

F 685
.C61
Copy 1

SPEECH

OF

HON. C. C. CLAY, JR., OF ALABAMA,

ON THE

CONTEST IN KANSAS

AND

THE PLANS AND PURPOSES OF BLACK REPUBLICANISM;

DELIVERED

IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, APRIL 21, 1856.

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.
1856.

...mer.
been hitherto
picion. When the
they neither name him

1851

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

CHICAGO, ILL.

1851

AFFAIRS OF KANSAS—SLAVERY QUESTION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill to authorize the people of the Territory of Kansas to form a constitution and State government, preparatory to their admission into the Union when they have the requisite population—

Mr. CLAY said: Mr. President, this debate, on the part of the advocates of insurrection in Kansas, has been worthy of their cause. From its inauguration by the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. HALE,] in his furious onslaught upon the President's annual message, down to the attempt to foist upon the Senate the spurious memorial of the amateur Legislature at Topeka, they have displayed more personal, partisan, and sectional asperity, than I have ever witnessed on this floor. They seem not to desire to restore peace, to preserve order, and sustain the laws, but to increase dissension, create disorder, and subvert the laws of that Territory. They appear not as impartial arbiters of this great controversy, but as zealous advocates with contingent fees resting on its decision. Determined to know and to present but one side, they concede no violation of law, order, morality, or propriety, by their clients. Instead of exhibiting the impartiality, dignity, and sobriety of an Areopagus, in whose justice and judgment contending States may confide, they have betrayed the rancorous prejudice of sectional bigotry, and the blind passion of selfish partisanship. They have assailed the reputations not only of those who have appeared as prominent advocates of slavery in Kansas, but even of those who have espoused neither side, but have striven to stay the hand of violence and to do justice to both parties. The newspaper contributions of hireling and anonymous writers have been gravely paraded as testimony on which to decide this great issue, and with which to defame men whose integrity and patriotism have been hitherto without reproach and above suspicion. When challenged to give their author, they neither name him nor indorse his statement;

but admit their high esteem for the man whom they aid in traducing. They seek to injure, and to shirk responsibility—

“Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike.”

The President has been assailed with a bitterness characteristic rather of personal enmity than political antagonism.

The Missourians have been spoken of as foreign and barbarous enemies, rather than as fellow-citizens, descended from a common ancestry and devoted to the same civil and political destiny.

The South has been assailed as aggressive and overbearing; acquiring territory, or giving it away to aggrandize herself, and appropriating federal property and offices to her own use, and to the exclusion of the North.

The North has not escaped detraction by her own sons; for they allege that she has always had venal men in market, ready to sell themselves to serve the ambitious purposes of the South. Those who proclaim the infamy of their own household must share the shame and endure suspicion; and when they wantonly and maliciously charge members of their own family with selling themselves, people will suspect that *they* have escaped that debasement only for want of a purchaser.

The President needs not the shield of another to protect him against the missiles of their malice, and is more honored by their censure than their praise. Covered in the complete panoply of truth, he has no vulnerable point exposed—not even a tender heel—which the curs that bay at him can wound. If a love of country, which embraces the whole Union, and knows no North, no South, no East, and no West, in the administration of the Government; if a strict adherence to his professions of political faith and observance of all the pledges with which he came into office; if a vigilant guardianship of the Constitution, and

uncalculating vindication of its great principles; if these are marks of the true patriot, enlightened statesman, and honest man, then has the President's official career illustrated that character. The people of his own section, deceived and misled by artifice, may unjustly condemn him in the present, but will in the future correct their error and unite with the South in awarding him the honor due to noble ends attained by noble means.

If the President's friends distrusted his fidelity to the Constitution and laws in discharging his official duty towards Kansas, the conflicting and contradictory charges of his enemies would furnish his vindication.

The Abolitionists charge that the President approved the Nebraska-Kansas bill to open new fields for slavery; the South Americans, that he did so to enlarge the area of free soil. The Abolitionists say his Administration has been exerted to make Kansas a slave State; the South Americans, to make it a free State. The Abolitionists abuse the President for removing Reeder; the South Americans, for appointing him. The Abolitionists say he was removed too soon; the South Americans, too late. The Abolitionists say he was removed for no official delinquency; the South Americans, that he was retained after repeated delinquencies. The Abolitionists complain that squatter sovereignty is frowned upon and threatened with suppression; the South Americans, that it is countenanced and encouraged. The Abolitionists complain that the proclamation is leveled at Free-Soilers; the South Americans, at pro-slavery men. Thus do the President's accusers contradict and confute each other, and prove that he has displeased extremists on both sides by occupying that middle ground which is consistent with the rights of both North and South, and hostile to the interests of neither.

Nor, sir, are the President's northern accusers consistent with each other. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WILSON] complains of the President for issuing his proclamation upon information communicated by Governor Shannon; while the Senator from Illinois takes it to have been issued upon the information of Lane and Robinson. The advocates of the insurrectionists denounce him because of the proclamation, while some of their clients thank him for it. The Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] denounces the President as a tyrant, looks in history for his prototype, and finds it in the person of George III; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] seeks his similitude in a field more congenial to his taste, finds it in the vulgar arena, and denounces him as a demagogue.

Neither are the President's accusers consistent with themselves. The Senator from New York, after his formal arraignment and elaborate accusation of him, as an accomplice of the Missouri invaders, virtually confessed the injustice of the charge, by failing to show the law the President had violated, or had not enforced, and by asking the question, "Cannot Congress clothe him with power to act; and is it not his duty to ask power to remove usurpation and subvert tyranny in a Territory of the United States?"

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WILSON] sat out with the bold assertion that the document sent us by the President would "carry a gigantic falsehood to the American people," made

up of "rumors of the hour." Yet, in his two days' speech of minute and elaborate details of Kansas affairs, he did not controvert, or attempt to controvert, a single material fact alleged by Governor Shannon. That leading men had placed themselves in an attitude of rebellion towards the Government; that they were attempting to subvert existing authority and establish a government of their own, and with that view had formed a secret military organization; that the execution of the laws had been openly resisted; that houses had been burned and other property destroyed; that pro-slavery families had been driven from their homes and forced to seek shelter in Missouri: these portentous and startling facts were not disproven, or seriously questioned. Indeed, in his apocryphal history of Kansas, he stated no fact irreconcilable with those set forth in the official documents.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] set out with the declaration that a challenge had been thrown down by the President—to be gathered from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut—to which he would reply and would show, "that the President had omitted his constitutional duty," that he had not interfered "when there was a state of facts that would justify and call for his interference." The showing he made was an extract from an inflammatory stump speech of Governor Reeder, published last May, declaring that Kansas "had been invaded, conquered and subjugated." He does not allege that Governor Reeder made any official call upon the President for protection of the people of Kansas, or any official statement of her invasion, or, indeed, that he officially or unofficially called the President's attention to the invasion. He sagely concludes, however, that the President must have seen or heard of it through that stump speech. And after a formal parade of that to prove a knowledge by the President of facts requiring his interference, the Senator conceded that he did not know that there was a state of facts to justify interference!

Again, that Senator, on the 3d of January last, in his violent attack upon the President, admitted "there had been nothing in Kansas to justify his official interference." But on the 28th of February, the same Senator charged, that *there had been a state of facts to justify and call for presidential interposition!* In the former speech he complained, that *while nothing had occurred to justify the President's interposition, yet he had interposed, whether justified or not.* In the latter speech, he condemns the President for not interposing, although advertised by Governor Reeder's stump speech of the urgent exigencies calling for Federal aid! Thus the Senator appears as the President's accuser for interposing and not interposing, at the same time, and under the same circumstances, ready to prove the affirmative or negative in order to convict him of official misconduct! One who did not know the man, would never suspect the identity of the author of the two speeches of 3d of January and 28th of February last. He reminds me of a client of large resources and small conscience, who, when asked by his counsellor what facts he could prove, replied, "Tell me what facts must be proven, and trust me for producing the evidence."

The Secretary of War has not escaped cen-

sure. Nor has less of the blindness of sectional bigotry been displayed in criticising his letter to Colonels Sumner and Cooke. His accusers pretend to have discovered a discrimination in favor of Missouri invaders and against Free-Soil insurrectionists. Far from showing in that letter the narrow and sectional spirit of his assailants, it is marked by a moderation, philanthropy, and patriotism they have not evinced, and can scarcely appreciate. If, sir, the omission of the words *invasive aggression*, in the peremptory part of the letter, was designed, why should the champions of the emigrants' aid society object or complain? Have not their hirelings entered that Territory with arms not fitted for sport, but war—not designed to kill game, but men?—and, with the fear of conscientious blood-guiltiness, and the cunning of fraud, they smuggled them into the Territory in boxes—marked “books,” or “carpenters' tools!” Are companies of men, specially equipped for war in New England, less deserving the name of invaders, than the Missourians with their mere fowling-pieces? The arrogance of pharisaical puritanism might justify the former and condemn the latter, just as it would deny the right to carry slave property there; but those whose visions are not limited to their own little section of this Confederacy, or who would not surrender to party the rights of the people of every State, can make no discrimination. If the Secretary had used the words “invasive aggression,” the Black Republicans should, and probably would, have understood it as menacing them; at all events, they would have howled as horribly at their use as they have done at their omission.

But, sir, the words were properly omitted, because they were unnecessary and liable to misapprehension and misapplication. The words used are coextensive with any exigency that could have been anticipated, or that can possibly arise. The colonels are ordered to obey the requisitions of the Governor for “*suppression of insurrectionary combinations or armed resistance to the execution of the law.*” What matters it, whether insurrectionary combinations or armed resistance be meditated and organized within or without the Territory, by citizens of Kansas or Missouri? Whenever insurrectionists or resisters endeavor to put their illegal purposes in action, by rising up within, or entering from without, they subject themselves alike to the consequences, and invoke suppression by military force of the Government. All who put themselves in opposition to lawful, civil, or political authority within Kansas, are insurgents, whether residents or non-residents. All who put themselves in armed resistance to the laws, no matter whence they come, are aggressors, and if they come from without are invading aggressors.

The orders are, too, in strict conformity to the act of Congress, in spirit and letter, adopting the very language of those acts in directing when, how, and for what purpose to exert the military force of the Government. Let the assailants of the Secretary compare the orders and the acts, and show wherein he has transcended, or fallen short, or departed in any degree, from the law; and if they fail, as they must, to show any departure, let them blame the makers of the law, and correct its imperfections. The words “*invasive aggression*” should have been omitted, because

they are not used in the law under and by which, and which only, the orders were issued.

Again, they were liable to misapprehension and abusive misinterpretation. What do Senators mean by *armed invaders* from Missouri? Are we so far advanced in this age of progressive departure from the provisions of the Federal Constitution, that the entrance of the people of a slaveholding State into the Territories is an invasion? Or are Missourians, in Free-Soil dialect, foreigners or savages? Is the entrance by them with arms in their hands, armed invasion or invasive aggression? Does not the Constitution guaranty to them, in common with the people of Massachusetts, the right to bear arms, and freedom of transit into or out of the States or Territories? And may not the militia of a State be marched into another State or a Territory where the standard of rebellion or insurrection is raised against the existing government? Does not the Constitution make this an obligation of the State governments instead of an invasion? Do Senators mean to renounce this obligation, and denounce its exercise in declaring against armed invasion? Do they mean to forestall and prevent the employment of the Missouri militia for the suppression of rebellion? If so, then they may find a pretext for censuring the Secretary. But, if they use the term in the sense used by the President and Secretary, as “*invasive aggression against the organized Government of the Territory,*” then the orders of the latter embrace the case which they say was omitted. The orders direct the officers to comply with the requisitions of the Governor, and suppress all insurrectionary combinations and armed resistance to the execution of the laws, without inquiring who are the insurgents or resisters, or whence they came. To have ordered them to prevent armed bodies of men from entering the Territory, would have placed the United States troops in conflict with the Missourians—the victors of Sacramento and Chihuahua, who disdain to conceal their weapons or play the part of assassins—while puling and coward knaves might have gone in without let or hindrance, in the garb of peace, carrying, concealed in boxes, the implements and munitions of war. This would doubtless have suited them and their counselors, but would have wronged the brave and encouraged the cowardly.

The entrance of armed men from Missouri or Massachusetts into Kansas is no invasive aggression, if they go as law-abiding citizens; and the character in which they go is not to be prejudged, but determined by their acts after they enter. The Secretary was right in not predetermining, or authorizing his subordinates to predetermine, their character.

The orders of the Secretary are public acts, and a legitimate subject of praise or censure. But the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Wilson] has gone behind the order and assailed the character of the Secretary. He has impeached the integrity of his conduct and impugned his motives. Indeed, he denied the purity of intention and propriety of action of the entire Administration. He has assailed, in like manner, the people of the South. He alleges that they and this Administration are sustaining lawless men from Missouri in their aggressive acts—the lawless men before whom the Secretary of War shrinks and bends! Sir, it

would justly excite mirth or indignation, and provoke bitter words of scorn or contemptuous phrases of ridicule, should a brave and responsible man charge with cowering before any men, and more especially lawless men, him whose patriotism and whose courage have been attested by his blood, and illustrated by his deeds on the heights of Monterey and plains of Buena Vista. But, when one who has displayed neither of those virtues, makes such a charge against such a man, he should be regarded rather with the pity with which we look upon an idiot, who cannot appreciate an emotion he never experienced.

This discussion has indicated the policy (more distinctly developed in speeches made elsewhere) of the self-styled Republican party. They are unwilling to hazard a contest for the presidency upon the old issues of abolition. They do not believe that the northern people are yet prepared to sustain them in an open assault upon the constitutional rights of the South; and hence the repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery in this District, the inhibition of the inter-State slave trade and other anti-slavery measures are suppressed for the present. Even the wrongs of the slave no longer form the staple of their appeals to the northern heart. No; the wrongs and injuries of the North and the usurpations and aggressions of the South furnish themes for their popular harangues. The South, they charge, has been robbing the North of its just share in the Territories, the treasures, and the honors of the Union. They affect not to be aggressors, but the aggrieved; and are implacably incensed against the President for assailing their false position. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WILSON] denies that *there is anything in the plans or purposes of the emigrant aid society hostile to the Constitution, to law, order, or peace, or aggressive upon the South.* And so do all of the party to which he belongs. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] denies that the North has ever "*made aggression or ever means to do so;*" declares that she "*asks to stand nothing more than our equals;*" and alleges that all the men about whom he knows anything, engaged in the anti-slavery enterprise of the North, "*have always disclaimed utterly the purpose, the desire, or the power to interfere with slavery in any State where it exists.*" On the contrary, he alleges that the North has always "*stood on the defensive;*" that, "*in the history of this Government there has been no North except to collect revenue from,*" and is grievously exercised about the territorial acquisitions of the South, and her possessions of the high places of the Government.

The Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] denies *there has been any disregard of constitutional obligations by the northern States,* and especially by New York and Massachusetts, and charges territorial aggrandizement on the South; and, addressing his constituents at Albany last fall, made "*the danger of extending slavery*" his text, and expatiated upon the *perfidious and insidious aggressions and bold usurpations of "the privileged class," "the slave aristocracy,"* their sectional partiality in *denying protection to northern wool, while freely giving it to the slaveholder's sugar; in giving millions of acres of public land to Alabama for railroads, or as gratuities, while not a dollar can be obtained for internal improvements in New York; and*

the humiliation exacted of northern Representatives as the price of *pensions to the old soldiers!*

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SUMNER] takes as his text for a discourse in Faneuil Hall "*the slave oligarchy and its usurpations,*" against whom he prefers like charges, and utters yet stronger denunciations.

The Senator from Ohio, [Mr. WADE,] in a stump speech in Maine last summer, denounces the slave power as "*a system of outrage, aggression, and wrong,*" and declares the men of the North and the South are more inimical than the Russians and the English, and that "*the pretended Union, now existing, is all meretricious.*"

Ay, sir, the Republican party was professedly formed to repel "*southern aggression!*" If its leaders can persuade the North that their assertions are true, they must achieve a sectional victory in the coming elections. They invoke to their aid, not only hatred of the South as an enemy, vengeance for the wrongs she has inflicted, indemnity for past injuries and security for the future, but the instincts of self-love and self-preservation. If their assertions be true, it is not only the duty of the northern people to sustain them at the polls, but if unsuccessful there in wresting power from the tyrants who oppress them, to take up arms and resort to revolution, as has been attempted by the Republicans in Kansas, and is approved by their advocates here. The plain import of the sentiments avowed by their leaders is, that not only the people of Kansas, but of the northern States, are suffering intolerable wrongs and oppression, and the inevitable tendency of their appeals is to civil war and revolution. If their counsels prevail, I sincerely believe civil war must and will come. The Union was formed by the several States as friends and equals, and was designed to secure justice, tranquillity, and equality to every State. If it has failed to answer its purpose, it is truly a meretricious Union, and its days will soon be numbered.

In order to test the truth of these assertions, to determine this issue of southern aggressions and usurpations tendered by the Black Republicans, and to vindicate the President from their aspersions, I propose to state briefly the account between the North and the South. Let us see which section has added more, and which has appropriated more of the Federal domain; which has contributed more, and which has enjoyed more of the Federal treasure, and which has disturbed the tranquillity of the other or the harmony of the Union. The facts are neither new nor strange, but may be found in the documents published by Congress.

At the conclusion of peace, in 1783, the States then north of Mason and Dixon's line had 164,081 square miles; the States then south of that line had 647,202 square miles. Pending the Revolution, the Northwestern Territory excited (as Mr. Madison expressed it) "*the lucrative desires*" of the northeastern people, to a degree threatening the existence of the Confederacy. That territory belonged to Virginia by repeated royal grants, as well as by conquest, achieved at her sole expense and by her unaided arms. To satisfy those desires, quiet the contest, and secure harmony and peace, she surrendered it to the Confederacy, and the ordinance of 1787 devoted it to free soil. That surrender reduced southern territory nearly

one half, and increased northern territory nearly threefold. Northern territory was thereby swelled to 425,761 square miles, and southern territory reduced to 385,521 square miles.

The Territory of Louisiana, next acquired, in which slavery was maintained by both French and Spanish laws, and guaranteed in the treaty of acquisition, was, by the Missouri restriction, so divided that the North took (exclusive of Oregon) 659,138 square miles, and the South retained 225,456 square miles. By that settlement, the South surrendered of slaveholding territory to the North about three fourths, and retained about one fourth. But, including Oregon as part of the Louisiana purchase, the North took 972,605 square miles, and the South retained 225,456 square miles; thereby the South surrendered more than four fifths, and retained but one fifth of that territory.

The acquisitions of Oregon, (if not included in the Louisiana purchase,) Florida, and Texas, resulted in a division by which the North got about 415,467 square miles, and the South retained about 271,268 square miles. By that arrangement the North obtained about three fifths of those territories.

The Mexican conquests engrossed by the North, added to her limits about 401,838 square miles. The South has grown from 647,202 to 882,245 square miles; having added but 235,043 square miles to her area since 1783. In the same time, the North, from 164,081, has grown to 1,903,204 square miles; having added in the same time, 1,738,123 square miles to her limits. The South has increased less than fifty per cent., the North near 1,100 per cent. in territorial area since the Revolution. The South commenced with more than four times the territory of the North; the North now has near two and a half times the territory of the South. The Federal Government never held one foot of territory east of the Rocky Mountains that was free soil when acquired; and, indeed, I question whether she ever held any west of them that was free soil. The northern States never ceded one foot of territory to the United States; and never yielded one foot of territory, that was free soil when acquired, to the use of the South, but have retained it all.

The South has ceded, of her own exclusive territory, 261,671 square miles, and has relinquished, of other slaveholding territory when acquired—belonging in common to all the States—972,605 square miles, and of slaveholding and non-slaveholding territory in all, not less than 1,738,123 square miles—an empire elevenfold greater than the entire area of the northern States at the peace of 1783, and more than double the entire domain of the States of the Confederation. When stronger and richer than the North, she magnanimously gave up nearly half her domain to hush the clamor of envy, avarice, and ambition, and preserve confederation. When reduced by that suicidal act to a minority in both Houses of Congress, on the application of Missouri for admission into the Union, the North, for the first time, avowed her purpose to appropriate all the Territories to her sole and exclusive use, and to refuse admission to another slaveholding State into the Union. The South then yielded to the demands of dominating power more than she had given, in the prodigality of her wealth, to the

importunities of dissatisfied weakness. She surrendered four fifths of slaveholding territory to the North, and submitted to that odious interdict, inhibiting her from holding slaves north of 36° 30', on condition of the admission of Missouri, and the extension of her territory south of that line. Yet, in less than twelve months, northern Free-Soilers violated the miscalled compromise, by refusing to admit Missouri; and from that day to the present, have persistently endeavored to transgress that line, and to deny the South the enjoyment of territories and admission of States south of it.

No impartial mind can contemplate the history of these territorial contests without being impressed with the arrogant demands on the one part, and the generous but unwise concessions on the other part. Instead of aggressing, the South has been retrogressing; instead of encroaching on non-slaveholding territory, she has been surrendering slaveholding territory; instead of demanding and exercising equal participancy in the common domain, she has been conceding this right until she seems almost regarded by northern Free-Soilers as a mere tenant by sufferance.

And yet, in seeming ignorance or disregard of these undeniable truths of history, we are told by some of her unjust and rapacious sons, that the North has never been aggressive, that she has always stood on the defensive, only asking to stand as our equals, nothing more; and that the South has always been acquiring territory for her aggrandizement, and cutting off, selling or giving away territory at the North for her enfeeblement.

But, sir, in seeming apology for the attempt to exclude slaveholders from the territories of the United States, we are modestly told by the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. WILSON,] that *slave labor blasts and curses the soil*; and are assured by the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. HALE,] with pious philanthropy, that New Englanders cannot endure the "*responsibility of sustaining, extending, and perpetuating an institution which, in their heart of hearts, they believe to be wrong.*" The Senator from Massachusetts, in his desire to disparage the South and extol the North—common to all of his party—tells us that many southern men, emigrating to Kansas, perhaps a majority, prefer making it a non-slaveholding State. He utters this assertion, as he does all others, upon the testimony of interested witnesses, many of them hireling contributors to northern presses, as zealously devoted to manufacturing public sentiment for the exclusion of slaveholders from the Territory as the Senator himself. That there are southerners of that class, is not improbable; but that there are, also, settlers from northern States who would prefer *introducing slavery*, I am well assured, and fully credit. But the reason assigned by him for the preference given by many poor white men for free institutions, is their experience in the South of "*the malign influences which bear with oppressive force upon free labor.*" What those malign influences are, he did not disclose, and I neither know nor can conjecture. In this connection, however, he speaks of our *artless, untutored, unpaid labor*, and quotes two or three lines from an agricultural address, made by me last spring, in which I spoke

of the exhaustion and impoverishment of the soil of portions of that State, "exhibiting the painful signs of senility and decay apparent in Virginia and the Carolinas." The inference deducible is, that, like all of his school of politics, he means to impress the idea that it is *slavery* which blasts the soil and causes all labor there to go unpaid. And, although he does not allege it, the implication may be fairly drawn that my address supplied him evidence for his assertion. I do not suppose the Senator ever read, or saw, the entire address, or more of it than the paragraph from which he quoted. Had he read it, he would have learned that it maintained that agricultural labor had not only been well paid, but better paid there, in the culture of cotton, than it had been in any field-tillage elsewhere; that it had enabled the State to realize about twenty millions of dollars annually from her cotton crop alone, and to become the largest exporter of agricultural products of *all the States of the Union*. Had he read but the paragraph preceding the one from which he quoted, he would have found that the impoverishment of our soil was properly attributed to the constant and changeless cultivation of the cotton plant; and that the folly of violating inexorable laws of Nature was illustrated in the result. That *this result* is caused by slave labor, is a conclusion as illogical as unjust. Indeed, I cannot suppose that any Abolitionist or negro-philist will concede that there is a *Divine* curse upon the labor of the negro, which prevents the earth from yielding her treasures in return for his tillage. As like causes produce like results, it will be found that artless *white* tillage has impoverished the soil not only of the South, but of the North, and of European States also, if there be any truth in agricultural reports. Countless proofs could be cited; but, as it gives me no pleasure to rehearse the errors or misfortunes of others, the statement may suffice.

If the Senator had informed himself as to the true character and condition of southern people, and the products of southern soil, as evinced in our exportations, he would have found that his real or apparent triumph over her poverty, her decline and prospective desolation, was as ill-founded as malignant. He would behold her in admirable and enviable contrast with her northern sisters. He would see that she has fewer paupers than the North, in proportion to aggregate population—that her field labor is better rewarded—that her poor white laborers have more land, more money, more of the essentials of ease, comfort, and independence, than a similar class in New England, or anywhere else. And if he would seek for the whole truth from credible and authentic sources, instead of partial glimpses, caught from garbled paragraphs and sentences collected in Abolition presses and pamphlets—if he would look at census reports, commercial and agricultural statistics, State and Federal, instead of the New York Tribune, or the pamphlet of the man in Maine, who so touchingly writes of the poor whites of the South—he would find that class have far less need of his tender sympathies than many nearer home.

If the Senator from Massachusetts had examined the exports of the Union, he would have seen, that those blasted fields that offend his vision, and that artless, untutored, and unpaid labor which invokes his pity, yield about four fifths of

the products of our commerce. He would have learned that *cotton, rice, and tobacco*, the peculiar products of slave labor, furnish nearly two thirds of the exports of domestic products of the Union. He would have discovered that, of the average annual exports of about \$100,000,000 during the last thirty-four years, while the non-slaveholding States can claim about \$20,000,000, the slaveholding States are justly entitled to about \$80,000,000 per annum. But to present a *stronger* contrast between the *values* of the fruits of labor, North and South, and to expose clearly and *conclusively*, not only the gross error and injustice, but the extravagant absurdity of the sneer of the Senator from Massachusetts, at the poverty and ill-rewarded labor of the South, I invite attention to the following facts developed in, and sustained by, the statistics of the Government. The population of the cotton-growing States, viz: South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, amounting in 1830 to less than one seventh of the aggregate population of the Union, produced in the following decade, from 1820 to 1830, in round numbers, \$21,000,000 more of our exports than *all* the other States.

The population of the same six States, with *Florida*—amounting in 1830 to but 129,863 more than the one seventh of the entire *population* of the Union—produced during the next decade, from 1830 to 1840, in value, in round numbers, \$220,000,000 more of our exports than all the other States.

The population of the same seven States, which, in 1840, amounted to less than one seventh of the entire population of the Union by 318,000, produced in the next decade, from 1840 to 1850, in value, in round numbers, \$39,783,000 more of our exports than all the other States.

The population of the same seven States, with Texas, in 1850, amounting to less than one sixth of the entire population of the Union, produced in the next four years, from 1850 to 1854, inclusive, in value, in round numbers, \$57,892,000 more of our exports than all the other States of the Union.

Now, sir, let it be borne in mind that, great as is the disparity in favor of the productions of slave labor in slave States manifested by the comparison instituted, it does not do those States justice—because I have only included the two products of cotton and rice exported by them, and excluded their breadstuffs, tobacco, sugar, and every other product, while I have given the other States credit for not only all their own exported products, but for much that is due to the States designated by name. It may be safely alleged, that the Union is indebted for more than one half its exports to less than one sixth its population contained in the eight States distinguished as cotton-growing. And as those exports form the *basis* of its *imports*, it may be added, that the Union is indebted to those eight disparaged and derided States for more than one half its commerce, and to the entire slaveholding States for about four fifths of it. I defy the Senator from Massachusetts to find any parallel for the exchangeable products, the materials of independence, of wealth and prosperity, indicated in the exports of the South. Sir, the reproach of poverty, of unrequited toil, of the malign influence of *slavery* upon labor, is made by uncalculating ignorance or

calculating malignity. It is an oft-repeated slander, which finds no substantial *fact*, and scarce a plausible pretext on which to stand. It is one of the poisoned arrows not tolerated in *honorable warfare*, which the foreign and domestic foes of the South are ever discharging at her; and when shot by the hand of any son of New England is not only poisoned with calumny, but barbed with ingratitude.

It is the domestic produce of the South that gives employment to the hands, and food and raiment to the bodies, of the people of New England; that has multiplied her population and magnified her wealth; that has built up her Lowell and her Boston; that has made her merchants princes, and her manufacturers lords of the loom; that has reticulated her surface with railroads and studded it with thrifty villages; that has enabled her capitalists to indulge in European magnificence and Asiatic luxury.

Take from New England, sir, the cotton of the South, and she would learn, in the sad reverse and rapid decline of her fortunes, the immense and incalculable value of that involuntary servitude which one of her Representatives, in inexcusable ignorance or more censurable malice, denounces as a "withering, blighting, and consuming curse." Take from her the fleecy fabric of the South, and in her waste water-falls, her fireless furnaces, her moss-covered mill-wheels, her grass-grown streets, her deserted villages, her unfrequented harbors, her dilapidated palaces, her untraveled railroads—in every spot, now full of life, and blooming with the vigor of commercial health and active enterprise—would be quickly seen the sad antithesis of death!

I allude to these facts in no spirit of vain triumph. I am constrained to do so by the wanton and ill-founded taunt of the Senator from Massachusetts. I could, too, easily paint a picture of the wrongs inflicted and sufferings endured under that system of servitude called voluntary in New England, which would prove that *there* labor often fails to get its just reward. But it yields me no pleasure to contemplate the misfortunes or faults, the errors or infirmities of my fellow-men—far less those of my fellow-countrymen. I rejoice rather in their virtues, their good deeds, and good fortune. I appreciate the intelligence, enterprise, industry, economy, thrift, and energy of the people of New England, and have awarded due honor and praise for their heroic struggles and achievements in every field of human labor, even in the very address the Senator quotes to misapply. I am ready to acknowledge, too, as in that speech, that the South is a large debtor as well as creditor of New England, deriving from her many materials of necessity and luxury. As just and friendly neighbors, they are mutually useful and beneficial; but as foes, neither lending nor borrowing, giving nor taking, the South would suffer far less than New England.

What New England has to sell, the South could make at home, buy elsewhere, or do without. What the South has to sell, New England cannot make at home, do without, or buy elsewhere. Cotton is the staple of her existence. She knows it, as well as she knows the plant is grown, and its fruits plucked by the hands of slaves. Yet, with all pious horror of slavery, she gives it daily aid and encouragement, in employing slave labor,

in rewarding slave labor, in using the products of slave-labor, in buying from and selling to the slave-owner—all for her own sake. How magnanimous and unselfish to refuse the slave-owner the privilege of enjoying, like herself, the profits of slave labor in peace and quietness! How grateful and honorable in her to curse the giver, while she pockets the gift—to denounce him as a thief, while she receives and appropriates the stolen property! Oh! sir, if she sincerely abhors the "peculiar institution"—if she sincerely desires its overthrow—if her conscience tortures her as accessory to our guilt, so long as we are permitted to hold a slave in a Territory, or reclaim him when a fugitive, let her ease her troubled conscience, and prove her faith by works of self-purgation and self-denial. *Then* will we believe her. Let her cease to buy, spin, weave, wear, or sell cotton. Let her cease the use of sugar, rice, and tobacco. Let her cease to buy molasses to convert into *rum*, with which to speculate on the vices, crimes, and miseries of the human family. Let her cease the carrying trade for the South; let her send no more vessels to our ports, or to those of Cuba or Brazil. When she refuses to make or receive *any* of the profits of slave labor, or to deal with slave-owners, she will vindicate her honor and the sincerity of her pious professions of philanthropy, relieve herself from the reproach of saintly hypocrisy, and will escape the "responsibility of sustaining, extending, and perpetuating an institution which in her heart of hearts she believes to be wrong." Until she do this, she *cannot* escape that responsibility.

What injustice has been done the North in distributing the Federal revenue, of which she has furnished not exceeding one fifth, or one dollar where the South furnished five dollars? Have her military defenses been neglected, her harbors, rivers, and roads unimproved, her soldiers unpensioned—in short, has she gotten less money than she was entitled to? Let us see:

Up to June, 1846, \$838 76 had been spent in defending, with forts, each mile of northern coast from the river St. John's to Delaware bay; only \$416 89 had been expended per mile of the coast from North Carolina to Mississippi, inclusive.

In June, 1847, \$60 01 had been expended in light-houses for each mile of the northern Atlantic shore; not half that sum had been spent on the southern Atlantic coast.

The disproportion in expenditure for lamps was still greater. The South had scarcely half as many lamps as the North had light-houses in 1840.

Of \$15,201,223 expended up to 1845, upon roads, rivers, and harbors, (excluding the Mississippi and Ohio, which are common to both sections,) \$12,743,407 were expended in the North; \$2,757,816 in the South: being \$2,805 for every ten miles square of the northern States, and \$451 for each ten miles square of the southern States.

Of \$35,598,964 paid in revolutionary pensions from 1791 to 1838, inclusive, \$28,262,597 were paid to the North, and \$7,336,367 to the South; being \$127 29 for every soldier which the North had in the war, and \$49 89 for every soldier the South had in the war; or \$14 35 for every white person in the northern States in 1790, and \$5 61 for every white person in the southern States in that year. And yet the South furnished one hun-

dred soldiers out of every two hundred and nine men within her limits, of military age, in 1790; the North one hundred out of two hundred and twenty-seven, according to General Knox's report; which he concedes does *not* do the South justice—because, he says, “in some years of the greatest exertions of the southern States, there are no returns whatever of their militia.”

Of invalid pensions, there was paid during the year ending 30th June, 1854, to the North \$303,652 81; to the South, \$132,087 35. The State of New York alone, received quite as much as all the southern States, excepting Tennessee.

Of pensions of all kinds, there was paid in the same year, to the South, \$459,965 84; to the North, \$1,068,010 30—New York alone receiving \$292,209 55. And yet the South has furnished more soldiers for all our wars than the North. The South furnished, for the war of 1812, (which was fought mainly to protect northern shipping and New England seamen,) 18,288 more volunteers than the North; for the war with Mexico, nearly two soldiers for one from the North; and for our Indian wars, a still larger proportion. And she has done this with but little more than half the population of the North!

Up to 1850, there had been granted to the new non-slaveholding States for internal improvements 18.5 acres for each square mile of their surface; to the new *slave*-holding States 9.3 acres to the square mile. Louisiana had received 10.8 acres; Alabama 9.8 acres, while Ohio had received 29.6, and Indiana 47.6 acres.

Alabama for all purposes of internal improvement has never received as much as 1,000,000 acres of land, nor indeed for railroads 500,000 acres, the assertion of the Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] to the contrary notwithstanding. New York received at one time in the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands, quadruple the amount, in value, of all the public lands granted to Alabama for internal improvements of all kinds. Yet the proceeds of the public lands within Alabama limits have brought to the Federal Treasury nearly \$20,000,000.

The bounties on pickled fish, and allowances to fishing vessels have exceeded \$10,000,000, of which nearly every cent has been paid to the North, and chiefly to New England. About \$300,000 is annually paid at the North for catching codfish.

A like disproportion in favor of the North against the South, in expenditures for postal services, for custom-houses, court-houses, payment of civil officers, and, indeed, every object of Federal care, could be shown. And yet, having received in fortifications for her defense more than double the amount expended on the same extent of southern coast; having received a light for every twenty-odd miles, to guide and protect her mariners along her own coast, while, for hundreds of miles along southern coast, not a warning beacon cheers the storm-rocked vessel; having received ten dollars, in cutting roads and canals, cleaning rivers and constructing harbors, where one dollar has been given the South; having received four dollars in *pensions* where one has been paid the South; having received in grants of land for internal improvement *two* acres for *one* granted the South; having received, in absolute bounties for her fishermen, more than

\$10,000,000, while no industrial pursuit of the South has enjoyed any bounty; having appropriated all of non-slaveholding, and five sixths of slaveholding territory, acquired, as admitted, by southern diplomacy, or southern arms, some of her sons complain that she does not enjoy a fair and just participancy in the treasures and territory of the Union!

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] assures his constituency that “in the history of this Government, there has been no North, except to collect revenue from!”

The Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] tells his constituency, that millions upon millions are lavished in war and diplomacy to annex and spread slavery at the South, while free territory at the North must not be looked upon, lest they may lust after it; that millions of acres of public domain are freely given to Alabama for railroads, or even gratuities, while not a dollar can be obtained for New York harbors; that northern Senators must humiliate themselves, to obtain justice for even their old soldiers; that protection is freely given southern industry, while it is refused northern!

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SUMNER] adjures his constituency, by their desire for economy in the Government and improvement in their rivers and harbors, by their hatred of tyranny, which has trampled on them, to prostrate the slave oligarchy.

Sir, the aggressions and usurpations of the South have merely this extent: she has struggled with a proud spirit but feeble power in maintaining her constitutional rights and repelling assaults; in resisting the appropriation of territory acquired mainly by her own diplomacy or blood to her own exclusion; in unsuccessfully opposing the extravagant expenditure in the North of four fifths of the revenue of the Government derived from southern toil; in exerting all means to preserve her slave property provided by the Constitution and the laws; in striving to secure for herself that justice and domestic tranquillity, for the guarantee of which to all the States the Union was formed; and in winning too often, though fairly, and filling too long, though well, with her own sons, the chief executive office of the nation.

The South does not seek to exclude non-slaveholding States from the Union; but only asks the admission of those who may choose to come in as slaveholding. She does not seek to exclude northern men or their property from the Territories; but only asks that her own citizens, with their property, may, too, be admitted. She does not deny the equality of the northern States in the Union; but only asserts her own. She does not demand any concession of northern rights; but only asks the acknowledgment of her own. She does not assail or disturb the domestic peace of the North; but only asks the forbearance she displays. She does not interfere with the internal affairs or social institutions of the North; but only asks the privilege of being allowed to manage her own. She offers no insult, no injury to her northern sisters or their sons. Can the same be truthfully alleged by all the northern States or by their representatives on this floor? Sir, I suppose they did not weigh the truth of their declarations; yet the Senators from New York [Mr. SEWARD] and New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] have

both denied any disregard of their constitutional obligations by the northern States, and the former Senator has challenged the President to the proof, especially against Massachusetts and New York.

Mr. President, it affords me no pleasure to criminate or censure the conduct of any State, or of any portion of the people of this Union. I am unconscious of having uttered a charge on this floor that could offend the northern people or any portion of them. I have eschewed all sectional controversies. But, sir, I should be unjust to northern friends, as well as faithless to my constituency, if I did not accept, on behalf of the President and the South, the challenge of the Senator from New York. With that view I must revive bitter recollections.

Is it no proof of disregard of constitutional obligation to break or seek to destroy the solemn and sacred compacts of the Constitution? Among them, and without which the Union would never have been formed, and the destruction of which the Union can never survive, was that securing to us a representation of three fifths of our slaves. Massachusetts has twice by her Legislature—*once* by unanimous vote—called for an amendment of the Constitution, so as to abolish this representation guaranteed by that instrument. The South would thereby lose twenty-one of her representatives, and the North would swell her majority in the other branch of Congress from fifty-three to seventy-four votes. What end has Massachusetts in view, when she proposes this amendment to the Constitution? Is it for self-defense, or is it to injure, to despoil the South? Is there neither injury nor insult offered or meditated, by this menace of that State to violate her bond of compact with the South? And will the Senator from New York reiterate his denial that Massachusetts has shown any disregard of her constitutional obligations?

Another constitutional compact is that requiring the rendition of *fugitive slaves*. The Constitution declares that the fugitive slave *shall be delivered* on the claim of his master. The language is plain, unambiguous, and unequivocal. The purpose and the manner of its execution are beyond doubt, and were never brought in question until the discovery of that *higher law*, of which the Senator from New York is a prominent advocate and exponent. The fugitive slave act of 1793 looked to the agency of State officers and State tribunals for its execution. Massachusetts and New York, together with several other northern States, had, previous to 1850, virtually nullified that act by State legislation. The acts of the States named were specially contrived to defeat the objects of the constitutional provision and congressional legislation. The process of recovery was made slow, costly, and embarrassing, and a trial by jury of the fact of servitude was required. The Supreme Court of the United States declared those acts in conflict with the Federal Constitution. The same States immediately after passed acts forbidding their citizens from aiding in the recapture of fugitive slaves, and imposing heavy penalties upon the master for any disturbance of the peace in any attempt to recapture his property.

Those acts of the States rendered the enactment of the fugitive slave law of 1850 necessary for the protection of our property. But that has

in like manner been virtually annulled by the legislation of several of the northern States. Massachusetts, "the model Commonwealth," has not only virtually nullified the act of Congress by her late legislation, but menaces with *disfranchisement* any lawyer who appears for the claimant of the slave; menaces with *impeachment* any judge who issues a warrant or certificate, or holds even the office of commissioner under the Federal law; and menaces with *infamous punishment* any ministerial officer, or officer of militia, who aids in its execution. Failure of the claimant to establish his claim by verdict of a jury, impaneled under the direction of State officers, paid out of the State Treasury, and counseled by a State attorney, hired for that purpose, subjects that claimant to a heavy fine, and confinement from one to five years in the penitentiary! Thus, in contempt of the compromises of the Constitution, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and that of Massachusetts, the slaveholder is, by her legislative enactment, denied his constitutional rights, and menaced with infamous punishment for their unsuccessful assertion; the seduction of southern slaves is encouraged, and their reclamation according to the supreme law of the land is forbidden!

Is it surprising, sir, that under the fostering Legislation of Massachusetts, and New York, and a few other northern States, companies of slave-stealers should have been organized in the non-slaveholding States, with branches in Canada, who make the theft or robbery of our property both their business and their boast? Their predatory incursions rob us annually, according to the estimates of distinguished members of Congress from the South, of slave property of the value of \$200,000.

But this estimate is certainly far too low. The New York Times, the mouth-piece of the Senator from New York, *boasts* that, since the passage of the fugitive slave law of 1850, 35,000 slaves have escaped from the southern States, of the value, it says, of \$35,000,000. "The most valuable slaves are those who escape," exclaims this honest editor. And he adds: "what interest in this country can survive an *annual* loss of \$4,000,000? Here is emancipation without the help of abolition." And these plundering forays of thieves and robbers, which, if committed by any foreign Power, would, in the days when the Union existed in *spirit*, as well as form, have aroused the whole people, North and South, to war and reprisals, not only escapes all punishment, or even rebuke, but receives the countenance and encouragement of State legislators, State Governors, and their Senators on this floor!

The champion and friend of the Senator from New York boasts and chuckles over an annual loss, by theft, of \$4,000,000 of slave property! I take his estimates as more reliable than those of southern men, because his associations doubtless afford him information we cannot procure. The Senator from New York, perhaps, can indorse his friend's statement. And the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] mentions, with ill-disguised joy and triumph, the expenditure of \$30,000 by the Government in recapturing Anthony Burns from Boston!

But, sir, Massachusetts shall not be tried upon the testimony, or convicted by the verdict, of

southern men. Neither shall she be acquitted by the partial and prejudiced judgment of the Senator from New York. By her own mouth shall she be accused, and by her own judgment shall she be condemned.

Massachusetts, which in 1643 covenanted with Plymouth, New Haven, and Connecticut, to restore runaway slaves upon a mere certificate, sent from those colonies, and secured for herself the same mode of recapture of her runaways; Massachusetts, which in 1703, by legislative enactment, *restrained* the manumission of negroes by exacting bonds of the master, to indemnify the town in which he lived from all charge for, or about, the negro liberated, because of his sickness, lameness, or other infirmity, and provided further, in case of manumission *without* said bond, for putting the negro to work for the benefit of said town; Massachusetts, which in 1707 punished with fine and imprisonment the harboring or entertaining of a slave without the master's consent; Massachusetts, whose own son, Nathan Dane, drew up and introduced into the Continental Congress, that provision in the ordinance of 1787, for the return of fugitive slaves; Massachusetts, whose own State Convention, in 1788, adopted the provision for the return of fugitive slaves, provided by the Federal constitution, without a single objection, and even with the approval of her patriot son, General Heath; Massachusetts, which in 1788, in view of that same provision in the Federal constitution, passed an act, inhibiting negro slaves from tarrying in her limits for a longer time than two months, and provided, in case of violation of it, punishment with stripes; Massachusetts, whose son, George Cabot, as Senator from that State, assisted in drafting the fugitive slave law of 1793, whose Representatives in Congress voted for the same, and whose son, John Adams, as Vice President of the United States, signed the same; Massachusetts, whose Representatives and Senators in Congress voted for a law, suggested by the same John Adams, and approved by him as President of the United States, empowering and requiring the chief justice of any district into which a slave might flee to cause his apprehension and delivery; Massachusetts, which in 1851, through her Legislature, while protesting against the fugitive slave law as abhorrent to her people, yet resolved—

"That while Massachusetts entertains these views of that law, she claims no right under the Federal Constitution to nullify, disregard, or forcibly resist the provisions of an act of Congress; that she has already, when such right was claimed by the State of South Carolina, expressed her opinion upon it, and she now reaffirms and repeats the following resolution, then passed by her Legislature, viz :

"That the Constitution of the United States of America 'is a solemn social compact by which the people of the said States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity formed themselves into one body politic, under a common government—that this Constitution, and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made under the authority of the same, are the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; and that no citizen, State or other member of the body politic, has a right, in any shape, or under any pretext, to annul or prevent the execution of the said Constitution, laws, or treaties, or any of them, excepting in such extreme cases as justify a violent resistance to the laws, on the principle of the natural and indefeasible prerogative of self defense against intolerable oppression.'"

—This same Massachusetts, regardless of her public honor, of her solemn stipulations of compact and confederation contained in the Federal Constitution, repeatedly acknowledged by her, now solemnly and deliberately, by her legislative action, violates her pledged faith and international integrity.

And in the face of all this—despite her own confession—the Senator from New York boldly denies that she has been guilty of any disregard of constitutional obligation! And the Senator from New Hampshire, with affected gravity, denies there has been any aggression on the part of the North. Indeed, sir, if I rightly interpret the sentiments avowed, and the public acts of both those Senators, they not only excuse and justify the nullification of Massachusetts, but also the theft and robbery of our property. The Senator from New York—if I mistake not—refused, while Governor of that State, to deliver up a negro thief identified, and arrested there, on the demand of the Governor of Virginia.

And in 1848 that Senator suggested such nullification of Federal laws by State legislation, and robbery and resistance of the master, in an address to the people of New York, in which he says:

"Reform your own code, extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and defend him as you would your paternal gods—correct your own error, that slavery has any constitutional guarantee which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished. Say to slavery, when it shows its bond, [that is, the Federal Constitution,] and demands its pound of flesh, that if it draws one drop of blood its life shall pay the forfeit."

What stronger commendation could he have furnished of the nullifying law of Massachusetts, or of organized slave-stealing, or of the murder of Kennedy, who perished in the effort to recover his slave in Pennsylvania? The Senator from New Hampshire justifies both the act of Massachusetts and robbery of our slave property in denying there has ever been aggression on the part of the North; and, indeed, affects to find its warrant in the Holy Scriptures, judging from his quotation from Deuteronomy.

Nor are nullification of Federal laws by State Legislatures, refusal to enforce them by State Governors, robbery and theft, the only expedients adopted to destroy the practical value of our constitutional right and legal mode for recovery of fugitive slaves. The general convention of Abolitionists assembled in Buffalo, in 1843, resolved, that, whenever called upon to swear to support the Federal Constitution, they would by mental reservation except that clause providing for fugitive slaves! Thus perjury and fraud are deliberately resolved upon and proclaimed as pious and proper means for wresting from us our property!

In fact, the doctrine is commonly held by Abolitionists, and perhaps by those Senators, that a slave becomes free by removal beyond the law which maintains his relation towards his master, and that the Federal Constitution does not recognize that relationship; and hence, that, whenever a slave escapes into a non-slaveholding State, he is thereby emancipated.

If, sir, to violate the sacred compacts of the Constitution, or the solemn obligations of treaties, or the laws of the land, designed for the protection of our property in slaves; if to refuse us any share in territory, which was nominally free

soil when acquired, and to exclude us even from that which was slaveholding when acquired; if to invade and rob our border States of their slaves, and to refuse to deliver the fugitive, or the negro thief, on demand, and to menace with the *penitentiary* the master who seeks his slave in your limits, be aggression, then may the South justly complain of some northern States and their citizens.

But aggression may be committed by words no less than by deeds—by States as well as by individuals. The slanderer or libeler is more detestable and dangerous than the robber or thief. The laws of all countries give redress to the victims of the former, as well as of the latter criminals. And does the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] know of no State or anti-slavery party, or man, in the North who has committed any aggression on the people of the South by *words* more offensive and injurious than the predatory irruptions of those bands of robbers who hang upon our frontiers? Is not our system of slavery habitually denounced as a *heinous crime* in the sight of God, which no human laws can justify, and no individual or State necessity can excuse or extenuate? Has not this been done by solemn legislative resolves? Is it not represented as the most *atrocious robbery* and the most pitiless and cruel tyranny? Are not the northern people adjured by their philanthropy, their patriotism, and their religion, “to trample *Altar, Constitution, the Union, under foot*,” if necessary to emancipate the negro? Are not slaveholders painted as tyrants towards their fellow-men and traitors to God, as inhuman, infamous, and despicable as Algerine pirates, or South Sea Islanders? Is not a ceaseless and persistent effort made to prepare the public mind North to loathe them as lepers and treat them as outlaws? Are not Christian seats required to close their churches against them as profaners of the sanctuary; civilized communities to exclude, and avoid them as engenderers of moral pestilence? Are not the aid of the pulpit, the court, the press, the hustings, the legislative hall, and the school, invoked to heap odium and infamy upon the heads of slave-owners, and make their very name a byword of hissing and scorn? Are not the purpose and plan of abolition to invoke upon the South the curse of Nineveh: “*I will cast abominable filth upon thee, and make thee vile, and set thee as a gazing stock?*” I need not quote authorities to establish the fact, that the reputation and renown of southern people are made the objects of systematic and persevering calumny and detraction. But, sir, as there are some recent illustrations in the speeches of men occupying seats on this floor, I will bring them to notice to-day.

In a speech at Albany, New York, in October last, the Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] took as his text “*the danger of extending slavery*,” and labors to prove that slaveholders are a “*privileged class*,” whom he charges with *fraud, perfidy, and dishonor*—with controlling the Government, domineering over the North, and preventing her from receiving her due share of the territories, treasures, trusts, and offices of the Union.

In the same month, in another speech, at Buffalo, New York, the Senator from New York indulges in similar denunciations, and says:

“*The non-slaveholder in slave States is allowed no inde-*

pendence, no neutrality” * * * “*whips, pistols, knives, enforce not merely their silence, but their active partisanship,*” [for slavery.] “*The right of free speech is lost to them, the right of suffrage is valueless to them, the honors and rewards of public office are denied to them.*”

This, sir, is the assertion of one professing to speak from personal knowledge acquired by a residence in the South. There is no difference, according to law and good morals, between the assertion of that which one knows to be false, and the assertion of that which he does not know to be true. I care not which horn of the dilemma the Senator chooses, but he must take one or the other. Sir, some of my predecessors—Senators from Alabama—were non-slaveholders. Some of her Representatives in Congress, in former days, were non-slaveholders. Many of the members of her State Legislature, at this day, are non-slaveholders, and many of those of past years were non-slaveholders. Doubtless, the same facts may be predicated of all the southern States. Non-slaveholders are as respectable, as proud of spirit, as independent and tenacious of their rights as slaveholders, and no less influential. I believe a majority of the officeholders in Alabama at this day are non-slaveholders. Being a slaveholder or a non-slaveholder is no recommendation or disqualification for office there.

The Senator from Ohio, [Mr. WADE,] speaking to a Maine audience in August last, denounces slaveholders as a “*handful of aristocrats*,” declares “*there is no more liberty for a white man in the South, unless he owns slaves, than there is for the slave himself*,” complains that the South has gotten too much territory, and “*is now smearing over with her slime the whole of the northern portion of this continent, with the intention of swallowing that also*,” and declares of slavery:

“*It is all a system of outrage, aggression, and wrong. Slavery founded in violence must always be aggressive; and the moment it ceases to be aggressive it ceases to be at all. That is its very life; its being is outrage; and the moment it ceases to commit these outrages, that moment it runs down. Therefore, if you will go along with us to restore things to the condition they were in previous to 1850, repeal this infamous fugitive slave law, and restore the rights invaded by the Kansas and Nebraska bills; if this is done, then you will not need to demand, what you have a right to demand, indemnity for the past and security for the future. Let us restore things to their former position; for, until we do that, our honor is not vindicated; the sense of justice of our fathers will not be appeased until we, their sons, have driven these vandals back and made them restore the rights they have stolen from us.*”

The Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. SUMNER,] speaking in Boston in November last, made “*the slave oligarchy and its usurpations*” his theme, and after showing the paucity of slave owners, says:

“*Yes, fellow-citizens, it is an oligarchy, odious beyond precedent; heartless, grasping, tyrannical; careless of humanity, right, or the Constitution; wanting that foundation of justice which is the essential base of every civilized community; stuck together only by confederacy in spoliation; and constituting in itself a magnum latrocinium; while it degrades the free States to the condition of a slave plantation, under the lash of a vulgar, despised, and revolting overseer.*”

After charging the oligarchy with taking the lion's share of offices and trusts of the Government, and enumerating its *usurpations*, he says:

“*Fellow-citizens, I have said enough to stir you; but this humiliating tale is not yet finished. An oligarchy seeking to maintain an outrage like slavery, and drawing its inspiration from this fountain of wickedness, is naturally base, false, and heedless of justice. It is vain to expect that men, who have serewed themselves to become the propagandists of*

this enormity, will be restrained by any compromise, compact, bargain, or plighted faith. As the less is contained in the greater, so there is no rileness of dishonesty, no denial of human rights, that is not plainly involved in the support of an institution, which begins by changing man, created in the image of God, into a chattel, and sweeps little children away to the auction block."

What more of defamation, vituperation, and vilification could be expressed or conceived? What worse could be uttered of Barbary corsairs or West India buccaneers? What Christian or civilized nation would form alliances with such monsters of iniquity, much less fraternize with them as members of the same political family, united by common interests, and devoted to the same civil destiny? What man of the least share of the virtues which constitute the grace and worth of manhood would take such miscreants to his bosom as friends, or recognize them as associates? And yet, those who profess to abhor and condemn us, when speaking behind our backs to a northern audience, here, on this floor, and in this city, seek the society, and, when permitted, make the acquaintance of slaveholders, salute them as equals, cordially grasp their hands as friends, and court their favor with abject sycophancy!

Mr. President, I shall not deign to vindicate my constituency or myself of calumnies so atrocious and so infamous. But I must say, that those who utter them are neither faithful friends nor frank foes: they deceive and mislead their constituents at home, and betray them here; they smile on us when present, and traduce us when absent; they

"Wear friendship's mask for purposes of spite;
Fawn in the day, and butcher in the night."

Such is the conduct of one whom the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] reverences as doing honor to the Senate by taking his seat on this floor—conduct which *he* humbly imitates, if his visits to the west end of this avenue have not been grossly misrepresented. Indeed, I suppose that Senator and all of his party have indorsed those calumnies by aiding in their publication, and circulating them under their own franks. And, sir, the Treasury of the United States is surreptitiously used to defray the expense of enveloping their pamphlet poison for dissemination through the mails.

Sir, we are not only represented as a people worthy of universal scorn, and deserving universal enmity, but our total destruction is encouraged and invoked by rallying to arms against us, not only all the world outside our limits, but our slaves and the non-slaveholders in our midst. To embolden our outside assailants, they are assured that we are utterly impotent for purposes of resistance or defense; and to encourage insurrection within, our slaves are assured of the sympathy of the world without. The Senator from Ohio, in the speech from which I have quoted, ridiculing the idea that the South can be driven by any aggressions to dissolve the Union, tells the people of Maine that "it is mean and contemptible in northern people to yield, as they have yielded, before this handful of aristocrats." "Yes, sir," says he, "the humbug of disunion has done more to cow down the spirit of the North than all other things put together. The fear of a dissolution of this Union! My God! only think of it for a moment! A dissolution

of the Union coming from the puny arm of the South. Six millions of people, with three millions of mortal enemies in their very midst, and no mechanic arts—not even the manufacture of a scow to row themselves across the rivers with! And yet they say, if you do not come to our terms, we will dissolve the partnership. Why, sir, there is not a business man anywhere, who, if he had such a partner, would hesitate to kick him out at once and have done with it."

The Senator from New York, [Mr. SEWARD,] in one of the speeches quoted, after speaking of the many bonds of the Union upon the North, says: "the slaveholders, in spite of all their threats, are bound to it by the same bonds, and they are bound to it also by a bond peculiarly their own—that of dependence on it for their own safety. Three millions of slaves are a hostile force constantly in their presence, in their very midst. The servile war is always the most fearful form of war. The world without sympathizes with the servile enemy. Against that war, the American Union is the only defense of the slaveholders—their only protection. If ever they shall, in a season of madness, recede from that Union and provoke that war, they will—soon come back again."

While "the world without" is thus aroused against us, and to "sympathize with the servile enemy," and the slaves within our limits are promised the sympathy of "the world without," these same men appeal to the pride, ambition, and envy of non-slaveholders in our midst to redress imputed wrongs by subverting the "privileged class," the "slave oligarchy." The Senator from Massachusetts tells them of the malign influences which bear with oppressive force upon free labor. They are taunted by the Senator from Ohio with the assertion, "that there is no more liberty for the white man in the South, unless he owns slaves, than there is for the slave himself;" and by the Senator from New York with the assertion that "slaveholders enforce their silence and their partisanship with whips, pistols, and knives." They are told by others no less credible, though less distinguished—high officials of the emigrant aid society—that their labor is unrewarded; that slavery taxes and degrades them; that the slave States are of small value indeed to the General Government, and southern trade is comparatively insignificant. And to bolster these calumnies, not only is history falsified, but southern men are vouched as witnesses, and their speeches garbled, misquoted, or misapplied.

And these are the foul libels and incendiary appeals, not of the scavengers of literature, who live like muck-worms upon corruption, but of grave and dignified men, who affect the honor, the decencies, and proprieties of gentlemen; of statesmen, who aspire to make laws for the government of twenty-five millions of people, to mold public opinion, to reform public morals and enlighten the public mind; of our peers, (nominally,) who sit on this floor as the equals of all of us, and the enemies of none of us, as the representatives of equal, confederate, and friendly States! If such be the effusions of the fountains of Black Republicanism, what must be the infusions of its cesspools?

Now, sir, I submit to honorable men whether greater aggression, or more wanton, or more base, could be committed against any society,

than such atrocious libels upon the southern people, and such violent and incendiary attacks upon their domestic institutions? They are intended and calculated to destroy all faith in them, to bring them under universal reprobation, to subvert, prostrate, and annihilate them. And yet—

“With that dull, rooted, callous impudence,
Which, dead to shame and every nicer sense,
Ne'er blushed, unless, in spreading vice's snares,
She stumbled on some virtue unawares,”

we are told there has been no aggression, no wrong done us; and the *President* is assailed with bitter invective, by those who participate in or approve these assaults, because, with true moral courage, and a just regard for our constitutional rights, he alludes to those citizens of the North who *officially intermeddle with our social institutions, and who are permanently organized in associations to inflict injury upon us by wrongful acts, which would be cause of war between foreign Powers, and only fail to be such in our system because perpetrated under cover of the Union.*

The Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. HALE]—the friend and associate of our assailants—assures us that all the anti-slavery men he knows “*disclaim, utterly, the purpose, desire, or power, to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists.*” There are none so deaf as those who *will not* hear; none so blind as those who *will not* see. Has he never seen or heard of those among whom Lysander Spooner is prominent, who deny that either the Constitution, the act of 1793, or 1850, requires the surrender of fugitive slaves—who declare that slavery itself is unconstitutional, and that Congress should, through its courts, *backed by military force, exert its power to abolish the institution in the States; and for that end should arm, organize, and discipline the slaves as militia?* Has he never heard of Phillips or Wright, Parker or Beecher, sage lawyers and pious doctors of divinity, who, conceding the constitutionality of slavery, propose to trample on Constitution, laws, and, if need be, the *Bible*, in order to put down slavery, and adjure the North to do so—peaceably if it can, forcibly if it must? Has he no knowledge of societies who annually announce and advocate the same propositions in their resolutions and addresses?

Sir, I was amazed at the declaration, even from the lips of the Senator from New Hampshire; for, notwithstanding his imputed addiction to trifling, and want of credit for sincerity, I did not think him willing to go into voluntary bankruptcy. No one can doubt that the Senator knows many more anti-slavery men than any southerner does, who are willing, ready and eager to assail slavery in the States, and only bide the time when they think they can do so safely and efficiently. He only deceives himself if he supposes such declarations from him deceive any one else. I need not go out of this Hall to find those who have avowed anti-slavery sentiments as extreme as can be uttered, and express the purpose and desire to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists. The Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] avowed, as much as eight years ago, when he declared there were “two antagonistic elements of society in America, freedom and slavery”—“that the party of freedom *seeks complete and universal emancipation*”—that slavery “*can be and it must be abolished, and you and I can and must do it*”—

and advised the cautious and insidious, but relentless and persistent mode by which to “*bring the parties of the country into an effective AGGRESSION UPON SLAVERY.*” He did not define his measure of abolition, but declared that “*whenever the public mind shall will the abolition of slavery, the way will open for it.*”

I think it was John Quincy Adams who said there were half a dozen clauses of the Constitution under which slavery might be abolished in the States. Who can doubt that a way would be opened, if necessary, through the bowels of the Constitution, to achieve the work by a party possessing the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and, thinking with the Senator, that they could and must abolish slavery. Indeed, did not the Senator deny to slavery the protection guaranteed it by the Constitution, when he said last fall that “it [slavery] is in violation of every line of the Declaration of Independence and the whole summary of personal rights contained in the Constitution?” And did he not invoke abolition even to save the Constitution, by declaring “slavery is not and never can be perpetual. It will be overthrown either peacefully or lawfully under this Constitution, or it will work the subversion of the Constitution, together with its own overthrow.”

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WILSON] avowed a like purpose and desire in a lecture at Boston, last spring, when he declared, with heroic egotism, “Send it abroad on the wings of the wind that I am committed, fully committed—committed to the fullest extent—in favor of IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL ABOLITION OF SLAVERY, wherever it exists under the authority of the Constitution.” Where he purposed to abolish slavery is explained in his letter, shortly after, to Wendell Phillips, in which he says: “I hope, my dear sir, we shall all strive to *unite and combine all the friends of freedom, forget each other's faults and short-comings in the past, and all labor to secure that coöperation by which alone THE SLAVE IS TO BE EMANCIPATED, and the domination of his master broken.* Let us remember that more than *three millions of bondmen, groaning under nameless woes, demand that we shall cease to reproach each other, and that we labor for THEIR deliverance!*” Thus, he points to the slaves in the States as those for whose *immediate and unconditional* emancipation he wishes to unite all the friends of freedom. His colleague [Mr. SUMNER] has often avowed the same designs, and did last fall, at Boston, when, after appealing to avarice and ambition to prostrate the “slave oligarchy,” for the sake of the treasures and offices of the Federal Government, he adds, as the crowning glory of such a triumph: “Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and you will possess the master-key with which to unlock the *whole house of bondage.* Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and the *gates of emancipation will be open at the South.*”

No one can misunderstand this language. It means that, when we are trampled under foot, and impotent for our defense, those who have their heels upon our necks will be able to dictate their own terms of emancipation to the southern States.

But, sir, why should I adduce proof of a fact which is as notorious as is the existence of an Abolition or Free-Soil party, and is known to every reading man in the world, except, forsooth,

the Senator from New Hampshire—taking his word for it.

Nor are those who concede that slavery in the States is beyond the reach of Congress under the Constitution, and profess their purpose to let it alone there, but yet avow their intention and their power to assail it in the Territories, this District, and wherever the national flag floats, less disposed or less determined to effect abolition in the States. They have the same goal in view, but propose to approach it by a circuitous instead of a direct path. They intend to constrain the States to do what radical Abolitionists propose to do by Congress or by force of arms.

What is the purpose of nullifying the *fugitive slave act*, and the constitutional provision under which it was framed, by personal liberty laws? The Abolitionists respond: "Give the panting fugitive this inestimable right [trial by jury] and in every northern State he is safe; for where can you find twelve impartial men among us who will decide, on their oaths, that a man has not a better right to himself than another has to him; that the blood which runs in his veins is not his own; that the right to liberty is not inalienable? *Secure this right to fugitives, and all the northern States of the southern part of the Confederacy will be drained of their slaves.*"

What is the object of abolishing the slave trade between the States? The Abolitionists reply: "Were it not for this grand canal of horrors—the 'infernal slave trade'—the dark waters would overflow and drown the *profitableness* of the system in these States, and *compel* them to *emancipate* in order to *save* themselves from *destruction*." * * "Cut this infernal artery, the monster would die; *starvation* would slowly but surely *consume* him in his southern, and *apoplexy* in his northern, abode. Fifteen years would number him among the dishonored dead."

Why abolish slavery in this District? The Abolitionists say, "The moral influence of it would pierce to the heart of the whole system. It would pronounce and sign its death-warrant. It would be the solemn verdict of the nation, decreeing the annihilation of this dark abomination. The highest legislative body of the Union representing the whole people would declare slavery *unfit to live*,—for let us not forget that Congress will abolish it, *not because it has the power, but because of its intrinsic wickedness*. The act would speak in authoritative tones to every slaveholding State, 'Go thou and do likewise!' It would write in letters of flashing fire, over the gateway of the national Capitol—'No admittance for slavery!' The whole system would thus be outlawed, branded with ignominy, consigned to *execration and ultimate destruction*.'"

Why prohibit slavery in the Territories? The Abolitionists say, "It is our *final hope for the extermination of slavery*. *Six or eight large States shall yet march into the Union with free banners floating in the breeze. Open the doors wide, and beckon in State after State from the Northwest, and the General Government is in our hands*. Then the *perpetuation of freedom* will be the great *idea of national legislation*. Slavery will melt away before its burning action, till the last vestige of it shall have disappeared."

Thus are we assured by the anti-slavery societies in their annual addresses, that in all these meas-

ures they have the same end and object in view—**THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE STATES**. They also assure us that they esteem as most efficient of all these measures, *the increase of non-slaveholding States in the West*.

What is the avowed purpose of those who, on this floor, oppose the admission of slaveholding States into the Union? The Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. SUMNER,] if my memory serves me, said: "Confine slavery to its present limits, and it will die of inanition like a spider under an exhausted receiver." Governor Chase, of Ohio, said "it would localize and discourage it." The Senator from Vermont [Mr. COLLAMER] said the northern people "consider that the extension of slavery over more country is to encourage and perpetuate it. *That the more it is circumscribed the less is it productive, and the sooner will it be emancipated.*"

And, sir, I might multiply quotations from numerous high authorities affording cumulative evidence of the same fact, that all of the measures proposed by those who disclaim a purpose to interfere with slavery in the States, but intend merely to denationalize and localize it, are conceived in the wish, and exerted with the expectation, that they will overthrow slavery in the States. The *indirect* consequences of the acts are the *direct* objects they hope to achieve. They seek the same end with radical Abolitionists, but by different means. The course of the latter is less odious and dangerous than that of the former. The one is open, direct, and manly; the other, insidious and dastardly. The one would afford an opportunity to repel the aggressor, or perish in the effort; the other would bind and paralyze us, and then starve us to death. The one offers no false hopes, but would destroy by one fell blow; the other eludes us with promises of mercy while slaying us alive. The one denies the obligations of the Constitution, or, admitting them, insists on a rescission of the contract, and a dissolution of the Union, in order that they may give free vent to their hostility, unrestrained by pledges of faith; the other, thinking they can accomplish abolition in the Union, and still enjoy navigation acts, fishing bounties, tariffs, and internal improvements, affect to love it, and reverence the Constitution, while accepting all the benefits it confers, and evading the duties it enjoins.

An army with banners is preferable to a Trojan horse. All the anti-slavery measures which have been suggested are legitimate fruits of abolition, upon which avarice and ambition feed and batten.

The first general abolition society in the United States was formed in Boston in 1832. They declared their object was "to effect the abolition of slavery in the United States, and to obtain for free *people of color* equal civil and political rights and privileges with the whites." They presented to the slaveholder the alternative of "*life or death*." They said, "The master must manumit his slave, or the slave will manumit himself"—to manumit him is "to shut the flood-gates of human woe and human blood"—to hold him in vassalage will "*have a direct tendency to unsheath the sword of vengeance, revolution and death*." Such were their avowals of purpose—such their somber vaticinations. Yet they only proposed to exert *moral* means. The next year the American Anti-Slavery Society was formed in New York. They

professed the same purposes, but proposed the exertion of *political*, as well as moral means; to invoke the aid of the pulpit, the press, and the school to teach "*that slavery is a heinous crime in the sight of God, and that the duty, safety, and best interest of all concerned require its immediate abandonment without expatriation;*" "to invoke Congress to put *an end to the domestic slave trade, to abolish slavery in all those portions of our common country which come under its control, especially in the District of Columbia, and likewise to prevent its extension to any State that may hereafter be admitted.*" All unlawful means in effecting it were however disclaimed.

What they have achieved has been partly told. Their growth has kept pace with population; their demands have increased with their power. Despised, hooted, and mobbed twenty years ago, they now constitute a strong political party confessedly; they *allege* the first in point of numbers in the northern States. They have rent asunder all orthodox Christian denominations but three, and sectionalized them under the designations of northern and southern churches. They influenced the Methodist Church North to violate the precepts of religion and principles of common honesty by appropriating to its exclusive use the common property, without even the plea of *necessity* with which the highwayman excuses his robbery. They have induced a general adoption by those churches of their shibboleth—*no communion with slaveholders*. They have supplanted the religion of Christ with the gospel of abolition—insomuch that their ministers every Sabbath proclaim war against the South, instead of "peace, good-will towards men;" and teach the damnation of slaveholders, instead of the salvation of sinners. They have rendered valueless the constitutional right of southern men to carry their slaves into, or through, several of the non-slaveholding States; and have made the slaveholder so odious in those States that he is greeted with insult and injury whenever he enters them. They have made it cause of reproach to befriend a slaveholder. They have driven southern students from northern colleges, and many southern travelers from their cities and watering-places. They have extorted from the Legislatures of at least five northern States acts virtually nullifying the fugitive slave laws of 1793 and 1850, and violating both confederate and constitutional obligations. They have acquired entire control of the Legislature of Massachusetts, which has not only twice adopted a motion to amend the Constitution by abolishing slave representation in Congress, but has initiated, under its paternal auspices, that *race of absorption* which one of her sons contemplates with complacency and doubt as to its result, by *legalizing the marriage of blacks and whites!* In *Massachusetts* coarse sensualism and refined taste may now gratify depraved or morbid appetites in free commerce of the sexes of every hue, from sooty black to Parian white, under the sanction of lawful *wedlock!* And, judging from the social affinities of the races thus declared, and the reported amalgamation already begun in Massachusetts, the time may not be remote when one of her Senators may offer to introduce at the levees of a President his sable spouse, and claim for her that equality here which she enjoys at home!

And now, sir, I ask, is it surprising that the

people of Missouri, and of the entire South, should regard the movement of Massachusetts for colonizing Kansas with distrust and disfavor, with apprehensions for their safety, and a disposition to fortify and defend themselves. Seeing what fanaticism has achieved, and contemplating what it proposes, how could the people of Missouri fail to exert every means reconcilable with constitutional or natural law to prevent the planting of a colony in their midst, embodying the sentiments and principles, the civil laws and ecclesiastical regulations maintained by the dominant party of Massachusetts? Had she proposed to convert Kansas into a *penal* colony, would Missourians have been at fault in resisting? Had she proposed to transfer there the foreign white *paupers*, who, with amiable philanthropy, she has forced back to their trans-atlantic homes, would Missouri have had no excuse in her example in repelling or expelling them? Yet, how much more detestable and dangerous than mendicants or criminals, are those who are taught by precept and example to disregard the Constitution and the laws, and even the Decalogue itself, in order to achieve their ends? *Paupers* are drones who tax society, but do not menace its existence. Ordinary felons are content with a small sphere of operation, and, with a few victims on whom to glut their evil passions, and rarely exhibit in a single individual a violation of *all* the laws of the land. While they break the law they acknowledge its majesty, and admit the justice of its penalties.

But Abolitionists deny all authority, human or divine, which permits involuntary servitude; advocate emancipation of the *black* race at every hazard, and by any sacrifice of the *white* race; counsel universal *treason* against the laws of man or God to resist imputed wrongs, and invoke universal rapine and desolation for their redress! They teach the slave that his master is a tyrant towards man and a traitor towards God; that to escape from him, by fraud or force, by falsehood, arson, murder, any means, is approved of God and all good men. They teach non-slaveholders to sympathize with fugitive slaves, to harbor them, to resist all who would arrest them, to *defend them as they would their household gods*, and to violate any law which conflicts with their rescue. They present the slaveholder the alternative offered by the highwayman to his victim, *your property or your life*. This dread prophecy of Abolition in 1832 has already become dire reality, as the loyal blood of Kennedy, Gorsuch, and Batchelder attests. And, what is more appalling than death to the brave men of the land of Daniel Boone, and as horrible to their chaste daughters as dishonor, they proclaim, as a necessary incident or consequence of emancipation, the elevation of blacks to perfect equality with whites and a race of absorption between them! What could be expected but enmity, dissension, and bloodshed between contiguous States with populations so antagonistic in sentiments and principles as Massachusetts Abolitionists and Missouri slaveholders? Yet Massachusetts has endeavored to make Kansas a seminary in which to plant all the abolition ideas I have enumerated, well knowing that such evils as domestic strife, fraternal bloodshed, and perhaps civil war, would be produced. And the Senator from Vermont,

[Mr. COLLAMER,] professing to be a man of peace, and to look forward with joyous hope to that millennial period when nations shall no longer go to war, says in his report, in substance, that these evils would possibly ensue, but that Massachusetts did right! And those other men of peace, the Senators from Massachusetts, [Mr. SUMNER,] and New York, [Mr. SEWARD,] say well done by Massachusetts, and well spoken by the author of the report. And the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. HALE,] contemplating the impending strife in Kansas, but protesting he is not a man of war, avows that he has "sometimes wished that God in his Providence would let it come!"

When I hear such inflammatory speeches from those standing here as guardians of that Constitution which was designed to insure domestic tranquillity, and who, by virtue of their senatorial office, have acquired an influence which all their talents combined would scarce impart to a private citizen, I am reminded of the priest who set fire to the temple with the flame he had stolen from the altar. Sir, the madness of the times has displayed no more frantic exhibition than we have witnessed on this floor. Divested of all the drapery of rhetoric, the plain logic of the champions of Black or Red Republicanism in Kansas is this: the natural and necessary results of the colonization of Kansas with Abolitionists are domestic violence and civil war; but these are lesser evils than slavery; therefore, let them come! The simple solution of the issue between pro-slavery and anti-slavery men in Kansas, which they all anticipate with complacency, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE] with joy, is the bloody arbitrament of battle, and the arguments to be used are grape, canister, and cold steel. But his joy is not—

"That proud joy which warriors feel
In meeting foemen worthy of their steel;"

but the joy of one in conscious security from danger, while looking out from his loophole of retreat over fields of human carnage.

The attempt to justify the course of Massachusetts in undertaking to control the destiny of Kansas by precedents, or to reconcile it with her obligations to her sister States, is not less insulting than disingenuous. Those who cite the settlement of the original colonies by England, or the western wildernesses by the different States of our Union, *know* that they were not stimulated by the inducements, the motives, the feelings, or the objects which gave rise to the Massachusetts movement towards Kansas. It was not to get rid of a redundant population, to wrest a wilderness from savages for the use of civilized men, to open new fields of commerce, to increase the defenses or add to the strength of our common country, that Kansas was coveted. Immigration to that Territory was matter of neither necessity nor choice. No, sir, deep-seated and rancorous hostility toward the South, or, if it be preferred, to the slaveholders of the South, originated the emigrant aid society. It was a demonstration of hostility to the South more offensive and inexcusable than any former legislative action touching slavery by any northern State. Hitherto, offensive legislation was intended to operate on persons or things within their own limits, or, if beyond them, through congressional acts. Such

were their personal liberty bills, and their instructions to their Senators and Representatives to vote against the admission of slaveholding States, and in favor of the abolishment of slavery in this District. This was the first effort to enact State laws, to operate extra-territorially against slavery. It was the first crusade against slavery, initiated, organized, and prosecuted under the auspices of a State. Congress in 1850 and 1854 had settled the doctrine of non-intervention, and disclaimed the power of the Federal Government to regulate the internal policy of the Territories, or to mold their domestic institutions. But this supreme power, disclaimed by Congress and denied to belong to the general Government of all the States, is arrogated by the single State of Massachusetts. Incensed at the neutrality of Congress, she has resolved to lay her own hand upon slavery, and crush it out from Kansas. She has attempted to legislate for Kansas and to govern it through the medium of a great moneyed corporation, sitting in Boston.

Knowing that slavery to some extent existed in that Territory, and that its proximity to Missouri, and sameness of latitude, soil, climate, and productions, tended to establish that institution—knowing that emigration proceeds mainly in the same parallel of latitude, and that those in the Eastern States who might be induced by interest, or driven by necessity to go West, would follow the main body of emigrants, and find homes in the unbroken wilderness of Illinois and Iowa, of Minnesota or Nebraska—those who controlled the legislation of Massachusetts, and have availed themselves of it, in order to divert this current of emigration from its natural and accustomed channel, and pour it into Kansas, have invoked the combined aid of the vilest passions of depraved humanity and the most irrational and ferocious fanaticism. Sectional envy, jealousy, and hatred of the South, have been aroused by representing the repeal of the Missouri restriction as conceived in the wish and framed for the purpose of extending slavery, and aggressive in its policy upon the rights of the North; and the northern people have been adjured by their self-love and self-respect to resent the insult and revenge the injury. And yet the very men who bewail the obliteration of the Missouri restriction, in affected strains of grief and indignation, as a breach of plighted faith, never kept the faith when an opportunity was afforded for its violation for their benefit and our injury, and never failed to denounce the restriction and stigmatize it as the odious *black line*, or *Algerine line*, while it existed. They talk with well-feigned dread of the portentous increase of the slave-power under that act, and of the past and prospective aggressions and usurpations of the "slave oligarchy," well knowing that the South has been retreating instead of advancing in relative territorial extent and numerical strength; that she has yielded in territory and treasure to the aggrandizement of the North and her own enfeeblement, until she is now unable to maintain her rights in the Union, and is dependent upon the Democratic party, the constitutional party of the North, for their preservation. They deprecate, in piteous and pious tones, the increase of slavery and the aggravations of the wrongs of the black race, well knowing that their introduction there will not add

one to the existing number of slaves, and will tend rather to ameliorate their condition.

Not content with appealing to anti-slavery feeling, to sympathy with the negro and hatred for his owner, to ambition and the love of sectional domination, they appealed to a passion which we are assured by one of the agents and orators of the emigrants' aid society never fails to unite the North—the *love of money*. They promised to make “a good thing of it”—that is, a scheme for realizing large pecuniary rewards for small risks. They proposed to colonize Kansas with anti-slavery paupers, men “*who could not do without the advantages offered them by the society*”—“*to be retained in its cause*”—“*to be under control of that organization*”—“*to be bound to it*”—“*to be under bonds to make Kansas a free State.*” I quote from the address of Mr. Thayer, the agent of the society. The organization was to secure them cheap transportation to Kansas, and there to build their dwellings, mills, churches, and school-houses. Thus much has been conceded by a prominent member of the emigrants' aid society, Mr. Thayer, in his public address. Thus much of the mode of working and the materials to be used has leaked out of Mr. Thayer in his appeals to the northern public for aid in this enterprise. Although, in the same address, he affects that the company will and do transport all who apply for aid without inquiring for their views of slavery, yet his own admissions negative this assertion. He pledges, upon condition of certain moneyed contributions, to send enough men *under bonds* to make Kansas a free State. He admits that those sent *cannot do without the advantages afforded them by the society*; that they are its retainers under its control—bound to it as apprentices.

The emigrants' aid men are, confessedly, not freemen, but *villeins* in the service of the company; not free agents, but agents of the company; dependents, unable to stand alone; beneficiaries, living on the bounty of their patrons. They go to Kansas, not of their own will or choice, but by the inducements offered by the company. They do not go relying on their own strong arms and brave hearts for support, but trusting to the company to afford them those *advantages they cannot do without*. They do not go to originate a State, but to mold one after the model prescribed in Massachusetts. Nor are Mr. Thayer's declarations the only evidence afforded that those emigrants are the hirelings, dependents, and liegemen of that society. The entire programme of their proceedings, from the advent of the first cargo landed in Kansas up to the last scene of the farce enacted by the mock Legislature at Topeka, had been published in Boston and New York in advance of the various performances. The eastern seers have enjoyed the rare triumph of witnessing the complete fulfillment of their prophecies in Kansas; but they have consulted the organs of the aid society who keep the book of fate for that Territory. Indeed, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WILSON] has displayed the same prophetic spirit on this floor, having told us several weeks in advance what has been done by the amateur Legislature at Topeka.

But, sir, there is one part of the machinery of the incorporation for ruling Kansas that has not been fully explained; and that is, when and how the stockholders are to derive the profits of their

investments. Whether to be paid in money, in land, or in labor, by their hirelings; whether in speculations in town lots, or the public lands, or the Indian reservations, is somewhat questionable. The bold blunder of Governor Reeder, however, coupled with the statements of the secretary of the emigrant aid company, directing what sites are to be located for the company, and for what purposes, show that they propose to speculate on the ignorance and helplessness of the Indians in getting possession of their lands, and, perhaps, on the frauds and perjuries of their hand-plants whom they may place as settlers and preëmptors on the Government lands. We are warranted, by the orders of the secretary and the example of the Governor, in saying that they mean to get land—honestly, perhaps, if they can; but, if not, still they mean to get land. They are not scrupulous about laws or treaties. Enough of their policy has been developed by their organs to show that the scheme is at war with the just and liberal spirit of the land laws of the United States, which were intended to secure homesteads, on easy terms, to the landless, and to prevent speculations in the public domain, or the appropriation of large bodies of it by individuals, or by associations, with great moneyed capitals.

But, if combinations of little bands of speculators, united in interest by small capital, should endanger popular rights, and excite the apprehensions of Congress, so as to induce the most stringent legislation to defeat their schemes, how much more dangerous and detestable a State corporation, whose moneyed capital is told by millions, and which aims at the appropriation of an entire Territory to the exclusion of the people of fifteen States of the Union! Individuals, or private companies, would absorb a few sections, or, at most, a township, while nothing short of a Territory will satiate the State corporation's lust of dominion. I have heard of the hardy pioneers organizing and arming themselves, preparatory to an approaching sale of the public lands, in order to silence by force, if necessary, the land monopolists who should attempt to purchase their humble homes. Is it surprising, that this mammoth corporation, which proposes to grasp a wilderness, whose boundaries are described by parallels of latitude and longitude, and settle it with its tenants, should excite the indignation, and provoke the resentment and resistance of those who dwell upon its borders?

And is it possible that any Senator will justify these contemplated schemes of land monopoly by the emigrant aid society? If Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts corporation, had proposed to buy the Territory, Congress would not dare sell it on any condition. If the State, or its corporation, through its agents, offered to enter the lands of the Territory, it would not be permitted at the land offices, or tolerated by the Government. Wherein lies the difference between the State or its corporation buying the Territory or entering the lands there, and the hireling emissaries of the State doing the one or the other for the benefit of the corporation? There is none in principle; it is achieving the same thing by different means. It is assuming dominion in the former case, openly and directly; in the later, covertly and indirectly. The former is honest; the latter dishonest. That it was intended and proposed to appropriate the

Territory to Free-Soilers by money power, the power of associated capital, is distinctly proclaimed. The same Mr. Thayer says, comparing the emigrant aid society with the southern emigrants, "we put our riches against their poverty, and say they cannot stand them." I could cite many similar declarations to show that land monopoly by the strength of associated capital was its aim and object.

Although the Constitution nowhere inhibits the intervention of a State in the affairs of a Territory, yet the attempt of Massachusetts to govern Kansas by laws passed in a State Legislature at Boston, would clearly be an invasion of the rights of other States to which they would scarcely submit. This, I presume, will be conceded by all the Senate, except, perhaps, the Senator from New York, [Mr. SEWARD,] who declared, that "*whatever is not expressly forbidden by the Federal Constitution may lawfully be done by the States!*"—a sentiment not only hostile to the peace of the Union, but to public virtue and State honor. But wherein is there any real or practical difference in Massachusetts passing laws to operate on the people of Kansas, and governing them through the medium of a State corporation sitting in Boston? If there be any, it is in favor of the government of the State, rather than of her corporation. Nor did the patrons of this eastern emigration rely upon the strength of money and numbers alone, to abolitionize Kansas. Despite the positive denials of their champions on this floor, their hirelings were equipped for violence and war. They did not carry with them the implements of industry, but the instruments of death. Cannon and Sharpe's rifles were their tools of trade.

It has been said on this floor, that fire-arms were not carried there until the invasion of the "Border Ruffians." To disprove this assertion, I will not adduce the testimony of Missourians, members of Congress, and private citizens, or of the Delegate from Kansas, but I offer that of the head and front of Black Republicanism, if not its embodiment—the editor of the New York Tribune. In his orders, issued early in March last, he tells his subalterns they "*must continue to do what they have been doing ever since the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act,*"—"pour free settlers into Kansas well armed with Sharpe's rifles or other convenient weapons." Who of his party will dare commit petit treason, by denying the truth of his assertion? The emigrant aid society, or some confederate association, supplied their first emigrants with Sharpe's rifles; which they were taught, by pious parsons, learned professors, and patriotic statesmen, were more efficient moral agents than bibles, among slaveholders. They were sent prepared, if they failed to triumph with the missile of the ballot-box, to resort to the missile of the cartridge-box. Physical force was contemplated, if other means failed to drive slaveholders from that Territory. Abolition presses were filled with such advice, and, indeed, the speeches of the Senators from which I have quoted suggest the same thing.

If, sir, those emigrants believed with the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. WADE,] that slaveholders were the enemies of the northern people—*Vandals*, who had *stolen* the rights of the North; or with the Senator from New York, [Mr. SEWARD,] that slaveholders were a *dishonorable and perfid-*

ious privileged class; or with the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. SUMNER] that slaveholders were *heartless, grasping, tyrannical robbers*, banded together for *spoliation*; or believed, with all those Senators, that there was no more freedom for non-slaveholders than for slaves in the South, who were alike governed with whips, pistols, and knives, by slaveholders; sir, if they credited these *honorable and veracious* Senators, how could they—plain, honest, unsophisticated men, who had never learned to smile and stab—be so regardless of self-preservation as to go unarmed to Kansas? And may I not add, how could they neglect the pious, patriotic, and self-defensive task of expelling slaveholders from that Territory?

Sir, I will dwell no longer on this point. The flame of civil war in Kansas was kindled by men who minister profanely in this temple of the Union, as well as by priests who impiously desecrate the house of God. They are even now industriously heaping fuel on the flame they have kindled. Repining at their failure to drive southern men from Kansas, they are now charging upon them and the President oppression of the people of the Territory. Whom do they mean by the people of Kansas?—the Free-Soil and free-State men, who have endeavored to extemporize an independent and equal member of the Union. And what is their number? Seven hundred and nineteen men, by their own counting! So said their own organ—the Herald of Freedom—published in Kansas, in stating the vote for the Free constitution. This fact was presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. JONES] nearly two months ago; and it has never been disproved, or, I believe, contradicted, brought in question, or alluded to, by the opposition. The Red or Black Republican party in Kansas is composed of a small minority of the people, by their own confession—of scarcely more than one tenth of the legal voters of the Territory! To give this minority the control of that Territory, is the immediate object of all the clamor, the weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth, which we have heard. To obtain for that party the control of this Government in order to satisfy the avarice and ambition of its leaders, is the ulterior purpose. The offense of the President and the Democracy is, that they will not yield to the arrogant demands of that minority and their leaders upon this floor.

[Here Mr. CLAY was obliged, by hoarseness of voice and physical exhaustion, to suspend his remarks. He said he had something more to say in reply to the Senator from New York, [Mr. SEWARD,] which, if his health permitted, he would deliver hereafter. He asked to print some concluding reflections, which he had not now the voice to utter.]

Yes, sir, it is the avarice and ambition of the few that has aroused and is stimulating the spirit of abolition and of sectional domination to seize upon Kansas and wrest it from southern settlers by fraud or by force.

Fanaticism and sectionalism serve as waves in the sea of popular passion, which selfish aspirants are lashing into fury, that they may ride upon their crests into office. It is not the elevation of the negro to perfect equality with the white man they seek, but the elevation of themselves to the high places of the Government. It is not for the

defense of the North against the aggressions and usurpations of the South that they labor, but for the destruction of the South, which stands as a lion in the pathway of their preferment to the Presidency, the Cabinet, and our foreign Ministry. It is not to secure Kansas for free labor that they struggle, but to secure it as a stepping-stone for their own self-aggrandizement. Through all the habiliments of language, with which they cloak their designs, *self* is as apparent as was the person of the Greek courtesan beneath the gauzy veil with which she was invested. To satiate their lust to shine and rule, they will imperil not only present peace and prosperity, but blast the bright hopes of the future greatness and glory of our common country. Determined to rule or ruin, they strive to consolidate the North to struggle for sectional dominion over the South, not only under the forms of peace, but to enter the listed field, and, by civil war, to enforce its mandates at the point of the sword.

But, sir, I hope that the smooth and insidious pretenses by which they are striving to enkindle a war of opposing sectional interests, more dreadful than foreign invasion, will be exposed and seen by the northern people in time to forestall their efforts, disappoint their selfish hopes, and defeat their traitorous designs.

There is, I trust and believe, in the Democratic party and the few remaining national Whigs of the North, an enlarged patriotism which no apparent sectional interest can corrupt, and a love of justice which no selfish sophistry can seduce. They know that the assertion that the men of the North and the men of the South are *enemies*, is a libel upon both, and an attempted fraud upon both, in order to serve the selfish ambition of pretended friends of one and undisguised foes of the other section of the Union. They know that in war southern blood has been freely shed in defense of northern soil, northern shipping, and northern seamen; and that southern men never paused to count their costs or calculate their gains when the interest or the honor of any portion of the Union was assailed by foreign foes. They know that in peace the South has lavished her golden treasures upon every industrial interest of the North, while neither claiming nor asking Federal bounties for any industrial interest of her own. They know that the South has yielded her own territory, as well as the common territory won mainly by her diplomacy or valor, to the North, with an unselfishness and generosity for which no parallel can be found in the history of any other confederate States. They know that the South has never claimed or enjoyed more than her share of the trusts and honors of the Federal Government; and that, if her sons have oftener filled the presidency, it was by the will of northern no less than southern freemen. They know that the South asks nothing that the North cannot grant and ought not to grant. They know that

the South is, and will ever be, in a minority in both Houses of Congress, and is powerless for aggression on the North in peace and under the forms of law. They know that, if Kansas should become a slave State, the balance of power will be, and forever continue, with the North. They know that northern interests and northern rights are neither menaced nor endangered by the South. And, above all, I trust they not only know, but feel, that the freemen of the South are fellow-countrymen, friends, and equals, with whom they are affiliated, not only by compacts under the same Federal Government, but by reciprocal interests and congenial principles; and not only by those but by mystic chords of sympathy—as strong, though not so sacred, as solemn pledges of faith—growing out of kindred blood, a common language, historic recollections of united trials and united triumphs in the past, and a cherished love of their undivided heritage of glory in the present.

But, sir, if, contrary to my hopes and expectations, Black Republicanism shall achieve the triumph at the North it so vauntingly predicts; if its leaders shall succeed there in identifying patriotism with sectionalism, liberty with licentiousness, loyalty to the Constitution with disloyalty to the rights of man, justice to the South with injustice to the North, southern men with enemies, and their northern friends with traitors; if its leaders shall raise a storm of infuriate fanaticism and vindictive sectional malice, which, sweeping over the North, shall overwhelm and prostrate the few heroic champions of the Constitution, of the equality of the States and the equality of their citizens, who now stand sentinels over the sacred trust of popular and State rights; if its leaders, fresh from fields of sectional victory, shall possess themselves of the executive and legislative branches of this Government—I know not what the South will do, but I think I know what she ought to do, in resenting insult offered and resisting injuries meditated, in vindicating her honor and preventing her humiliation. I trust, sir, despite the insolent and insulting taunts of poverty, weakness, and dependence on the Union, hurled at her by her enemies even on this floor, that she will not take counsel of her fears but of her hopes, rather—hopes inspired by proud recollections of past heroic achievements, by exulting consciousness of her present power, by glowing visions of her future greatness, and by that indignant fervor of soul which her wounded honor and imperiled independence must enkindle. I trust, sir, that, whenever Black Republicanism shall take possession of this Government, and weigh in its balances, and against its avarice and ambition, the honor and the rights of the South, she will not stoop to impetrate justice or pause to expostulate, but will boldly throw her sword into the scale and assert her natural privilege of self-defense.

l
t
l
e
l
z
l
P
c
d
o
s
e
t
a
p
a
g
w
t
h
m
e
c
h
w
s
q
a
w
d
w
t



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 016 085 231 8