

P19152
1000

S P E E C H

OF

MR. TIMOTHY RIVES,

OF PRINCE GEORGE AND SURRY,

IN THE

VIRGINIA STATE CONVENTION,

On the 29th March, 1861,

THE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL RELATIONS

BEING UNDER CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

RICHMOND:

PRINTED BY CHAS. H. WYNNE.

E464

R29

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Library
West Virginia University

MR. TIMOTHY RIVES,

OF PRINCE GEORGE AND BARRY,

IN THE

VIRGINIA STATE CONVENTION,

On the 20th March, 1861,

THE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL RELATIONS

BEING UNDER CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RICHMOND:

PRINTED BY CHAS. H. WYMAN.

SPEECH.

Mr. RIVES of Prince George and Surry.—Mr. Chairman, there is no man more sensible than I am of the great responsibility which rests upon this Convention. Sir, I will remark at the outset, that during this debate, I have not heard one word uttered by any member who has spoken. You, therefore, who have had these advantages over me, will, I am satisfied, while I give my views upon the great questions which now agitate the country, excuse me for not referring to what others may have said. That others who have been so fortunate as to hear the eloquent arguments which have been made here, have received much light on the subject, there can be no doubt. Nor am I vain enough to believe that the effort which I am now about to make, will influence the mind of any of the Committee. Elected by a generous and confiding constituency, who knew my defect in hearing when they cast their suffrages for me, I rise to perform a duty, which they, against my wishes, imposed upon me; for, I will here add, that I did not wish to become a candidate, and made it known to them, that if they would nominate some other individual, who entertain views similar to my own, that I would take the stump for him in the district and keep it till the day of election. Under these circumstances, the unanimous voters of Prince George and Surry sent me to this Convention.

In laying down the line of policy which I think Virginia ought to pursue, should I be so unfortunate in any of my remarks, as to place any member in a false position or misstate the record of any public man or measure, I trust my attention will be called to it, that the proper correction may be made. I will go further and add, that whilst I cannot engage in a sparring debate, I will cheerfully answer any questions that may be put to me in writing, during the delivery of my remarks. Again, if I know my heart, I accord to every member the same honesty of purpose, the same purity of motives which I claim for myself.

Every consideration, so far as I am myself concerned, would have induced me to remain silent. Having assumed the responsibility, however, as their representative in this Convention, I shall attempt to perform my duty to the best of my ability, and in accordance with what I believe to be their sentiments on the present alarming state of affairs.

Sir, no man is more sensible than I am of the wrongs and injustice that have been perpetrated by the North upon the South. No man has more resolutely, more constantly and more persistently battled against these aggressions, without variation or change, than I have. Yes sir, I claim here, that if there is one peculiar characteristic that distinguishes my limited public career, it is that of one unvarying line of standing up for the rights and interests of the South; and so far as my record is concerned, I defy any man to point out a single act which is not in keeping with this declaration—I defy any man to lay his finger on any act of inconsistency in my whole political life. But, sir, I don't rise to vindicate the consistency of my past course, upon the subject of slavery or any other subject. In the line of my duty, sir, I deemed it necessary in past days to oppose the elevation to the governorship of the distinguished Governor McDOWELL, of Rockbridge, also my distinguished and eloquent friend from Kanawha (Mr. SUMMERS), likewise the gentleman who now occupies the Executive mansion. I opposed these gentlemen, sir, in pursuance of a consistent line of policy which I had marked out for myself. I performed my duty without fear, favor or affection. "I nothing extenuated, or set down aught in malice." And I tell gentlemen here, that I will now battle with all the powers at my command to maintain the Union. Yes, sir, I shall do everything that I can, in the line of public duty, to keep floating the banner of the Union, to hold up that banner while I have strength to do so. I will tell agitators, North and South, to keep the peace. I will stand between the two, and with hands outstretched I will keep the enemies of the Union apart, till the people in their majesty come to the rescue and save from Vandal

hands the great heritage of our ancestors. I will state briefly, sir, the line of policy and the course of argument which I shall pursue:

First, sir, I shall attempt to show, that, under existing circumstances, the Union should not be dissolved.

Second, That, from the foundation of the Government up to the present time, there never have sprung up any dissensions—no differences have ever existed between the different sections of the country—no dissensions, either sectional or local, have arisen which have not been corrected and redressed by legislation, and such other modes as are recognized by the Constitution.

Third, That the legislation of the country and the Constitution of the country were always sufficient to vindicate the rights of every individual and each section, and that they are sufficient to-day to maintain the rights of all without a resort to disunion, and that disunion affords no redress.

Fourth, That there have been, for the last twenty-five or thirty years, a set of individuals who have been constantly endeavoring to break up the Union; and that they are merely availing themselves of the present state of things to give effect to their designs.

Again, sir, I propose to show that politicians from the North and the South, whose designs have been to dissolve the Union, have been universally condemned by the American people up to this time, and that the secession movement, which was inaugurated in the Cotton States, is the result of their efforts, long since planned by designing demagogues and political aspirants for power.

Having referred to these subjects in the past history of the country, I propose at a proper time to show that the plan of adjustment which we recommend is sufficient to settle the whole matter in dispute between the North and South.

Why, sir, should the Union be dissolved? Do you enjoy your religion now? Do you enjoy your liberty? Have you a position among the nations of the earth? Has the right of search been abandoned? Is not your flag allowed to float every where, commanding the respect of all nations? Has not your population increased from three millions to thirty-one millions? Has not your territory increased until it is no longer bounded by the Atlantic and the Mississippi, but by the Atlantic and the Pacific? Does not all this exist? If you have your right to worship God as you may see fit; if you have enjoyed your liberty; if you stand high among the nations of the earth, commanding their respect every where; if your population has increased from three millions to thirty-one millions; if you have your rights secured under the Constitution, and you have grown up under it and prospered to the degree that no country has ever prospered before—why dissolve this Union? Why? But one answer is given. There has arisen a great question upon the institution of slavery; and at the proper time I shall refer to that subject.

It is my opinion, sir, however man may attempt to sever this Union, God in his wisdom has so constituted the American Union that the American people in these thirty-four States are bound to remain together by the unchangeable decrees of His will. Climate, soil, products and labor, adapted to each section, all prove it. Behold the beef, pork and grain pouring in from the North-western portion of this country. Turn to the sunny South, and see what her products are. She produces the sugar, the cotton, the rice, the tobacco. Listen to the Middle and New England States, and hear the busy hum of the machinery that is hourly throwing back the raw material manufactured into raiment for the toiling planter of the South and the Hoosier of the North-west, in exchange for the food they receive at their hands. All this stands a living fact before the eyes of the present generation.

From the first settlement of our ancestors at Jamestown, daily and yearly experiments have been going on to ascertain the climate, soil, labor and products adapted to each section of the country; and now that the great problem is solved, that slave labor alone is adapted to the sunny South, and that this institution has gradually receded from the North, where it was neither profitable nor desirable, we, who have the slave labor where we want it, rashly strike a suicidal blow at the American Union, upon the preservation of which, in my opinion, the permanence and perpetuation of this institution rest.

I repeat, sir, that the hand of God is seen in this. Our necessities and dependence on each other will make and continue us one nation. If not by choice, circumstances will make us so.

Gentlemen may complain that our association with our brethren of the North is unnatural. They reproach their Maker without knowing it. In His providence, He has placed in the same forest beasts and insects, which war upon and devour each other. So with the birds of the air and the fishes of the sea. They alike present to the eye of man inconsistencies to him wholly irreconcilable. Still they are working out the mission which God ordained they should fill. The deadly asp reposes on the bed of the violet; the rose in its fragrance has a thorn on its stem, which bears it weeping with the morn-

ing dew. All this may seem unnatural to man, still it is the work of God—all pronounced *good*.

Look at the Indians. We have driven them from the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific; still they carry on their fur trade with us, not from love, but from necessity.

With all this before our eyes, are the people of the different sections of the country to rend the Union asunder because all do not think alike? It is to carry out His divine will that this seeming incongruity exists; and if we are wise we will have no hand in separating those whom God has joined together.

Mr. Chairman, I stated that I would show that from the foundation of the Government to the present time, every controverted question, whether of constitutional construction or of legislation, had been met and adjusted by the modes and measures of redress provided for in the Constitution itself, without resort to dissolution or secession. I will refer to a few of the prominent measures that have arisen during the existence of our Government.

The first prominent question that came up was the old United States Bank charter, which was signed by Gen. Washington. The next was the Alien and Sedition laws, which called forth the famous resolutions of 1798 and '99; and my friend from Northampton (Mr. FISHER) read from those resolutions and the report, enough to prove, not his own view of the question, but to prove that Mr. Madison's whole object was to show that this Government is so constituted, that the Constitution they had adopted contained within itself provisions for adjusting any and all difficulties that might arise. The next was the presidential contest which took place in the House of Representatives in 1800, between Mr. Jefferson and Aaron Burr, which led to an amendment of the Constitution. Then followed the war of 1812 and '14, with all the fury of the opposition of the New England States—its enemies heaping upon Mr. Madison unmeasured denunciation, placing him at the head of what was at that time called the War-junto, composed, as they said, of "James Madison, Felix Grundy and the Devil." Indeed, so intense was the excitement, that from it sprang the Hartford Convention. In spite of all this opposition, the war was carried to a successful termination—the flag of the Union still waving in triumph, and our nationality established on a basis more permanent than ever before.

In 1819 and '20 the Missouri Compromise was passed, giving such alarm to Mr. Jefferson, that in his own words, the news of its passage fell upon his ears like the alarm of a "fire bell at night." Yet it remained unrepealed for thirty years, and nobody ever thought of dissolving the Union to get clear of its operation. On the contrary, although it deprived the South of establishing slavery North of 36 degrees and 30 minutes North latitude, it was suffered to remain unmolested because of its object to guard against a difficulty that might endanger the existence of the Union.

In 1828, the tariff bill of that year, known as "the bill of abominations," was passed; and so oppressive was it in its operation, that in 1832 South Carolina threatened to nullify its operation within her limits, and by her act came near bringing on hostilities between herself and the Federal Government, which must ultimately have led to her subjugation or separation from the Union, had not Virginia interposed her advice to stay the hostile attitude at that time existing between the parties. Then, as now, true to the Union, she sent her favorite son, B. W. Leigh, as a mediator, asking that South Carolina on the one hand, and President Jackson on the other, should postpone all action of a hostile character, with a view of an amicable adjustment of the whole question. Her advice was heeded, and as ever before, a remedy was found within the limits of the Constitution to adjust the difficulty.

In 1835, the abolitionists commenced pouring in their petitions before Congress, which for a time produced the wildest excitement. Still the wisdom of the statesmen of that day foiled them in their efforts to dissolve the Union, which they so much desired. Again and again was the effort made to engraft the Wilmot Proviso on our territorial laws; but in this its friends failed, by the devotion of some of our Northern friends to the rights and interests of the South.

The annexation of Texas, and the acquisition of territory from Mexico, after a protracted war with Mexico, led to the Compromise measure of 1850, which both the Whig and Democratic parties pledged themselves to abide by in 1852 as a final settlement of the territorial question.

In 1854, the Nebraska Kansas bill was passed, repealing, in direct terms, the Missouri Compromise line; and in 1857 the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Dred Scott case, decided that Congress had no power to pass a law to prohibit slavery in the territories, and that said territory every where within the limits of the United States was open for the admission of slavery.

Thus it will be seen, that all these measures, and many other vexed questions, running through a series of years, were all adjusted by means afforded in the Constitution, without a resort to secession or a dissolution of the Union.

The history of our country shows that all her great statesmen of the past, though arrayed against each other on the policy of legislation, and differing on the construction of the Constitution, yet, whenever disunion showed its alarming front, each and all of them, as one man, rallied to the rescue. Who does not recollect the terrific convulsion which shook to its foundation the whole commercial and financial system in every part of the Union in the great struggle between President Jackson and the United States Bank? Thousands and tens of thousands of petitions were pouring into Congress, praying that the Deposites might be restored to the United States Bank. Failures of banks, firms and individuals were daily announced in the columns of every press in the Union. All, all seemed powerless before the impending storm. Congress itself looked more like the arena of gladiatorial combatants than a House of legislation. Daily and nightly members went armed to the Capitol, not knowing at what hour personal collisions might occur. Bristling bayonets, it was predicted, would glitter up Pennsylvania Avenue—all to overawe that man of "iron will," who stood erect with the patriotic sentiment, "The Union, it must and shall be preserved!" Who does not recollect the memorable declaration of Daniel Webster at that period, at Baltimore, when asked on Sunday to address her citizens? He justified himself in violating that sacred day by proclaiming "that there were no Sabbaths in a revolution." Who has forgotten the clarion notes of the great Clay, when he introduced his resolutions of censure against President Jackson? Hear him proclaiming to grave Senators, "We are in the midst of a revolution, which, although bloodless, yet we are rapidly advancing to a concentration of all the powers of Government in the hands of one man." Again, sir, in 1850, when the dissolution of the Union seemed almost inevitable, instead of yielding to the passions of the hour, we find Clay, Cass, Benton, Webster, Calhoun and Douglas, care-worn statesmen, who had battled, as party men, against each other, all rallying around the altar of their country, determined to adjust the difficulties and save the Union, though it should be the last expiring efforts of some of their lives.

Sir, should not this review of the settlement of our past difficulties teach the hasty and inconsiderate of the present day to pause in their mad career of secession, and profit by these examples of wrongs redressed by constitutional means, some of which were more alarming than any of which we now complain. But, sir, it is not worth while to conceal the fact—*Dissolution of the Union* is now, and has been the aim of the infatuated leaders of parties, North and South, for the last twenty-five years, under the pretext of redressing fancied wrongs. This fact I now propose to establish to the satisfaction of every member of the Committee.

The first evidence which I shall introduce is the letter of Hon. William L. Yancey, written June 15th, 1858:

"MONTGOMERY, June 15th, 1858.

DEAR SIR:—Your kind letter of the 15th is received. I hardly agree with you that a general movement can be made that will clear out the Augean stable. If the Democracy were overthrown, it would result in giving place to a greater swarm of flies.

The remedy of the South is not in such a process. It is in a diligent organization of her true men for the prompt resistance of the next aggression. It must come in the nature of things. No national party can save us; no sectional party can ever do it. But if we could do as our fathers did—organize "committees of safety" all over the Cotton States, (and it is only in them that we can hope any effective movement,) we shall fire the Southern heart, instruct the Southern mind, give courage to each other, and at the proper moment, by one organized, concerted action, we can precipitate the Cotton States into a revolution.

The idea has been shadowed forth in the South by Mr. Ruffin; has been taken up and recommended by the *Advertiser*, (of Montgomery, Ala., Mr. Yancey's organ,) under the name of "League of the United Southerners," who, keeping up the old party relations on all other questions, will hold the Southern issue paramount, and will influence parties, Legislatures and statesmen. I have no time to enlarge, but to suggest merely.

In haste, yours, &c.,

W. L. YANCEY.

To JAMES SLAUGHTER, Esq."

Mr. Chairman, the effort was made during the last Presidential campaign to show that this letter was not intended to prepare for the dissolution of the Union, but the words upon its face were too plain to admit the perpetration of such a humbug. Every man knew what these words meant: "But if we could do as our fathers did, organize 'committees of safety' all over the Cotton States, (and it is only in them that we can hope any effective movement,) we shall fire the Southern heart, instruct the Southern mind, give courage to each other, and at the proper moment, by one organized, concerted action, we can precipitate the Cotton States into a revolution." Committees of safety were to be formed. Has this been done? I think my friend from Princess Anne (Mr. WISE)

got up such a committee; and I believe he now is, or has been Commander-in-Chief of the Minute Men in his section. As I never knew my friend to play second fiddle to any man, I will not charge him with doing so to Mr. Yancey; but I must say that he was either carrying out his command in that letter, or that they thought very much alike and believe in the same plan of operations, so far as committees of safety are concerned.

Has the Southern heart been *fired*? Has there been *concerted* action between the Cotton States? Have they been *precipitated* into revolution? No man is bold enough to rise now and say that all this has not been done. Even Mr. Yancey himself, I think, should have cause to fear a visit from the ghosts of Annanias and Sapphira were he, in the existing state of affairs, to deny its disunion sentiments.

Sir, no military order was ever carried out more completely to the letter than have been the orders set forth in that letter. It is no prophecy, but direct instructions what to do, and how to do it, and no man now dare deny the fact. I warned the people throughout the State, in the late presidential campaign, what would be the result if his counsels were heeded. His design was too plain to admit of a doubt. Hear what he said in his speech at Memphis, August 14th, 1860, during the canvass for the presidency:

“It is said that I wrote a letter to James S. Slaughter, and that that letter is a disunion letter. I deny it. There is not a word in that letter that I take back to-night. There is not a sentiment in it that I disavow.”

Sir, I must be permitted to say, that, in my judgment, when that letter is looked at, its date noted, June 15th, 1858,—this denial before the American people, August 14th, 1860, during the presidential campaign,—the existing living facts of the Cotton States having precipitated themselves into a revolution,—it would have been much better for him to have died before these things were fulfilled, than to rise now and avow that he did not, in that letter, lay the plan for a dissolution of this Union. No man in America would believe it, though one were to rise from the dead and say so.

But, sir, it was necessary to take a bold stand at Memphis. It is in the State of Tennessee, where rest the remains of the great Jackson, whose whole life was devoted to the interest of his country and the preservation of that Union which he so much idolized. It is the home, sir, of Andrew Johnson, who has nerve and metal enough to make a leader for the Democratic or any other party contending for the republican principles upon which our government rests. He it was who dared, in the Senate of the United States, to stand up and face the Hotspurs of the South, whether assailed by single file or in solid column. Overpowered by numbers, they fought hard for his head; but his head did not drop—there was only a Wig-fall. (Laughter.) Nobly and generously have the Union men of Tennessee responded to their champion in behalf of the Union. And, sir, I do not wish it to be forgotten, that a part of the Hon. Mr. Yancey's plan to effect his purpose was to break up the Democratic party. Here is what he said in his Memphis speech on that subject:

“The Douglas men, what do they do? Ah! they say he is a disunionist—Yancey is an agitator—he disrupted the Democratic party—he got up the Alabama platform to divide the Democratic party—and yet it so happens that history tells you that the Alabama platform simply asked for our constitutional rights, and did not say that we would go out of the Union, but out of the Democratic party. We went out, did we not? Eight of the Democratic States went out, and I could call that a pretty wide breach—so wide, indeed, that no Douglas man can ever get to Heaven, if it is between it and hell. (Laughter.) And yet it so happens, when I went back to the Democracy of Alabama, it fell to my fortune to lead off in the cause of conciliation and moderation, and, in endeavoring to heal the breach that had occurred at Charleston, to give the Democracy time to repent. To reconsider, I took occasion to lead off in asking that Convention to send us to Baltimore. Had it been my object to break up the Union by that disruption, I had already broken up the party and had the Union at my feet, and yet you find me in the Convention at Montgomery, saying, ‘let us go back with the olive branch; although they have done us a wrong, let us go back and unite the gallant Democracy once more in gallant and glorious support of the Constitution and the rights of the South.’”

That party which had repelled every effort, from the foundation of the Government, to dissolve this Union, was to be broken up. Nay, more. He avowed that he had broken it up. Hear him: “History tells you that the Alabama platform simply asked for our constitutional rights, and did not say that we would go out of the Union, but out of the Democratic party. We went out, did we not? Eight of the Democratic States went out, and I call that a pretty wide breach—so wide, indeed, that no Douglas man can ever get to Heaven, if it is between it and hell. (Laughter.)” Douglas men denounced as not good Democrats by a gentleman who openly avowed that he had

broken up his own party, by a breach made by these same Cotton States, seven of which are now out of the Union. Still he did not mean disunion! He had the Union, then, where he thought he could smash it at any time. Hear him: "Had it been my object to break up the Union by that disruption, I had already broken up the party, and had the Union at my feet." Sir, was there ever such inflated arrogance since Satan took Christ upon the Mount to tempt him. This great Union at the feet of William L. Yancey! The scene is too rich to be lost.

Look, sir, at that grand panorama, as I run it before the mind's eye. Behold all that vast country extending from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. Behold the Great Father of Waters rushing down the Valley of the Mississippi—see yon mountains towering in the blue sky of Heaven—see our own Peaks of Otter peering up in their grand sublimity—look, sir, at the thirty-one millions of happy human beings mingling together on this continent—raise your eye to the sun in Heaven—see his light and feel his rays—hear that multitude, with one voice, thanking their God for all this—then look, in a far-off corner of the canvas, at that little, booted-legged Bantam chicken-cock crowing out, "*all this is at my feet!*" Do that, sir, and you have the picture to life. But, sir, I have other evidence that the Hon. Gentleman had laid his plans to dissolve the Union. Here is what he said at Columbia in July, 1859:

"To obtain the aid of the Democracy in this contest, it is necessary to make a contest in its Charleston Convention. In that body, Douglas' adherents will press his doctrines to a decision. If the State-Rights men keep out of that Convention, that decision must inevitably be against the South, and that, either in direct favor of the Douglas doctrine, or by the endorsement of the Cincinnati platform, under which Douglas claims shelter for his principles. The State-Rights men should present in that Convention their demand for a decision, and they will obtain an indorsement of their demands, or a denial of these demands. If indorsed, we shall have a greater hope of triumph within the Union. If denied, in my opinion, the State-Rights wing should secede from the Convention, and appeal to the whole people of the South, without distinction of parties, and organize another Convention upon the basis of their principles, and go into the election with a candidate nominated by it, as a grand Constitutional party. But in the presidential contest a Black Republican may be elected. If this dire event should happen, in my opinion, the only hope of safety for the South is in a withdrawal from the Union before he shall be inaugurated—before the sword and the treasury of the Federal Government shall be placed in the keeping of that party. I would suggest that the several State Legislatures should, by law, require the Governor, when it shall be made manifest that the Black Republican candidate for the Presidency shall receive a majority of the electoral vote, to call a Convention of the people of the State, to assemble in time to provide for their safety before the 4th of March, 1861. If, however, a Black Republican should not be elected, then, in pursuance of the policy of making this contest within the Union, we should initiate measures in Congress which should lead to a repeal of all the unconstitutional acts against slavery. If we should fail to obtain so just a system of legislation, then the South should seek her independence out of the Union."

I ask the people of Virginia and this Convention to contrast the position of Virginia now with the position which she occupied at Baltimore, when this programme had been carried out at Charleston. Every one will see that the great effort now is to drag Virginia out of the Union, as she was then dragged out of the Convention. But I think, sir, that those who are engaged in it will, like the foolish virgins, be found "without oil in their lamps."

I will now refer to the disunion sentiments proclaimed by members of the Convention which adopted the Ordinance of Secession in South Carolina, on the 20th day of December last. I quote from the "Charleston Courier:—"

"Mr. RHETT said, that the secession of South Carolina was not the event of a day. It is not simply the election of Mr. Lincoln which is the cause. This matter had been gathering in the head for thirty years. Some of the most gigantic intellects and patriotic statesmen have participated in the events. The secession of South Carolina is only the consummation of the labors of such men as Calhoun, McDuffie and others. The election of Mr. Lincoln, and the sectional organization at the North, was the last straw on the back of the camel."

No equivocation there—full confession by one who knew that "the secession of South Carolina is only the consummation of the labors of such men as Calhoun, McDuffie and others." The election of Lincoln was only a straw upon the back of the camel.

What said the Hon. Mr. KEITT? Hear him rejoicing at the consummation of his labors. I quote again from the "Charleston Courier:—"

"We are, as the gentleman from Edgefield (Mr. Inglis) has well said, performing a

great act. We are performing an act which embraces the interest of the present, and also embraces the interest of the whole future to come. I have been engaged in this movement all my life, but will be content to have this act ratified to-morrow. I am in favor of adopting the resolution of the gentleman from Richland. We have carried the body of the Union to its last resting-place, and we are now about to raise a Southern Confederacy from its grave. I think it better that we should postpone the ratification till to-morrow."

Ponder, I pray you, brother members of this Convention—take warning, people of Virginia—and be no longer deceived by public-men. Here is the consummation of the work of a lifetime of one whose life and public services have been the pride and boast of his friends, but, for the first time, it is made known that his great aim has been the destruction of the Union—that Union which the great WASHINGTON spent a lifetime to establish, which now holds his sacred remains, which woman—yes, patriotic, virtuous woman—has saved for posterity. The body, I repeat, of this Union has been carried by South Carolina to its last resting-place—to its grave! Sir, was there nobody in that State to drop a tear to its memory? Where, sir, were the Sumters, the Marions and other heroes who fought and bled for that Union? Perhaps, sir, the Union was laid in the same grave which holds them; if so, that is some consolation. The proof is full—the case completely made out against the disunionists of the South, and, unless some member desires additional proof, I will, for the present, let that side of the question rest.

Mr. Chairman, I will now introduce proof equally strong, that there are now, and have been, disunionists at the North equally determined to destroy the Government. Before doing so, however, I wish it distinctly understood, that I do not attribute to the disunionists of the South the same motives which actuate the disunionists of the North. The Southern disunionists favor a dissolution of the Union, because they think it will better protect and perpetuate slavery. The disunionists of the North favor dissolution, because they think it the best and only means to abolish slavery. No matter which succeeds, the Union will be no more—a calamity I pray that may not happen. The people of the United States never sustained any such party, either through their representatives or otherwise, as will appear from the record which I now lay before the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I read from the Congressional Globe of the second session of the 27th Congress, 1841-2:

“MONDAY, January 25th, 1842.

“Mr. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS presented the following petition:

“PETITION TO DISSOLVE THE UNION.

“*To the Congress of the United States:*

“The undersigned, citizens of Haverhill in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, pray that you will immediately adopt measures peaceably to dissolve the Union of these States:

“First, Because no union can be agreeable or permanent which does not present prospects of reciprocal benefits.

“Second, Because a vast proportion of the resources of one section of the Union is annually drained to sustain the views and course of another section, without any adequate returns.

“Third, Because (judging from the history of past nations) that Union, if persisted in, in the present course of things, will certainly overwhelm the whole nation in utter destruction.

“This petition is signed by Benjamin Emerson and forty-five others.”

Mr. ADAMS moved its reference to a select Committee, with instructions to report an answer to the petition showing the reason why the prayer of the petition should not be granted. That petition, thus presented by Mr. Adams, asked that the Union of the States should be peaceably dissolved; and the motion was to refer the petition to a select Committee with instructions to report why the prayer should not be granted. I refer to it to show what was the position of Southern members in the House of Representatives, in regard to this question of the dissolution of the Union.

Mr. HOPKINS addresses the Chair and asks: “Is it in order to move to burn the petition in the presence of the House?” The learned G. W. HOPKINS of Va., who lived an ornament to his country and who died regretted by all, asked whether it was in order to move that the petition be burned in the presence of the House—a petition asking Congress to take into consideration the question of the dissolution of the Union.

What next? Mr. WISE, my distinguished friend from Accomac, said: “Is it in order to move to censure any member presenting such a petition; and to move that the House

do now proceed to inquire whether a member has offered such petition to this body, and to proceed accordingly?"

Mr. MERRIWETHER of Georgia, "raised the question of reception, and moved to lay the question on the table; remarking that he did not think such a petition should be allowed to come within the walls of the House."

What was the next move? The member from the Albemarle district (Mr. GILMER, of Virginia) offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, That in presenting to the consideration of the House a petition for the dissolution of the Union, the member from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) has justly incurred the censure of the House."

Thus, in 1842, when that petition to dissolve the Union was presented, a Virginia representative in Congress moved to censure that gray-headed old man, who had been President of the United States, who had been Foreign Minister, who had occupied the highest positions in the Government—to censure him for presenting a petition in favor of a dissolution of the Union, and asking for its reference to a select Committee with instructions to report an answer setting forth the reasons why the prayer of the petition should not be heard. Virginia then said that that man should be censured.

What next? A long discussion followed, and finally a motion was made to lay the whole subject on the table. Let us analyze the votes. Mark you, now, I am condemning Mr. Adams as much as any one could; but I introduce this matter to prove what was the opinion of Virginia and the South in 1842, in reference to a petition for a dissolution of the Union, when presented by abolitionists. The motion is made to lay the whole question on the table. I have put myself to some trouble to ascertain how that vote stood. The motion to lay on the table was a test vote, involving as it did the resolution of censure. I want to show how Virginia, how Georgia, how Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina and Louisiana voted then; and I take it that no man, with the past history of these States before him, could encourage now any act looking to the dissolution of the Union. If I could have heard my friend from Princess Anne, when he spoke here the other day, I would have got behind him and brought up the ghost of John Quincy Adams to remind him of old times.

Members of Congress from South Carolina who voted against laying the whole subject on the table: Messrs. Caldwell, Campbell, Pickens, Rhett, Rogers, Sumter. Seven out of the nine members from South Carolina voted against laying the whole subject on the table. On that question then she stood right upon the record; and when her Commissioners came here to induce Virginia to help her to break up the Union, this record should have been brought before them, and they should have been reminded that South Carolina, in 1842, voted to censure Mr. Adams for presenting a petition looking toward the dissolution of the Union. It will be observed, that amongst the names stands Gov. Pickens of South Carolina, born, it is said, insensible to fear, and it may be insensible to shame, if he can justify his past censure of Mr. Adams, with his present lead for disunion.

The motion to lay on the table was lost, and then a motion was made to reconsider the vote on Mr. Merriwether's proposition to receive the petition and lay it on the table. The vote was reconsidered, and the question came up on the reception of the petition. Let us see how South Carolina voted on that question. She voted in the negative—the following South Carolina members voted no: Messrs. Butler, Caldwell, Campbell, Pickens, Rogers and Sumter.

How did Georgia stand? Four of her representatives voted against laying the whole subject on the table, and three voted in favor of it. Two out of the three Louisiana members voted against laying on the table. Both the Mississippi members voted against laying the whole subject on the table, and both voted against receiving the petition. Every member from Alabama voted against laying on the table, and against reception.

There is the record of those States, in 1842, on the question of a dissolution of the Union. Florida and Texas had not then been admitted as States.

But that is not all. Virginia had, at that time, a champion in Congress; and when I use the word "champion," I do not want it inferred that I draw a distinction between him and other members. I want it recollected that, on the subject of slavery, I have followed him through all my life—I allude to the gentleman from Princess Anne (Mr. WISE.) The first high mark he made was in that contest with Mr. John Quincy Adams. Then it was that the member from Accomac—at that time—fleshed his sword. Then it was that he showed a degree of eloquence and power not surpassed by any man North or South. In that struggle I was with him. I admired his weight of character and talents and abilities. He bore the plume of Virginia high up above the black banner of abolition. He is a statesman of great eloquence. Give him a little more ballast and he will do well. But he carries too much sail. [Laughter.] I refer to him as part of the

history of the country, and because he has weight of character and honesty of purpose that give his opinions the highest consideration, especially in the South, on this subject.

Mr. WISE then said, "that he rose in the House, not to utter one word on the question of postponement. He would not raise his voice, on a question like this, whether they should postpone the question of a dissolution of the Union till Monday. He asked that a voice from the tombs might be heard—that the farewell address of George Washington, the Father of his Country, might be heard in that hall. Sending the volume to the Clerk's desk, he wished the Clerk to read the following passage which he had marked." Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Accomac had read a portion of Washington's Farewell Address, to rebuke Northern abolitionists for attempting, in 1842, to dissolve this Union. I will read it to the people of Virginia. I implore the mothers of Virginia to call their children to their knees and repeat it to them. I implore the fathers of Virginia to call their sons around them and read it to them, as my friend from Accomac did to Northern abolitionists. Let it influence their hearts and strengthen their arms in resisting an association which is raised to strike at the liberty and the very life of the Union to which we all look for our national preservation.

Here, sir, is the Father of his Country speaking. Here is the language recommended to be read by the gentleman from Princess Anne (Mr. WISE.)

(From Washington's Farewell Address.)

"The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence—the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed,—it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

This is part of the argument used by the distinguished gentleman from Princess Anne at that day. I take up the same argument now, and use it against the enemies of this glorious Union in this Hall, or wherever else they may come from. I take up the same weapon which he used against John Quincy Adams, and employ it against those who are now seeking to dissolve this Union.

I will proceed to read from the arguments of the gentleman from Princess Anne:

"Mr. WISE said, that he had this address read, because, if the author of it were now living and present, he could not have pictured the scenes that have taken place better than it was prophesied."

Recollect, sir, that this was the "scene" in 1842 prophesied by the author of that address. Sir, what a scene would be presented if the author of that address could rise to-day, and once more look upon that Union which he so much loved. Shame would mantle our cheeks; our lips would quiver, and our knees tremble at his presence. What, sir, to open his eyes and see seven States gone out of the Union—to see commissioners from three of those States standing in our presence, telling the tale of their own destruction of that Union, and to hear them applauded by members on this floor—members of a Virginia Convention, the land of his birth, the repository of his bones! Sir, the slow, unmoving finger of scorn would rest upon us, and well might we call upon the mountains to roll down upon us and cover us in our shame.

"Mr. WISE here read the items of a thoroughly digested plan of operation for 'the perpetration, dissemination, signing and presentation' of a great variety of different forms of memorials, all having a bearing, more or less direct, on the continuance and existence of slavery in the United States. The directions were very minute, going down even to the folding and endorsing of the forms of memorials, and directing them to be forwarded to the Hon. Seth M. Gates, the agent of the Abolitionists on the floor of Congress. Here (Mr. WISE said) was a deliberately formed plan of operation, with a member of the House for its organ and agent, and all the forms of petition put into the people's mouths, ready cooked and concocted beforehand. Many of them were, word for word, such petitions as had been already presented in that house: one, indeed, the peti-

tion for the dissolution of the Union, did not appear among them, but every movement was planned which led to that result. The entire train was carefully and skillfully laid, the mine was already sunk beneath the Constitution, and the incendiary stood ready with his torch prepared to blow the Union into ten thousand fragments."

There is proof, full and complete, that this Union was to be dissolved by abolitionists and British agents, to destroy the institution of slavery. And to-day and here, we hear a dissolution of this Union openly advocated, in the face of all these abolitionists, and with that same great power, England, watching with a sleepless eye the first opportunity to strike a blow at slavery, as she has done every where, whenever it was in her power to do so. I warn the friends of slavery every where in the South, that that institution, in my opinion, should never surrender the protection to that property, whether assailed at home or from abroad, which is secured to us by the Constitution of the United States.

Again :

"Mr. WISE resumed his remarks, and observed that when the House adjourned on the previous day, he had been examining the evidences, and they were many and strong, which went to show that English influence abroad was in league with the same English influence at home, to dissolve this Union; that there was foreign conspiracy, aided by home agents, to effect a union between abolitionists and dissolutionists in this country. Mr. WISE said he now proposed to show to the House, and that on the highest authority—an authority which would not be questioned—that an American citizen had gone to England, and had there asked, not merely British countenance and British prayers, but for British money also, to aid in destroying the happy union of the States."

Mr. Chairman, the abolitionists had *then* to send to Great Britain to get "British money" and British agents, to aid in destroying the happy union of these States. I doubt very much, sir, whether, if the abolitionists wanted aid to assist them in "destroying the happy union of these States," whether they would have to go to England to find it.

I hope it will be recollected that I do not attribute to the dissolutionists of the South the same motives which actuate the abolitionists in the North. I disclaim it now, as I have done before. But I will show from the record the whole truth, vouched for and verified by a Virginia member of Congress; and if gentlemen are thrown into bad company, I hope they will profit by their error, and do so no more. When this Union is at stake, no man or party shall escape his own record, whenever any trust is reposed in my hands that makes it necessary for me to expose it. The people shall see this whole question, in all its nakedness and deformity.

I quote from the same speech :

"Mr. WISE said: When our population had been but three millions, we had proved ourselves able to achieve our independence. When it was seven millions, we carried to a successful issue a second war for free trade and sailor's rights; and he was determined, so far as his efforts could go, that we should not be conquered now, when our population had reached seventeen millions. But those defences which British cannon had failed to break down, were now to be broken down by a British party influence. Go on, (cried Mr. WISE) you shall have your reward. Go on with this, your moral treason, and carry it so far as to come within Chief Justice Marshall's decision, in Burr's case, and you shall get your hemp!"

Mr. Chairman, when I could hear, I was fond of going to church; and how pleased I have been when ministers at revivals seemed so much rejoiced at the work of God in converting sinners. How often have I heard them, when the brethren were lukewarm and the sinners many, pour forth that good old tune—

"The harvest fields are blooming, but the laborers are few,"

And now, in the same spirit, Mr. Chairman, I make known that the hemp-fields are blooming, and modestly ask whether there are any *traitors* in the land? Oh no, sir, there are no *traitors*; we are all *submissionists*. John Quincy Adams was guilty of moral treason then, for presenting a petition for dissolving the Union, and asked that a committee might be appointed to report the reasons why the prayer of the petitioners should *not* be granted. But now, those who have *dissolved* that Union in open day are not guilty of moral treason, but they are pinks of consistency and patriotism; whilst we who are resisting their acts, (as was my friend from Princess Anne, at that time resisting the act of Mr. Adams) are called "*submissionists*."

I stick to my witness and his record to decide this question, with the remark, that whoever thinks proper to call me a submissionist, that he will the next time he writes his name, write the word "*traitor*" after it: that will balance the account.

But to continue the extract from Mr. Wise's speech :

"England had one naval depot at Halifax, and she was making another at Bermuda. Such was the rumor. She was planting herself at both ends of our coast, at the North and at the South. But England must be suffered to go on and prepare her dockyards and her arsenals, and to establish one depot after another. She was to make contracts to supply them, not only with her own citizens, but with the merchants of Boston. She was to establish her line of steamers; her mails were to touch from point to point, and form an unbroken line of speedy communication. Every thing was to be put in readiness to facilitate the approach of a combined force, to act simultaneously against the coasts of the United States; but we, we were to do nothing—we must have no home squadron, no naval depots, no steamers, nothing in the shape of defence, lest, forsooth, we should be providing defences for slave property."

Mr. Chairman, no man could have pointed out more accurately the dangers to slavery than my friend from Princess Anne (Mr. WISE) did, in the above remarks; and I repeat here, sir, that every word that he then uttered, so far as the protection of slavery against danger from abroad is concerned, is applicable to the state of things now existing, and in a ten-fold degree, since the withdrawal of seven States from this Union. Her line of steamers are here; they touch from point to point; she has her mail facilities; she wants but an excuse to attack our institution of slavery, as her whole history shows, and for one, I will not agree to give up the defence of this whole nation, and rely on seven or fifteen slaveholding States; and I defy any man to controvert successfully what was so well said at that time by the member from Princess Anne. Indeed, sir, he will never be able himself to answer the speech which he made on that occasion. It is the ablest effort of his life. And whatever he may say here on the points then made, I tell him this speech will answer it all: it will be "the same against the same," as the judges say when calling over the docket.

Let hear him further:

"Mr. WISE said, that on a subject so vital and so general as this, he looked to the North as he looked to the South. He had as much confidence in the one as in the other. When war did come, if come it must, the Kentucky sailor would meet the sailor on the Chesapeake, and both would act with the sailor from New Bedford, and they would fight side by side to defend the common honor of us all. There were no dissolutionists in his section of the country. They were an unknown species. If they dared to show their faces in the South, as it seemed they did not blush to do in the North, they would meet with a very speedy and a very summary disposal."

No dissolutionists in the South! Can my friend say that now? Let him open his eyes—he will see them all around him; they are not now an unknown species. Will he make a summary disposal of them? I fear not. On the contrary, I fear he will act with them. I fear that he and his Kentucky sailors will turn their backs upon the sailor from New Bedford. For myself, sir, I prefer holding this whole nation to its responsibility to defend each and every part of it, whether attacked on account of slavery, or for any other cause. They have ever done it, and, in my opinion, will continue to do so, if we stand up to our true Northern friends.

Mr. WISE further said:

"The abolitionists and the disunionists might again assemble at Hartford, and declare it against the religious sense of right to go to war with England to defend slave property; but their fate would be the same as had, in religious retribution, overtaken their predecessors—to be hated—to be ever after suspected—to become a by-word—he would not say to be politically damned in the minds of all true-hearted Americans, and of their descendants."

Sir, was there ever such a lashing given to dissolutionists and abolitionists as my friend from Princess Anne (Mr. WISE) here gives? He works them in couples—drives them into the Hartford Convention together, makes them refuse to go to war with England to defend slavery, to be hated and suspected alike, to share the same fate—to be politically damned in the minds of all true-hearted Americans, and of their descendants. Our army swore terribly in Flanders, but nothing like this. But, sir, he was fighting for the Union. I endorsed him then. I was proud of his stand, and Virginia owes him ten thousand thanks for it.

"Again he would say, that if a war with England was necessary, and nothing else would do to awaken and revive that American pride and love of country which had achieved our independence, the sooner it come, the better. Let it come, and we would soon teach the English party—the abolition disunionist party at home and abroad—

that, though they might succeed in leaving the land defenceless on its coasts, we had still our mountain fastnesses, our hills and rocks to fly to; we had still a country to love and a people to defend it."

If nothing else would revive the love of country, war was even invoked to do it. Yes, we can stand a war with the world when we are united. But how will it be when we are divided?

Mr. Chairman, the foregoing extracts from my friend's speech show that he had been speaking against the danger of foreign influence, in connection with the abolitionists and dissolutionists at home. I now proceed to read extracts from the same speech, to show the bitter terms in which he denounced the effort to separate the Northern from the slaveholding States of this Union.

Mr. WISE further said "he had hitherto been speaking against the danger of foreign influence. But let it be remembered that the voice of the Farewell Address, which Washington bequeathed as his last legacy to his beloved country, warned us no less against the danger of sectional influence. It warned us against the ruinous consequences of arraying the North against the South—the East against the West. Yet what had we seen, in the very teeth of that Address, solemnly read in this Hall? A deliberate proposition to separate the Northern from the slaveholding States of this Union."

Mr. Chairman, I hope it will not be forgotten that when all this denunciation was poured forth upon the ^{disunionists} and abolitionists, that the Union had not then been dissolved. And I further hope it will be remembered that the Union is now dissolved, so far as the action of the seven States which have seceded could do so. Then it is a simple rule to work, that if so much punishment is deserved for trying to do a thing, what punishment should be given those who have actually done the deed. I wish these things remembered, because the extracts which I will now read may be applicable to the States which have seceded, and to those who wish to drag Virginia out with them.

Mr. WISE said, referring to what he supposed to be a denunciation by Mr. Adams of Washington's Farewell Address:

"Yet he had not been surprised at what he supposed he had heard, because the union of these twenty-six happy, independent sovereign States was a much more sacred thing than Washington's Farewell Address, sacred as that was. The thing that Washington had recommended, looked for, hoped for, longed for, prayed for, was surely more sacred than the address which recommended his countrymen to preserve that thing. If it was an act unholy, partaking of sacrilege—an act from which the gentleman shrank with horror—to denounce the address, oh! how could he ask, as a son of one of the venerable patriots of the Revolution—an old man—one who had himself looked upon Washington and heard his living voice—one who had served his country well, and in return been well treated by that country—how could he bring himself to contemplate the dissolution of this Union, which Washington loved so well? How could he think for a moment on the destruction of the work of his hands, when he could not bear the thought even of speaking disrespectfully of his Farewell Address? Was not the gentleman trifling with things too sacred to be trifled with? Was not this Union a thing too valuable, not to us alone, but to all the nations of mankind—to every subsequent age of the world? Was this to be hazarded for such an object as attacking the slaveholders of the South?"

As an effort of eloquence, the above could hardly be surpassed; as a tribute to the value of the Union, no man living or dead can surpass it. And I leave it to ring in the ears of those who wish to destroy this Union, as it rung in the ears of Mr. Adams.

But hear him further:

"Our enemies—the enemies of free government—had been wishing and predicting that the Union of these twenty-six free States never could stand—that it must fall; and they had been exerting a corresponding influence with a view to destroy it. They looked at every unfavorable occurrence, and exclaimed, 'Ah! we said so! See here! See there!' Every popular outbreak that took place in any portion of this wide land, though not to compare with what was continually happening in Ireland, or even in the manufacturing districts of England or in France, under the bayonets of a standing army, they hailed as the approach of what they so much longed for and cried for. 'See the Union is dissolving like snow before the sun!' It would be told in Europe with exultation that the Ex-President of the United States had brought forward a proposition to dissolve the Union, and had seriously proposed to discuss it. What! had not enough been done already to disgrace our credit abroad? He was bound, with sorrow, to admit the fact. Had not enough, and more than enough, been done by professed friends of the Union to disgrace it before the world, by breaches of public and of private faith? But what must be the effect of such an announcement on the already prostrated credit? Was it not enough to alarm the money lenders of Europe to hear that a proposition had been

allowed to be introduced into the legislative hall to dissolve the Union? Would they not very naturally conclude that our Government was fast tumbling into ruin? What better than madness was it seriously to entertain a proposition like this?"

No English influence here, Mr. Chairman, engaged in dissolving our Union; but my friend made all Europe do then what they are now doing—giggling and laughing at our self-destruction as a nation, crying out, "See there! see here! I told you so! I told you so!" Sir, with what a master's hand did he then draw the effect upon our credit abroad from the mere presentation of a petition to dissolve the Union. What must be its effect now, that our Union is shattered into flinders? Can folly—can madness go further? Further, sir, what must Europe now learn of the stability of our Government, as practically illustrated—to be broken up by a single State at pleasure, with or without cause, as she may think proper? Under such a Government our credit abroad would not be able to borrow a dollar from a man who wished to secure what he might lend. What, sir, would Rothschild or any other capitalist of Europe say, if three agents, wanting ten millions of dollars for their respective governments, were to present themselves to him to borrow it? He would ask the agent of the United States of the character and stability of his government, and would be told that it rested on a basis of thirty-four States, any one or more of which could break it up at any time at their own will and pleasure, with or without cause. He would tell his clerk to make a note of it. Then turning to the agent from England, would put the same question, and would be told that his government was such that no one branch of it could destroy it—that it could bind itself as a nation, and that nothing less than the constituted authority of the nation could dissolve it, or release it from its just obligations—that it could only be altered by its own consent, or by revolution. A further question might be asked: Can your government be destroyed, as any one member of the Government of the United States can destroy that government? The answer, no, sir, being made by the other two agents, I ask, is there a fool in the world who would not loan the money to either of the two governments or nations instead of the United States? Yet, sir, this fatal stab has been given to our government by prating, ambitious aspirants, who have been disappointed in their hopes of getting into power.

One more extract from the speech of my friend from Princess Anne, and I will dismiss him as a witness against disunionists and abolitionists.

Mr. WISE said: "Let each member of the House endeavor to realize what that gentleman (Mr. ADAMS) might thus have been, and then look at him to-day, at the situation he now occupied in the legislative halls of his country. Should Mr. Wise describe who it was that was the object of the present proceeding, and what he was? Oh! no, no, no, no. The gentleman from Massachusetts possessed a brighter imagination than Mr. WISE; let him point to himself the contrast what he might do, and what he was now doing. All he could say was, to thank God that the gentleman, great as he was, neither had, nor was likely to have, sufficient influence to excite a spirit of disunion throughout the land. Mr. W.'s reliance was on the public virtue. They would learn the gentleman's object with a regret such as none could feel but those who loved their country as did the people of this Union. The gentleman was politically dead; dead as Burr—dead as Arnold. The people would look upon him with wonder—shudder and retire."

Yes, sir, a disunionist, not for dissolving the Union, but for presenting a petition of forty five citizens praying for peaceable secession, and asking the committee should report the reasons why the prayer of the petition should not be granted, is pronounced as dead as Burr, as dead as Arnold.

I have shown from the record the effort of the abolitionists in 1842 to dissolve the Union, and the signal rebuke it received at the hands of the South, including the votes of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. I will now read a petition to dissolve the Union, presented in Congress by Mr. Joshua R. Giddings, on the 25th day of February, 1850, which is as follows:

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

The effort made to dissolve the Union by the abolitionists, as stated in what I have read, was because the Constitution of the United States pledged the whole strength of the Union to support slavery. Well, sir, the vote was taken upon the reception of the petition, and it was decided in the negative—yeas 8, nays 162. This was in 1850, showing

that but eight votes could be found even to receive a petition to dissolve the Union in the House of Representatives—Allen, of Massachusetts; Durkee, of Wisconsin; Giddings, of Ohio; Goodenow, of Maine; Howe, of Pennsylvania; Julian, of Indiana; Preston King, of New York; and Root, of Ohio. In the Senate of the United States the reception of the petition received but three votes. That is a tolerably good vote upon an effort to dissolve this Union.

Now, I ask you if I am to join in this effort of the abolitionists to dissolve this Union? I ask you if I have not proved conclusively that the whole effort of the abolitionists has been to dissolve this Union in order to destroy slavery, and I ask you if I have not proved on the other side that the effort of the disunionists in the South has been to dissolve the Union in order, as they think, to perpetuate slavery? I ask you now, where is our duty? If we divest this Union of its nationality and of its power, will it protect this institution of slavery, or will it result in its final overthrow? I think there is but one answer to that question. I will never join the abolitionists of the North. I am ready to take the oath before Heaven, that I will never join John Quincy Adams, that I will never join any other Abolitionist. They may cry aloud that the Federal Constitution is a league with hell and a covenant with death, I will never join them in the dissolution of this Union. You may join them, gentlemen, if you think proper; I will not do it. If my people are disposed to do it after seeing this record, which I do not believe they ever will do, let them do so, and I will take my stand upon the Constitution and the Union as handed down to us by our forefathers.

Mr. Chairman, I call your attention, and the attention of the Convention, to another point. I have referred to the action, in 1842, of Mr. Adams. I have referred to the action of the abolitionists in 1850. Now, I will carry you back. Go with me back, and run a parallel between the condition of the country as it existed in 1842, when Mr. Adams offered this petition, and to its condition in December last, when South Carolina seceded from the Union. Go back with me, and I will show you that if there was cause for the dissolution of the Union in December last, there was ten-fold cause on the part of the South in 1842. Texas had not then been annexed. She was admitted in the Union in 1845. At that time the Missouri Compromise line was running through all the territory of the United States, dividing it and prohibiting slavery north of that line. At that time the only fugitive slave law in operation was the act of 1793, the original act, signed by George Washington. The Supreme Court had not then decided that Congress had no power to pass a law prohibiting slavery in the Territories. At that time the Compromise measures of 1850 had not been passed, to which both the great parties in the country pledged themselves to abide. In 1842 British emissaries were cooperating with the abolitionists at the North, the Missouri Compromise line was still in operation, the Supreme Court had remained silent upon this subject, there was no fugitive slave law except the ineffectual one of 1793, and yet there was then no cause for dissolution, in the opinion of the South, declared by the votes of its Representatives.

Look at Florida in 1842. She had not then been admitted into the Union. The Indians were prowling through the country murdering the inhabitants, sparing neither age nor sex. Look, sir, at that mother, with her frightened babes around her. Behold that daughter, in the bloom of womanhood, fleeing from that treacherous savage. See that father, already prostrate on the earth, slain by the hand of the savages whilst defending his household. Look at my friend from Franklin, (Mr. EARLY,) with his gallant men, penetrating the everglades and swamps of Florida, exposed to all the dangers of climate and disease, with no object in view save to do his duty and protect the innocent from death, or perhaps a fate more terrible. Thus stood Florida in 1842. How is it in 1860? Peace reigns throughout her borders. The balmy breeze wafts the fragrance of her flowers to a contented and happy people. See that mother, no longer trembling with fear, surrounded by her happy children. Hear her recounting to them the dangers through which they and she had passed. Behold that beautiful damsel tripping from her flower-garden. Hear that clear, ringing, merry laugh. See that healthy hue of the peach bloom on those lovely cheeks. Look at those raven tresses flowing in ringlets over a form that would grace an angel. See those ruby lips, like

“The rose that weeps with morning dew
In smiles and tears resembles you,
That glitters in the sunny ray
When love drives sorrow's clouds away.”

See this, and tell me whether base ingratitude is not stamped upon her brow for leaving a government that had done so much for her. Have her citizens forgotten? Can they forget the gallant dead who sacrificed their lives in the Indian wars which devastated her fair fields? Not only that. Look, sir, at my friend from Franklin, (Major EARLY)—he who, in the vigor of youth and manhood, stood by her in her distress, is

now in a Virginia Convention calling to her to "come back, come back, to that Union to which you are indebted for all you are, and to which you owe a debt of gratitude which you can never, never pay." If she hears him not, well may he exclaim,

"How sharper than a serpent's tooth
It is to have a thankless child."

Look at Texas. In my judgment there is no parallel between her case and that of the other States that have gone out of the Union. After she had declared her independence of Mexico, she stood vacillating, first on the right and then on the left, coquetting first with England and then with the United States. But old General Houston had sense enough. He knew that he might play the coquette with England, but that when Texas came to link her destinies with those of another nation, she would choose the United States, whose people were bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh. The battle of San Jacinto was fought with fewer men than it took to guard old John Brown. The hero of that battle knows the value of Union, and yet stands firm to his plighted faith. This Government gave Texas \$10,000,000 in exchange for territory, admitted her into the Union, and afforded her every facility. She was admitted into the Union sixteen years ago, and she has ever since enjoyed the protection of the United States, which guarded her frontier settlements against the Indians. And now, sir, an Ex-President of the United States, a venerable, worthy, intelligent and patriotic gentleman, who had the honor, when President, to forward to Texas the proposition for annexation to the United States, he is now in this Convention, and willing, strange as it may seem, to permit this prodigal daughter to run off from her mother. He is the last man whom I would expect to see occupying such a position. I will not believe that he has taken that position until I hear it from his own lips. Never, never! I cannot stand here now discussing the question whether Virginia shall sanction the rebellious course of that rebellious State. She leaves the United States because she is not satisfied. Where is she going next? She is doing a very poor business, sir. It is a miserable principle to catch what you may and run off with it as fast as you can. Ask the men who fell upon the soil of Mexico, ask their widows and children, whether their toil and suffering shall all be in vain, and whether Texas shall now be allowed to turn her back upon the Union which has paid so dearly for her.

Sir, we had obtained all these advantages since 1842. We had obtained the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; we had obtained the Compromise Measures of 1850; we have had the fugitive slave law amended; and we have had the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in the territories; we have had slavery established in New Mexico. Our rights stand clear and undisputed. The whole territory of the United States stands open for occupation by any one and every one. All these advantages we have gained since 1842, when abolitionists wanted to dissolve the Union; and now it is men of the South who seek to accomplish that dread purpose. Why do this, when we have a Union which may well defy destruction after the severe ordeals which it has passed?

What is there for us to complain of now? Prepare your bill of particulars. Your first complaint is the election of Abraham Lincoln. For that the Union is to be dissolved. I am not going to consume the time of the Convention in enquiring how the election of Lincoln was effected. All I say is that a man who knew anything about the canvass must know, and will admit, that it was by dividing our votes that Lincoln was elected. I speak of the Whig party, of the Douglas party, and of the Breckinridge party. If we knew that we had to fight a common enemy, and that that common enemy had not divided his forces, we were the greatest fools in the world to divide our forces.

The Committee then took a recess till 4 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. RIVES resumed his remarks. He said:

Mr. Chairman, it is my object to close what I have to say this evening, for I do not want it supposed that I would consume any more of the time of this Convention than is absolutely necessary for me to set forth my views. When I closed my argument at two o'clock, I had taken up what I supposed to be the causes of complaint of the South. I shall repeat them.

I stated that the election of Mr. Lincoln was one cause alleged by the South why the Union should be dissolved. Another cause is that the territories are not now open to settlement with slavery, as they should be. Another cause is that the fugitive slave law is not enforced as strictly as it should be by reason of the existence on the statute books of some non-slaveholding States of personal liberty bills. These I understand to be the

prominent features of complaint. It is true there is something said about Northern sentiment not concurring with us on the subject of slavery as an institution.

I shall attempt to meet the three first allegations, but I cannot be expected to change the convictions of men as to whether slavery is right or wrong. All I have to say on that subject is, that those who do not like to have slaves can get rid of them very easily, and those who do like slavery find great difficulty in procuring them. I like slavery, morally, socially and politically, and I wish I had more slaves. I speak of African slavery, and of no other sort. I do not justify slavery on the ground of the Bible, or on what St. Paul said, or what was done in Rome. The slaves of that day were as white as you or I am, and I would help to break the shackles off every white slave, if the earth itself were to open and swallow me for it. I stand by the institution of slavery, but it must be the slavery of the black race, not of the white race. Do not tell me that Rome could take those whom she subdued and make slaves of them, and that that is good logic to apply to our institution. It is the weak point on which members of Congress have foolishly planted the defence of the institution of slavery. No man with a thimble full of brains in his head ought to get up and defend our institution of slavery on the ground that St. Paul, or any body else, said that white men might be held in slavery. The whole argument can be turned against us, and has been turned against us. I have never resorted to it, and never will.

Let them think at the North as they will; but we tell them that when they come here and think aloud, we will deal with them just as we dealt with old John Brown. I alluded to the fact that it took more men to guard John Brown than it took to win the battle of San Jacinto. I did not say that with any view of reflecting on my friend from Princess Anne, (Mr. WISE,) for I believe he was actuated by proper motives. He saw that danger might come, and he took precaution against it. If he had not had forces enough there to repel any attempt at rescue of Brown, his name would have gone down amid the anathemas and denunciations of the whole American people. I honor him for what he did, and justify him thoroughly.

I now beg leave to call attention first to the question of the election of Lincoln. I want to know what Bell man, or Douglas man, or Breckenridge man of any prominence, stated in the canvass, that the election of Lincoln, without any aggression on our constitutional rights, would be a just cause for a dissolution of the Union? I heard many of the friends of the supporters of each on the stump, and I never heard the first man of them avow to the people that the mere election of Lincoln would be, in the absence of any aggression on our constitutional rights, a just cause for a dissolution of the Union. On the contrary, when our distinguished Senator, Mr. Hunter, spoke in the city of Petersburg, the question was directly put to him, whether, in his opinion, the election of Lincoln, before any aggression on our constitutional rights, would be sufficient ground to dissolve the Union? and his answer was, that he did not believe it would be; but that, if any State went out of the Union for that cause, he would not help to force her back. I take it, then, to have been admitted, that the mere election of Lincoln, in the absence of any aggression on our constitutional rights, would not justify a dissolution of the Union.

The question, whether he has committed any aggression on our constitutional rights, is a question which it is not necessary for me to argue. He has only been in power since the 4th of March last. Every law on the statute books was passed before he got into power. Let him do his worst, and he can only carry out laws passed by Congress—the majority being sometimes of one party, and sometimes of another. No law stands on the statute books that ever did receive the signature of a Black Republican President, because we never had such before. All these laws have been passed by the Congress of the United States, going through the ordeal of an examination by a President who was either a Whig or a Democrat. If the existing laws are worthy of condemnation and censure, bring up the Presidents who signed them, and hold them responsible. If a Whig President signed them, and they are defective, censure him and his party. If, on the contrary, a Democratic President signed them, I say, as a Democrat, censure the President and his party.

What Abraham Lincoln may do I cannot say. But if he is guilty of any act that is designed to impair our rights, I am satisfied that every man in this house is ready, as I am, or any other man, to resist that act. I regret, sir—I regret exceedingly—that when a Black Republican President came into power, twelve Southern Senators, instead of continuing in their positions, left the Senate. I regret that, when he came into power, thirty-three members of Congress withdrew. By that act alone, they placed us in the power of a Black Republican majority. By that act, the son of the man to whom I alluded a while ago, in connection with the presentation of abolition petitions to Congress, has been confirmed for the highest foreign mission in the gift of the Government. How could he have been confirmed by the Senate if the Southern Senators had remained.

in their places? How could any acts of Congress be passed that would have operated against the South with the presence of the thirty-three members who had left? I repeat, sir, that we, in the South, who expected to have had sufficient strength, with the aid of the Northern conservative vote, to control the action of the President, are now left in a weak minority, because of the secession of these Southern Congressmen. Had they remained, they could have put their veto upon every nomination that he might make that was objectionable to the South. But we lost that power. These Congressmen went out, and I cannot see, for my life, how they can justify that act under the circumstances.

Again, sir: Look at your House of Representatives. Every single Northern State, except Kansas, Rhode Island and Connecticut, have held their elections, and we find, upon estimating the results, that had the States that have gone out remained in the Union, and we elected Southern men, we would have had a majority of seventeen in the next Congress. With a majority in the Senate already secured during Lincoln's term, so that it could not be broken down, with these facts existing, how, I ask, could any injury result to the South from the election of Mr. Lincoln? What, I ask, have these gentlemen to say for turning their backs upon us under such circumstances? They can offer no justification for such a course. There was no necessity for it; and nothing can result from it but evil. Suppose, sir, you were to turn your back upon the people of Albemarle, and leave their interests to the tender mercies of a majority against them, could you go home and justify yourself with that people? I think not, sir. Virginia has been sustained by her Senators. They kept their seats, and we are standing here now ready to resist any aggression that may come, confident, as we are, that truth and justice are invincible. We are ready to meet and resist any aggression with shield brightened, with arms burnished. Yes, sir; we are to resist the shock as best we may; and for this, and for seeking an honorable adjustment of all difficulties and the restoration of peace throughout our once happy country, we are called *submissionists*, while these gentlemen, who fled from the mere shadow of danger, are looked upon as jewels of perfection. Has it ever occurred to you that Gen. George Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, John Quincy Adams, Van Buren, Harrison, Taylor, Pierce, and Buchanan, have occupied the chair now filled by Lincoln, and that the same Constitution and laws that controlled them control Abraham Lincoln? Tell me that the same laws that controlled all these distinguished Presidents are not strong enough to control Lincoln? Sir, if they were not, why did not these flying Congressmen stand to their post, and in a patriotic spirit aid to make them so? Let us not be further annoyed by this mad cry of secession, which is kept up by the rash and precipitate men among us. Why, sir, by this time I thought that the dagger of these secession Brutuses would ere this have been plunged deep and fatally into the heart of the chief of Republicans. Regardless of threats, I confidently rely upon the great heart of the American people, their virtue and their moral integrity. I rely on the virtuous masses to maintain the laws that have been enacted in pursuance of the Constitution, and if they are not found strong enough, let them be rendered stronger and more effective.

What is the next question? We can't have the fugitive slave law executed. I admit that this law has not been as effective as I would desire it to have been, and I condemn the personal liberty bills as strongly as any man; but the personal liberty bills are subject to the provisions of the 2nd section, 6th article of the Constitution of the United States. If they are not in violation of the Constitutions of the States where they have passed, they are in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and are therefore void. What, sir, is the power that the Government has to enforce the fugitive slave law? Mr. Buchanan told you, in his last message, that the President had the power of the Army and Navy to enforce this law. He told us that in every controverted case that had arisen during his administration, under the fugitive slave law, the General Government had succeeded in having the slave returned. He did not say that all who escaped had been caught and sent back; but he did say that, in every contested case, the General Government succeeded in executing the law. We know that the Compromise Measures of 1850 were adopted, and that law was one of the series of measures that constituted the compromise. Millard Fillmore signed that law, and he caused it to be executed in the case of Anthony Burns, the fugitive slave in Boston, though the Marshal, or one of his aids, was shot down in the discharge of his duty. If the President of the United States has the power of the Army and Navy at his back, what more does he want, in order to enforce that law? Why contend that the personal liberty bills are unconstitutional, when their being so makes them harmless? What material injury are these personal liberty bills, which are known to be inoperative and void, while we have the power of the Army and Navy, President and Supreme Court to enforce the fugitive slave law? What better position do we want than to have Northern abolitionists acting under void laws, while we are acting and seeking our rights under operative constitutional laws? We have that position now; and, if necessary, the South had

ample power to amend the fugitive slave law and make it more efficient. But disunionists say the law can't be enforced in good faith. This, to some extent, may be so; but will disunion give better faith or a better fugitive slave law? Let us see what the Army and Navy have done, and what they are able to do. Your Navy, it is true, can't penetrate inland; but it has its sphere of effective operation. Your Army was sent to Kansas by the President, and established peace there. It went to Utah, and put down Brigham Young, the terror of the terrible. A commissioner was sent down to Paraguay, and he took a few men-of-war with him, and readily obtained all the rights that were demanded. They have done all this, and much more, and now we are told they can't catch a negro. I don't believe one word of it, sir. They can do it. And here I beg leave to call the attention of gentlemen to the condition of the negro. They all know as well as I do that a negro will run away. Here is a paper published in my town, and in that I find advertised five negroes who ran away—two from Petersburg, one from Surry, one from Dinwiddie, and one or two from another neighboring county. The rewards offered are \$20, \$25 and \$100. If a citizen were to catch them, I think he would deliver them; but if they are not caught, are you to call the people of these counties abolitionists? The negroes will run off. They are rational beings, and sometimes the cruelty of the master, and sometimes laziness, or an indisposition to work, causes them to run away. It is a species of property, and though it should escape, as we all know is often the case, it would be nonsense for us to get up and say that because, as in the case of the counties to which I referred, they are not returned, that the people of the region to which they escape are abolitionists. Because you cannot catch your negro who escapes to the North, it does not follow that all there are abolitionists. No man can be found in Virginia who will, without the inducement of reward, go and hunt up another man's negro and catch him; and there are many who will not do it for reward. I am telling the plain truth, though if I knew of any man in Virginia who would harbor a runaway negro, with a view to enable him to escape, I would be the first man to hold him to a just responsibility, under the laws. If people do so at the North, let the laws be enforced with reference to them. Let the negro be pointed out by the master, and I take it he will be returned, judging from the past.

I am comparatively a young man. I am called old, but I don't admit that I am. I never felt so. Look back forty years and see the institution of slavery as it existed then. See the great change in it that has taken place within that time. The negro worked contentedly on the farm then, and went into his cabin at night and on Sabbath with no new-fangled ideas in his head; and you never heard, as you do now, of a negro running away. What is the fact at the present day? Your railroads penetrate every section of the country—your omnibus drivers are upon every line, and every young man that is able to afford it, instead of riding on horseback, dashes along in a buggy, with a negro beside him dressed in better style than were our fathers; and the first thing you hear is, that the black dandy, instead of going into the kitchen and eating his supper, is off to some other region discoursing about the geography of the country as glibly as his master, and soon you find he is making an effort to run off. Did you ever hear of any running away but this new stock, this same fancy stock, buggy drivers, carriage drivers, and waiting maids? That is what causes all this trouble. So far as my habits are concerned, I treat them well. I do not let my negroes sit up by my side and drive me.

The third question is, that you cannot go into the Territories with your slaves. What is the reason? The plainest reason in the world is, that you will not go. In 1856, during the canvass, in the effort to fill up Kansas, the offer was made in the city of Petersburg to every emigrant of \$50, and of \$100 to every one who would carry a slave with him. They got about twenty-five to go under the first offer, but they could not get one to go who had a negro. What is the reason that you cannot go to the Territories? Is it because the Missouri Compromise line is repealed? Has not the Supreme Court decided in the Dred Scott case that the Territories are open to slavery everywhere? The Supreme Court says that the Congress of the United States has no power to pass any law prohibiting you from going there. No man, however, in his senses, would think of taking a slave worth \$1500 from South Carolina, Alabama, or any of the cotton States, to settle in a new Territory before it had even been cleared. In order to calm those who are now dissatisfied, the Committee on Federal Relations have made a report, which I think ought to satisfy everybody.

Having now shown that you are not prevented from going into the Territories with your property, by the decision of the Supreme Court, I now come to consider the report of the Committee of Twenty-one. But before I proceed to consider that report, I beg leave to explain the position I occupied before my constituents. When they honored me with a nomination, I set forth plainly and clearly my views. I claimed that the true position to be taken by the South was this: that we of the slaveholding States should make out a catalogue of our wrongs, upon which we should all agree as covering them

all; that we should set forth the mode and measure of security and indemnity asked for, and then call upon the North to concede and adopt it. We should say to them, you know that you have been guilty of wrongs towards us, and that you can give us the redress asked for without injuring you. I would appeal to my Northern friends and say, here we are brethren of the same nation; we together commenced and carried the Revolution to a glorious close; the bones of our ancestors whitened the plains of our country both North and South; we fought and triumphed together; we were identified in the war of 1812-14; upon the lakes of the West, upon the plains of the South, and the fields of the North, we were fighting in a common cause for the sake of a common country; in the Mexican war the North and the South met upon the same battle-fields and shared in the same glorious triumphs; upon the sandy plains of Mexico lie bleaching together the bones of Northern men and Southern men. If our Northern friends should refuse us the security and indemnity I have indicated, and if an appeal to the glorious memories of the past and the hallowed recollections of a common struggle in which the North and the South have engaged, should fail to secure us our just demands from the North, then I should say to them, let us agree to part in peace. Do you take all the public property North, and we will take the public property South. If we get more than we are entitled to, we will pay the difference; if you get more than you are entitled to, you must pay the difference. We will take the public lands in the same way, and we will assume our fair proportion of the public debt that the General Government may owe. But if this proposition is rejected by the North, then I would say, "Revolution" is the word—"Victory or death."

Virginia knows her wrongs. Let her take those wrongs and set them forth, covering every complaint. Let her meet in conference with her sister border States, and then let them say to our Northern friends, here are South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama and other States that we desire shall come back. Give us such guarantees in regard to our rights as will enable us to ask our brethren of the South to come back.

If I understand the propositions that have been reported by the majority of the Committee on Federal Relations, I believe they will cover that ground, and I think I shall establish that fact before I sit down.

Here, sir, is the first section of the report of the majority of the Committee on Federal Relations, which calls upon the North for a division of the common territory, according to the line of the Missouri Compromise—the line of 36° 30'. That is substantially the proposition which was submitted by the Peace Conference, and which has been ridiculed as a cheat and a fraud. Do you remember that in Congress every Southern man voted to extend the Missouri Compromise line? Do you remember that it was Mr. Clayton, with two Whigs, two Democrats, and two Freesoilers on that committee, that reported that extension measure? It was a Southern measure in 1848, and the repeal in 1854 was a Southern measure also.

Now, sir, I will run over the various sections of this report hastily, because I think that they embrace all the wrongs which the South complain of, and other gentlemen may scrutinize them more closely. The first section of the amendments to the Constitution proposed by the Committee, providing for a division of the territory, says:

"In all the present territory of the United States north of the parallel of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes of north latitude involuntary servitude, except in punishment of crime, is prohibited. In all the present territory south of that line, involuntary servitude, as it now exists, shall remain, and shall not be changed." Is there any objection to that? It secures you against any change whatever. "Nor shall any law be passed by Congress or the Territorial Legislature to hinder or prevent the taking of persons held to service or labor from any of the States of the Union to said Territory." All that is in this section, mark you. Now, the great bugbear of complaint on the part of Southern men is, that the Territorial Legislature will not let you carry your slaves there. So far as that right is concerned, this first section covers the whole ground upon that subject. Another cause of complaint was the fear that if the territory was free under the laws of Mexico, that might prevent slaves from being brought there. We have provided against that in this first section, which goes on to say: "Nor shall said rights be in any manner affected by any preëxisting law of Mexico; but the same shall be subject to judicial cognizance in the Federal Courts, according to the remedies and practice of the common law." In our efforts to meet all objections and to reconcile all differences, we struck that Latin word *status* out of the Peace Conference proposition. All at once it appeared, when the subject was discussed, that nobody in Virginia knew what that Latin word *status* meant, and so we struck it out. We were not going to put into the Constitution a word from a dead language, after it was found out that nobody knew what it meant. This pretended ignorance was a ruse to raise an objection to a measure that it was feared would be satisfactory. If they are so afraid of Latin, I hope the Legislature will strike out of the law such Latin phrases as *scire facias* and *ad quod damnum*.

[Laughter.] But it was a miserable exception taken to the Peace Conference plan, as every one knew what *status* means; but in the kindest spirit of conciliation, and with a spirit to reconcile all objections, we agreed to change the mode of expression, though the idea is the same. The concluding portion of this first section admits the States into the Union upon their own terms. It says:

"When any territory, North or South of said line, within such boundary as Congress may prescribe, shall contain a population equal to that required for a member of Congress, it shall, if its form of government be republican, be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, with or without involuntary servitude, as such Constitution of the State may provide. In all territory which may hereafter be acquired by the United States, involuntary servitude is prohibited, except for crime, north of the latitude of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes; but shall not be prohibited by Congress or any territorial legislature south of said line."

So that you see if you want to come in with slavery, come in; if you want to come in without slavery, come in; do just as you please. Won't that satisfy you? Some people, you know, never can be satisfied, especially the politicians. Sir, I have seen, when children got very mad in their nurse's arms, the nurse carry them to the looking-glass to let them see how ugly they looked, and then, in the intensity of their passion, the children break the looking-glass. That is the force of the objection of the politicians to this provision. You can't satisfy them. I want this matter to go before the people, and they will determine whether it is right or not. You may ridicule it here, if you choose; but I tell you, when it comes out of the hands of the wire-working politicians, and gets before the honest farmers, the people will sanction it. Yes, sir, the people will endorse it. But you cannot satisfy these aspirants after power and place, who, in all their action, are shaping their course to get there.

But look at the second section:

"No territory shall be acquired by the United States, except by discovery, and for naval and commercial stations, depots, and transit routes, without the concurrence of a majority of all the Senators from States which allow involuntary servitude, and a majority of all the Senators from States which prohibit that relation; nor shall territory be acquired by treaty, unless the votes of a majority of the Senators from each class of States herein before mentioned be cast as a part of the two-thirds majority necessary to the ratification of such treaty."

That section, sir, indirectly gives each division of the country the veto power in relation to the acquisition of territory. What do we understand this section to provide? Not, as the Constitution now declares, that two-thirds of the Senators can make a treaty, but a majority of all the Senators from each section. You must not only have two-thirds, but a majority of the Senators from each section. Doesn't that suit you? Doesn't that guard you? What could you have more explicit, more safe than that? Before a territory is admitted, if the North wants to admit it upon one line of restriction which will not suit the South, the South will say, "You can't do it;" and if the South wants to admit it upon terms that will not be satisfactory to the North, the North will say, "You can't do it." It requires that a majority from each section shall give their consent. Therefore, it places us in such a position, that when admitted, it must be by the consent of both parties, and the terms of admission distinctly settled before it comes in.

The third section declares:

"Neither the Constitution, nor any amendment thereof, shall be construed to give Congress power to legislate concerning involuntary servitude in any State or Territory wherein the same is acknowledged or may exist by the laws thereof, nor to interfere with or abolish the same in the District of Columbia, without the consent of Maryland and Virginia, and without the consent of the owners, or making the owners who do not consent just compensation; nor the power to interfere with or prohibit representatives and others from bringing with them to the District of Columbia, retaining and taking away, persons so held to labor or service, nor the power to interfere with or abolish involuntary service in places under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States within those States and Territories where the same is established or recognized; nor the power to prohibit the removal or transportation by land or water of persons held to labor or involuntary service in any State or Territory of the United States to any other State or Territory thereof where it is established or recognized by law or usage; and the right during transportation, by sea or river, of touching at ports, shores and landings, and landing in case of need, shall exist, but not the right of sojourn or sale in any State or

Territory, against the laws thereof. Nor shall Congress have power to authorize any higher rate of taxation on persons held to labor or service than on land.

"The bringing into the District of Columbia persons held to labor or service for sale, or placing them in depots to be afterwards transferred to other places for sale as merchandise, is prohibited."

This section gives us the right to carry our slaves to any State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, keep them there, and bring them back when you want to do so. Does any body want more than that? Further, it gives you the right of transit from one slave State to another, by railroad, by water, or otherwise; and you shall have the right of transit through any State or Territory, even where the laws prohibit slavery, so that you don't sojourn there. Do you want any more than that? "Nor shall Congress have power to authorize any higher rate of taxation on persons held to labor or service than on land." That is a plain proposition, providing a check upon a higher rate of taxation on slaves than on land, and needs no comment.

Then we come to the fourth section, which guarantees and protects that part of the Constitution which gives us a right to pass laws for the re-capture of fugitive slaves: "The third paragraph of the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution shall not be construed to prevent any of the States, by appropriate legislation, and through the action of their judicial and ministerial officers, from enforcing the delivery of fugitives from labor to the person to whom such service or labor is due." It distinctly and emphatically states that that provision shall not be construed so as to prevent the delivery of fugitive slaves.

The fifth section prohibits the slave trade. It says: "The importation of slaves, coolies, or persons held to service or labor, into the United States and the Territories, from places beyond the limits thereof, is hereby forever prohibited." Will that satisfy South Carolina? I doubt it. It will satisfy four of the States of the Southern Confederacy. There are two, perhaps, which it will not satisfy—South Carolina and Florida—which voted against it in the Southern Constitution. It will satisfy all the States, perhaps, except those two, and if they are not satisfied I am sorry for it.

Now, mark the words of the sixth section, which reads as follows:

"Congress shall provide by law that the United States shall pay to the owner the full value of his fugitive from labor, in all cases where the marshal, or other officer, whose duty it was to arrest such fugitive, was prevented from so doing by intimidation from mobs or riotous assemblages or by violence, or when, after arrest, such fugitive was rescued by like intimidation or violence, and the owner thereby deprived of the same."

I have heard but one objection to that section; and of all the objections that I ever heard to any measure, this one has the least sense in it of any. What is that objection, sir? It is, that you are taxed to pay for this property, that the money to pay for the fugitive slaves comes out of the public treasury. That is the objection raised by the three hundred and fifty thousand of us slaveholders. Well, sir, now just let me work out the calculation on this table. Your negro runs away to New York; he is worth a thousand dollars; he is rescued from the marshal; you go to Washington; you prove your right of property to your negro; you prove that he was rescued; you prove his value, you get your thousand dollars. On such an occasion, if it was in the old times—which have now departed, and I wish they were here again—if it was in the old times, when you got home, you would have had a sort of family feast, because, if the lost had not been found, you, at least, had the value of your negro. Imagine yourself sitting down beside your wife and family, with the thousand dollars in your hand for your negro. You count it out before your good old woman, who has always revered the Constitution, who has raised children and grand-children under it, and who has stood up in defence of it in all times of its adversity. You say, "Old lady, I've got a thousand dollars for my slave, but they have taxed me to pay a portion of it." "Well, old man," she says, "what is your portion of the tax?" "Well," he replies, "I haven't made the calculation." Now, let us see what his portion of the tax would amount to. There are three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders in the United States. Make a division of a thousand dollars among them. If you do that, you will have to reduce it to mills. One thousand dollars—a million of mills. Divide that thousand dollars, or a million of mills, among three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders, and you will have just three mills as that slaveholder's part of the thousand dollars. The wife says, when she learns the amount, "Well, old man, it isn't worth while making any fuss about that." [Laughter.] Now, there are three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders, who contribute nine hundred and ninety nine dollars, ninety nine cents, and seven mills, and yet, when one slaveholder, who gets his thousand dollars, pays three mills, he complains of it. [Laughter.] But

carry the principle further. Ah! sir, you dare not work it out before your children. This calculation which I have made you see is only among the slaveholders—three mills to each slaveholder. But there are thirty-one millions of people in the whole United States. Eighteen of the States do not own slaves. Seven millions, six hundred and fifty thousand of the population of the South don't hold slaves. And all these in the North and in the South, by the provisions of this section, will contribute their portion to the public treasury, for the purpose of paying for the negro. Suppose you divide that thousand dollars among those thirty-one millions of people; you could not divide it so as to make a comprehensive calculation. No, sir, the result would be such that you could not give it a place in whole numbers, and the fraction would be so small as hardly to find a place in our currency. And that, sir, is the objection raised against this section.

Have you got any other property that that privilege is extended to? Have you any other kind of property that you can call upon the national treasury to pay for? If I go to the North with one of those black darkies, and he gets away from me, I get a thousand dollars. If I go to the North, and a pickpocket steals a thousand dollars from me, have you any law for that? If your horse is stolen, have you any law to apply to that? If I go to the North, and take my wife or my son with me—for the common law gives me the right to their services, during the coverture of the one and the minority of the other—should they be taken from me by the mob, have you any law to compensate me for their services? No. But you have for your negro. And I make this reference to show the absurdity of the objection to this section, which gives exclusive privileges to the slaveholder. If your property is pressed into the service of the United States, if your horse is taken for the purposes of war or any other public use, due compensation is to be made to the owner, and you contribute your part freely. But here a negro is taken, without being of use to anybody, he is of no service to the country, but he is paid for to protect you against the abolitionists, and he is paid for cheerfully. It is an exclusive privilege accorded to Southern men, and yet Southern men complain, that they are made to pay their proportion. I do not complain of it. Every man has to yield something in the abstract, when he enters into society with others. And when I get so poor as to quibble about paying my three mills I have to pay for that negro, I shall be ready to doubt my honesty.

The seventh section provides that the elective franchise and the right to hold office shall not extend to persons who are of the African race: that, I suppose, ought to satisfy those who have been complaining about free negroes voting. It ought to satisfy them, if their complaint has been founded upon anything right and proper.

Well, now, sir, what is the closing section? It gives assurance that these matters shall not be opened again for agitation. Hear it:

“No one of these amendments, nor the third paragraph of the second section of the first article of the Constitution, nor the third paragraph of the second section of the fourth article thereof, shall be amended or abolished without the consent of all the States.”

Mr. Chairman, I ask you—I appeal as far as my powers will go to every man in Virginia, and ask him whether these provisions are not satisfactory—whether they do not furnish reasonable guarantees upon the subject of slavery, and whether this closing provision that none of them shall be interfered with, without the consent of all the States. The Constitution of the country has kept the Union together for 72 years, and I ask you if these guarantees are provided, and cannot be repealed without the consent of every State, judging from the past and reasoning to the future, how long would it continue to exist? Sir, it would live until this period arrives. Man in the course of his life arrives at a culminating point; in other words, there is a certain period of life when the physical and mental powers are at the highest state of perfection. Then he begins to retrograde, and so continues, until he at last arrives, as Shakespeare says, at the condition of being a second child. So with nations. Look at the history of the world. Go back, and you will see, that they go on increasing in population, in extent of territory, in civilization, in art, in all that makes a nation, until they arrive at a culminating point, and then God, in His wisdom, for some cause unknown to man, allows them to retrograde and go on in their downward course, until, finally, the spot that was once brilliant with art, once illuminated by intellect, goes into oblivion, and is forgotten. Look at the Eastern world. How are their nations fallen! Their works of art are even now being dug up, as at Nineveh—works that cannot be accounted for, unless the country was at some day inhabited by intellectual and powerful men, who had arrived at the highest points of perfection in science and arts. You cannot reconcile the existence of such works, with the barbarous and uncultivated, which Bayard Taylor tells us of. Those nations must have, at some time, enjoyed a higher condition of civilization and art. To that extent

will the American Union go; and if we complain that it must fall then, it is complaining against God, whose decrees we should rather submit to with that resignation which becomes a Christian people.

Mr. Chairman, I have now nearly approached the conclusion of my argument. There are one or two points to which I may yet refer. I am satisfied that the Convention is tired of hearing me; that even those of my friends who agree with me are tired; and I know that those friends from whom I differ, I speak of my secession friends, who are devotedly attached to the South, but not more so than I am, are dissatisfied with the line of argument I have laid out. It is natural that they should be. They believe their plan of action right. I believe their motives are correct, but I believe that the preservation of this Union will save slavery against every attack, North and South. I ask you to adopt for yourselves, in your own conduct, the golden rule—that you will, when you lie down at night, repeat this golden rule—that you would do to others as you would that they, under similar circumstances, should do unto you. Sir, I am ready to follow that rule, and then let him that has done no wrong cast the first stone. Suppose some of the States of the North had gone out of this Union, and had taken the forts, the arsenals, the dock-yards, and the money belonging to the General Government—suppose seven States of the North had done it—what would you have done then? Sir, the people of the South could not have been held back. I repeat, sir—I repeat—suppose they had done it. That is the way to test the principle. Does not every body know that Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana—every one of them—took the forts that belonged to the General Government, which they now hold in their possession, before any ordinance of secession had been passed? If South Carolina justified herself in taking the forts and Government property within her limits, on the ground that she had withdrawn, I ask you what justification can States have that did this act before any withdrawal had taken place? Suppose this attitude had been assumed by a Northern State? Go to Blennerhassett's Island, wake up Blennerhassett, and ask him to answer the question, whether, if he, not to aid South Carolina, but to aid Aaron Burr, had gone that far, it would not have brought him within Chief Justice Marshall's decision in Burr's case?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to refer you to the speech made by the South Carolina Commissioner, Mr. Preston, before us in this hall, in which he avowed that secession was a peaceful measure, and, in the same speech, he told us that, in South Carolina, every man, from sixteen years old to sixty, who could walk, was armed. And we sat here and heard that advocated as a peaceful measure—every man armed to do a mission of peace. Suppose it were known that, in the city of Richmond now, every man who could walk, from sixteen years old to sixty, was armed, would you say their mission was peace? Sir, the fact would show the falsity of the assertion. It is very easy to make an eloquent speech when a man has every thing prepared at his hand; but I tell you that these eloquent speakers, when they go beyond their preparation, when their imagination gets to rolling and tumbling, are very likely to meet with a great fall. It is no matter where a man flies, but he ought to be very careful to see where he lights. (Laughter.) Suppose Mr. Preston had said, that South Carolina had seceded, and, as an evidence of the peaceful character of the measure, every man or woman that could walk, from sixteen years old to sixty, was seen going to church to offer up thanks to God for their deliverance, would not that be considered a peaceful mission? Would not they be held as doing God's service? But when you see every one of them carrying a bowie-knife, a revolver, a rifle or a musket, on their way to church, you would say, "Look here, there is not going to be any praying here to-day—there is going to be fighting—look at them all armed." (Laughter.) That was the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Chairman, who came into this hall, and asked, "whether Virginia, like the trembling Egyptian, will skulk for shelter beneath the crumbling fragments of a past greatness?"

Sir, I tell you that there is intellect in Virginia—there are men here of far too high integrity, of far too great powers of mind, far too superior to allow the wool to be pulled over their eyes by any such talk as that. I think the States which have seceded will come back, if we get these guarantees, and I tell my friends to be of good cheer. We have the example of the prodigal coming back after he had fed a sufficient time on husks; and if they do not come back before, I tell you about 1864, when we have to elect another President, they will be on hand. If they do not come back, and we fail to get these guarantees, it will then be for us to say where we will go. When I get to the bridge, I will cross it, and not before. If we fail to obtain these guarantees, and South Carolina fails to come back, I will then look around, survey the whole ground, and determine what to do. I tell you that, when Virginia goes out of this Union, she will never come back; and those who use the argument of destroying the Union, for the

purpose of afterwards reconstructing it, presume too much upon the ignorance of the people—they understand the whole scheme. Break up the Union to reconstruct it! What would be thought of a father who would give his little daughter, five years old, a doll, and her sister Mary, two years older, were to break off one the arms? Your daughter comes to you and says, "Papa, sister Mary has broken off one of the arms of my doll." "Go away, my child," says the father, "let Mary break it all to pieces, and then bring it to me, and I will mend it for you." Our little children would laugh at such an idea. The argument is too absurd to require further notice.

Sir, Virginia is not powerless and her sister Border States of the South are not powerless to protect themselves in the Union. It is a rod held over our heads by those who have plotted disunion, and I do not envy them for it. By the Constitution of the Confederate States, Congress can prohibit slaves from being carried into her limits. Here is a spirit of revenge to be gratified to hem slavery within our limits, if we do not go to them; for we know they want our slaves, from the price they pay for them.

What has been the complaint of South Carolina and each of these other States, Virginia included? That the free soilers intended to restrict slavery to its present limits—to girdle us with a belt of fire. They justify themselves on conscientious religious belief. But there is no such excuse for those Southern States who have reserved the power, if we do not act to suit them, to aid the abolitionists in fixing that girdle of fire around us. Does not every body know that they have no conscientious scruples upon the subject of slavery, and they would only carry out that most sordid of all passions—*revenge?*

I take the ground here openly, that we have not slaves enough in Virginia. We have committed the greatest piece of folly in disposing of our slaves. All that we have are not enough for our own wants, if we would turn our attention more to the cultivation of cotton. An export duty on cotton is to be imposed in the South—no such export duty will be imposed on cotton in the other States. Then see what our position will be.

I have made some calculations to illustrate my position. I get the figures from the United States census. The cotton produced in Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky and Arkansas, in 1840 and 1850, is given in the census:

The amount of cotton made in Virginia was—

In 1840,	8,748 bales.
In 1850,	3,947 "

Being a falling off of nearly 5,000 bales.

In North Carolina, the cotton made was—

In 1840,	129,815 bales.
In 1850,	50,545 "

A falling off of nearly 80,000 bales.

In Tennessee, the cotton made was—

In 1840,	69,250 bales.
In 1850,	194,552 "

In Kentucky, the cotton made was—

In 1840,	1,728 bales.
In 1850,	750 "

In Arkansas, the cotton made was—

In 1840,	15,000 bales.
In 1850,	65,344 "

Now, look how the thing works. From the above exhibit, it will be seen that Arkansas, in 1840, with a slave population of 19,935, made 15,071 bales of cotton, and in 1850, with a slave population of 47,100, made 65,344 bales. Estimating the cotton crop of 1840 and 1850 as the basis for the crop of Arkansas in 1860, and it gives 260,000 bales. Tennessee, with a slave population, in 1840, of 183,059, made 69,250 bales, and in 1850, with a slave population of 239,459, made 194,532 bales. These two States, having continued the cultivation of cotton, show that, as the slaves increased in number, a corresponding increase in cotton followed.

Whilst Virginia, North Carolina and Kentucky in 1840 made 140,287 bales, and in 1850 only 55,250 bales, showing a decrease of 85,037 bales. Let these States resume

the cultivation of cotton to the extent that they did in 1830, and the aggregate crop of the above five States would be more than 650,000 bales, more than sufficient to supply the cotton manufactories in the States of Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Vermont. The entire number of bales of cotton manufactured in these States in 1850 being 531,925, leaving a surplus of cotton, after supplying the factories in the above States, of 118,175 bales.

These Southern States talk about prohibiting us from sending slaves to them. Sir, we have not got as many slaves now as we want. This exhibit shows what can be done with slaves in the production of cotton. Let us keep our slaves at home, and keep the Union together. Put your slaves to the raising of cotton in Virginia. Every man who has ever cultivated cotton knows that it interferes with no other crop, except the corn crop, and that our present stock of slaves is inadequate to the cultivation of cotton on a large scale. I call upon Virginia, then, not to be frightened by the threat to prohibit the border slave States from sending their slaves into the Cotton States. We have not got enough slaves for ourselves. I call the attention of my friend from Greenville county, (Mr. CHAMBLISS,) a county small in territory, but great in intellect and wealth. In 1840 she made 572,629 pounds of cotton. Look, then, at Sussex. In 1840 she made 851,315 pounds of cotton—both counties making together nearly a million and a half of pounds. Let us, then, have no fears about what we can and what we will do if we succeed in putting down this tyrannical party that would make Virginia secede from the Union. Let us have recourse to the cotton crop, and then, instead of Virginia falling back in her career, she will become more prosperous than ever, and instead of disposing of her slaves, she will keep them in her own hands, and employ them in a profitable manner.

What, sir, would be our condition were we to sever the Union and form a Southern Confederacy? It would, in effect, be to bring Canada to the borders of Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee, with no fugitive slave law for the recapture of slaves—no treaty of extradition for their delivery; but with every barrier swept away. The border States become the battle ground of predatory warfare, whilst the cotton States upon the gulf would be secure from harm. What is there, sir, to justify such a state of things? Nothing, sir, nothing. The ambition of a few disappointed aspirants for power might be gratified at the expense of the comfort, safety and repose of the community. The leaders are expected to do this work, and their reward has been offered them in this hall. Here is what was said in our presence by Judge Benning, the Commissioner from the State of Georgia, Feb. 18th, 1860:

“Again, if you join us, you will be at the head of a great Confederacy. You will direct its policy. Honors will wait on your great men.”

Yes, sir, “honors will wait on your great men!” Let not Georgia lay the flattering unction to her soul. The freemen of Virginia have read with some profit that there was once before a tempting serpent which caused a great fall; and they will not be sold nor delivered by her “great men,” if they never are honored with office.

That is not all. Here is his provision for the little men. I quote from the same speech:

“Now, if the slave States were separate from the North, the collection of the revenue from customs would require that a string of officers should be stationed at short distances along the whole boundary line between the North and the South, to collect the duties, and a penalty to guard against smuggling. Detachments of the army would also, it is probable, be placed along the same line. These officers and army detachments might be charged with the duty of intercepting all slaves attempting to escape, and of keeping watch for all agents of abolition, and other suspicious persons. This done, and but a very few slaves would escape—a state of things would be produced which would make escape extremely difficult.”

Of whom would this army and this border line be composed, to “intercept all slaves attempting to escape?” Would we, who are slaveholders, form any portion of it? No, sir, there is not a slaveholder in Virginia who would keep a slave if he had to stand guard night and day around his own plantation, to prevent his own slaves from escaping; much less would he go on the line to prevent the slaves of others escaping. Every slaveholder knows this to be true, and it is not worth while to deny it.

Sir, this army would be composed of non-slaveholders, the laboring classes—composed, perhaps, of what Senator Hammond, of South Carolina, called, in derision, “the mud-sills of society.” A more patriotic set of men never lived than the non-slaveholders of Virginia. They have stood by us on all and every occasion, whether engaged in foreign

war, or in suppressing domestic violence. They will do it now and forever. But I tell these Cotton States—aye, sir, I dare say to the 350,000 slaveholders of the South, if they expect, in a time of peace, these men are going to leave home and friends, debar themselves of their social relations, break the ties of family and kindred, to go on the frontier line of Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee, to form an army to intercept the escape of our slaves, that they will be deceived. They might for a time silently march on their solitary beat, but when worn out with their monotonous tramp, tramp, they would say to each other, “Here we are, separated from our wives, our sisters and our daughters, to whom our protection is due, guarding the slaves of others, when we do not own a negro in the world. We will fight for the slaveholder, we will defend his property when assailed, as we ever have done, but ‘King Cotton’ must not expect us to compose a ‘standing army in time of peace,’ for the protection of his property, when what little we left at home is protected by the laws of the land.” That would be the result of the experiment. And I venture to assert, that if any member of the Convention which framed the Federal Constitution had suggested such a scheme to prevent the escape of slaves from the United States to Canada, the idea would have been ridiculed.

Mr. Chairman, I have nearly brought my remarks to a close. I hope and trust that my arguments have been candid and fair, based on recorded facts, which speak for themselves. Further, sir, I am an office-holder of the General Government. Let that be told to the people. I am the Collector of the port of Petersburg. And I tell you another thing—I made an estimate last month of my quarter’s pay, from the 1st of December to the 1st of March, and what do you think it amounted to? Just \$26.25. [Laughter.] I make this statement because I want to disarm men of an argument which they might possibly use against me, that I am an office-holder, and that therefore I advocate the views I do. I know that no candid, fair-minded man, however, would make that argument. I am actuated by no such principle, because, if I know myself, I am one who would not

“Bend the pregnant hinges of the knee,
That thrift may follow fawning.”

I never question a man’s motives. If he does any thing right, I give him credit for it. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury wants the key, let him send for it, and he shall have it. I have no favors to ask, no frowns to dread. But I cannot believe it is the duty or the interest of Virginia to sever her connection from those States that have stood by her and the South so long. I cannot agree in my heart to leave the million and a half of men who voted in the North for Bell, Breckenridge and Douglas, to the tender mercies of their Black Republican opponents. I will do my best to get the sons of the South to preserve the Union.

Be so kind, sir, (to Mr. HOLLADAY, of Portsmouth) when you go home, to tell the good people of Portsmouth that I put myself to the trouble to see how much was contributed by the North when the yellow fever raged among them. Tell them I looked over with pleasure, to see how much it was that came from the North to relieve suffering humanity at Portsmouth. Tell them that I had the honesty to say here, in the presence of the world, that the people of the North came to your aid when your dead lay so thick that you could hardly get people enough to bury them.

Let us see what was done for the town of Portsmouth in 1855, during the prevalence of the terrible malady which devastated that town. Let us see what was done by the North to stop the current of the black vomit that seemed to course with such deadly effect. At that time a committee was appointed in the town of Portsmouth to receive subscriptions in aid of the sufferers. Let us see what they have reported on the subject of contributions from the Northern States:

Contributions for Portsmouth in 1855, during the rage of the Yellow Fever.

There was contributed in money from all sources	-	-	-	\$86,067	63
Of which Maine gave	-	-	-	758	00
New Hampshire	-	-	-	50	00
Massachusetts	-	-	-	5,008	47
Rhode Island	-	-	-	704	66
Connecticut	-	-	-	350	03
New York	-	-	-	20,694	90
New Jersey	-	-	-	1,500	77
Pennsylvania	-	-	-	12,877	74
Total from the North,	-	-	-	\$42,544	57

There, sir, is the amount contributed by the non-slaveholding States of the North. And Massachusetts, with her trained band of abolitionists, contributed \$5,000 to a slaveholding community, and a people who thankfully received it. Let others say what they will, I never, never will forget it. If example is worth anything, we should set a good one by doing justice to those who stood to us in time of need. Let it go to the North, sir, and let them see then that we are not insensible to the favors which they extended to our citizens when in distress. For myself, sir, I say in all candor, that I cannot express my gratitude to these States in terms by any means adequate to its depth; and I feel assured that these communities, which were more immediately the objects of these munificent donations, feel deeply grateful.

But let them speak through the report of their committee—pouring forth, as it does, the thanks of a Christian community in terms more chaste and eloquent than any thing that I can say. The head, the heart and the hand that drew it, knew how to appreciate the charitable aid of these “good Samaritans.”

Hear the committee:

“How sublime a eulogium on the character of our institutions and our people, did this spontaneous outpouring of benevolence in behalf of a plague-stricken city present! The citizens of every section of our country—the old and the young, as well as little children—people of all shades of politics and religion, simultaneously, and without concert, joined in the holy charity which was to furnish food and comfort for a dying community! When our wants became known—and they were by no means few or small—there was not a day on which supplies of money, provisions, medicines, and necessaries of all kinds, were not flowing in upon us.” * * * * * “Assistance was not alone furnished us in provisions and money. When the call for personal help went forth, our cries were heard and nobly responded to. Intelligent and philanthropic physicians, kind and skillful nurses, and gentle, sympathizing women, flocked to our relief. They knew the danger they were about to encounter, but that did not cause them to hesitate. Intent only on ministering to the wants of sick and suffering humanity, all thought of danger to self was discarded, and vigorously and nobly did they battle with the plague-fiend—some to fall, to rise no more until the sounding of the last trump! Martyrs to humanity! Exemplars of heroism! They fell more nobly than if cut down on the battle-field, amid the pomp and circumstance of war. No martial strains or loud huzzas cheered them in their labors. Nothing but the shrieks of the suffering and the groans of the dying saluted their ears. Noiselessly and without applause, save that afforded by a consciousness of their holy mission, they followed in the track of the pestilence, rendering all the aid to its victims which an arduous course of theory had placed at their command.”

Thus rolled back to the noble friends of suffering humanity at the North and the South, and to high Heaven itself, the voice of Christian souls who had been remembered in the days of their affliction.

Norfolk, too, was at that time cursed with the same pestilence. Here, sir, is what was contributed for the relief of her sick and dying:

Total amount in money contributed for relief of Norfolk in 1855,	-	\$157,237 72
Of which amount—Maine gave	-	\$1,663 00
New Hampshire “	-	80 00
Massachusetts “	-	10,627 55
Rhode Island “	-	2,257 66
Connecticut “	-	1,150 10
New York “	-	35,518 39
New Jersey “	-	5,319 42
Pennsylvania “	-	20,171 64
Ohio “	-	126 20
Illinois “	-	5,480 00
Total in money from the North,	-	\$82,393 96
Total in money from North for Portsmouth,	-	42,544 57
Total for both cities from the North,	-	\$124,938 53

In addition to all this, there were physicians and nurses from the North, volunteering their services, in the face of danger and death, to these afflicted strangers, whom they had never seen. Yes, woman, the ministering angel in our afflictions, was found speeding her way to soothe the fevered brow, and wipe away the clammy sweat of death. Amidst

