

the non-organization of this House will rest with those two parties.

I did not intend to occupy so much of the attention of the House upon this subject, and would not but for the interruptions. I now come to consider of another position—a position which deals with the Republican party of this House. And in dealing with this subject, I wish to say that I now intend to fix the responsibility of this discussion, and of the introduction of the resolution by the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CLARK,] in its proper place. When we met here, and the first development of sentiment was made between the two parties upon the first ballot for Speaker, the fact was ascertained that the Democracy did not consider that any gentleman of the Republican party was fit to preside over the deliberations of this body. When I say *fit*, I do not use it in any disrespectful sense, but I use it in reference to the great political position that party occupies. The further fact became manifest, that the Republican party did not consider any gentleman upon the Democratic side of the House fit to hold that position. They did not mean that in any disrespectful sense, but they meant that such were the two political organizations, that they did not consider, in the existing condition of things, that any Democrat ought to preside over the deliberations of this body.

Mr. JOHN COCHRANE. Will my friend from Mississippi give way to a motion to adjourn?

Mr. McRAE. I yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. JOHN COCHRANE. Then I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and thereupon (at forty minutes past four o'clock, p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### IN SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 14, 1859.

Mr. TOOMBS and Mr. SEBASTIAN appeared in their seats.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

#### ADMISSION TO THE FLOOR.

Mr. DAVIS. I offer the following order:

*Ordered*, That the assistant engineer in charge of heating and ventilating, have the privilege of the floor of the Senate, so far as in the opinion of the Presiding Officer his duties make it necessary.

The object simply is to allow the assistant who has charge of the heating and ventilating of this Chamber, to come into it during the session to see it when it is filled, both in the galleries and on the floor, to examine the thermometers, and see that the registers are all performing their functions properly. It cannot be done so well if he comes into the room when it is vacant. He is now excluded by the rules from coming into the Chamber when the Senate is in session. I merely wish to give him that permission under the direction of the Presiding Officer.

The order was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

#### \*\*\*\*\* INVASION OF HARPER'S FERRY.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the following resolution, submitted by Mr. MASON on the 5th of December:

*Resolved*, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the facts attending the late invasion and seizure of the armory and arsenal of the United States at Harper's Ferry, in Virginia, by a band of armed men, and report whether the same was attended by armed resistance to the authorities and public force of the United States, and by the murder of any of the citizens of Virginia, or of any troops sent there to protect the public property; whether such invasion and seizure was made under color of any organization intended to subvert the government of any of the States of the Union; what was the character and extent of such organization; and whether any citizens of the United States, not present, were implicated therein or accessory thereto, by contributions of money, arms, munitions, or otherwise; what was the character and extent of the military equipment in the hands, or under the control, of said armed band, and where and how and when the same was obtained and transported to the place so invaded. And that said committee report whether any and what legislation may, in their opinion, be necessary, on the part of the United States, for the future preservation of the peace of the country, or for the safety of the public property; and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers.

The pending question being on the following amendment, offered by Mr. TRUMBULL:

After the word "invaded," in the fourth clause of the resolution, insert:

And that the said committee also inquire into the facts

attending the invasion, seizure, and robbery, in December, 1855, of the arsenal of the United States at Liberty, in the State of Missouri, by a mob or body of armed men, and report whether such seizure and robbery was attended by resistance to the authorities of the United States, and followed by an invasion of the Territory of Kansas, and the plunder and murder of any of its inhabitants, or of any citizen of the United States, by the persons who thus seized the arms and ammunition of the government, or others combined with them; whether said seizure and robbery of the arsenal were made under color of any organization intended to subvert the government of the States or Territories of the Union; what was the character and extent of such organization; and whether any citizens of the United States, not present, were implicated therein or accessory thereto by contributions of money, arms, ammunition, or otherwise; what was the character and extent of the military equipments in the hands or under the control of said mob, and how and when and where the same were subsequently used by said mob; what was the value of the arms and ammunition of every description so taken from said arsenal by the mob; whether the same or any part thereof have been returned; and the value of such as were lost; whether Captain Luther Leonard, the United States officer in command of the arsenal at the time, communicated the facts in relation to its seizure and robbery to his superior officer, and what measures, if any, were taken in reference thereto.

Mr. WADE. It was not my intention, Mr. President, to say anything upon the subject of this resolution until late yesterday, when my name, I believe, was called in question by one or two of the Senators on this floor. I made up my mind, on the introduction of this resolution, that I would vote for it; not however with the hope that any beneficial result would probably flow from it; for it seemed to me from the first that the only effect it would be likely to have would be to increase that state of excitement that seems already to be sufficiently strong, at least for all practical purposes. But upon this resolution the whole subject of controversy between the northern and southern States has been discussed; and I have been alluded to in such terms as I suppose renders it almost essential that I should say something. I have no desire to speak frequently on this most hackneyed subject; I have not, during the whole time I have had the honor of a seat here, been very forward in pressing my views on this subject upon the Senate or the public; but when measures of great public importance to the northern States, as I deemed them, were pressed upon our consideration, I have been compelled to state the views that I entertained upon them. I have not obtruded myself upon the Senate, and I am constrained to speak now simply because of the allusions which have been made to me in the course of the debate.

It was said by the mover of this resolution, that one great object of it was to elicit the state of northern feeling with regard to the recent invasion at Harper's Ferry.

Mr. MASON. Will the Senator indulge me a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WADE. Certainly.

Mr. MASON. That has been ascribed to me once or twice in the course of the debate, perhaps upon both sides of the Chamber. It was a misapprehension. I did not say, or mean to say, that any object of the resolution was to elicit the state of northern feeling in reference to the occurrence at Harper's Ferry. My colleague may have said something of that sort. What I did say, and what I design and hope to ascertain by the investigation, is to find out from what source the funds and the counsel were obtained that led to or induced that incursion at Harper's Ferry. I had reason to believe, and I have reason to believe, that it came chiefly from the New England States.

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, I stand corrected in that particular, although I got the impression that it was a part and an essential part of the design of the mover of the resolution, to inquire into the state of northern feeling on that subject. It seems I was mistaken. I believe the colleague of the Senator from Virginia, avowed that to be the principal object of the resolution. I had supposed that it could not be very essential to introduce a resolution for the purpose of ascertaining what public sentiment at the North was on the subject of this invasion of Harper's Ferry from any source whatever. I know very well that, for the basest political purposes, that great and overshadowing party to which I belong, has been charged with complicity in this affair; but we have treated the accusation with scorn and con-

tempt. We who have not before been charged ostensively with any crime whatever, we who have maintained peace and good order, are all at once charged, in general terms, through some of the papers of the North and the papers of the South, with being parties to treason, murder, and stirring up insurrection! The charge is so entirely overstrained that I must say it fell upon my ears without creating one single emotion. I care nothing about a charge of that kind made in such general and sweeping terms.

But, Mr. President, I know what the effect of it may be in that part of the country where there is an acute jealousy existing as to the motives of northern men. The charge is made through the only papers that can reach the ears of the southern people, and where no antidote will be suffered to go in order to explain public opinion. It seems to me that the southern people are misguided upon this subject; that they entertain the idea that northern men, in considerable numbers, respectable men, are concerned in some deliberate conspiracy against their rights. Now, sir, I must say that if such a state of feeling does really exist there, the southern people themselves are principally responsible for it. They will suffer no opinions to be circulated among them unless they are first cut and trimmed to their own prejudices. If a northern man goes down there and honestly avows his opinions, he is in peril of his life; he is turned out of any southern State; his sentiments, however honest, and his motives, however noble, will not exculpate him from the charge of being an Abolitionist, or something of that kind, and he will be hurried out of your States; and you, who speak of the observance of constitutional rights, will you stand by him there when he invokes the Constitution of the United States to shield him against your unwarrantable prejudices? Not at all, sir. You will no more suffer a northern man to circulate among you, unless he leaves his manhood and his independence behind him, than the Chinese would suffer a stranger to invade their cities. You will not suffer the papers of a great and all-prevailing party in the North to circulate among you, so that you may learn the designs of the party through that source which carries its intelligence to the party in the North.

Then, sir, can you but be deluded? I should suppose if there was any danger of circulating incendiary matter among the people of the South, that would be the most dangerous of all which went to teach the people there that a great party, controlling all the free States, were sympathizing with raids upon the South; were ready to lend themselves to any uprising that might be got up there. If I were to judge of dangerous incendiary, I should say that would be the most dangerous of all; yet it is carried into those States without, as I said before, any antidote, or anything to explain it. The Governors of your States may proclaim that the great mass of the northern people are ready to abet the acts of those who recently made an attack on Harper's Ferry. What could be more dangerous to the institutions of any southern State than statements like this, if promulgated there?

Why, sir, it is a strange state of things that we find prevailing all around us. A strange state of sentiment has sprung up all at once. I beg to know what has taken place that has given rise to this inquiry, and I will say it, to these most intemperate speeches that have been made on the subject? Why, sir, twenty-one men, all told, deluded men; yea, sir—judging from the very act they undertook to accomplish—insane men, have invaded a great and powerful sovereign State, and they have met that retribution which every sane man knew must be their lot in undertaking what they did. When a gang of conspirators are apprehended and brought to justice in every other case, as far as I know, all excitement ceases over the graves of the malefactors; and why not here?

Mr. President, I understand it is said that the northern people sympathize with John Brown in the raid that he made upon the sovereignty of Virginia; and that is a great cause of complaint. Sir, I do not stand here to control the sympathies of the human heart, under any circumstances; because they are not subject to human control; but I think I can explain the reason why many northern men have deeply sympathized with old John Brown, the leader of this gang. I ask you here, however, always to discriminate between the man

and the act that he committed. Gentlemen seem incapable of drawing that line of discrimination. They run both together, and they treat old John Brown as a common malefactor. They have a right to treat him so; but he will not go down to posterity in that light at all. I think I know why it is that some considerable feeling and sympathy exist in the North for old John Brown, and it cannot be understood unless we go back for four years, and see what was taking place in a distant Territory of the United States, and what part John Brown acted on that theater.

Sir, if the people of Virginia are excited almost to madness because a conspiracy has been formed and traitors have made a raid upon their sovereignty, what do you suppose were the feelings of northern men, whose relations and friends had gone into a far distant Territory, and formed colonies there, weak and feeble, scattered through a wilderness; when it was the deliberate purpose of a great, powerful, and almost all-pervading party, to drive them out, or to coerce them to subscribe to opinions and institutions which they abhorred from the bottom of their souls? Many were murdered in cold blood, and others were driven out and their property was destroyed. They appealed to Congress; but they got insult instead of sympathy. When I state this, I state what I know. My blood boiled then, in view of the oppression and tyranny that sacrificed that Territory. I need not go through all the volume of testimony on that subject. I speak by the book. One hundred witnesses attest the truth of every word I say. Their record is indelible. It will go down to posterity, and it will show the damning fact that this Government did, at least, connive at the acts of great bands of conspirators, who, arming themselves lawlessly with arms of the Federal Government, invaded a peaceable Territory; took possession of the ballot-boxes; drove its people from the polls; expelled them from their possessions; exercised acts of tyranny over them; deprived them of every right; and, in a great many instances, murdered them ruthlessly in cold blood.

But, sir, that was a great way off; it was in a Territory of this Union. It was not every man on this floor who had friends there exposed to those attacks, and hence they did not create the same excitement that is created when the invasion comes nearer home. But I declare here in my place that, in my judgment, the only difference between the two cases is this: that in the case of Kansas the invasion was made with no other purpose than to fix slavery there at all hazards and by force of arms, while old John Brown and his men, with a like unlawful purpose, undertook to extirpate slavery from the State of Virginia.

The free-State men of Kansas got no consolation from this Government. I remember well when their petitions came in here asking for redress, and I remember that a Senator stood forth in his place and said: "We will subdue you; you are traitors; we will hang every man of you; this Government has proved itself the strongest Government under heaven to protect the civil rights of men, and now I want to see how strong it is to punish traitors." That was the language dealt out to the citizens of that Territory when they appealed to us for redress. Understand me, sir; I do not go back to the history of Kansas for the purpose of justifying old John Brown and his crew in their invasion of Virginia, but in order to show you why it is that the men of the free States, to some considerable extent, do sympathize with this old hero. In the darkest hour of Kansas, when the rights of the free-State men were imperiled, when their men were murdered in cold blood, several of whom were from the State of Ohio, when everything looked dark and gloomy there, and when your Government failed to interpose its strong arm in their behalf, then it was that old John Brown appeared upon the stage of action. Arming himself as well as he might, he commenced to do that justice to himself and his fellows that the Government had denied, and he did it with a heroism and a determination that then not only challenged the admiration of his friends, but even the respect of his enemies. He went forward with a firmness and determination that carried terror into the hearts of the border ruffians, and he hurled them from the Territory and really conquered a peace.

Now, sir, in order to understand northern sentiment, it is necessary fully to appreciate the feel-

ings of those men whose friends were stricken down in that defenseless Territory. Old John Brown was their champion. He carried himself through those scenes nobly, to the acceptance of all and the admiration of all; and there it was, as has been often said here, that he learned the art of war. Undoubtedly, sir, that raid was the parent of this. It is true old John Brown lost two of his sons there; they were murdered in cold blood before his eyes, literally hewed to pieces; and I believe that he was maddened by the scenes through which he passed in Kansas, because I do not believe that any sane man on earth would have undertaken the enterprise that he undertook at Harper's Ferry.

Well, sir, he marched upon Harper's Ferry; he conspired against a great sovereign State, to overthrow its institutions; and I say to the Senate—though I shall get no more credit for it than my fellow Senators who have preceded me have—that I do not sympathize with or approve the act. Old John Brown resided, for a long time, not a great way from that portion of the country from which I come. He was always reputed among the most honest and upright men in that community. There was nothing against his character. He was known to be a brave, generous, disinterested man, the admiration of all that knew him, even before he passed through those scenes in Kansas. He proceeded upon this lawless mission, and I suppose the idea entered his head while he was in Kansas; indeed, I saw it stated in the papers that there it was that he found his associates; there it was that he conceived the idea of invading the southern States and emancipating their slaves. From there, he went to Canada, and in Canada he made that famous constitution or form of government which, in his crazy mind, he conceived was to supersede all others. But, Mr. President, [Mr. Mason in the chair,] you must bear me witness that he bore himself, among the disastrous scenes of this unwarrantable enterprise, with that same calmness, with that same sublime heroism and indifference to fate that had characterized the man on all other occasions. I have heard even those whose territory he invaded, speak of him as a man who challenged their admiration for his personal qualities, though they had, of course, no sympathy with the act that he had perpetrated. The Governor of your State, sir, who met him face to face in an interview, was compelled to say, "He is brave, he is honest, he is sincere." It is rarely that a man brave, honest, and sincere, is led to the gallows or the stake; but, nevertheless, if these qualities misguide him into a lawless raid upon the rights of others, he must suffer the penalties of the law, and no man stands here to justify him.

I ask you in the generosity of your hearts to separate and distinguish between approval of a lawless invasion, and sympathy for a sublime hero taking his life in his hand and marching up to the altar to offer it there a sacrifice to his highest convictions of right. Sir, his course was disinterested. He is frequently spoken of as a common malefactor, a vulgar murderer, a robber. Sir, he proposed nothing to himself. His conduct was as disinterested as man's conduct can ever be; but he was misguided, he was demented, he was insane; still the people of the North do not forget the great services that he rendered to their cause, to their relations, and their friends, who were in peril in the Territory of Kansas, nor can the human heart divest itself of a sense of that heroism which has characterized him from the time that he was overtaken until the grave closed over him.

Therefore, sir, they do sympathize with him; but I beg of you not to be misled by this. Do not jump to the conclusion that the people who hold meetings in admiration of the personal qualities of John Brown, one single man of them, stand forth to justify his nefarious and unwarrantable act. I do not know that a single application to save his life was made from that quarter. If it was, I did not hear of it. They supposed that, according to the law existing in the State against which he had offended, he properly suffered the extreme penalty of the law. And here I will say before I pass from this branch of the subject, that in my intercourse with all the people who knew old John Brown, in my intercourse with all the men who have sympathized with him in his last trial, I have never yet heard of a man,

woman, or child, that stood forth as a justifier of his raid upon Virginia. If the people sympathized with a felon upon the gallows anybody would know without inquiry that it was no ordinary case. Our people do not sympathize with crime; but they do feel those emotions which are elicited by those traits of heroism that characterized this leader during the whole course of his life, and shone most conspicuously in his death.

But enough of that, Mr. President. It is exceedingly absurd to endeavor to implicate the Republican party in the acts of old John Brown or anybody else. They have their principles, which are well known by all the community in which they prevail. Our doctrines are well understood. The limitations upon our doctrines are well known by all who choose to know them, and those who do not choose would never understand them although they were written upon the face of the sun. The Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. Johnson,] the other day, and the Senator from Alabama, [Mr. Clay,] yesterday, if I understood them, undertook to read us a lecture on our understanding of the Declaration of Independence, and the doctrines growing out of that instrument; and I have thought that probably here is the great departure between them and myself, between those who believe in the institution of slavery and those who do not. The Republican party, so far as I know, believe in the Declaration of Independence. They do not believe that it is a tissue of glittering generalities. They do not believe that it is a mere jingle of words having no meaning. They do believe that every man bearing the human form has received from the Almighty Maker a right to his life, to his liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They do not believe that this right is confined to men of any particular name, nation, or color; but they believe that wherever there is humanity there is this great principle.

The Senator from Tennessee said that the Declaration of Independence applied only to white men; that white men have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and he said it did not apply to all; that it was never intended to apply to any other class of persons than the white race. Do I understand that Senator, then, in the converse of the proposition, to hold that the black man has no right to his life? Let us narrow it down to that; will the Senator say that a negro has no right to life? If he has, he has just as great and as inalienable a right to his liberty and to the pursuit of happiness. Sir, there is nothing more abhorrent to the mind of most northern men than the idea that one man was created by his Maker to be a mere drudge, a serf, to another; that it was the intention of the Almighty in creating a particular class of men, that they should forego their own happiness, their own right to cultivate their faculties, and that they were born for no better purpose than to minister to the happiness of some other man, regardless of their own. To a man thus born, his being would be a curse. He might scoff at the Creator who had raised him up, not to regard his own happiness, not to regard the culture of his own mind, but as a being whose life, whose limbs, and all whose faculties were dedicated by the Almighty to minister alone to the promotion of some other man's happiness. Sir, that is not the teaching of the Declaration of Independence. It was never so intended, nor are the framers of that instrument liable to be taunted with hypocrisy because they did not carry out practically, to their full extent, the ideas of that great and Godlike instrument. They were framing a Government for these States. They knew, to be sure, that the sovereign States of this Union existing at the time, had their own institutions; they knew, to be sure, that slavery prevailed there; but there was not a man of them who did not proclaim it to be wrong. I am not going to read those hackneyed declarations of theirs, but I say to you, you cannot find the man that was instrumental in framing the Constitution of the United States, or the Declaration of Independence, but what said over and over again that the system of slavery wherever it exists is wrong and cannot be justified upon any principle; and to attempt to justify it would be to reduce the Government of these United States down to a level with the meanest despotism that exists on the face of God's earth. If one may be created for no better purpose than to minister to the welfare of another, the only question will be, who are the privileged

classes—who are to be ministered unto, and who are the menials to do their work? All monarchies act upon this principle, and therefore it is that kings assume to reign by divine right. It was the purpose of our fathers to put the dagger to the heart of such an absurdity. All men, say they, are created equal, and have these inalienable rights. All men feel that that is so.

Why, sir, what said Jefferson? The Senator from Tennessee, I believe, said that if he gave this scope to the Declaration of Independence, inasmuch as he was a slaveholder himself, he would be a hypocrite in saying it. That does not follow. The Senator from Alabama, if I understood him, declared that if this was so, then those who held slaves were great criminals, and were guilty of the greatest wrong. That does not follow by any means.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator doubtless does not mean to misrepresent me. I said that if the libel, as I think it, pronounced by his party upon the slaveholders was true, then we were criminals.

Mr. WADE. I do not know that I understand the Senator.

Mr. CLAY. I said that if the assertion of your party, that slavery and polygamy stood together and were equally crimes against revealed religion, was true, then both the slaveholder and the polygamist were criminals alike.

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, I am not one of those who suppose that all slaveholders are deeply criminal. I know very well how habit and custom, and even necessity, modify all our abstract opinions. I understand that well, and I never mention it in the North without the proper qualifications, notwithstanding the Senator thinks I hate slaveholding and slaveholders so much. I give you here, on this floor, my worst version of your institutions. I hold no such doctrine as the Senator charges us with. I do not charge Thomas Jefferson, nor Mr. Madison, nor General Washington, nor Mr. Randolph, nor Mr. Tucker, nor any other of the great statesmen to whom we look up with such reverence, with hypocrisy or anything sinister or wrong; because, when they made this declaration, and declared that the word "slave" should not be in the instrument which they were framing, for the reason that it grated harshly on their ears, and they knew it was an infringement on natural right, they held slaves in the States themselves. The fact that they held slaves did not prevent their making this declaration, nor did it prevent them, on all occasions, from inveighing against the institution and wishing they could find some means by which they could do away with it. General Washington himself was, according to your understanding of it, just as much an Abolitionist as you charge me with being. He believed the system wrong—morally, politically, in every way—and he hoped some means would be found whereby it might be abolished. Yes, sir, that was the word. He wished that some means would be found by which this system should be done away with, and he declared that, whenever there was an opportunity, his vote should not be wanting to accomplish it. How long do you suppose that he could remain upon the soil of Virginia to-day with this declaration upon his tongue?

In the administration of public affairs you cannot govern a nation upon an abstraction. You cannot impeach a man with inconsistency because he cannot live in the administration of public affairs up to the finest spun theory that you may produce. All I ask of these great men they performed. They found themselves surrounded with this institution; they saw its working and its operation; they saw that it was all wrong, in policy and in theory; they saw that in morals it was equally wrong, and they wished to get rid of it; and on all proper occasions they constantly declared it to be a wrong, and they invoked the people about them to come up to the work, and, as fast as it could be done, to do away with it. Therefore, sir, they were consistent. They knew that their slaveholding in the States was in direct contradiction of that great and Godlike declaration that they had put forth to all mankind, and they sought to get rid of it.

Mr. President, it is not a great while ago since the view that those great men entertained on this subject was universal, North, South, East, and West. I wish Senators would bear that in mind; because, perhaps, it would moderate their asper-

ity of feeling against those who still stand where, but a very short time since, we all stood together. That slavery is to be justified as a divine institution is a doctrine that is not five years old, in my judgment. Mr. Clay, at the head of the old Whig party, denounced it down to a very late period in his valuable life, in stronger, infinitely stronger terms than I could denounce it upon this floor, as wrong, continually wrong; and the great party that adhered to his standard in the South, were all equally orthodox upon this subject; there was no discordant note there; there was not a Clay Whig in all the South who would stand up and say "this institution of ours is to be justified upon principles of moral right and justice"—not one. So well known was this fact, that I remember it is not much more than four years ago since the speakers in the South, and the leading papers in the South, put forth this doctrine—the Charleston Mercury, I recollect, was one—that the framers of our institutions were all Abolitionists, agreeing precisely with our doctrines, (and it cannot be denied, because the record evidence that they left behind them is perfectly overwhelming,) but that they did not understand the subject; they had not made it their study particularly; but now the South have reviewed the whole doctrine, and have come to another conclusion. They now find that the old doctrine was altogether at fault; that the relation of master and slave is the true relation of man, upheld by divine inspiration, instituted of God, and approved of and in accordance with nature itself. The Charleston Mercury went so far as to say that if this was not so, the Abolitionists were right. Yes, sir; it staked everything upon the new light that had broken in in modern times, which shines so fiercely that it has dimmed and obliterated even the Sermon upon the Mount.

Yes, sir; this is a modern light that has sprung up since you began to raise the standard of slavery, declaring that it should dominate over this great nation, and should prostrate every other interest. It grew up along with your new territorial doctrines; it grew up along with your Dred Scott decision; it grew up with your meditated design of opening the African slave trade. It is a key to them all. It grew as cotton grows; and we were told here not long since that cotton was king, and had dictated this new code of morals. I challenge any Senator to deny that I state this doctrine aright.

Is it not a fact that you claim that on a review of the question of slavery you have got new light? The old doctrine was that it was wrong in morals and could not be justified; but now you hold the contrary. We, sir, adhere to the old doctrine. We have not seen the new light that has broken in upon the South. We were not admitted into the great council where the investigation was had which resulted in finding out that the institution of slavery is in accordance with nature and approved by God.

It is true, sir, that I cannot touch the institution within the boundaries of the States where slavery is established by law, for there the Constitution does not enable me to reach it. I am no more responsible for it in your States than I am for it in Turkey or any other foreign country, where I hear of it with regret, and where I have nothing to say upon the subject; but when you undertake to thrust it forth where it has no foothold, where there is no necessity that it should go, there, like Mr. Clay, of Kentucky, I meet you to contend inch by inch; nay, with him in the last noble sentiment that he uttered, I would suffer my arm to fall from its socket before, with my consent, this accursed institution should invade one inch of territory now free.

One word more as to the effect of this doctrine. Do I stand here to accuse a gentleman who is a slaveholder of the South with crime? I have never done so. You may say that if we regard slavery as wrong, and as a robbery of the rights of men, we should accuse you with being criminal. Well, sir, the logic would seem to be good enough were it not modified by the fact that with you it is deemed a necessity. I do not know what you can do with it; I was almost about to say that I do not care what you do with it; I will say it is none of my business what you do with it, and I never undertake to interfere with it. To be sure, believing it to be wrong—wrong to yourselves, and wrong to those whom you hold in this

abject condition, I wish that you could see the light as I see it; but if you do not, it is a matter of your own concern and not of mine. I can very well have charity towards you, because with all my opposition to your institution, I can hardly doubt that if we had changed places, and my lot had been cast among you, under like circumstances, my opinions on this subject might be different, and I might be here, perhaps, as fierce a fire-eater as I am now defending against fire. I can understand these things, and I accuse no man.

In reading over the Globe of yesterday, I perceive that the Senator from Tennessee, in passing, said, that somewhere I had made a disunion speech. I would ask the Senator to what speech he alludes, for I am not aware that I ever made any disunion speech.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee. I do not know whether I can make myself heard distinctly or not, being hoarse, but I will try to do so. I did not assume that the Senator had made a disunion speech; but I was summing up doctrines and teachings, commencing at a pretty early period of the country, and bringing them down to this day, that, as I thought, would end in dissolution; and I referred to speeches made by the Senator from Massachusetts, and by the Senator from Ohio, in which they inculcated the same doctrines which I thought would result in dissolution. I did not impugn their motives, but I said their teachings would finally result in a dissolution of the Union. I referred to two speeches made by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Massachusetts. I did not assume that they were in favor of dissolution; but said that the doctrines thrown out and inculcated by them were calculated to result in a dissolution of the Union. I can call the Senator's attention to the paragraph.

Mr. WADE. Then I understand the Senator to say that while we did not preach disunion, we held doctrines that he inferred might lead to that.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee. Precisely.

Mr. CLAY. Perhaps the Senator alluded to me; and as I think he has denounced the Union in quite as strong terms as perhaps any fire-eater has done, I will invoke his attention to what I have read in his presence heretofore and imputed to him, and he did not then deny that it was a correct quotation from his speech; hence I presumed that he admitted it. In 1856, in some remarks which I submitted upon the affairs of Kansas, I quoted an extract from his speech delivered the summer preceding, in Maine, and I will say, in justice to him and to myself, I then had the speech by me; I have not been able to find it since, although I have made a search for it among my papers for his benefit, this morning.

Mr. WADE. I remember what the Senator stated.

Mr. CLAY. But this is a correct quotation from the speech, in which the Senator declared that "the men of the North and the South are more inimical than the Russians and the English;" and that "the pretended union now existing is all meretricious." He said, furthermore, in the same speech, in allusion to this same union, this "meretricious" union, "there is not a business man anywhere, who, if he had such a partner, would hesitate to kick him out at once and have done with it," meaning such a partner as the South. That was, perhaps, what the Senator alluded to; and I think it is due to him and to myself, that I should bring it to his attention.

Mr. WADE. I remembered what the Senator from Alabama had stated, and I was going to remark on that, too; but I was noticing in the speech of the Senator from Tennessee what I have already alluded to.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee. By permission of the Senator, I will say, that if he will take the context of my speech prior to the point where the Senator from Massachusetts was referred to, he will see that I was summing up the evidence tending to show that certain teachings had been promulgated which would result in a dissolution of the Union. I referred to the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Ohio as inculcating similar doctrines. I have the two extracts that I alluded to before me that I thought were similar to those I had before quoted, and which, in my judgment, tended to a state of things which must result in a dissolution of the Union.

Mr. WADE. I am entirely satisfied with the

explanation: I did not know but that the Senator intended to insinuate that I had made a dissolution speech. Now, as to the Senator from Alabama, and what he has said in regard to that speech which I made in Maine, I will state that I did make a pretty fierce speech down there in Maine on the stump. [Laughter.] I remember that very well. I do not think, however, that I was rightly reported. I believe the gentleman who professed to report my speech did not profess to do it literally, but he gave a summing up of his own convictions of what I had said.

Mr. CLAY. In justice to myself, then, I will say that he did himself great injustice; because, when I read this in his hearing about four years ago, he made no denial of it; he did not qualify it at all, as he now does.

Mr. WADE. I am not in the habit of retreating in the face of the enemy, and I do not very often explain anything, but I am in pretty good temper now, and I will state what I have said, in regard to this speech, in Ohio, when it came out there first. I was challenged there with a speech that I had made in Maine, and it was read to me as containing doctrines that some thought highly objectionable. Well, sir, my recollection of the speech was entirely different from that. I do not know that the speech was ever reported at all. I do not think it was ever pretended to be literally reported at all. If it was, it was done not by a friend, but by an enemy, I believe.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator permit me to say that I saw this in a paper that was supporting his party at the time, and that commended the speech very highly; a paper, I think, at Springfield.

Mr. WADE. Now, if I recollect what I said in regard to the first clause of that, it was this: that speech was made at the time of the irritation consequent on the invasion of Kansas, when our northern people were excited in the way that I have already stated; and I alluded to the sources of irritation existing between the different sections of the country, and the manner in which they were persevered in, the repeal of the Missouri compromise, the war in Kansas, and the murders that had been committed there; and then I declared, according to my recollection, that unless some means of preventing and stopping these things were taken, it would result in just what they charge me with having said. I said it would ultimately result in making the different sections of this country as great enemies as two hostile nations, or something like that. That is my recollection, and I know it is the explanation that I gave immediately after the speech was made and reported; but I am not particular about that. As to the other parts of that speech, I have no particular recollection of them. The report was never handed to me for correction. It was never seen by me before it was sent out to the public, and I do not now know anything about it.

Mr. CLAY. I did not understand the Senator to disclaim the sentiments imputed to him, but only the language. He does not recollect the language; but he does not deny that such were the sentiments he then entertained and, perhaps, uttered.

Mr. WADE. I said, that if the course of things of which I spoke was persevered in, the result would be to make us enemies; which, I think, is very different from saying that we were enemies now. It strikes me to be a difference, and I believe it was laid down with that qualification.

Mr. CLAY. But the Senator repeated the sentiment in a stronger form than I have read it to him. I did not want to read the worst part of it to him, because I did not wish to inflame him or excite any unpleasant feeling in the Senate. As, however, he persists in saying that he is misrepresented, I will read another extract from the speech. I had it all together, and I assure him it was reported by one who professed to be his friend—to be a Republican. I got it in a Republican paper. I do not know with what motive it was sent to me; but it was certainly sent to me from the place where it was delivered. Here is the extract:

"There is really no Union now between the North and South, and he believed on two nations upon the earth entertained feelings of more bitter rancor towards each other than these two nations of the Republic. The only salvation of the Union, therefore, was to be found in divesting it entirely from all taint of slavery."

Mr. WADE. What speech does that purport to be?—

Mr. CLAY. The same speech; that is my recollection. I have not the entire speech before me, but I have some extracts from it.

Mr. WADE. It seems to be reported in different language, I do not think I said so. I, of course, do not profess to remember exactly what I really said in a speech delivered some years ago; but I do say now that there is no very considerable degree of good feeling existing between the different sections of the Union. I do not know, to-day, but that that sentiment, if it was not true then, is very nearly true now, as near as I can learn. I have already alluded to the fact that northern men cannot travel or do business in the southern section of this country—so we read in the papers. Great numbers of merchants on their way doing business, were lately turned back. There was no particular accusation against them that I can hear, only that they came from a section of country of which the southern people are exceedingly jealous, and, I must say, intolerant. If I spoke of there being a sentiment of hostility between the different sections, it was because I lamented and deplored such a state of feeling. I undertook to state my views of a fact either existing then or that would exist, if the practices which I condemned were persevered in, and it is so now. I stand here now to deprecate it. Why, sir, who does not know that there is but very little intercourse existing even between members upon this floor from different sections of the country? There is not that cordial greeting and good fellowship that I should like to see, that everybody ought to desire to see. Mr. President, it is lamentably so, and if it is censurable, to allude to it, and state it as a fact, and a fact to be deplored, I may be censurable.

There is one thing more which I will notice in passing. The principal reason why I undertook to speak to-day, was on account of personal allusions to myself; otherwise I should have said nothing on this subject; but the Senator from Georgia [Mr. IVENSON] saw fit, in his place in the Senate, to assail my colleague in the House of Representatives, (Mr. SHERMAN,) and to impeach him because of a transaction which he characterized as exceedingly dishonorable and derogatory, as I understood him, to the character of a gentleman, and which he thought should go to destroy that confidence that is reposed in one so situated. When I heard his denunciations I was happy to find that the Senator did not accuse Mr. SHERMAN of any erroneous vote, or of any wrong action. Mr. SHERMAN's course, in the other branch of Congress, has been known of all men for some four years past. He has been a very active and a very worthy member; and if there was anything wrong in any principle that he has advocated or any vote that he has given, I am sure that the vigilance of that astute Senator would have found it out. I say, then, I was exceedingly gratified to find that my friend in the other House was so little assailable upon this floor or anywhere else. We consider him as one of the brightest ornaments of the State of Ohio. That great State seeks to do him honor, and I rejoice to know that the great party to which I belong repose in him the utmost confidence. They have found nothing in him but what they approve; and the Senator, after all his investigations, could find nothing more than this: that Mr. SHERMAN had recommended the circulation of a certain book. Now, I want to ask the Senator if there is anything in that book that he thinks dangerous to the people of any section of this country? I want to know from that Senator, if he believes that that book cannot safely be entrusted to the hands of any freeman in this Government? The Senator does not choose to answer me.

Mr. IVENSON. Mr. President, I do not choose to stultify myself by answering any such question as that. It is too apparent to any man of common sense who has read the book, what would be the effect if its recommendations were carried out.

Mr. WADE. Well, sir, since the question has been up, I have taken some pains to look through that book; and I find nothing there but arguments addressed by a non-slaveholder of a slaveholding State to his fellow non-slaveholders in those States, laying down rules and regulations for their proceedings, and arguing this great question of slavery as it affects the interests of non-slaveholders in the slaveholding States. Unless such arguments

are unlawful there, I see nothing in the book but what is just, right, and proper for the consideration of all men who take an interest in these matters. Why, sir, has it come to this, in free America, that there must be a censorship of the press instituted; that a man cannot give currency to a book containing arguments that he thinks essentially affect the rights of whole classes of the free population of this nation? I hope not, and I believe not.

Why, sir, the great body of the statistical information in that book, as I read it, is drawn from the census of the United States, from your public documents, and from the archives of the nation. Is it improper that arguments deduced from these sources should be addressed to the free population of this country anywhere? If they may not be, it is the hardest argument against the spirit of this institution that I have seen yet. If we really have among us an institution that we are cherishing and seeking to spread broadcast over the land; so delicate in its texture that the free people cannot have information that they themselves claim, I say again, it is fraught with an inference more fatal to that institution than any I have heard of yet.

Mr. President, I have pursued this subject much further than I intended when I arose. I have heard the muttering thunder of disunion greeting my ears through all the southern hemisphere. All your principal papers have already fixed upon a contingency when this Union shall end. In some of the southern States, if I read aright, proceedings are pending now having for their object the overturning of this Government, and the erection upon its ruins of a southern confederacy; and this idea is brought into the Halls of Congress, and we are compelled to listen by the hour to speeches filled with denunciations of our party, telling us that the Union is to be dissolved if the people elect as President an honorable man, of a great predominant party, holding to principles precisely such as the old fathers of the Government held. The Republican platform is nothing more nor less than the old Republican platform marking the landmarks of the Government as laid down by them; we claim no more; we claim to live up to those doctrines; we claim not to harm the hair of the head of any section of this Union; and yet we are to be told by the hour that if we succeed in wresting this Government from your hands, and placing a constitutional man in that great office, according to the forms of the Constitution, you will nevertheless make this a contingency on which you will disrupt and destroy the Government.

I say to gentlemen on the other side, these are very harsh doctrines to preach in our ears. What, sir, are you going to play this game of statesmanship with us? Will you go into the election with us, with a settled purpose and design that if you win you will take all the honors and the emoluments and offices of the Government into your own clutches; but if we win, you will break up the establishment and turn your backs on us? Is that the fair dealing to which we are invited? I am happy to know that you propose to make that contingency turn upon an event that will make it impossible to be consummated. The Government, to-day, is all in your hands; it has been in your hands for years; you are partaking of all its emoluments, all its measures you have molded, and you have designated the men who receive its honors. Year after year you have done this, and men have come here from the free States, men holding our opinions, we have sat here patiently, but we have been deprived of all the honors and emoluments that flow from this Government, as though we were its enemies; but did we ever complain? Not at all. We did not expect that we should share any of those favors, unless it should be so that our glorious principles should commend themselves to a large majority of the people of these United States.

But, sir, if it should turn out so—and Heaven only knows whether it will or not—I give gentlemen now to understand, this Union will not easily be disrupted. Gentlemen talk about it in a very business-like way, as though it were a magazine to be blown up whenever you touch the fire to it; as if, on a given day, at a moment's warning, at your own election, at any time and in any event, you can dissolve the bonds of this great Union. Do you not know, sir, that this great fabric has

# THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE.

THE OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF CONGRESS, PUBLISHED BY JOHN C. RIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THIRTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, 1st Session.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1859.

NEW SERIES.....No. 10.

been more than eighty years in building, and do you believe you can destroy it in a day? I tell you, nay. Sir, when you talk so coolly about dissolving this Union, do you know the difficulties through which you will have to wade before that end can be consummated? Have you reflected that between the North and the South there are no mountain ranges that are impassable, and no desert wastes which commonly divide great nations one from another? Do you not know that, whether we love one another or not, we are from the same stock, speaking the same language, and although institutions have made considerable difference between us, the great Anglo-Saxon type pervades the whole? We are bound together by great navigable rivers, interlacing and linking together all the States of this Union. Innumerable railroads also connect us, and an immense amount of commerce binds all the parts, besides domestic relations in a thousand ways. And do you believe that you can rend all this asunder without a struggle? I tell you, sir, you will search history in vain for a precedent; there has been no such Government as this that has ever rent asunder by any internal commotion. I know that Poland was broken up and divided, but it was by external force. We are bound in the same ship; we are married forever, for better or for worse. We may make our condition very uncomfortable by bickerings if we will, but nevertheless there can be no divorcement between us. There is no way by which either one section or the other can get out of the Union. I do not say whether it is desirable or not. There is no way by which it can be effected, but least of all on the contingency that you have spoken of. I tell the Senator from Georgia, if you wait until a Republican President is elected, you will wait a day too late. Why do not you do it now, when, I say again, you have the Government in your own hands? Why tell us that it is to be done when our man is elected? I say to you, Mr. President, he would be but a sorry Republican who, elected by a majority of the votes of the American people, and consequently backed by them, should fail to vindicate his right to the presidential chair. He will do it. No man at the North is to be intimidated by these threats of dissolution that are thrown into our teeth daily, and I ask Senators on the other side, why do you do it? I know not what motive you can have in preaching the dissolution of this Union day by day. If you are going to do it, is it necessary to give us notice of it? There is no law requiring that you should serve notice on us that you are going to dissolve the Union; [laughter;] and I should think it would be better to do it at once, and to do it without alarming our vigilance on the subject. It grates harshly on my ears; and I say to gentlemen that if a Republican President shall be constitutionally elected to preside for the next four years over this people, my word for it, preside he will. Who will prevent him?

Mr. President, I have said all and more than I intended, and I regret that it has become necessary for me to say anything on account of what has been said on the other side. I regret that at this early period of the session we should get interlocked with this old controversy. I wish it might have been postponed. I shall vote for this resolution most cheerfully, and will give it the furthest and most extended sweep that you may desire, because it is my wish that if there is any misunderstanding with regard to the participants in this affair, you should have the greatest latitude that you can desire to ferret them out, and make them known to the public.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I did not choose, during the progress of the Senator's speech, to interrupt him, but he made some allusion to the Helper book, and indicated that upon close examination he found it contained nothing very objectionable.

Mr. WADE. I said that I looked it over, and saw nothing objectionable.

Mr. BROWN. Very well, let me see whether the Senator means to say that this is not objectionable. I read from the 76th page of the pam-

phlet, the platform which it lays down to be acted upon by all who approve the views and position of the author:

1. Thorough organization and independent political action on the part of the non-slaveholding whites of the South.
2. Ineligibility of pro-slavery slaveholders. Never another vote to any one who advocates the retention and perpetuation of human slavery.
3. No collocation with pro-slavery politicians. No fellowship with them in religion. No affiliation with them in society.
4. No patronage to pro-slavery merchants. No guestship in slave-waiting hotels. No fees to pro-slavery lawyers. No employment to pro-slavery physicians. No audience to pro-slavery parsons.
5. No more hiring of slaves by non-slaveholders.
6. Abrupt discontinuance of subscriptions to pro-slavery newspapers.
7. The greatest possible encouragement to free white labor.

I ask the Senator whether he approves of that.

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, I must confess that, living in a free State, and with the views that I have always entertained upon the freedom of circulation and dissemination of any matter of interest among freemen, I can see no kind of objection to that. It is advice, and, of course, may be submitted to the consideration of freemen to act as they see fit. I suppose there would be no objection to its circulation in our section of the country.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I supposed, from the whole tenor of the Senator's remarks, which seemed designed, not only to keep alive, but to inculcate kindly relations between citizens of the different parts of the Union, that he would be prompt to say, what he certainly has not said, that he repudiated this language, "no affiliation in society with slaveholders." There is an open, direct declaration that all associations, all good neighborhood between northern men and southern men are to be broken up.

Mr. WADE. I believe that the Senator has misunderstood what I said, or intended to say on that point. I have not said that I approve of the sentiments in the book; I think some of them are intolerant; but I do not see why they are not proper to be submitted to the consideration of freemen. I do not know that a single man North or South would approve of them; but we are in the habit of leaving all such things to be considered by the people. Certainly that sentiment is more intolerant than I should recommend, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. BROWN. Then the book continues, immediately after what I before read:

"This, then, is the outline of our scheme for the abolition of slavery in the southern States. Let it be acted upon with due promptitude, and, as certain as truth is mightier than error, fifteen years will not elapse before every foot of territory, from the mouth of the Delaware to the embouchure of the Rio Grande, will glitter with the jewels of freedom."

Now, sir, we have been told over and over again, in this very debate, that there is no purpose to abolish slavery in the States. Gentlemen have told us within the last two days, that any charge of that kind is not sustained by the facts, and not sustained by their honest judgment; yet here is a book recommended to public favor by sixty-eight members of the other House of Congress, and one of them the candidate of your party for the Speakership. The contest has progressed for ten days, and that candidate has not, up to this time, disavowed the sentiments of this book. The extent to which he has gone, has merely been to say that he signed the recommendation for the book without having read it, and without having known what it contained, and doubtless he has discharged the obligation which rests upon him of examining the book, to see what it was that he had recommended; and if he does not approve of what the book contains, does he not owe it to himself and to you and to his party to say so? On another page of this book, I find:

"And now, sirs, we have thus laid down our ultimatum. What are you going to do about it? Something dreadful, of course! Perhaps you will dissolve the Union again. Do it, if you dare. Our motto, and we would have you understand it, is the Abolition of Slavery, and the Perpetuation of the American Union. If by any means you do succeed in your treasonable attempts to take the South out of

the Union to-day, we will bring her back to-morrow—if she goes away with you, she will return with you. "Do not mistake the meaning of the last clause of the last sentence."

Now, turning to the title page of this book, I find this:

"I have read the 'Impending Crisis of the South' with deep attention. It seems to me a work of great merit; rich, yet accurate, in statistical information, and logical in analysis."

That note is signed "WILLIAM H. SEWARD." He seems to have read the book, and to have known what it contained, and to have recommended it. Now, when these things occur, can our people doubt what is the purpose of your party; that you do mean to do what you say; that you do mean to abolish slavery in the States; and that you do mean to do it promptly? Else why do you not cut loose from this party? Why is the man whose note I have read, Mr. SEWARD, the universal favorite of your press in the northern States, or almost the universal favorite, for the Presidency? These things cannot overcome us like a summer's dream, and not excite our wonder.

Mr. WADE. Mr. President, I have before me an extract from a Richmond paper, showing that people there are recommending entire non-intercourse with the northern States. That is a matter pertaining to their own interest as I take it. They have certainly a right to do it; at least I think they have. That is a matter for themselves. Now, I wish to be understood as not indorsing the sentiments of this book. I have not said anything about them, except that they are proper to be submitted to others. If the people of any slaveholding State have a right to take up the subject of emancipation, I suppose they have the right to discuss it among themselves and to vote down such a proposition if they please. I suppose nobody doubts that. But here, sir, I have another work, called the Ruffner pamphlet. I suppose the Senator from Mississippi has seen this. It contains doctrines almost going on all fours with those he has read from the Helper book. This Ruffner pamphlet was indorsed by the Governor elect of Virginia, and contains doctrines very similar, indeed, to those which he has read from Helper's book. This was well known to the people of Virginia when they voted for Mr. Letcher, and I do not know that it furnished any objection to his being the Chief Magistrate of that great State. Why, then, is it that JOHN SHERMAN having recommended this book, should be pointed out as disqualified to hold a high and responsible office? I do not know that I will send this to the Chair to have it read, but I do say that this pamphlet contains doctrines exceedingly similar to those of the book from which the Senator has just read; and it was recommended in the strongest manner by John Letcher, who is now elected Governor of Virginia. His is the second name on it. Therefore, it seems that if this was not peculiarly objectionable, neither can that book be.

Mr. BINGHAM, and others. Let us have it read.

Mr. WADE. Then I will ask the Secretary to read it.

The Secretary read, as follows:

SHERMAN AND LETCHER—EQUALITY OF THEIR TREASON.

SIR: It would seem that the House of Representatives of the United States, after five days of unparalleled excitement and confusion, is yet unorganized, because JOHN SHERMAN, of Ohio, the most prominent candidate for presiding officer of that august body, signed, several months since, a circular recommending the proposed distribution of one hundred thousand copies of a compendium of my anti-slavery book—"The Impending Crisis of the South." The objection thus urged against JOHN SHERMAN, of Ohio, is of precisely such a nature as that which might be urged against John Letcher, of Virginia, formerly a member of Congress, now Governor elect of the Old Dominion.

I have before me, "for general circulation," an "Address to the people of West Virginia, showing that slavery is injurious to the public welfare, and that it may be gradually abolished, without detriment to the rights and interests of slaveholders." By a slaveholder of West Virginia. Lexington, Virginia: printed by R. C. Noel, 1847. Closely following the title page, is a letter to the Rev. Henry Ruffner, D. D., author of the address, requesting a copy for publication, and expressing the opinion that the reverend gentleman's argument "was not only able; but unanswerable;

and that its publication will tend to bring the public mind to a correct consideration of that momentous question. The signature of this sympathizing letter, which is dated "Lexington, Virginia, September 1, 1847," are, in regular order, as follows: S. M. Moore, John Letcher, David P. Curry, James G. Hamilton, George A. Baker, J. H. Lacy, John Eckles, James R. Jordan, Jacob Fuller, Jr., D. E. Moore, and John W. Fuller.

"It will be observed that John Letcher, ex-member of Congress, now Governor elect of Virginia, is the second signer and indorser of Dr. Ruffner's pamphlet. And what is the character of the pamphlet? It shall speak for itself. Dr. Ruffner says:

"Let all the west, on due consideration, conclude that slavery is a pernicious institution, and must be gradually removed; then, united in our views on all the great interests of our West Virginia, we shall meet the approaching crisis with inflexible resolution; and West Virginia can and must succeed in her approaching struggle for her rights and her prosperity."

"Nowhere, since time began, have the two systems of slave labor and free labor been subjected to so fair and so decisive a trial of their effects on public prosperity, as in these United States. Here the two systems have worked side by side for ages, under such equal circumstances, both political and physical, and with such ample time and opportunity for each to work out its proper effects, that all must admit the experiment to be now complete, and the result decisive. No man of common sense, who has observed this result, can doubt for a moment that the system of free labor promotes the growth and prosperity of States in a much higher degree than the system of slave labor.

"It is the common remark of all who have traveled through the United States, that the free States and the slave States exhibit a striking contrast in their appearance. In the older free States are seen all the tokens of prosperity—a dense and increasing population, thriving villages, towns, and cities—a neat and productive agriculture, growing manufactures, and active commerce.

"In the older parts of the slave States, with a few local exceptions, are seen, on the contrary, too evident signs of stagnation, or of positive decay—a sparse population, a slovenly cultivation spread over vast fields that are wearing out, among others already worn out and desolate; villages and towns, 'few and far between,' rarely growing, often decaying, sometimes mere remnants of what they were, sometimes deserted ruins, haunted only by owls; generally no manufactures, nor even trades, except the indispensable few; commerce and navigation abandoned as far as possible to the people of the free States; and generally, instead of the stir and bustle of industry, a dull and dreary stillness broken, if broken at all, only by the wordy brawl of politics.

"But we depend not on general statements of this sort, however unquestionable their truth may be. We shall present you with statistical facts drawn from public documents of the highest authority. We shall compare slave States with free States in general and in particular, and in so many points of view that you cannot mistake in forming your judgment of their comparative prosperity."

"Some Virginia politicians proudly—yes, proudly, fellow-citizens, call our old Commonwealth the mother of States! These enlightened patriots may pay her a still higher compliment by calling her the grandmother of States. For our part, we are grieved and mortified to think of the lean and haggard condition of our venerable mother. Her black children have suckled her so dry, that now, for a long time past, she has not milk enough for her offspring, other black or white.

"But, seriously, fellow-citizens, we esteem it a sad, a humiliating fact, which should penetrate the heart of every Virginian, that from the year 1700 to this time, Virginia has lost more people by emigration than all the old free States together. Up to 1840, when the last census was taken, she had lost more by nearly three hundred thousand. She has sent—or we should rather say, she has driven from her soil—at least one third of all the emigrants who have gone from the old States to the new. More than another third have gone from the other old slave States. Many of these multitudes who have left the slave States have shunned the regions of slavery, and settled in the free countries of the West. These were generally industrious and enterprising white men, who found, by sad experience, that a country of slaves was not the country for them. It is a truth, a certain truth, that slavery drives free laborers—farmers, mechanics, and all, and some of the best of them, too—out of the country, and fills their places with negroes.

"What is it but slavery that makes Marylanders and Carolinians, and especially old Virginians and new Virginians fly their country at such a rate? Some go because they dislike slavery, and desire to get away from it; others, because they have gloomy forebodings of what is to befall the slave States, and wish to leave their families in a country of happier prospects; others, because they cannot get profitable employment among slaveholders; others, industrious and high-spirited workmen, will not stay in a country where slavery degrades the workman; others go because they see that their country, for some reason, does not prosper, and that other countries, not far off, are prospering, and will afford better hopes of prosperity to themselves; others—a numerous class—who are slaveholders, and cannot live without slaves, finding that they cannot live longer with them on their worn-out soils, go to seek better lands and more profitable crops, where slave labor may yet for a while enable them and their children to live."

"So our great Virginia, with all her natural facilities for trade, brings to her ports about one five-hundredth part of the goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States. Shall we be told that the cause of this decline of Virginia commerce is the growth of northern cities, which, by means of their canals and railroads and vast capital, draw off the trade from smaller ports to themselves? And what then? The cause assigned, is itself, the effect of a prior cause. We would ask those who take this superficial view of the matter, why should the great commercial ports be all outside of Virginia, and near or in the free States? Why should every commercial improvement, every wheel

that speeds the movements of trade, serve but to carry away from the slave States more and more of their wealth for the benefit of the great northern cities? The only cause that can be assigned is, that where slavery prevails, commerce and navigation cannot flourish, and commercial towns cannot compete with those in the free States. They are merely places of deposit for such country produce as cannot be carried directly to the northern market. Here northern and foreign ships come to carry away these products of slave labor, and this constitutes nearly all the trade of southern ports."

"When a white family own fifty or one hundred slaves, they can, so long as their land produces well, afford to be indolent and expensive in their habits, for though each slave yield only a small profit, yet each member of the family has ten or fifteen of these black work-animals to toil for his support. It is not until the fields grow old, and the crops grow short, and the negroes and the ever-seer take nearly all, that the day of ruin can be no longer postponed. If the family be not very indolent and very expensive, this inevitable day may not come before the third generation. But the ruin of small slaveholders is often accomplished in a single lifetime.

"When a white family own five or ten slaves they cannot afford to be indolent or expensive in their habits, for one black drudge cannot support one white gentleman or lady. Yet, because they are slaveholders, this family will feel some aspirations for a life of easy gentility, and because field-work and kitchen-work are negroes' work, the young gentlemen will dislike to go with the negroes to dirty field-work, and the young ladies will dislike to join the black sluts in any sort of household labor. Such unthrifty sentiments are the natural consequence of introducing slaves among the families of a country, especially negro slaves. They infallibly grow and spread, creating among the white families a distaste for all herculean labor, and a desire to procure slaves who may take all drudgery off their hands. Thus, general industry gives way by degrees to indolent relaxation, false motives of dignity and refinement, and a taste for fashionable luxuries. Then debts slyly accumulate. The result is, that many families are compelled by their embarrassment to sell off and leave the country. Many who are unable to buy slaves leave it also, because they feel degraded, and cannot prosper where slavery exists. Citizens of the valley, is it not so? Is not this the chief reason why your beautiful country does not prosper like the northern valleys?"

"And then, fellow-citizens, when you have suffered your country to be filled with negro slaves instead of white freemen; when its population shall be as motley as Joseph's coat of many colors—as ring-streaked and speckled as father Jacob's flock was in Padan-aram—what will the white basis of representation avail you, if you obtain it? Whether you obtain it or not, East Virginia will have triumphed, or rather slavery will have triumphed, and all Virginia will have become a land of darkness and of the shadow of death.

"Then, by a forbearance which has no merit, and a supineness which has no excuse, you will have given to your children, for their inheritance, this lovely land, blackened with a negro population—the off-scourings of Eastern Virginia—the rag-end of slavery—the loathsome dregs of that cup of abomination which has already sickened to death the eastern half of our Commonwealth."

"Behold in the East the deleterious consequences of letting slavery grow up to an oppressive and heart-sickening burden upon a community. Cast it off, West Virginians, while yet you have the power; for if you let it descend unbroken to your children, it will have grown to a mountain of misery upon their heads."

"It appears, then, that the above (which I venture to say is just as good 'treason' as any that can be found in my book) is the sort of anti-slavery in which the Governor-elect of Virginia reposes his political faith. In what respect, then, is JOHN SHERMAN a greater traitor than John Letcher? If the former is unfit to be elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, is not the latter unfit to be inaugurated Governor of 'the mother of States?' It is to be sincerely hoped that our dear sister, Virginia, may suffer no violation of her honor from any of the doings of this designing Letcher. Let him be looked after.

Yours, respectfully,  
H. R. HELPER,  
No 43 Pine street, New York.

To the Editor of the New York Tribune.  
Mr. HUNTER. I rise for the purpose of explaining that great injustice has been done to Mr. Letcher by reading the paper in that connection, without a proper explanation of the circumstances accompanying it. It is true that when he was a young man, and when he first commenced the practice of the law, he heard an address from a Mr. Ruffner, in the town in which he lived, and that he signed a request, with others whose names are appended to that paper, asking that it should be published for circulation. After it was published for circulation, it was so different from what he had imagined it to be, that he refused to aid in its circulation.

But sir, it is also true—the fact is well known, for this was a matter canvassed in our late gubernatorial election, that Governor Letcher did publicly disclaim all participation in the principles embodied in that address, and furthermore said, what is known to us all in Virginia, that the sentiments which he had entertained at that time many years ago, and which at that period were entertained by a good many in Virginia, in regard to the abstract question of slavery, whether it was good or evil, he had changed, as they had done, for it has been the result of the discussion, and of this agitation which we have had, that a great

change has taken place in the sentiment of the people of Virginia, and particularly in the opinions of those who at one time considered slavery an evil. Governor Letcher, therefore, is not responsible for that; or if he ever had been he disclaimed it entirely and thoroughly in the late canvass; and that this disclaimer is sincere is proved by all his speeches and actions while he was a member of the other House, a period, I believe, embracing some seven or eight years.

Mr. WADE. I did not present that to the Chair, because I supposed it contained the opinions of Mr. Letcher, but to show that he had recommended these sentiments to the people of Virginia, and so far as I know without any censure for having done it. I do not know that he indorsed the sentiments here, but he gave them circulation.

Mr. HUNTER. I have just stated that he did not recommend it. He heard an address delivered, and, after hearing it, he and others requested that it should be printed for circulation. Seeing it after it was printed, he said it did not contain the sentiments which he thought it contained, and therefore he would not aid in its circulation, and he did not, and refused to pay for its printing.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, a single word in regard to this Helper pamphlet. It was written by a native son of North Carolina. It was originally a large book of several hundred pages, made up chiefly of statistics and of quotations from the opinions of eminent men of every age, of our own and other lands. The facts and quotations embodied in this book, it was thought by men opposed to the extension of slavery, were important, very valuable, and an effort was made to have a compendium made up out of this book, a cheap pamphlet, for general circulation. Members of the House of Representatives were asked to sign—not a recommendation of that book—but of an abstract, a compendium, a pamphlet, to be made out of the facts embodied in the book. There were persons who had read that book who thought it of great value, but who disapproved of some of the sentiments in it. I never saw a man who did approve of some of the sentiments in it, which have been read by the Senator from Mississippi. By mistake, these objectionable sentiments of the author are retained in this pamphlet edition. The members did not sign an indorsement of the book as a whole, but they signed for a compendium to be made up out of it. These are the facts of the case; and I think it quite as fair to hold Mr. Letcher responsible for the sentiments of the pamphlet from which extracts have been read, as to hold these gentlemen responsible for these objectionable sentiments.

Mr. BROWN. If the Senator will allow me, I have not so much objected to gentlemen for signing papers the contents of which they do not know. That, I see, might happen, for we take things too much on trust; but, my point is, that gentlemen, having now seen what is in the book, have not repudiated the sentiments of the book. The candidate for Speaker in the other House of Congress—I am not canvassing their conduct, but referring to historical facts known to all—has not yet disavowed the sentiments of the book. He says he signed it without knowing what was in it, but now that he does know what was in it, why does he not disavow it?

Mr. WILSON. An attack was made in the House of Representatives upon Mr. SHERMAN, and upon those gentlemen who signed, not for the original book, but for a compendium to be made up out of it, and under these circumstances explanation and disavowal were out of the question. But the Senator from Mississippi must know that there is not a man who signed that recommendation who can agree with the sentiment that intercourse should be discontinued between non-slaveholders and slaveholders. It is intolerant and bigoted. I do not agree to it—I know of no man who agrees to it. The attack was got up on this pamphlet by the New York Herald, and both Houses of Congress have been turned into advertising mediums for this book. It is now peddled by the boys in the streets of Washington, and sold largely, and orders are coming from all parts of the country for this work. I think we have had quite enough said about it, for we are engaged, I think, in rather small business in turning these halls into advertising rooms.

Mr. CLINGMAN. However this may be a

sufficient defense for the other gentlemen who signed it without reading it, I desire to say that Mr. SEWARD's note is not an indorsement of the compendium, but of the original work, without any expurgations as it is published here. He says: "I have read 'the Impending Crisis of the South' with deep attention"—not the compendium, but the whole work. "It seems to me a work of great merit; rich, yet accurate, in statistical information, and logical in analysis." Now, I should like to know if the Senator from Massachusetts is authorized to disavow for Mr. SEWARD approval of any portion of the book. Mr. SEWARD praises it for its accurate statistical information and logical analysis. Now, let us look at it. I find, on pages 64 and 65, that the author seeks to make it appear that the slaveholders of the South owe to the non-slaveholders, by mathematical calculation, \$5,944,148,825; and he then goes on to say:

"Now, sirs, we ask you, in all seriousness, is it not apparent that you have sledged from us nearly five times the amount of the assessed value of your slaves? Why, then, do you still clamor for more? Is it your purpose to make the game perpetual? Think you that we will ever continue to bow at the wave of your wand, that we will bring humanity into everlasting disgrace by licking the hand that smites us, and that with us there is no point beyond which forbearance ceases to be a virtue? Sirs, if these be your thoughts, you are laboring under a most fatal delusion. You can goad us no further; you shall oppress us no longer; heretofore, earnestly but submissively, we have asked you to redress the more atrocious outrages which you have perpetrated against us; but what has been the invariable fate of our petitions? With scarcely a perusal, with a degree of contempt that added insult to injury, you have laid them on the table, and from thence they have been swept into the furnace of oblivion. Henceforth, sirs, we are demandants, not supplicants. We demand our rights, nothing more, nothing less. It is for you to decide whether we are to have justice peaceably or by violence; for, whatever consequences may follow, we are determined to have it one way or the other."

This is the sort of calculation which Mr. SEWARD commends, and this is the sort of language which gentlemen think free from objection. I should like to know from the Senator from Massachusetts whether he is prepared to disavow this work for Mr. SEWARD likewise.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. SEWARD is accustomed to speak for himself, and when he comes here I have no doubt he will do so. Certainly, I am not authorized to speak for him. I spoke for myself; and I have yet to see the first Republican who concurs in some of the objectionable sentiments which have been urged in this book. There are, however, some points in the book which have been stated, to which I do not see any objection.

Mr. MALLORY. I concede, sir, that gentlemen may frequently sign papers the contents of which they do not know; perhaps most men are too apt thus to assume an unknown responsibility; but this cannot possibly be such a case. I refer Senators on the other side to the Congressional Globe containing our proceedings of April 5, 1858, in which the character of the very person who wrote this book was fully exposed, and ignorance of who the author of this book was, cannot possibly be pleaded; and it must be presumed that those who indorsed the book, particularly a member of this body, present when the explanation as to Mr. Helper was made, must have had a knowledge of who the author was; and I propose, in connection with this, although Senators seem disinclined to have anything more said on this book, to at least place this on record, for perhaps it may have escaped the attention of Senators on the other side. Mr. Biggs, on that occasion, in reply to the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. Wilson,] brought it especially to his attention who this very man was, in these words:

"Hinton Rowan Helper, the author of the 'Impending Crisis,' is a native of Davie county, North Carolina. His first appearance in active life was as a clerk of Michael Brown, a merchant in Salisbury, North Carolina. Mr. Brown is an elder of the Presbyterian church; and, after Helper removed to Salisbury, he also joined the Presbyterian church, and, so far as was publicly known, conducted himself with propriety. After living with Mr. Brown several years as clerk, it was understood at Salisbury that he formed a partnership with Mr. Coffman in the book business, and left for the North to buy in a stock of books. He did not return, as expected, but shortly thereafter went to California, and there, or shortly after his return, wrote a book called 'Land of Gold.'"

"He returned to Salisbury about 1854, where he remained some time without any apparent business. In the summer of 1856, as is reported and believed, he procured surety for, and obtained money. He, however, about that time, left for the North, where he now resides, never since having returned to North Carolina. After leaving North Carolina,

he changed his name from Helper to Helper; and it was disclosed last year that, while a clerk for Mr. Brown, he purloined from him \$300; and, after an exposure by Mr. Brown, Helper, making a merit of necessity, himself publicly confesses, in a hand-bill which I have before me, this thieving on his part, and excuses it on the ground that he was enticed to the act by some ambiguous expression of a friend of his that it was allowable for clerks so to do; and the further excuse that it was an indiscretion of youth, although at the time he was in full standing in the Presbyterian church, and, as he says himself, was seventeen years of age. It is due to the Presbyterian church to say, that this man is not now a member of that church."

This was April 5, 1858.

Mr. MASON. Please to read the residue of it. If I recollect aright, the then Senator from North Carolina requested the Senator from Massachusetts, who had referred to this man Helper, to append to his speech the history that he gave of him.

Mr. MALLORY. The rest of it is in these words:

"Now, sir, when and why he altered his name, I know not, except he defines Helper—one who helps himself from the purses of others without their consent; and therefore concluded the change of name more appropriate to his character. He is a dishonest, degraded, and disgraced man, and although—much to be regretted—a native of the State, yet he is an apostate son, ruined in fortune and character, and catering to a diseased appetite at the North, to obtain a miserable living by slanders upon the land of his birth; and I deeply regret that the Senator from Massachusetts has, by a reference, so dignified the creature as to render necessary this exposure. Such is Mr. Helper of North Carolina, author of the 'Impending Crisis of the South,' alias Mr. Helper, once of North Carolina, but who has left the land of his birth for the good of the State."

"Now, sir, I would respectfully suggest to the honorable Senator from Massachusetts to append a note to the edition of his speech, giving the true character of the author of this book, upon which he has relied, so that the readers of his speech may not be, as he has been, so unwittingly misled by authority so degraded and unreliable."

I think, sir, that after that exposure, deliberately made here, and which I know attracted the attention of the Senate at the time, it is too late, at least for the members of this body, or for any man holding a distinguished political station or seeking one, to plead ignorance, at least, of what the character of the author of the book was.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I remember the remarks made by the late Senator from North Carolina, which have now been read by the Senator from Florida. A short time after those remarks were made, and after they went out to the country, I received from Mr. Helper a package of papers, now in my possession, and these papers prove this—nothing more, nothing less—that Mr. Helper, when a boy of seventeen years of age, engaged in a store in North Carolina, took from Mr. Brown—the man who employed him—\$300, in small sums, running through months, perhaps years; that the man who employed him knew nothing of it, and never made the discovery; that after this, Mr. Helper voluntarily confessed to this man, who then regarded him as a friend, that he had taken this money; that his conscience troubled him; that he was ready to make restitution; gave his note, and went to California; worked and earned the money, and paid principal and interest; and the man kept the secret in his breast for seven years, and until after this book was published.

These are the facts of the case. Nobody can justify the act. Mr. Helper does not do it himself. In an address "to the public," dated August 25, 1857, he frankly admits his guilt, and expresses his contrition. In this address, he says:

"A recent breach of confidence on the part of one whom, until now, I have for a period of more than ten years, constantly esteemed as an aged and venerable friend, and a strictly conscientious regard for the truth, impose upon me, as I conceive, the duty of publicly confessing to the world (which, until within the last week, has been entirely ignorant of the facts,) the worst, and, as far as I am able to judge, the only really bad act in my life. That act I will state truly, as follows:

"On or about the 25th of February, 1847, when little more than seventeen years of age, I became a clerk in the store of Mr. Michael Brown, Salisbury, Rowan county, North Carolina. Soon thereafter, a friend of riper years, with whom I was in the habit of associating occasionally, and whose father, a man of wealth, is now a prominent citizen of one of the adjoining counties, remarked to me in a tone and manner which, at the time, I did not exactly understand—and to which remark I made no response—that he believed it was allowable for clerks to take money from the drawer without charging themselves with the amount. The remark in question made a wrong impression on my mind, and led me into an error which I do not attempt to excuse, but which I endeavored to atone for, and did atone to the satisfaction of the injured party, Mr. Brown, who confessed himself fully satisfied, and assured me that he would never think any the less, but rather the

more of me, on account of what had transpired—faithfully promising, at the same time, that what I had so voluntarily and frankly revealed to him, he would never disclose to any mortal creature."

"It is too true, as Mr. Brown, after a lapse of nearly seven years, has seen fit to inform the editor of one of the Salisbury papers, (who, by the by, is the most unreasonably bitter enemy I have in the world,) that I, while in the service of himself and of his son, Calvin S. Brown, did secretly misappropriate \$300—no more, no less—of the funds belonging to the store; but neither Mr. Michael Brown, nor his son Calvin, nor anybody else, would ever have known anything about the wrong which, owing in part to the imprudent remark of my companion, and in part to my youthful indiscretion, I had committed, had I not, in obedience to the promptings of my conscience, voluntarily confessed it—a confession which I made to Mr. Michael Brown, having sought him out for the purpose—at the Howard Hotel, New York city, in the fall of 1850, which was about eight months after I left Salisbury, and when I was between twenty and twenty-one years of age. Up to that time, and indeed up to within a few days past, if any one ever suspected that I had wronged my employer, I never received the slightest intimation of the fact."

"In Mr. Brown's hand I placed a note for the \$300, and, while temporarily residing in California some years ago, sent him a check in full payment of the principal and interest. His acknowledgment of the receipt of payment is now in my possession. I also have from him several very friendly letters, which reached me in California, and, more than one of which he takes occasion to say, he has the highest regard for me, and makes inquiry as to when he shall have the pleasure of seeing me again in Salisbury, to which place, after an absence of more than four years, I returned in April, 1854, and where I resided principally until June, 1856."

"Mr. Brown is, and has been ever since I know him, an elder in the Presbyterian church; and supposing, as a matter of course, that his word was as good as his bond, if not better, I never entertained the remotest idea that he would ever divulge the secret which, under the peculiar circumstances, has been so long known only to himself and me. But Mr. Brown, in consequence of my unsophisticated candor, had me in his power, and because I have written an anti-slavery book, which Heaven knows I was induced to do from the purest and most patriotic motives, and which I firmly and conscientiously believe is the best, the redeeming act of my life, he has forfeited his word, and sought to degrade me in the estimation of the public. Mr. Brown, to whom I first communicated the particulars, has told the story of my most culpable deviation from the path of rectitude, and I now confirm the story by reconfession. Nearly seven years ago I made a clean breast of it to him; I now make a clean breast of it to the public. That I was ever led into such an error, I deeply deplore; and I can hardly say I deplore it more deeply now than I did when it was known only to God and myself. Long since, I did in the premises what duty seemed to demand. Whatever additional atonement may be required, I am anxiously desirous to make. And now, leaving Mr. Brown to the consolations of his own conscience, and to such gratification as his ideas of honor can furnish him, I humbly await, and shall quietly submit to, the verdict of the public. If a fault even so grievous as this, committed at an age when the benevolence of the law itself regards the judgment so immature, and the principles of conduct so unformed, as to cast over us the shield of infancy, is beyond the reach of pardon; if no repentance however bitter is sufficient to expiate it; if, when awakened to a sense of its guilt, the unhappy youth, even while yet within the age of minority, voluntarily seeks out his injured friend, confesses the fault, which else had never been discovered, and devotes the first earnings of his labor to making restitution to the uttermost farthing; if a subsequent life of rectitude which challenges irreproachability; if, indeed, no effort of his, no lapse of time, can wipe out the stain of that early fault—then I trust I may at least receive this harsh sentence from those only who have no sins to be repented of, and whose lives have been so pure that they are serenely conscious of requiring no pardon in this world or in the next. For myself, my faith in the Divine economy is strong enough (notwithstanding the gratuitous assertion of the Carolina Watchman, that I am an infidel—a statement which I here pronounce destitute of the slightest foundation and utterly untrue) to assure me that sincere repentance of wrong, and an earnest effort to do right, are, for me, a better reliance."

"May I add that I hope I have those instincts of a gentleman, which would make it easier for me to die than to violate a confidence so trustfully committed to my honor, and so inexpressibly sacred in itself, as that which I, in the unsuspecting fullness of my heart, confided to Mr. Michael Brown."

Mr. Helper committed a wrong; he voluntarily confessed that wrong; and he righted that wrong. He must submit to the judgment of mankind for this youthful indiscretion, be that judgment what it may. It seems to me, however, that his repentance, confession, and restitution should shield him from the harsh judgment of generous men.

After the publication of Mr. Helper's book, the Washington Union said of him:

"The real name of the author of 'The Impending Crisis' is Helper, and not Helper. Mr. Helper is a native of Rowan county, North Carolina. Some ten years ago he took up his residence at Salisbury. In that State, and there entered into a partnership with Mr. Michael Brown in the book business. Soon after the formation of the partnership, funds were raised, placed in Mr. Helper's hands, and he started for the city of New York for the purpose of replenishing the joint stock of books. Weeks and months flew by, and not a word was heard by Mr. Brown of his partner. Finally, he received a letter from Mr. Helper stating that he (Mr. H.) had deposited the money in the bank; that he was in wretched health, and that he was about embarking for Germany, where he expected to die."

"Again was Mr. Helfer missing, and again he turned up—not as a sickly bank depositor, looking forward with resignation to Germany and death, but as a new man, with a new constitution, a new name, and in a new land. He had journeyed to California, and the result of his observations in the land of gold appeared in the form of a modest octavo, which bore, and we presume still bears, the new name of Hinton H. Helfer."

In his appeal to the public, Mr. Helfer declared that—

"It is utterly untrue that Mr. Michael Brown and myself ever entered into a co-partnership in the book business, or that he, or anybody else, ever placed in my hands a dollar, or any other sum, to buy books on speculation."

"As for my name, it is precisely as I write and speak it—Helfer and not Helfer. To say nothing of other documents, which I could produce to sustain me in this declaration, my father's family Bible, in which his own and his children's names are all recorded in his own handwriting, shows that Helfer is the true name, and he who writes or pronounces it otherwise, does so either in ignorance or in error."

In support of these explicit denials of the charges made against him by the Union—charges which continue to be repeated against him—Mr. Helfer has fortified himself with ample testimony. In regard to the charge of want of fidelity to Mr. Brown, in business affairs, he has this letter from Mr. Brown, which disposes of that slander upon him:

SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, September 28, 1857.

DEAR SIR: Having noticed the article in the Washington Union, in which it is stated that you and myself, some ten years ago, entered into the book business in this town; that funds were raised, and placed in your hands; and that you started to New York for the purpose of replenishing the joint stock of books; that you deposited the money in bank, and never rendered to me any account of it, &c., I feel it due, not only to you, but also to myself, to say that the statement is utterly untrue. It is, of course, well known to you and myself, and everybody here, that you were never in co-partnership with me in the book or any other business; and I have no hesitation in saying that I have no knowledge of either myself or of any other person having ever placed in your hands any sum of money of which you have not rendered a correct and honorable account.

Yours respectfully,  
MICHAEL BROWN.  
Mr. H. H. HELFER.

To the charge of the Union that his "real name is Helfer—not Helfer," he fortifies his denial by this testimony of gentlemen of character in his native State—testimony that ought to put this charge at rest forever:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, Rowan County.

We, the undersigned citizens, residents of the county and State aforesaid, do hereby certify that the family Bible of Daniel Helfer, deceased, has this day been laid before us, and that the following records, which we extract verbatim, appear in the said Bible, now in possession of the family of the said Helfer, deceased.

"This Bible is the property of Daniel Helfer, bought of Abram B. Jones, at Mocksville, May 30th, 1822."

"Daniel Helfer, son of Jacob Helfer, sen., was born March 17th, in the year of our Lord 1794."

"Daniel Helfer and Sally Brown were married, Oct. 30th, in the year of our Lord 1817."

"Hinton Rowan Helfer, son of Daniel Helfer, and Sally his wife, was born Dec. 27th, A. D., 1829."

We also certify that among said records appear the names of six other children, all of previous date to that of Hinton Rowan Helfer, and that the true and correct orthography of the name is HELFER; and that we are well acquainted with the author of the "Impending Crisis of the South; How to Meet it," and with other members of his family, and that his true name is as he represents it, to wit:—Hinton Rowan Helfer.

Witness our hands and seals, this 24th day of August, A. D., 1857.

THOMAS McNEELY, [l. s.]  
[Clerk of the Superior Court.]  
WILLIAM ROWZEE, [l. s.]  
[Landlord of the Mansion Hotel.]  
ALEX. LONG, [l. s.]  
[The oldest physician in the place.]

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, County of Rowan.

I, James E. Kerr, clerk of the county court, in and for the county and State aforesaid, do hereby certify that the above named persons, whose genuine signatures appear to the above certificate, are highly respectable citizens of our said county, and that said certificate was made before me on the day and year above written.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of my office at Salisbury, this [l. s.] 24th day of August, 1857.

JAMES E. KERR, Clerk.

A few days after the late Senator from North Carolina had called the attention of the Senate to the action of Mr. Helfer, he placed in my hand a package of papers explanatory of the charges made against him by others and indorsed by Mr. Biggs on the floor of the Senate, with the request that I should place the facts before the Senate. Mr. Biggs soon after left the Senate, and I saw no fit occasion to bring the matter before the Senate, and I did not wish to obtrude the affairs of Mr. Helfer upon this body.

Mr. CLINGMAN. I will barely say that I have heard a very different version of this transaction from that given by the Senator from Mas-

sachusetts; but, of course, it is not important to the Senate that I should give it. He has stated the excuse of this man, and it may go for what it is worth; but I wish to call attention to one point. Every Senator will see that if there was an understanding, as it is alleged, that Mr. Elair should expurgate this work, and that these names were to go down to an expurgated edition, he has practiced a gross fraud on sixty-odd signers; and yet I do not find that any one of them has denounced him or the printer or anybody else for this fraud. It is a little extraordinary that such a work should have gone out and been before the country for a long time, and that none of these gentlemen has thought proper to complain of it until there is investigation; and even then I do not find that there is any sort of complaint made of the parties who failed to make the expurgation that was intended to be made. It looks, therefore, like a mere effort to escape a responsibility while an election is pending.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I do not feel any interest in this matter, except as it constitutes a part of the history of the times. I never heard of this Mr. Helfer until he was cited as authority by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, in 1858, and an honorable gentleman who was then a Senator from North Carolina, [Mr. Biggs,] and who, it seems, knew the history of the man in the State which he had disgraced and left, promptly, upon the spot, exposed his real character to the country, and suggested to the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, as his speech was to go abroad where this man was employed at his dirty work, that he should append to his speech this little piece of biography. I infer that the Senator has been silent, and that it has not been done. I have never seen the speech since. But the Senator tells us now that, after that, this Mr. Helfer placed papers in his possession, intended to show that this was an act of indiscretion of his youth, that he repented of it, and that he paid back the money to his employer, and that the employer, to protect him as I suppose, kept the whole matter secret, until he wrote this book. Now I, of course, know nothing about that or what the character of the proof was, whether it was satisfactory, or persuasive, or conclusive, or otherwise; but it is a little remarkable, looking at the character of the honorable Senator who gave this little biography of the man, that the fact, if he had been honest enough to repent, had not been stated to him. If it was true, and that Senator knew it, I will vouch for it, he would have stated it. That is a small matter, however.

I say I have been interested in this subject only as a part of the history of the times; and, now, what is that history? This man Helfer, branded as he was in 1858, branded only because he had been cited as authority on this floor, published his book, I suppose, in a larger form—I never saw it—and was aided where it was published, to enable it to do its work, either in distemping and poisoning the mind of the people of the free States against the people of the slave States, or, in its still more offensive form, in endeavoring to get up a feeling of hostility, hatred, and non-intercourse between two classes of people in the same States. That was done some two years ago. Afterwards, gentlemen, who, it is to be taken for granted, read the book—I mean in the large volume—and who knew its contents, as they allege now, without knowing what form the new edition was to assume, but knowing what the old edition contained; gentlemen, for the purpose of attaining the ends had in view by that writer and those who backed him, to the number of sixty-eight members of Congress, intrusted with the administration of one of the departments of this Government—men holding that position before the country—indorsed the book in blank, for it is an indorsement in blank, upon a representation that they should get up a cheaper edition, scatter this venom in some form, and give it freer circulation by cheapening the commodity. He proposed to make a compendium of it, and they indorsed it in advance. They knew what the original book contained, by their own showing; it is a part of their excuse. They could not know what the compendium was to contain; but, under their signature and by their recommendation, they sent it out to the world as a valuable book, a book intended for great and valuable ends, and recommended it to the perusal of all who should give

credit to their names. That is what I understand they have done. They knew what was in the book; it is to be presumed, in justice to them, that they did; because they said, according to my recollection, that the book had been brought to their notice, and that they recommended it.

Now, sir, I do not mean to impeach any of these gentlemen. They are the best judges; they are the only judges of their own conduct. If they can reconcile it to themselves as a part of their duties to their fellow-citizens, in their own States, to send a work of that sort among their people for information, and to affect and to mold public opinion, let them do it upon their responsibility. I never heard of the book until this recommendation of it came out, and I sent to the North for it; and, so far as I have read it, it is the most vile, false, truthless compendium of slander upon the South that I ever did read. It is more; it is an attempt to array man against man in our own States. It is an attempt to array a class of my fellow-citizens—I ought not to designate them as a class, but a portion of my fellow-citizens in my own State, who do not own slaves, against those who do own slaves at home—to array man against man, and family against family, and all the discord that could be brought in society by getting up a sort of war of classes—an internecine war. I take it for granted that was in the original book. I never saw the original book.

But, I say, it does not remove one atom of responsibility from those sixty-eight men intrusted by their fellow-citizens with the administration of this Government when they say "we indorsed it in blank, and we did not know what was to be put into it." It is there. But they have done more than that. I speak of it again as a part of the history of the times. That party, that new political party, who designate themselves here as Republicans, I do not mean Mr. A, or Mr. B, or Mr. C, but those who lead the party, who mold the measures, who give the counsels, and who execute those counsels, have here, recently, and, as far as I can learn, clandestinely, got up a subscription to print one hundred thousand copies of this book for circulation in the free States. I see a great effort made there by voluntary contribution of large sums of money to print this cheap edition, and, I presume, for gratuitous circulation; for a part of the proposition was, that they should receive, at a cheapened rate, a number of these compends proportionate to their subscription. I look at it as a part of the history of the times.

Sir, it will have no effect in the country for which it was intended. I was born and raised, and my ancestry, for two hundred years, in the slave States. I claim to know something of the spirit of that people, and I tell honorable Senators here, and the country, that, in my own State, and, as far as I know and believe, everywhere throughout the slave States, there not only is no distinction between those who hold slaves and those who do not hold slaves, but it is not in your power to create it. You may bring this Government, which you are intrusted here to administer under the Constitution, into odium among them; you may deny them its protection; but you cannot create dissension between them. Your efforts there will be idle, vain, and futile.

Sir, I witnessed it the other day on the occasion of the incursion at Harper's Ferry, stimulated, as I believe will be shown whenever this inquiry is gone into, by northern money, if not by northern counsel; I witnessed it the other day at the Ferry, when that sudden, traitorous incursion was made for the purpose of exciting a slave insurrection—the avowed object being to excite a slave insurrection—when weapons were brought there to be put into the hands of the slaves of the very sort that an unskillful hand would use; I witnessed this: that at the first tap of the drum in the villages when it was announced that the Abolitionists were there in arms for the purpose of inciting an insurrection, and had brought arms to be put in the hands of the slaves, of the young men of the villages and the neighborhood, who rallied immediately to go and put it down, not one in twenty was a slaveholder; and probably not one in ten belonged to a family who held slaves. Sir, there was no dissension—no discrimination; and if any one of you were to hold the language that is held by this book—any language that was intended to foster dissension between those who hold slaves and those who do



not—they would brand you as a traitor to your country and its institutions. That is the spirit of the non-slaveholders of the South. There is no distinction between us—none; none at home; none ever conjectured, until it was conjectured in the free States for the vilest purposes of treason. I tell you, sir, that is the spirit.

A book of that sort is indorsed in blank, to be circulated in a cheap form among the people; intended, upon its face, to inflame dissension and civil discord in the slave States, and among the white people, too; and the excuse is given for it that it was not read in advance, and they did not know what was to be put into it. Sir, they know it now; they have known it here at least for the last fortnight. They know that that vile incendiary in the northern States, at this hour, under the recommendations which he takes with him from these sixty-eight men, is peddling the vile book among your people, in person, and how many are banded with him, I do not know. You have known it here for more than a fortnight, and your excuse is that you were deceived, and that you wrote your names too lightly; but, I ask, where is the proclamation you have sent out to call back this incendiary book, and to denounce it? Tell me when that was done; when any one of these, far less more than one, who have put their names and the sanction of their names to that paper, assembled together, or when they went simply to countermand what they have done or to denounce it. Nowhere—nowhere.

Now, sir, again I say, this interests me only as a part of the history of the times. Honorable Senators on the other side of the floor have said, and I do not doubt have said with sincerity that is to say for the time they have brought themselves to the belief, that they want still to retain and to foster and to cherish the fraternal affections that once existed between the different sections of this Union. I ask them as men of sense, how is it possible to reconcile their professions with their actions? One of those honorable Senators who seemed most fraternal in his expressions—I allude to the Senator who offered the pending amendment—in shielding, as he attempted to do, the party to which he says he belongs from any responsibility for the late treasonable incursion at Harper's Ferry, in order to prove that they were innocent, read to us here from what he calls their book of principles, their platform; and among the very first paragraphs that he read, was one declaring that the institution of slavery and the institution of polygamy were twin relics of barbarism, and should be classed and denounced together. That was a very fraternal exhibition, coming from this party who ask to be shielded from the appellation of Abolitionists! I never read this book of principles, as they call it, and never saw it. I do know that this party, now rejoicing in the name of the Republican party, is one of very recent growth under the new appellation. It appeared first in the New England States, according to my recollection. What name they then assumed, I do not know. They were called the Know Nothing party. Whether that was a term of derision, or one that they assumed to themselves, I am uninformed. What name was then appropriated by them, I do not know. Their principles, then, were those which had been got up by an ephemeral party established a short time before, and a leaf from whose book they seemed to have taken, called the Native American party, for they entered upon a crusade against all who were not native-born Americans. I say, I do not know what name they assumed then, because all their acts were under the ban of secrecy, and sworn secrecy. When the shell was broken, and they came out under their new appellation of the Republican party; then, if there was any principle of union among them; if there be at this day any principle of union in this so-called Republican party; if there be any principle of union which, if abandoned, would bring dissolution to the party and instant dissolution, it is the principle of abolition.

You may say, and say with truth if you please, that there is a small party of men, whom you call fanatics in the New England States, who are the true Abolitionists, the real simon-pures, such men as Wendell Phillips, and Garrison, and Abby Kelly, as I believe her name is, who has unsexed herself for the purpose, and others of that class. You may say, if you please, "they are the real

simon-pures, and we claim to be purer than they are; we are not Abolitionists, we are Republicans." If you are not Abolitionists, why this constant war upon slavery? You say to us, "we do not intend to interfere with slavery in the States." The honorable Senator from Ohio, [Mr. WADE,] whose manly character none admire more than I do, made the same profession here just now: "we do not intend to interfere with slavery in the States." Why, then, do you stigmatize it as you do in your platform of principles, connecting it with the most indecent, loathsome, forbidden practices known to Christendom? If it is a part of the principles of your party that you do not intend to interfere with slavery in the States, why do you indorse this book of Helder's that recommends civil discord and dissension and internecine war among the people in the slave States? Old John Brown did exactly the same thing. He declared more than once after he was in captivity, that he never intended to shed blood; that he came there for no such purpose; and, he said further, that, after he got there, he allowed no man to be shot down who did not come with arms in his hands. That was his profession; but what was his practice? One of the most respected and respectable citizens of Harper's Ferry, who was the mayor of the town, a man sixty years of age, while walking in the presence of his fellow-citizens upon the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, not only without the exhibition of arms but with none, possibly a pen-knife in his pocket, because he was the clerk or the agent of the railroad company, was shot down and killed from the engine house in front, some hundred yards off, where old John Brown was with his men in command. Yet he said he would have nobody shot down that did not come with arms in his hands, just as I hear proclamation after proclamation in the face of fact, "gentlemen you may go home and be contented; we do not intend to interfere with slavery in the States"—the profession on one side, and the whole range of debate, contradicting it.

Mr. President, the honorable Senators again have said on that side, with some feeling, that there is a sort of spirit of bravado among the southern people looking to the approaching election of a President, because it has been announced over and over again that if an exponent of the principles of the Republican party is elected, be he who he may, as he must of necessity be elected by a purely sectional vote, on such principles and purposes as have been proclaimed by that party, a dissolution of the Union will ensue; and we are threatened with trying to frighten you from your propriety. If I know anything of the condition of the southern States—a condition into which they have been brought by the conduct of your people, under your own lead; if I know anything of the feeling of the people in the southern States, the question will not be, shall the Union be dissolved? but the question among patriots—honest-minded, thinking, responsible men there—will be: is there any mode on God's earth by which the Union can be preserved? That will be the question—is there any mode left by which the Union can be preserved? Sir, there will be no restless or heated spirits there to bring about a dissolution. If an effort is made, it will be an effort—and God grant that it may be a successful one—to preserve the Union under the Constitution.

Now, look at those States, look at my own honored State of Virginia, almost in a state of war, with warlike preparations going on in every county, with troops in the field—her own native troops, got together for the occasion, military law prevailing in one portion of the State, and necessarily; the Legislature now, embodying the mind of the people of Virginia, projecting what? Measures of defense at home, providing for an increase of the military force, providing for the full and complete arming of the whole State, and appropriating money for the purpose. That is what now engages their attention; and honorable Senators are surprised that, in that state of the public mind, citizens from other States should be questioned when they go into it. Yes, sir, I doubt not they are questioned, and are made to tell who they are, where they come from, and what their business is; precisely as any people, who are remitted by the conduct of their neighbors to the necessity of providing for their own safety, are obliged to do everywhere. I say this has resulted

from the conduct of their own neighbors, the free States, and the late issue of counsels, given—where, perhaps, we may one of these days ascertain—the late issue at Harper's Ferry, which is contemptible only because it failed. Why have Senators not looked forward to know what an insurrection of slaves in slavery is? That that man, Brown, purposed it, none can doubt; and that he had the means, so far as weapons and ammunition went, none can doubt. I said here once before, and I take pride in repeating it, the State of Virginia was saved from insurrection among her slaves, only by the loyalty of the slaves. Yes, sir, that those fields do not now present a scene of incendiarism and blood is owing only to the loyalty of the slaves upon the soil of Virginia. I say the attempt is contemptible only because it failed, and it did not fail for the want of abundant means to carry the plan into execution.

That being the state of things, honorable Senators, who live at a distance in these free States which they commend so highly, may entertain their opinions whether it was wise or unwise in the Governor of Virginia to bring this military array into Virginia. They may entertain their own opinions as to whether it is fraternal or whether it is quarreling to question the citizens of their States when they come into that State; but to appreciate the actual state of things they must have been there, forming a part of the population, forming a part of the society, holding a part of the responsibilities of that society, to have known what it was for armed men to come from other States bringing with them arms and munitions of war to incite the slaves to insurrection, and to see that their conduct, after they were seized and put to death, not only did not meet with reprobation and execration, but in your churches, in your pulpits, in your social gatherings, among the simon-pures of the Abolition party at least, he was held up as a hero, and the only regret expressed was that the expedition failed.

Now, Mr. President, it is not remarkable, I should think—I know it will not appear so in history—that, under a Constitution which was intended to promote domestic tranquillity and the public peace, when we see practices such as these from the neighboring States, the people of the slaveholding States met their responsibilities, and armed—armed for their own defense and their own protection.

I have taken no part in the debate, as Senators will bear me witness. I was anxious that the resolution should pass at once, for it is a simple resolution of inquiry. All Senators on that side of the Chamber have expressed their readiness to vote for it; but it is to be encumbered, if their votes should prevail, with a proposition on a totally different question, of a totally different character, and which, from its very terms, is intended to present the resolution on the part of the State of Virginia in mockery. The occurrence at Harper's Ferry had its own aspects. The purpose was insurrection. It had its own aspects in various forms, and the resolution was directed to each one of those aspects, to get at the facts. The honorable Senator from Illinois takes up an occurrence of some four years' standing, which resembles this in nothing except that there a portion of the public arms was seized from a public depository, and reiterates the words of the resolution from Virginia, and demands a similar inquiry into that. It is the reiteration of mockery. It can be received in no other sense. The Senator is responsible for his own acts; I have no right to hold him to account; I do not presume to do it; I only want to expose the necessary aspect of this thing before my people as well as before the country. If we are to have this inquiry let us have it. If you are entitled to an inquiry on any other subject, ask for it, and lay a foundation for it; but if you connect it with this, the result must be of necessity, whether designed or not, either to overshadow it or to obscure it, to mingle it up with other matters and take away the good results; if any, that are to be derived from getting at the facts in this case. I do not say so, therefore, in any spirit of bravado, I say it as a matter of duty on my part, I cannot take the resolution with that amendment to it. If it should be the pleasure of the Senate to let the amendment prevail, I wash my hands of it, and we will make the inquiry in the best way we can at home.

Mr. CHANDLER. I merely wish, Mr. President, to say a single word, to correct the truth of history. The Senator from Virginia has stated that the Republican party originated in New England; from Know Nothingism. It is not true, sir; it had no such origin; it originated in no such place, and from no such source. The Republican party was born in the State of Michigan, on the sixth day of July, 1854, and had no origin from Know Nothingism; or any other thing, except the outrageous—I will use the term—the infamous repeal of the time-honored Missouri compromise by the Congress of that year. It was christened the Republican party at its birth. It is perfectly evident that the Senator from Virginia knows nothing at all about the Republican party, its origin, its ends, or its aims. He does not know anything about its birth or its principles. I merely wished to correct the misapprehension on his part, that it was born in New England, or any where else, out of the State of Michigan. There is where it was born, sir; and we glory in the production of such a child.

Mr. BIGLER. Mr. President, when the Senator from Virginia offered this resolution, I hoped it would pass the Senate by common consent. It relates to an exceedingly important subject, one about which the whole country was deeply agitated, and which it seemed to me even this body could not trifle with, much less encumber the proposition with the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I should have gladly voted immediately for the original proposition, and against the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I shall now vote against the amendment. I shall vote against that proposition under any circumstances. I am not willing to assimilate the investigation of an affair so unimportant, a matter of which we have already heard all perhaps that can be developed, with a subject so grave as that proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Now, sir, I had little inclination to discuss this general subject presented by the resolution; for I am sure all will agree that there is that measure of agitation, throughout the whole country, as to make it the duty of all to forebear as far as possible. Neither party to the issue will be justified in adding fuel to the flame, which is already burning in all parts of the country. I have been fearful that the debate might grow so extreme on this floor, as to heighten the excitement which exists as well in the North as in the South. I doubt whether, at any previous period in the history of this country, the people have been so deeply agitated on questions involving the peace of the country. I am very much misinformed, if the agitation amongst the great mass of the southern people is not at a higher point to-day, on the slavery question, than at any previous period; and whilst I regret that fact, whilst I lament it, whilst I would have, if otherwise, if possible, I cannot close my eyes to circumstances which could not fail to produce such a state of feeling.

The raid of Brown in Virginia is not, to my mind, the principal of the circumstances which have produced this state of feeling. I think the developments which have surrounded that affair; the developments which are now so freely made in reference to the proceedings in Kansas; the outrages of old man Brown himself, whilst there; the murders that were committed, and the violent measures which were adopted to control the political sentiments of that Territory, which were at one time denied, but now admitted, tend to disgust the popular mind with the men who countenanced the lawless measure. Next came the developments of Captain Forbes, a foreigner, who states that he was engaged to come to this country by anti-slavery men, to arrange a system of interference with slavery in the States; to go to Kansas also, and to head a party there which should control the decision of the slavery question by physical violence. This man Forbes, it seems, differed with Brown, as to the plan of operations. He would have organized a different scheme of interference with the southern States. He preferred a system of stampeding the slaves from their northern borders; a plan of organizations of companies at different points along the line between Pennsylvania and Virginia, and along the more northerly slaveholding States, by which he could steal the property of the people and carry it off to Canada. That that man was countenanced, and, to some extent, by men holding pub-

lic position in this country, will not be seriously denied.

Then came the Helfer book, to which the Senator from Virginia has referred with so much feeling and eloquence and conclusive argument. Sir, I confess my amazement that members of Congress should have led themselves to countenance, to any extent, a work so directly calculated to engender the worst possible feeling between the people of the northern and the southern States, and, as the Senator from Virginia has well said, not only between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, but between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding citizens of the same States; countenancing domestic feuds of the bitterest character; advising non-intercourse between those who have slaves and those who have none; advising one class of people to separate themselves from another. No circumstances could be better calculated to inflame angry passions in the South than those to which I have referred.

Then came the numerous demonstrations in reference to old Brown himself; the manifestations of sympathy with the man if not with his acts. I agree that these were not so general as some of the Senators on this side have supposed, but they were imposing; they were witnessed at every important point throughout the northern States. The Legislature of Massachusetts came within three votes of adjourning, as a mark of consideration for Mr. Brown. A meeting was held at Cleveland; another, I am sorry to say, was held at Philadelphia, and a number in New York city; and worse than all, cannon was fired at Albany under the direction of an appointee of Governor Morgan. In some instances, Brown was dignified into a martyr, and, in others, extolled in the most blasphemous language.

Now, sir, you know, and every Senator here knows, that I do not concur in all that is said by my southern friends on this subject, and I do not wish to be understood at this time as intimating, in the present angry controversy so dangerous to the peace of the country, that I think them faultless. No, sir; there are often sentiments enunciated by them that are well calculated to produce retaliation and recrimination in the North—sentiments radically wrong and offensive. I would gladly arrest this conflict both North and South. But, sir, my main purpose in rising was to call attention to some points in the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WADE] this morning; the most palpable error which he could have possibly committed was his attempt to break the force of the allegations which were made, that to some extent the Abolition party, with which he is identified, were responsible for the outrages of Brown, by referring to the career of a wretched man in Kansas. He says he condemns emphatically all demonstrations of sympathy with the acts of Brown. He disavows it for himself and for those with whom he is associated, and, of course, I cheerfully accept any disavowal made by a Senator on this floor for himself or his friends. I am glad to hear the disavowal. But what next did the Senator do? He gave us the history of this man Brown in Kansas, and undertook to show that there were reasons in it why he should command sympathy in the North; that his career there should commend him to the favor, or rather to the sympathy of a large class of the northern people, and if I did not misunderstand him, to himself and his party. So far at least as Brown operated against the establishment of slavery in Kansas, that good work which he had done there the Senator was ready to commend.

Now, sir, that is not the judgment of the people of Kansas; that is not the view of even the Republicans of Kansas. The Herald of Freedom, at Lawrence, published by a man who proposes to make Mr. Chase, of Ohio, President, and Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts, Vice President—the leading Republican organ in that Territory—so far from acknowledging Mr. Brown as having been a useful man there, speaks of his career as one full of mischief to the people. I do not want to say one word on my own authority about this unhappy man, who has expiated his offenses on the gallows. I would it were possible to bury the whole of this whole story of his wrongs, and to wipe it from the history of the country; but I think it due to a correct public judgment, and with a view to correct this grounded feeling in the North among men who may mistake the character of this man

Brown, that I should notice briefly what those say of him who acted with him in Kansas.

What does this leading Republican paper say of Brown? It states, without any kind of hesitation or qualification, that which would have been denied in this body when the Lecompton question was under consideration, that Mr. Brown came there armed by the anti-slavery men of the North; it describes his arrival in the Territory; it states that Brown manifested a desire, at some town in the northwestern part of New York, to go to Kansas, and to fight what he called the fight of freedom; but he would not go without arms and money. He was immediately supplied. He went to Kansas; and, in a very brief time, he showed his capacity to disturb the public peace. He was very soon in disfavor with leading men of the anti-slavery party, because of his extreme views and his mischievous measures. We find him at Lawrence, in the fall of 1855, with four of his sons, armed with broadswords, and revolvers in their pockets, prepared for war. In May, 1856, according to the testimony of the Herald of Freedom, Mr. Brown headed a murderous foray which went out in the dead of night and called up, one after another, five helpless citizens, and murdered them in the most cold-blooded manner. I will not repeat the testimony which identifies this man with these crimes, because it was given at length the day before yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee. I only allude to it. It is not necessary to give it in detail, for no one will deny the facts. Mr. Harris, however, swears positively to Mr. Brown being the commander of that murderous foray. Young Mr. Doyle describes the commander as an old man with a slender face; and the identity is too perfect to admit of a doubt.

Where next does Mr. Brown make his appearance in Kansas? At the head of a marauding party, near Fort Scott, indulging in violence and rapine. What next? What next of this man, Brown, whose career in Kansas the Senator from Ohio thinks might well excite the admiration of the anti-slavery party in the East? Why, sir, his next outrage was an expedition into Missouri, where he murdered or instigated the murder of a Mr. Chew, and carried his slaves off to Canada. Then he spent a brief period in the North, perhaps recruiting his stores and his arms, and returned again to Kansas.

What next, sir? The Herald of Freedom states that he was a party to an organization at Lawrence, to take the life of any man, free-State or pro-slavery, who should accept office under the Lecompton constitution, and that the evidence is in the possession of respectable men at Lawrence. Next, he conceived his scheme of an aggression upon some sovereign State. He must carry this work of his further than the Territories, and it is stated that so extreme and cruel were his schemes, that even the highwayman Montgomery shrank from them, and separated from Brown because of his cruelty. Next, he is in Iowa, with a body of men, drilling and preparing them for an expedition into some slave State. Perhaps he had not then fixed the scene of his action; but it was desirable that he should have men drilled, as commanders, in case a slave insurrection could be brought about. Next, he is gathering his munitions of war and his men in Virginia, to make an assault upon the helpless and quiet town of Harper's Ferry. The preparations are made, and the attack is made in the silent hour of the night, and helpless and quiet citizens are slain in the streets. Brown gets possession of the armory. Two of his sons are with him, and it is said that, when they were shot down dead by his side, he rebuked one of them for crying aloud with agony. I do not know whether this statement be true or not. I saw it stated in a very authoritative form, in the papers, by those who were on the spot. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY] says it is true, and was told to him by Mr. Washington, who was a prisoner in the armory. What next? The wretched man is conquered; he is taken off to the courts for trial; he is convicted; sentenced to be hung; he is next on the gallows, reeking with the blood of his fellow-citizens, covered all over with infamy and crime, with a career of four years behind him unprecedented in the history of crime in this country.

Now, sir, that there could be any sympathy for this man, or demonstration as a mark of respect

for him, is almost incredible; it is humiliating to admit that such was the case; and I am glad that every Senator on this floor can get up and say, as we hear them say with much earnestness, that they have no sympathy with Mr. Brown's acts and outrages; that they had no part in aiding or abetting him, nor had their party friends; that no member of the Republican party sympathizes with Mr. Brown, or favored his atrocious schemes. I accept all the disclaimers, as they choose to give them. I am glad to do so; but, sir, there is something behind all this which they, as a party, ought to consider. They will not deny that there is a party of men in the eastern and northern States who sympathize with Brown—I do not mean with the man, but with his acts—who did, by their sentiments and means, encourage Brown to believe that it was right to use violence in order to overthrow slavery; whose teachings would seem to be a warrant to a man like Mr. Brown, to make any aggression on a southern State that he might choose to make. That will not be denied; nor will it be denied that a large class of these men voted with the Republican party at the last presidential election. The Wendell Phillips, Gerrit Smith, and Cheever school, I admit, do not agree with everything that the Republican party say; but they prefer the Republican party to any other in this country; and, whilst the Republicans deny that they are Abolitionists, in some way or other they managed to get these extreme Abolitionists to vote with them. They must have believed that, in some way or other, the Republican party intended to abolish slavery in the States.

Mr. COLLAMER. Will the gentleman indulge me for a moment? Does he say that Gerrit Smith and Garrison, and their followers, voted with the Republican party?

Mr. BIGLER. I spoke of that school of politicians.

Mr. COLLAMER. Neither of the men I have mentioned vote with the Republican party.

Mr. BIGLER. I do not say that Gerrit Smith did himself vote with them; but I say a large portion of the Abolition party did, and it will be necessary that a large portion of the Abolition party do it again, if you carry the northern States, as you think you will carry them. Why, sir, I understand that Gerrit Smith alleges to this day that he would have had a large vote for Governor of New York, in 1858, perhaps forty or fifty thousand, if it had not been for Mr. Seward's Rochester speech. The irrepressible conflict was necessary to save New York in 1858.

Now, it will be a very easy matter for our Republican friends, if they desire to settle this question on the principles of the Constitution, to bring it about. They can do more to allay this agitation in the North than any other party. They can separate from these extreme men; they can discard them; they can tell them that they have no sympathy with their doctrine, and that the Republican party can in no way carry out their views. Will they do this? No, sir; they dare not; for by this they would lose their ascendancy in the North.

Now, sir, let us look at this matter practically. Republican Senators discard Brown and his sympathizers. They say they are not for interfering with slavery where it exists. They say they intend to sustain the constitutional rights of the South; that they are not for engendering strife between the North and the South, but are for maintaining the Union and the peace of the country. If they intend really to make the Constitution their guide, of course they will take it from the hands of the judiciary, because that is the tribunal to define its meaning. If they are willing to take the Constitution as defined by the Supreme Court, there is no reason on the face of the earth why this question should be a part of their platform in the North; there is no reason why it should be a leading, if not the only element of their faith. Since the decision in the Dred Scott case, it is settled that the people of the free States have no control over this question; have no power to touch it any way, not even through their Representatives in Congress, except so far as relates to the rendition of fugitive slaves or the admission of States.

Then, sir, why not drop it entirely? They say they are not for interfering with slavery, except in the Territories; but if Congress cannot legislate on the subject, as the Supreme Court has

held, in what way can the people of the free States influence the question in the Territories? Only those who go to the Territories, and exercise their rights through the ballot-box, when the question comes up, can influence its decision in any way. Then, sir, will they agree to sink the slavery question? Will they drop this issue from their platform? Will they abandon this apple of discord amongst us? For one, as a member of the Democratic party in the North, I would cheerfully do it; but would the Republican party do it? No, sir; for if it were done, there would be no Republican party. It is the very vitality of that organization. Abandon the slavery question, in all its phases, and the whole organization is paralyzed in an hour. That is the leading element of that organization, without which it cannot exist at all; and yet, if the Constitution, as defined by the Supreme Court, is to be respected, the people of the free States have no power over the question, can in no way influence the question of the number of slaves, or of slave States, except by refusing to admit a State because it is a slave State.

That is the way to allay this dangerous feeling in the North. Let the doctrines of Mr. Helffer, and of other able writers, be discarded. I do not expect any response on the other side, to my proposition to abandon the slavery issue in the free States. They could have no party without this issue, and the broader they make it, the larger their party becomes; and whenever they will restrict it to the constitutional ground, they will have a very small party in the North. They may say that we are as much at fault as they, in this agitation; that we have as much to do with keeping up this feud between the States as they have. I do not care to debate that point; but I have said, for one, I would be glad to sink this controversy forever, for the peace of the country and for the peace and the stability of the Union.

Sir, it is very well to get up here and declare in favor of the Union. I am willing to do that as ardently as any man. Senators on the other side can do it. But, sir, all history shows that the war of crimination and recrimination, which is now raging between the northern and the southern people of this nation, cannot fail to produce such a state of feeling, that finally separation will be inevitable. A people, to be united, must be fraternal; and if we take the literal meaning of the sentiments enunciated by the extreme men North and South, it would seem to be impossible that the Confederacy can be long continued.

Sir, I may speak for my own State. She is loyal to the Constitution and the Union. Her heart beats in unison with the constitutional rights of all the States. She will perform her duty to all and to each. I assure our friends from the South that it will be a long time before the demon of sectionalism will have such a hold on the old Keystone as to shake her fidelity. If our Republican friends will not agree to sink this question as a futile and mischievous one, then let us have it thrown out boldly, in its worst possible form, and let us decide the question in some decisive way. If they will give the northern Democracy that opportunity, we shall be thankful. Republicanism is an element only in the combined opposition which has torn us down for years. Without that element the opposition will be prostrated; we shall be triumphant. That element, thrown out plainly and distinctly, as it ought to be, would, as the Republicans know, separate the other wings of the opposition from them, and render our triumph certain. In any emergency, there is a majority in my State that will not countenance, to any extent, aggressions upon our sister States of the South. I do not mean such a raid as that of John Brown; I do not mean a conspiracy to incite insurrection and bloodshed; but a majority will denounce and discard every sentiment calculated to engender ill feeling between the States and the people of the States, and every sentiment tending to the perpetuity of this excitement and this sectionalism. That is what they will do; and in every emergency, a majority of that people will stand by the Constitution and by the Union.

But, sir, there are ambiguous sentiments enunciated by the leaders of the Republican party which have given them the benefit of the whole anti-slavery feeling of the North—not only those who would resist slavery in the Territories by constitutional means, but those who would assail the institution everywhere, and who are not willing

to tolerate it in a neighboring State. But those sentiments have so frequently been produced here, that I do not care to present them now. I intended to read one, a letter of the Senator from New Hampshire, written to a meeting at the Tabernacle in New York in 1855, but as he is not in his seat, I shall forbear. But I say it is sentiments such as have been enunciated by the Senator from New York, not now in his seat, and the Senator from New Hampshire, and others; that have induced the belief, among the extreme anti-slavery men, that the Republican party, in some way or other, and at some time, was to be the agency through which their views of abolishing slavery everywhere were to be carried out. Now, sir, let us have this question fairly and distinctly before the country. If it cannot be sunk and abandoned—for we people in the North ought to be ready to sink it—we have, in fact, no rights on the subject if we take the Constitution as defined by the Supreme Court. We have no interests at stake, no responsibilities to bear. What, then, is there left for this agitation? Nothing on the face of the earth but mischief; nothing but an aggravation of our neighbors of the South; nothing but an endless feud and strife endangering the peace of the country, if not the stability of the Government. It will be for the Republican party to consider, before they enter into another contest for the presidential chair, whether they will continue this agitation; whether they will reassert their doctrines, or whether, for the sake of the peace of the country and the quiet of the States, they will abandon this fruitless feud.

I shall not pursue this subject any further. I remarked, some time ago, that I did not wish to be understood as indorsing all that is said on this side. No, sir; sentiments have been enunciated here, by Senators from the South, which I do not sanction by any means. I maintain that, so far as relates to slavery to-day in any of the States, we have a perfect right to our judgment. My friend from Georgia almost established the fact that we were all Abolitionists in Pennsylvania because we had abolished slavery. We did abolish it, and we have the right to establish it. If I go into any of the Territories, I have a perfect right to resist the establishment of slavery in such Territory; and I may do it for any reason that I please, either because I am against the institution, *per se*, or because I think it bad policy; but I must exercise that right in accordance with the laws and the Constitution.

Now, sir, I do not agree with the extreme views of my friend from Georgia. I have told him over and over that the only effect of his doctrines is to weaken those who stand by the rights of the South, in the North. But, sir, the difference in the position of the northern and southern States on this subject ought to be appreciated by many of our people in the North, who do not, I think, properly realize the position of southern men. I mean that they do not allow themselves to realize the position of the southern people. Suppose we had any common institution in the North—it matters not what it might be; it might be the relation of marriage, if you please, or some general law regulating commerce or the sale of liquor—suppose we had such a law, and we had maintained it for a long time, and believed it to be right, believed it to be in no way offensive to Christianity or morality; and suppose the southern people were constantly denouncing us because of that law; suppose they were to assimilate it to Mormonism; suppose they used degrading epithets in reference to it, and even suggested that, because of that institution, they would have no further intercourse with us, and that they could not have further intercourse because that intercourse would be degrading, or would be, to some extent, countenancing a great wrong; I ask, how would we feel, and how would we act?

I felt the force of the remark of a southern Senator the other day, when he said to me: "Sir, you would be much more violent than the men of the South, and you northern people do not know yourselves; you would go to greater lengths, in repelling such humiliating interference with your domestic affairs, than we of the South." It is in this way only that we can realize how these attacks affect the feelings of the southern people.

But, sir, I shall not pursue the subject any further at present, and I hope that we may proceed with this subject, in all its future phases, in mod-

eration and with a patriotic desire to promote the peace of the nation. When this committee shall be raised and the examination made, then I shall be gratified if no man who has not already been named be involved, or in any way implicated, in the outrage committed on the State of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. Foor in the chair.) The question before the Senate is on the amendment moved by the Senator from Illinois to the resolution presented by the Senator from Virginia, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. SLIDELL. As two or three Senators have gone over to the other House, requesting to be sent for when the question is taken, I suggest that the roll be called over informally, before the vote is taken.

Several SENATORS. They can come in soon enough.

Mr. SLIDELL. Very well.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 22, nays 32; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Anthony, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hamlin, Harlan, King, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson—22.

NAYS—Messrs. Bayard, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Crittenden, Davis, Fitch, Green, Hann, Humphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Lane, Mallory, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Sautsbury, Sebastian, Simmons, Slidell, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Thomson, Toombs, Trumbull, Wade, Wilson, and Yulee—32.

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the adoption of the resolution offered by the Senator from Virginia, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will proceed to call the roll.

Mr. CRITTENDEN. I had desired, at first, that the vote on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Virginia should be taken as promptly as possible. I thought it due to the subject, due to Virginia, and due to the whole country. A debate, however, has sprung up of such a various and protracted character, that I have rather felt it to be my duty, in consequence of this prolonged discussion, in which much has been said of great consequence to the country, to make some reply; but the hour is so unsuitable, and my friend from Virginia has manifested so great an anxiety to have this business despatched, that if it be at all desirable to have the vote to-night, I will postpone to some other occasion what I have to say.

Mr. GWIN. I should like to have my vote recorded on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I left the Chamber, leaving orders to be sent for in the event of a vote being taken. Now, if it is not objectionable to the Senate, I should like to have my vote recorded. I wish to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California asks permission of the Senate to record his vote upon the amendment which has been voted upon. That vote having been announced to the Senate, according to the practice of the body, it can only be allowed by the unanimous consent of the Senate. If no member of the Senate objects to the recording of the name of the Senator from California, it will be recorded in the negative upon that amendment.

Mr. COLLAMER. Has that ever been permitted in the Senate? I have asked that privilege myself, and been refused. I think it has been the uniform practice to refuse it, and gentlemen have contented themselves with stating how they would have voted if they had been here.

Mr. GWIN. I should have voted in the negative.

Mr. COLLAMER. That answers the purpose. Mr. GWIN. There has been no vote since; and inasmuch, I repeat, as I gave instructions to be sent for, I should like to have my vote recorded.

Mr. COLLAMER. I have asked the same privilege myself, and it has been refused.

Mr. GWIN. The yeas and nays only go to the country. Explanations never do.

Mr. COLLAMER. I wish to be understood as objecting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will proceed to call the roll on the resolution.

Mr. MASON. I would only say to the honorable Senator from Kentucky what I am sure he will appreciate, that with every disposition in the world to yield to his perfect convenience, unless he deem it a matter of moment to himself that

he should occupy the floor on the resolution, I infinitely prefer that we should take the vote at once, for it is really of moment that the inquiry should be gone into while the subject is recent and attention can be given to it.

Mr. CRITTENDEN. Under those circumstances, certainly, I yield any right to address the Senate now, and shall take some early occasion when I can do so.

The question being taken by yeas and nays on the resolution, resulted—yeas 55, nays 0; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Anthony, Bayard, Bigler, Bingham, Bragg, Bright, Brown, Cameron, Chandler, Chesnut, Clark, Clay, Clingman, Collamer, Crittenden, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Durkee, Fessenden, Fitch, Foot, Foster, Green, Grimes, Gwin, Hamlin, Harlan, Hann, Humphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, King, Lane, Mallory, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Powell, Pugh, Rice, Sautsbury, Sebastian, Simmons, Slidell, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Thomson, Toombs, Trumbull, Wade, Wilson, and Yulee—55.

NAYS—0.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MASON. I move that the committee consist of five persons, to be appointed by the Vice President, as the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made, if there be no objection. The Chair hears no objection.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Several messages in writing were received from the President of the United States, by Mr. JAMES BUCHANAN, jr., his Secretary.

On motion of Mr. DAVIS, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business; and after some time spent therein, the doors were reopened, and the Senate adjourned.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, December 14, 1859.

The House met at twelve o'clock, m. Prayer by Rev. L. D. FINCKEL.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

#### THE SPEAKERSHIP.

The CLERK stated the question before the House to be on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. HICKMAN,] to amend the Journal of Friday; on which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McRAE] was entitled to the floor.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Clerk, I regret that my position yesterday, in regard to not being interrupted, was misunderstood by some of my friends, whom I had not permitted to interrupt me, while I permitted others to do so. I have to state that my position was, that I did not wish to be interrupted by members on my own side, but that I would permit members on the other side to interrupt me. My remark will be so found, I think, reported in the Daily Globe. I state this for the information of a friend, who thought that I had, perhaps, treated him unkindly in that regard.

I come now, Mr. Clerk, to the question of fixing on the Republican party, in this House, the responsibility for the delay in the organization, growing out of the introduction of the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CLARK,] and of the discussion which has taken place under it. Outside of the general opposition which the Democratic party would have to the election of any gentleman to preside over our deliberations from the Republican side of the House, owing to the political antagonism that exists between the two parties—a reasonable and well-founded objection, and one which will be sustained by the country—another objection grew out of the fact that, on the opening of the House, and on the ballot for Speaker, it was shown that the gentleman presented as the candidate of the Republicans, had affixed his signature to a paper recommending the circulation of the Helper book throughout the country, and especially in the South; and he is, of course, presumed to indorse the sentiments contained in it. The book is of an incendiary character, and proposes revolution in the southern States and war between non-slaveholders and slaveholders. It incites the slaves to rebel against the whites; so that it was expected that it would result in the shedding of blood of the southern people.

Now, can gentlemen reasonably say that, looking to the excitement in the northern States on the subject of slavery, southern gentlemen on this

floor should not be sensitively affected by the fact that a candidate for the Speakership had aided in the circulation of such a book? If he had signed that recommendation with a knowledge of the character of the book, the just judgment of the country would say that he ought to be condemned. But the gentleman says that he did not know the contents of the book or compendium. Well, let me say to gentlemen that, if they did not know precisely what the book contained, they did know, by their own admission, that it was of an incendiary character, and intended to produce revolution and bloodshed in the South. I charge that the gentlemen knew, at least, that it was a work published and circulated for the purpose of affecting injuriously the interests of slavery in the South; and, knowing the excitement that exists in the South on account of northern agitation against us, I say that any gentleman who aided in the circulation of that work, knowing it to be adverse to slavery, is criminally responsible before the country. But, if the gentleman who is presented as the Republican candidate for Speaker was not aware of the contents of the book, and does not recollect having signed the recommendation, then I say that the fact of such a work being found in the country with his name to it, without explanation from him, renders him liable to the censure of the country.

But, sir, I have said that it was reasonable, and that the country would so admit, that southern gentlemen should feel sensitive upon this subject, sensitive in relation to what appears to be the programme of the party issuing this book. I will read to you the three first positions which the writer of that book says he has nailed to his flag, and by which those who sustain it must live or die; and I will ask you, then, whether southern gentlemen could sit here without sensitiveness, and see a gentleman indorsing such sentiments as that book contains, occupy that chair. This, sir, is the first of the positions taken which are to be inscribed upon the flag of the party:

"Thorough organization and independent political action on the part of the non-slaveholding whites of the South."

This is the next position:

"Ineligibility of pro-slavery slave owners; never another vote for any one who advocates the extension and perpetuation of human slavery."

There is a declaration in this book which the gentleman has indorsed, which declares the ineligibility of any member from the South to occupy that chair! Could we sit here and not feel sensitive when a gentleman who had taken that position in reference to every gentleman from the South, was presented by his party to fill that chair and preside over us? But here is the third position:

"No coöperation with pro-slavery politicians. No fellowship with them in religion. No fellowship with them in society."

Could southern men sit here and not be sensitive to the fact that the gentleman presented by the other side as their candidate for Speaker has indorsed that sentiment—no association with us in social matters? If that gentleman should be elected to preside over this House, how could we conduct the business of the House without southern members having official intercourse, and, to some extent, personal associations with him? Yet, sir, he had taken the position by his indorsement of that work that he would have no intercourse with slaveholders.

Now, sir, I say that in this state of things, when this gentleman was presented as the candidate of the other side, southern men had a right to be sensitive to the position which he had taken upon this subject without any disclaimer upon his part that he had indorsed such sentiments. I say then that it was reasonable, when the first ballot taken disclosed the fact that the Republican party had the fairest prospect of success in the election of Speaker, that southern men should feel sensitive on the point that their candidate should have declared that he would have no political or social affiliation with men from the South, and that the gentleman from Missouri should have introduced his resolution. I say that the just sentiment of the country will determine that it was reasonable; that the gentleman from Missouri and the Democratic party will not be held responsible for it; but that the party who have given rise to it are responsible, and shall and will be held responsible for it.