work of time; but when the migration of the free State emigrant is completed, he will have planted the germ of the highest order of civilization known to the human race. But while he is making the preliminary arrangements, nay, while revolving the question of "removal" in his mind, the slave State emigrant will have *improvised* (if I may so say) the caricature he calls a State—a thing of lean and half-famished "sand-hillers" and "poor white folks"—slaves and slaveholders; but still a craft of State, something to be officered and manned by two Senators, one Representative, and majors, colonels, and generals "too numerous to be mentioned." This superior speed of the slaveholders in "getting up" a new State they know full well, and hence their joyful acceptance of such "popular sovereignty," *over the left*, as is given the people of these Territories by this bill; and this fact, our free State office-seekers, nick-named statesmen, might know, if great learning or blind ambition had not emasculated them of all practical knowledge of things they ought to know, as well as of all common sense.

The gentleman from Vermont, [Mr. MEACHAM,] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. CHANDLER,] indeed, every gentleman who has

opposed this bill here or elsewhere, have appealed to the Missouri compromise as a compact, excluding Slavery from these Territories—as a settlement of the Slavery controversy of that day, assented to by the slaveholding States as the consideration for the like assent of the free States, to the permission of Slavery south of the compromise line. Gentlemen of the free States, insist that this was an agreement between the two sections, fairly made, and consequently, binding in honor; though, from the condition of the parties to it, not irrevocable by act of Congress. This statement of the case, it seems to me, with those who recognise the obligation of these Slavery compacts, (which I do not, for reasons stated hereafter,) is rather a “tight fit,” and a number of Southern gentlemen, have stepped manfully forward, acknowledged the obligation and their willingness to abide by it in spirit and letter. To those gentlemen—hopelessly, irreconcilably separated as I am from them, by the distance of the poles apart on every point of the Slavery controversy—I cannot deny myself the pleasure of frankly stating my sincere appreciation of a manly and courageous act, honorable alike to their heads and hearts. But this class of moderate Southern politicians, constitutes the most dangerous enemy of the Anti-Slavery movement. These are the fatal opiate which lulls the Northern mind to a dreamless slumber, while the Slavery propagandists are hatching their plots of mischief. Sir, as an eternal opponent of Slavery; as one who loathes it with a strength of abhorrence, which has no language for expression, I most sincerely regret, if this iniquitous measure is doomed to pass this House, that the South does not present an unbroken column against the Missouri compromise, in order that every intervening obstacle to a fair contest between Liberty and Slavery, may be taken out of the way. But sir, this contest, which is a moral and political contest, can never be conducted to advantage by the friends of Liberty, while these amiable Southern gentlemen stand between the opponents of Slavery and the Slavery propagandists. Sir, as a friend of Liberty, I rejoice that Southern opposition to this bill is waning into an insignificant handful, now numbering less than a baker’s dozen, and that it must soon be utterly annihilated by the “compact-breakers” and Slavery propagandists. When that time shall have arrived, the North will be a unit, and a doughface as rare a bird as the black swan. Then sir, let Slavery stand from under, for its hour will have come.

That the acts of Congress by which Missouri was admitted as a slave State into the Union, Arkansas organized as a Territory without restriction of Slavery, and Slavery excluded from the territory called in this bill Kansas and Nebraska, constituted in substance and intention, a compact between the Slavery extensionists of that day on the one part, and the Slavery restrictionists on the other, admits of no rational doubt. When I say that these acts of Congress constituted a compact between these parties, I do not of course, mean a contract for breach of which a suit may be maintained in a court of law, or a bill for specific performance in a court of equity. All I mean by this language is, that these acts

constituted such an arrangement of the slave controversy, as was considered binding in honor and good faith, upon those who were parties to it; and upon those who should succeed them in the Federal Congress. That such is the understanding of perhaps every advocate of this perfidious bill on this floor, is evident by the attempt of each to *extenuate* this breach of faith on his part, by accusing its opponents of a like breach of faith in subsequent organizations of newly acquired territory.

It is not my purpose to follow gentlemen in their pettifogging objections to the above arrangement as a compact. It will suffice to say, that if they could convict their opponents of the perfidy laid to their charge, (which they cannot,) still their conviction would not acquit the advocates of this bill, of a deliberate violation of the faith of their fathers. But sir, on this question of the force and efficacy of these Slavery compacts and adjustments, strange as the avowal may seem, my judgment and my sympathy are with the South. Those compacts and adjustments, by the Constitution of the United States, are utterly null and void, for lack of the semblance or shadow of power conferred on Congress to establish, recognise, or guaranty Slavery under any circumstances whatever. But by the moral constitution of the universe, all compacts to plunder, or to connive at the plunder and spoil of our fellowmen, our equals before our Common Father of the great patrimony of life, liberty, and happiness, which he has given in common to all his children, are doubly void, being both impious and immoral. As a simple act of Congress, the restriction of Slavery in these Territories was both constitutional and just; and the Representative from the free States, who shall, by any act of omission or commission, impair in one iota, the strength or vigor of that act, will deserve to be coiled with a gang of imbruted slaves, driven to the far South, and taught under plantation discipline, not to huckster and jockey with other men’s liberties, until he shall have learned by a slave’s experience, the value of his own.

But, further, by the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, and its consequent passing under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, the Slavery then existing in that Territory, was *ipso facto* abolished. For the Slavery restrictionists therefore, to agree to the continuance of the system in Missouri, Arkansas, and what is now the State of Louisiana, in consideration of its restriction in what are now called Kansas and Nebraska, was an attempt to purchase the freedom of what was already free, by the enslavement of those who were also equally free. As a compact, therefore, the Missouri compromise was immoral, unconstitutional, and utterly void; and the wonder to me is, that gentlemen from the free States, should now seek to avail themselves of this corrupt and humiliating concession as the foundation of their opposition to this iniquitous bill. For myself sir, (and I speak for myself alone,) I would as soon bring a suit before a court of justice against a thief for a dividend of stolen goods, as insist on anything granted to me in consideration of a concession on my part, at once cowardly, inhumane, and unjust. No, sir,

purpose of appropriating the territories to
uses of Freedom.

On this arena therefore, Congress invites a
struggle for supremacy between Freedom and
Slavery. "A clear field, and no favor," is our
language. "Fight it out on your own hook; it
is your matter, not ours." In this state of con-
gressional impotency, or wilful disregard of a
solemn duty rather, what hinders, nay, what in-
centives are there not, for a servile war? Where
will the end thereof be—can gentlemen tell us?
Sir, we of the free States are not precipitating
this crisis. Southern politicians, with a few
Northern men, under the mesmeric influence of a
Northern Administration with Southern instincts—
or, as to principles, I do not like to predicate
those of this Administration at all—are in league
to rush the nation upon an experiment, the end
whereof may be, the blowing up of the experi-
menters "with their own petard."

Experience also Mr. Chairman, admonishes us,

... need quote no further from this masterly description of domestic Slavery; a description unsurpassed in the fearful precision of its language, and its utter condemnation of this modern "domestic institution." Look at this picture, all of you Democrats who are about to throw wide open the doors of this vast territory, to what this slaveholding judge has so eloquently proven to be, and is constrained to denounce from the bench as an immorality, admitting of no excuse but the overbearing necessity of maintaining Slavery where it actually exists. There is no Slavery now in these Territories. This crime and curse have been thence by law excluded now these three-and-thirty years, and there is no chance for their gaining foothold there, but by the treason of Northern demagogues who are endeavoring to dust the people's eyes to the enormity of this wickedness, by their senseless and disgusting cant; their miserable, miscreant, pot-house babble, about "popular sovereignty," "congressional non-intervention" and the "regulation of

I would ask nothing on the ground of that ignominious Missouri compromise—that first and fatal surrender of the principles and honor of the free States, to the insatiable covetings of the fell spirit of Slavery propagandism—that pioneer to this *last* infamous project, but only the *last*, because Congress cannot at the same time, sin both in the present and in the future.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to be distinctly understood, in what I say on the validity of this Missouri compromise, and I therefore will endeavor to restate my position. It is this. The restriction of Slavery *above* the line of 36° 30' north latitude, by the eighth section of the act of Congress of March 6, 1820, was and is constitutional, and therefore, as an act of Congress, obligatory until repealed; but it acquired no additional force or efficacy, by reason of any congressional assent, expressed or implied, to the existence of Slavery *below* that line. Again, suppose Congress should organize two Territories within the present limits of Utah, and in one should prohibit polygamy; and as a consideration, compact, or compromise for this, should not disallow it in the other; the prohibition would be valid; but would acquire no additional sanctity by reason of such compromise. One further illustration on this point. Suppose Southern gentlemen, unable to procure from Maryland and Virginia, slaves to supply the New Orleans market, should demand a repeal of the acts of Congress prohibiting the African slave trade; and should propose to extend the Missouri slave restriction to New Mexico; and Congress should thereupon, re-open the foreign slave trade, and at the same time, exclude Slavery from New Mexico; this would be a compromise, identical in principle with the Missouri compromise; and yet, sir, the exclusion of Slavery from New Mexico, would be valid; but I trust there is no Representative on this floor from the free States, who would demand its observance on the ground of a concession so infamous and atrocious, as the re-opening of the piratical slave trade. It will be obvious from these illustrations, that the principle of these compromises, is wholly indefensible, utterly rotten; and that sooner or later, they must all perish in their own corruption. No contract between private persons in any civilized community, based upon such considerations, would be tolerated for one moment in a court of justice; and inter-State or intersectional compacts, thus condemned by the moral sense of mankind, cannot in the nature of things be obligatory.

But, Mr. Chairman, have we of the free States, any reason to expect that the slaveholders will recognise the obligation of those compromises, whenever the interests of Slavery may, in their judgment, demand their violation? JUSTICE sir, or the notion that some things may of RIGHT belong to individuals; and that things which belong to the individual cannot be rightfully taken from him without his consent, is of itself alone, the sole ground of the inviolability of "compacts and compromises"—a man's *right to himself*, is of course the highest and most sacred of all his rights—consequently, to deprive a human being of self-ownership, and to subject him against his will, to the property ownership of another, is the

highest act of injustice, short of wilful murder, that man can perpetrate upon his fellow. Every human being of mature years, is under the highest and most solemn compromise or compact with every other, that *he will not* invade this *sacred right of self-ownership*. The slaveholder is, therefore, the violator of this deepest seated foundation of human rights. He breaks the great "compact" on which hangs the very existence of distributive justice and social order.

How then can the slaveholder be expected to abide by "compacts and compromises," when such obedience comes in conflict with his slaveholding usurpation; that great "nullification" of God's supremacy, and man subjection to the moral law? With the slaveholder, power and right in all things conducing to mastery over his slave, are convertible terms; and he applies inexorably, this odious definition to all "compromises and compacts," with whomsoever made, the purpose of which is, to exclude Slavery from any State or Territory of the Union. This immutable purpose of the slaveholders, developed from the earliest history of the Government under the Federal Constitution, and now made so plain that "he who runs may read," it is to be hoped will ultimately so impress itself on the minds of statesmen of the free States, (if indeed, the race, like the mammoth, has not been long extinct,) as to teach them the inherent wickedness of that odious monopoly of human souls and bodies, that they may cease to splint and bandage it as a national interest, with "compacts and compromises;" but on the contrary, induced to treat it as it is, a curse and crime—the odium and the enemy of civilization, of national honor and prosperity.

How long shall it be Mr. Chairman, ere we learn what Slavery is?—that it is but the perfect subjugation of the victims of war—war matured, ripened, and embalmed; as it were, the blackened and desiccated mummy of war—a fossilized mob. In the slave States, are to be found thus preserved through generations, the wars, and murders, and rapine of the petty African chiefs who kidnaped and sold each other to the Dutch and English and Colonial slave traders. Here in Christian America, under the pretended sanction of the American Constitution, may be found, a *conserve* of these wars and butcheries and kidnappings, with the horrors of the middle passage superadded. This is Slavery—American Slavery—transferred from barbarous Africa by American, and British, and Dutch barbarians, to become the chief corner-stone in the temple of American liberty, and the especial pet of American proslavery Democracy and Christianity.

To this description of Slavery, the idea of compact, of agreement, is alien utterly. It has no place in the slave code, and I fearlessly assert that we of the free States, cannot without dishonor, without GUILT, claim to ourselves any *kind* of profit or advantage, as the consideration of an agreement on our part, that the people of the slave States, may either make or hold slaves of a certain designated portion of the national territory; whether that profit or advantage consist in the MORAL, SOCIAL, and ECONOMICAL benefits derive from the exclusion of Slavery from a certain *othe*

designated portion of the national territory; or whether we receive from the slaveholders, a compensation in MONEY, in lieu of such moral, social, and economical advantages. In either case, if slaveholding be a CRIME, then we of the free States, by such a compact, become *participants* in the CRIME. If any gentleman is startled by the inevitable result of this argument, but still doubts, then let him substitute PIRACY, or any other universally admitted crime, for Slavery, and he will see at a glance, that he must either cease to declaim against slaveholding as *wrong*, or else must relinquish his demand for the observance of *compacts based on concessions to the right of slaveholding*.

By the slave code, the master can make no agreement with his slave; and for gentlemen of the free States, who haggle about the sacredness of this compromise, to make agreements with their horses, would be no more ridiculous, as a legal bargain, in the eyes of Southern gentlemen. This was different even under the ancient common law, during the midnight of the dark ages, when Slavery was allowed in England. Even in that dark night of superstition and violence, if a master made a contract with his slave, no matter how trifling the subject, the contract was valid beyond its own provisions. It amounted to an absolute emancipation of the slave. Even in that age, every presumption of law was in favor of liberty. But not so with the guilty, sneaking, contemptible slave codes of our own times and country. By these, not only the presumptions of law are against *liberty*, but, in a majority of the slave States, perhaps all of them, emancipation of slaves is absolutely forbidden, excepting on condition of removal from the State. This contrast shows the difference between our own times and those of ancient days. It shows that ancient common law Slavery was the offspring of ignorance and barbarism, but that, as the light of Christianity, with its gentle, humanizing influences, dawned upon that darkness, it set the nations in motion forward, progressing towards emancipation and civilization. It shows, too, that modern Slavery is the whelp of avarice; and that its continuance is impossible, except by reversing the onward movements of civilization, and turning us back to the barbarism of Africa, with the beauties of which, modern sham Democracy seems absolutely enamored; and determined to force that barbarism as a dowry, under the attractive title of "popular sovereignty," on the people of Kansas and Nebraska. But I would say to gentlemen from the free States, that those who make agreements and compromises with them, that those OTHERS may enslave their fellow-men, anywhere or for any purpose but for punishment of crime, have no just reason to expect such compromises will be observed, when either the INTERESTS or the POWER of the enslavers come in conflict with the terms or the objects of such compromise. Such compacts on both sides, are violations of faith with mankind; or complaints therefore, that the slaveholders do not keep within the bounds limited by the honor compromise, but endeavor to break over them without our consent, are not well founded. We, of the free States took the "thirty pieces

of silver," and in consideration thereof, consented to the limits within which all the cruelties and loathsome abominations of Slavery might be practiced; and did not perhaps, anticipate that the slaveholders would treat their concessions to freedom as an "Indian gift," (a GIFT to be resumed when desired by the *donor*.) So neither did ISCARIOT probably, when he bargained *merely* to show the chief priests and Pharisees, where the SAVIOUR might be found, anticipate so dread a consequence of the mercenary act, as the CRUCIFIXION; the verdict of mankind has nevertheless consigned the BETRAYER to an immortality of infamy. Let us therefore profit by this example; and bargain no more for the transfer of the RIGHTS and LIBERTIES of OTHER MEN.

Sir, when the people of the free States sell the black man's freedom to the slaveholder, it is not strange that the latter insist on guaranty of title; and when this guaranty is most easily effected by a breach of the contract of guaranty, this infraction becomes the natural and characteristic remedy; and herein gentlemen of the free States have a practical illustration of the proverb, "What is got over the Devil's back goes under his belly." And sir, this naming of the PRINCE of KNAVES and *rascally compromisers*, vividly recalls to mind, that celebrated *compact* of his, so closely analogous in *principle*, with these "truck and dicker" compromises by free State politicians, of the black man's *inalienable* right to liberty, whereby the ARCH OPPRESSOR, for an *impious* consideration, offered to transfer "all the kingdoms of the earth," of which, he owned not a foot, to the GREAT EMANCIPATOR.

Sir, will Northern statesmen never learn, even by experience, that Slavery is an incurable ulcer on the body-politic, wearing out the very life of freedom?—that it is a ceaseless aggression upon justice, and, from its very nature, eternally opposed to law and order?—that it and Freedom never, never can be so fraternized as to dwell together in unity?—that, in its nature, it is the repudiation of justice, which is the foundation of law? Why not look this mere surface truth in the face, and cease these vain attempts at tinkering up alliances and compacts between interests in their deepest nature, eternally and irreconcilably hostile? Why talk of "compacts," when we know that Slavery lives and has its being in breach of faith; that its fell and hateful spirit is aggression, violence, and the gratification of its own unbridled will? Hence the seizure of Texas, the dismemberment of Mexico, the eager coveting of Cuba, and now, lastly, this attempt to thrust its execrable self upon Kansas and Nebraska. Sir, the spirit of Slavery is the deadly enemy of human rights, the enemy of the human race. Compromises with it, are as impious as they are foolish and vain.

The spread of this spirit, like the march of the pestilence "that walketh in darkness," is the terror of mankind. The spirit of Liberty and the spirit of Slavery cannot co-exist in harmony. Attempts to unite angels of light with "goblins damned," would be no more audaciously impious. Sow as many pillows under the armholes of oppression and injustice, daub them with the untempered mortar of "compacts and compre-

mises," as much as you will, still your attempts to join together what God Almighty has put asunder, ought and must and will, fall to pieces as a miserable botch of pseudo statesmanship, fit only for the scorn and derision of mankind.

Why sir, is there a man on this floor, so unreflecting as not to feel assured, that in our political machinery of Slavery and Freedom, the friction of its working, as each increases in strength and extent of surface, will increase also in severity, and become more and still more remediless, until the harder and stronger will have ground the weaker to powder? "Compacts and adjustments" have been "weighed in the balance and found wanting," and the issue between Liberty and Slavery, so long "staved off" by self-glorifying statesmen, aspiring politicians, and "lower law" divines, must now be joined, thanks to the restless little, and would-be great men who commenced clubbing the apple of the Presidency so long before it was ripe, and while themselves also, were equally green.

The political crimes and follies of every struggle for the Presidency, the distribution of the spoils when that struggle is over, to incompetent and worthless political fortune hunters, as a reward for the frauds and falsehoods, the tricks and cheats, successfully practiced on the masses of the people of the free States, to decoy them into the support of some impotent tool of the Slavery propagandists, are just beginning to open their eyes to the palpable fact, that our partisan politicians are neither patriots nor statesmen, but rather a gang of political privaters and freebooters, who have navigated the ship of State on to the outer circuits of the great whirlpool of universal Slavery; and that unless this piratical crew are cast overboard, and the ship's helm put HARD OVER with a stern and defiant hand, her cargo of Freedom is lost forever.

"Liberty for the slave, or Slavery for the free laborer," is now the dilemma into which the Union is forced by the cupidity of the slaveholders and the corruption of free State political adventurers; and as NON-SLAVEHOLDERS, there is no choice left to us, but to submit to the iron despotism of the Slavery propagandists, or suffer the North and the South, like Abraham and Lot of old, to part as friends, rather than to live together as rival enemies, in a hopeless and embittered struggle to harmonize systems so utterly, fatally irreconcilable, as LIBERTY and SLAVERY.

The gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. STEPHENS,] the other day, seemed to imagine himself fighting over again the great compromise battle of 1850; and inasmuch as Northern gentlemen at that time either were, or affected to be alarmed for the safety of the Union, the gentleman is under the delusion that the like bluster now, will produce the like effect upon the present Congress. That gentleman, (and he is by no means the only one in the same darkness,) evidently did not then understand the causes which led to that ruinous and disgraceful surrender of Northern principles and Northern honor; and he must have been dreaming from that time to this. That compromise may be said to have been the last will and testament of certain very distinguished, but aged and infirm, candidates for the Presidency, wherein

they gave and bequeathed to the South, all the rights and benefits guaranteed in that compromise, in consideration of the anticipated support of Southern politicians for that high office; and the usual testamentary form running in this wise: "We, A. B., &c., being weak in body, but of sound and disposing mind and memory, in view of the uncertainty of political life, and the certainty of political death, and being fully persuaded that this is our last and only remaining chance for realizing the high object of our ambition, do give and bequeath," &c., would have been no inapt preamble to those measures.

But sir, that compromise was, and ever has been, odious to the people of the free States, of all parties. Out of compassion to the eminent gentlemen, to further whose chances for the Presidency it was made; and to quiet the nerves of certain timid and conservative gentlemen who were doubtless, really alarmed at the "ravings, and hissings, and howlings," (to use the amiable language of the gentleman from Georgia,) of Southern gentlemen on this floor, that compromise was reluctantly acquiesced in by the Whigs and Democrats of the North. But it never received more than a reluctant, a loathsome acquiescence; and in this lurks the great and fatal delusion of the projectors and advocates of this most iniquitous measure. Neither the intellect, the heart, nor the conscience of the people of the free States, was with, or for that compromise. On the contrary, the intellect, the heart, and the conscience of that people, (those of them, I mean, who were endowed with these attributes,) condemned, repudiated, abhorred that dishonorable, that humiliating act. But sir, the gentleman from Georgia, and those who are co-workers with him, are laboring under the strange delusion, that the compromise of 1850, has now become popular in the free States, and that this Nebraska and Kansas bill, being only another cub of the same litter, will also speedily become as great a favorite with the people of the free States. From hence sir, comes to the advocates of this bill, the pleasant fancy, that all the opposition to the guilty project of cursing with the mildew of Slavery the heart of the North American continent, and turning it into a kennel for the breeding of slaves for the shambles of the South, are but the "ravings, and howlings, and hissings, of the beaten and routed ranks of the factionists and malcontents;" as the gentleman from Georgia has it.

Why sir, we "factionists and malcontents" predicted just such a *finale*, to that weak and wicked bargain, sale, and surrender of humanity and justice, and the honor and interests of the free States; and we take this new rascality very coolly; but your treacherous arrow has touched the crural nerve of the drowsy and slumbering old fogies who were snoozing comfortably under the shadow of Southern chivalry and Southern honor; but now, the great deep of the Northern heart is heaving with the indignation of those betrayed, but thoroughly roused leviathans; and my advice to the chivalry and doughfaces is, to "stand from under;" "for if thou hast run with the footmen, and they have wearied thee, then how canst thou contend with horses?" Yes sir, if the few obscure, despised, and hated Abol-

tionists, as you contemptuously call them, have been an over-match for you, what are you to do when the united hosts of the betrayed and indignant free States enter the course against you? Oh, says the gentleman from Georgia, to the Representatives of the free States, betray your constituents, commit treason against humanity; and make your names but other words for hypocrisy, knavery, and cowardice. "Go back to your constituents and tell them you are right, and they are wrong." Yes sir, the gentleman from Georgia recommends that we return to our constituents with this flagitious "lie in our right hands," and try to palm it off on the reading, reflecting, moral, religious, and intelligent people of the free States; and he seems to think they will take all such stuff for Gospel, as readily as a congregation of illiterate, half-drunken, pot-house loafers would, the oracular crudities, cant, and humbuggery, of a favorite political leader, from whom they expected to receive gratis, both politics and whiskey.

But in this business, this sublime, heroic business, of bearding constituents by throwing their cherished principles in their faces, is a game that two may play at; and I say to the gentleman from Georgia, "physician, heal thyself." Suppose the gentleman returns to his own constituents, and tells them that "they are wrong, and he is right;" that slavery is a great moral wrong, a curse to master and slave, and a double curse to those who are neither masters nor slaves; and that it ought not to exist at all, much less be extended over those Territories now free. I flatter myself that I shall be able to convince the gentleman from Georgia, that my proposition is reasonable in comparison with his to us of the free States. Looking through the returns of the seventh Census, I find all classes of the gentleman's constituents, number 110,601. Of these, 63,435 are slaves, and 816 free colored. Now, the gentleman would not need to expend much breath in good faith, to conquer the prejudices against liberty, of this, the largest portion of his constituents. The residue of them, numbering 46,320, are free white persons, of whom 10,935 are males, above the age of twenty years. About one-tenth, or 1,100, are slaveholders, the balance, 9,800, are "poor white folks;" (I believe they are so termed at the South.)

Now sir, I am persuaded that a gentleman so full of the red-hot lava of eloquence as the gentleman from Georgia—one so richly endowed with the gift of making the *better appear the better reason*, would have but little trouble in demonstrating to those *poor* constituents of his, that the enslavement of the negro, by degrading labor, had been the cause of the poor white man's poverty and degradation, and would be forever a "dead lock" on the moral and social elevation of themselves and their posterity. By these, and other arguments which the gentleman's talents and genius would at once suggest, it seems to me he might, without very serious trouble, persuade *this class* of his constituents, to "conquer their prejudices" in favor of an institution, at once the poor man's curse and the rich man's crime. But by what arguments the gentleman might succeed in persuading the eleven hundred slaveholders in his

district to "conquer their prejudices" in favor of "faring sumptuously every day" on the fruits of labor, extorted from their bondmen by the cruel appliances of the slave system, I do not know. It might, I think would be an ugly job; but by so much would its accomplishment be the more worthy the gentleman's prowess. But tough and ugly as the job may be for the gentleman, it will not compare in difficulty with that which he commends to some of us of the free States. The "prejudices" of my constituents, for instance, in favor of the "golden rule," and the Declaration of Independence, added to the universal instincts of humanity—the teachings of reason—the voice of conscience, as well as the invincible biases of a Christian education, all would constitute a Gibraltar of difficulties, which I confess would be sufficient even, to dampen the chivalry of the veriest of the Quixotes among the Slavery propagandists. Besides, in my case, with the exception of some two or three hundred Government officials whose "prejudices" on these subjects, are not vincible, but vendible, I have of male constituents of twenty years old and upward, over twenty thousand capable of reading and writing, together with a like number of women, equally well instructed, intelligent, and if possible, of still more unconquerable love of justice, liberty, and Christianity, and a corresponding abhorrence of Slavery. All these, Mr. Chairman, constitute a phalanx of emancipationists whose "prejudices" in favor of universal liberty under just and humane laws, I have neither the inclination nor the audacity, even to ask them to "conquer." No sir, no! I confess it, I have no stomach for such a fight. My choice would be most decidedly, to "let out the job" to the gentleman from Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would say here to that gentleman, or any other Southern gentleman, in all good faith, that if his chivalry move him to the conquest of the prejudices of this formidable army of "fanatics" in favor of liberty, I will, on their part, guaranty to him a courteous and cordial reception among them, and a patient and candid hearing of all he may have to say upon the whole merits of this great controversy between Liberty and Slavery, or between those he denounces as "fanatics, serpents, and adders," and the slaveholders.

I will go further. I will guaranty that the gentleman will not find among that twenty thousand of my constituents, five hundred who do not utterly loathe and execrate domestic Slavery as a gross moral wrong, a physical, political, and social curse; but nevertheless, he may advocate Slavery and denounce Liberty, with all the vehemence of his most exciting declamation; and yet he shall be received with hospitality, heard with candor, and treated with courtesy and kindness; not a hair of his head injured, or a threat of personal violence uttered against him. The gentleman may talk to them of the "ravings, howlings, and hissings of vipers and adders," with the unction of one fresh from a dance in the snake apartment of Noah's ark, and yet I am sure my constituents will be moved to merriment only, at such extravagant language, not to insult or violence. Yes sir, though I would hold myself responsible for all I have undertaken in behalf of

the gentleman's safety, and the decorum of my constituents, still I would not stand surety, that the graduates of the numberless school-houses the gentleman would see there, might not oppose to him, arguments more destructive to his reasoning, than the brickbats from our Pro-Slavery opponents were wont to prove, to our limbs and heads. Finally sir, I am fully persuaded that the gentleman would return from his campaign among my constituents, fully satisfied that they constitute a moral, intelligent, industrious, and happy a people, dwelling in the delightful and happy homes conquered from an unbroken and repulsive wilderness, and transformed by the resistless energy of free labor, into green pastures and teeming fields; and on the whole, exhibiting as fair and desirable a spectacle of the physical, social, and moral blessings of liberty as can be found on the footstool of the benevolent Creator.

But to return to the gentleman's favorite theme, the "conquest" of what he is pleased to term "prejudices" against Slavery—or in other words, our instinctive love of Human Liberty. This is the conquest to which we are so fervently invited. To do this, involves the self-perversion of human nature from its loftiest, holiest instincts, to its lowest, fellest depths of utter, hopeless degradation. This is the "SUBLIME SPECTACLE," for the repetition of which the gentleman entertains such fervent yearning. Sir, one having a taste for the sublimity of that spectacle, where SELF is sacrificed to DUTY, cannot appreciate the one so ravishing to the gentleman's perverted vision. There may be sublimity in audacious wickedness, such as was exhibited when the Prince of Hell solicited adoration from the Prince of Life. One whose nature is ravished by this kind of sublimity, may well enjoy the sublimity of that scene depicted by the gentleman from Georgia, with so much apparent, and I doubt not, real satisfaction.

But sir, the gentleman's wish is father to the thought that the people of Boston, on the occasion to which he alludes, overcame their hatred of Slavery and the insolence of the slave power. Sir, I ask, and I hope some son of Massachusetts will answer on this floor, whether, at the command of an apostate son of New England, the descendants of the Pilgrims and Puritans, quenched the fires of liberty lighted by their fathers, when they first set foot on the sands of the glorious old Bay State? Whether they did or not "crush out" and conquer their hate of oppression, their devotion to the principles, for the preservation of which, their fathers' blood moistened the first battle-fields of the Revolution? Sir, as one of the humblest of all the children of the old Bay State, I give the degrading intimation of the gentleman from Georgia, an indignant denial! No sir, never! In a moment of weak commiseration for that "archangel ruined," the people of Boston, Massachusetts, reluctantly smothered their convictions of duty to themselves and country, but did not conquer their love of Liberty, nor obliterate from their hearts their reverence for the principles and deeds of their glorious fathers. Sir, they did not forget the Revolution; they did not forget Lexington and Bunker Hill. Their fault was, that in a moment of great excitement and strong temptation, they

declined from the "straight and narrow path" of right by "doing the evil" of yielding to the demands of the slave power, "that the supposed good," of even a chance that Daniel Webster might be President of the United States, might come of it. But sir, I trust that Massachusetts, by that kind of financiering, has by this time, learned that the slave power, like its great progenitor, leads its followers into trouble, but leaves them to extricate themselves as they best may. But if the cheat in that Presidential game of poker was not enough to dispel the delusion, this last foul play of the slave power, by the aid of free State political poachers, to steal from Freedom this great Territory, and consign it forever, to the doom and curse of Slavery, has uncapped the volcano; and these "smothered convictions," not "conquered prejudices," are blazing over New England, and all the free States, with an intensity, threatening the existence of Slavery itself. And this, Mr. Chairman, is but the "beginning of the end." This new outbreak of the fires of Freedom is but the natural reaction of man's moral nature, from that state of collapse into which it fell, on yielding to the senseless and infamous "compromise measures"—that "finality" of fools, without which, the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. CLINGMAN,] gravely told us, "we should have no Government now;" to which I reply, if the Federal Government was unshipped from the Constitution, and placed on the frail trap-sticks, called the compromise of 1850—that hateful and wicked conglomerate of treason and folly—the sooner we have "no Government" the better. Let it perish; for when this Government shall cease beyond reclamation, to act as the guardian of Liberty under the Constitution, and shall permanently fall into the hands of Slavery propagandists, as it now is, and for many years has been, by the treason to Liberty, of the party called in derision, Democratic, it will not be worth preserving. I am willing, sir, (and I speak the sentiments of an overwhelming majority of my constituents,) to abide by the Constitution of the United States, when administered according to its spirit and letter. But, as one of the humblest of the people of the free States, I am not willing to see the Constitution perverted from the beneficent ends for which it was framed; and the Government under it, transformed into a felon's league for the oppression of the black man, the impoverishment and degradation of the white laborer; and rendered serviceable only to promote the inordinate ambition and cupidity of some two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand slaveholders, and the few thousand of free-State renegades, purchased by Executive patronage. The Constitution, thus distorted and perverted, is the slaveholders' Constitution and Government. It exists for their benefit, to gratify their cupidity, to satiate their ambition, to protect their exclusive interests, to extend their system of labor and social order, to promote their execrable anti-freedom and anti-civilization policy; and it is theirs to enable them to work all this mischief, at any cost of public morality, pecuniary expense, or national honor. To this remorseless lust of Slavery propagandism, every other sentiment, every other interest, and every

other principle, are offered as cheap and fitting sacrifices. To appease this "never-gorged Leviathan," the whole immense patronage of the Federal Government is made to minister. Before this deformed and hateful monster, every officer of the Executive and judicial departments is made to bow and swear allegiance, from the President down, through all that countless swarm, numbered by hundreds of thousands, all trained to the lowest and meekest servility of passive obedience, and distributed over and through the whole land, and mugged as frogs in the plagues of Egypt—each and all of these, civil, military, and naval, dependent on this omnipresent power of evil. The independent man who seeks employment under the Federal Administration, no matter what his qualifications or fitness—no matter if he were Washington or Franklin, Jay or Adams, Lafayette or Kosciuszko—if he were to re-appear with his old-fashioned devotion to human liberty, and ask for a petty clerkship under some braying ass, whom the slaveholders and their flunkies had wrapped round with the lion's skin of authority, he would be rudely thrust aside, to give place to any worthless puppy, mean enough to fawn at the footstool of power for crumbs of patronage. Sir, the children of those whose blood soaked the battle-fields of the Revolution, unless degraded enough to play the sycophant to this atrocious slave power, so far as protection or patronage under the Government, purchased with their fathers' blood is concerned, are as much *aliens*, as if they had been born and reared cannibals of New Zealand or the Fejee Islands. In their own country, in the homes of their fathers and their fathers' fathers, they are aliens and outlaws—made such by this guilty combination of slaveholders and renegade politicians of the free States. No sir, the Government has ceased to be the Government of the people of the United States, or for the people of the United States. It is the slaveholders' Government—a base and villanous oligarchy, the only intent and purpose of which is, to multiply offices to be filled by the Government hangers-on, and paupers, generated by the slave system; to collect the taxes needful to fill the mouths and pockets of this famished brood of cormorants; and to extend, strengthen, and perpetuate the accursed system, so utterly ruinous to the moral, political, and social interests of the free laborer. It is the slaveholders' Government; and for one, I am for reform or separation; I am for justice, and for liberty—without which there can be no justice; and sir, if this Government will not secure to us of the free States, the Territory which is *now free*, and has been made and kept free by act of Congress, now for more than an entire generation, then sir, it is not the Government in which the non-slaveholders of the United States have an interest to the value of the President's salary. For such a Government, so administered, I have neither respect nor affection; it is fit only for reform or revolution. On this subject it is best for us of the North and South that we understand each other. Either the Federal Constitution does or does not recognise slaves as *property*, and guaranty to the master, property in his slaves. If the Constitution does this, then it is a

hypocrisy, a delusion, a *cheat*; but if it does not, then the Government, under the joint misrule of the slave and doughface powers, has been and is, a usurpation and a fraud, which will not only justify, but absolutely demands, either an Administration based on the FREE spirit of the Constitution, or a dissolution of the Union. Sir, I speak very plainly, and I disdain to resort to the usual cant about devotion to the Union, and all that. I think I know my constituents well, and am well known by them. I know that they are willing to abide in the Union, under the Constitution our fathers framed; and in that Union, and under that Constitution, they have borne much, and for the preservation of those in their purity, will do, endure, and dare as much as men may do, endure, or dare, in any form in which patriotism may demand the exercise of those high qualities; and yet sir, I feel warranted in saying to you in their names, and in their behalf: that whenever the slaveholders and doughfaces shall have satisfied them that the Federal Constitution is in reality the bulwark and guaranty of chattel slavery; and they are called upon to choose between Slavery and the Union on the one hand, and Liberty and dissolution on the other; without an instant's delay or hesitation, they will choose Liberty for themselves and their children, at any cost and every hazard. But sir, neither I nor my constituents entertain any such view of the Federal Constitution. We believe its perversion to the base use of extending and perpetuating Slavery, has been a violation of its letter and spirit; and we are for dethroning the usurpers, and placing in their stead, those who will so exercise the powers of the Government as thereby to "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." To these beneficent ends, we believe the powers of the Constitution are ample; and that the exercise of these powers for the extension or perpetuation of human Slavery, is a usurpation which, if persisted in, will make a dissolution of the Union not only a *right*, but a *duty*. To bring the Federal Government "actively and perpetually on the side of Liberty," and to denationalize Slavery, and confine it strictly to the States where it now exists, are the ends we contemplate, and for these we shall labor, through sunshine and storm, through good report and evil report—beaten, we shall renew the fight—successful, we shall push on the victory—replying to all testy gentlemen who oppose to this resolution of ours, (as was so successfully done in 1850,) threats to secede from the Union, what the benevolent Uncle Toby said to the fly, "the world is wide enough for thee and me," simply reminding gentlemen that—

"The fight of Freedom once begun,
Bequeathed from bleeding sire to son;
Though baffled oft, is ever won"—

And that, as it has been heretofore, so it will be again. Liberty must triumph, and Slavery perish.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 136 008 5

