The North Carolina Argus.

TERMS: $2 IN ADVANCE.

SAMUEL FULTON, PUBLISHER.

This Argus o'er the People's rights doth an eternal watch keep: No soothing strain of Maia's Son can lull his hundred eyes to sleep.

No. 24.

Wadesborough, N. C., Saturday, June 14, 1851.

Vol. IV.

THE NORTH CAROLINA ARGUS,

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY

SAMUEL FULTON,

PROPRIETOR.

Samuel Fulton and Orin Scoville,

EDITORS.

TERMS OF THE PAPER.

tion of six months.

Three Dollars if not paid until after the expiration of six months.

☞ No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the Editor.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

One square, first insertion,	$1.00
" " each subsequent insertion	25

A liberal discount made to those who advertise by the year.

Sixteen lines, or less, make a square.

☞ All letters addressed to the Editor must be post-paid.

From the Marion (S. C.) Star.

THE PALMETTO STATE.

AIR—"*O, Susannah, don't you cry for me.*"

When last we met, my dearest friends, our souls were light and free,
Having cast aside all selfish ends, and bid dull care to flee;
Each hoped to rear his name aloft, in this, our native land,
With buoyant hearts at danger scoffed, nor feared stern fate's command.

CHORUS.

Oh, Carolina, so small, so brave, so free,
No other land beneath the sun is half so dear to me.

Each longed against some tyrant foe his blood to pour out free,
To add a single leaflet to the old Palmetto tree;
"Side by side," without a groan we'd welcome danger, toil,
Living, would live to her alone, when dead would deck her soil

Oh, Carolina, so small, so brave, so free,
No other land beneath the sun is half so dear to me.

Alas, these castles in the air, these visions of renown,
To me are naught but things that were, hopes lost like suns gone down;
In distant lands I'm doomed to roam, with strangers live and die,
Still, still, Carolina is my home, the apple of my eye.

Oh, Carolina, so small, so brave, so free,
No other land [illegible] so dear to me.

For sin[illegible] care.
They bring to mind old Christmas times and friends that loved me here;
These times again must roll around, but I no joys will see,
Cast then, when mirth and wit abound, a lingering thought on me.

Oh, Carolina, so small, so brave, so free,
No other land beneath the sun is half so dear to me.

May honors cluster round your heads, success crown all you do,
Carolina love you when you're dead, as I love her and you;
And may the old Palmetto Flag forever wave on high.
And all her sons desire alone beneath its folds to die.

Oh, Carolina, so small, so brave, so free,
No other land beneath the sun is half so dear to me.

ZEMR.

ONE MORE STANZA FOR THE ARGUS.

We'll throw our banners to the breeze, from Union's tower so strong,
With the stripes and stars on distant seas, which rights the freeman's wrongs:
The freedom of our nation proud, we'll march in arms to save,
Till victories on the distant shore shall echo back on wave.

Oh, Carolina, why do you think to halt?
The woman once for doing so turned to a lump of salt.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Written for The Argus.

AGRICULTURE.

No. 5.

We have noticed the advantage of sseeding lands relative to their preservation from washing, and in this and in our following articles we are to show the other benefits to be derived.

If the rule we have noticed were to be adopted, it will readily be seen, that in the proportion as lands grow richer, in that ratio will a less quantity of land produce the desired amount required by the farmer, for market and home consumption. At the present time the average amount of corn and wheat produced from an acre in our State, would not vary far from two barrels or ten bushels. If then we desire to raise one thousand bushels per year, we would plant or sow 100 acres. This amount planted to corn would require say 4 hands and 3 horses; but if the lands were rich and capable of producing ten barrels per acre, then to raise the same amount of grain would only require twenty acres, or one fifth of the territory now employed; which, so far as the labor necessary to produce the crop is required, would of course be in the same degree less, with the number of acres cultivated. The advantages to the farmer in this instance is much every way. He saves seed, he saves in the wear and tear of farming utensils, such as hoes, plows, harness, &c. He saves team work, and in the cost of its keeping, he saves in the wear of his lands, and in hand labor; and finally, he saves his money and the interest of it, which is invested in all the surplus appendages which he now employs, and which are indispensible under the present system, over that which would [illegible] ed under a system we propose. If we were in possession of data by which we could come at the present amount of the cost of all these surplus outlays over what would be required under the new system, it would astonish the world. Let us suppose that 1,000,000 acres of land is now under cultivation in our State and that every 20 acres requires one man and horse, then to till that amount we would have 50,000 men and 50,000 horses. If a mode of farming could be introduced by which the same amount of produce could be raised with one fifth of the amount of [illegible] the number of and the teams after the same ratio; then we would have 40,000 horses to sell, and if we were to allow their worth per head to be $30, we could sell $1,200,000 worth of horses. On this item we are loosing the interest of the money invested in them, and besides this, their keeping which in one year, if we allow the keeping of each horse per head to be worth $20, would amount to $872,000 and say nothing about the interest of the money expended for feed, and the expense of care necessary to be bestowed. If we assume that of the 40,000 surplus hands 10,000 of them are servants, and that they are worth four hundred dollars per hand, we could sell them for $4,000,000. The cost of keeping them and the interest of money invested, is also another draft from our pockets, which in one year would amount to the nice sum of four hundred thousand dollars, if we allow it to be worth $20 per hand a year to cloathe and feed them. But this amount is not half the cost of cloathing and feeding a servant, which every man who keeps them knows, and if we were to add the actual cost, it would double the sum named. But we have yet 30,000 men of that surplus help to dispose of, and if we allow that each man besides feeding and cloathing himself, could earn $25 per annum, then we are loosing on their labor each year $750,000; for, if their labor can be dispensed with in the department of business in which they are now engaged, they could seek other employments and the amount they would earn would be the precise amount we now lose; from the fact, that we have that amount of labor invested, in stock yielding no profit, which, were it diverted and invested where it would produce, any body can see that whatever that income might be, it would be so much gain to the people, and the State.

That lands in our State may be made to produce in the manner we have stated, we contend, evidences at hand.—A certain gentleman residing in the suburbs of our town, some three years since, purchased about an acre and a fourth of a worn out tract of land, and commenced fertilizing it, and last season he raised, we are informed, seventy-five bushels of corn on the premises and then, sowed in peas, and the income of the two crops raised within one year, from that small spot, will amount to at least $120. This is conclusive evidence of what we have been stating, and shows that less land may be made to produce the amounts we only obtain from large territories, and at a great cost.

We have now considered the benefits to be derived from seeding lands in the matter of raising crops, and we have no hesitation in guaranteeing every position we have assumed, and every result to which we have arrived, if the means proposed are adopted strictly. But there are still other benefits to be derived, the first of which we will notice is, that we shall be able to furnish our own markets with hay. It is a humiliating fact that our seaboard cities, and our inland towns located on navigable water courses, are now, and have been for years past, and we know not how long, importing the article of hay from the Northern States in large quantities, and from ports from 12 to 1500 miles distant. The precise amount of the cost of this article to the citizens of our State we cannot tell, but are informed by those having better advantages than we that there is no doubt but that the amount imported will reach annually to $100,000! One half of this is profit to the producer and transporter, and consequently, we lose that little sum.

Another draft on the farmer under the present system is, that he is compelled to keep his stock on the commons, or, in other words, on the long pasture. The sad consequences arising from this patent right, or no right at all, system of rearing stock we shall not attempt to fully demonstrate, as it would take the mathematical genius of Archimides to give a solution, and then the immensity of the result could not be comprehended by a mind less intelligent.

In our next we shall endeavor to show the advantages to be secured in raising stock, the mode of keeping, &c., &c.

THE STUDY OF AGRICULTURE.

If we desire to be good, practical Farmers remarks a writer in the Rural New-Yorker, we must *Study* Agriculture; and there are a few [illegible] inquiry. A farmer may understand, as his father did, the every day principles of farming operations well enough to make a living for himself; but there is much more ahead which may be reached by a proper exertion. He must note every principle, and watch the effects of every new system and endeavor to follow all the most profitable modes in every department of husbandry.

LARGE CASTING.

The propeller of the United Sates steamer San Jacinto was cast at the works of Messrs. Merrick & Son, on Friday. This is the largest propeller ever made in this country of brass, and probably the largest brass casting. Twenty thousand pounds of copper and tin were melted down in two hours and a half from one furnace, and the nett weight of the propeller is estimated at 16,000 pounds. The time occupied in filling the mould was 1 minute and 55 seconds. The whole operation was successfully performed, and there is every reason to expect a successful casting. The dimensions are as follows: Diameter, 14 feet 6 inches: length, 4 feet; greatest width of blades, 5 feet 9 inches; area of the surface of the four blades, 108 square feet; pitch of propeller, 40 feet, expanding to 45 feet.

Philadelphia Ledger.

The poultry of the United States is valued in the statistics at $20,000,000—the State of New York having over two millions invested in it. In the egg trade the city of New York expends nearly a million and a half of dollars annually.

POLITICAL.

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER'S SPEECH

AT ALBANY, NEW YORK.

Fellow citizens:—I owe the honor of this occasion—and I esteem it an uncommon and extraordinary honor—to the young men of the city of Albany; and it is my first duty to express to these young men of the city of Albany grateful thanks for the respect they have manifested towards me. Nevertheless—nevertheless, young [illegible] mistake for your object, or your purpose. I am [illegible] to myself whatever may properly belong to me, as a token of personal and political regard from you to me. But I know you, young men of Albany, it is not I, but the cause—it is not I, but your own generous attachments to your country—it is not I, but the constitution of the Union which has bound your ancestors and mine, and which, for more than half a century. It is those that has brought you here to day, to testify your regard towards one who, to the best of his humble ability, has sustained that cause before his country. (Cheers.) Go on, young men of Albany! Go on, young men of the United States! Early mind is the chief prop and support—reliance and hope—for the preservation of public liberty and the institutions of the country. Your mind is ingenuous, generous, just. It looks forward to a long life of honor or dishonor—and by means, by the blessings of God, that it shall be a life of honor, of usefulness, and success, in the professions and pursuits of life; and that it shall close—when closed it must be—with a claim to the gratitude of the country. Go then—uphold the institutions to which you are born. You are manly, fearless, bold. You can do nothing but to do wrong—dread nothing but to be found recreant to patriotism and to your country. Gentlemen, I certainly had not the expectation of appearing in such an assemblage as this to-day. It is not probable for much [illegible] a long time to come—I may again [illegible] large assemblage of my fellow-citizens. If I should not, and this were the last, or one of the last of all the occasions in which I should appear before any large number of the people of the country, I shall not regret that the appearance was here. I find myself in the political capital—in the greatest, most commercial, most powerful State of the Union. I find myself invited here by persons of the highest respectability, without distinction of party. I consider the occasion as somewhat august. I know that among those that now listen to me there are such as are of the wisest, the best, the most patriotic, and the most experienced public men of the country, men of character and high station—and here are persons from all the walks of professional and private life, distinguished for talent, and virtue, and eminence. Fellow-citizens, before such an assemblage and on such an invitation, I feel bound to guard every sentiment and every expression—to speak with precision such sentiments as I advance, and to be careful in all that I say, that I may not be misapprehended nor misrepresented. I am requested, fellow-citizens, by those who invited me hither, without distinction of party, to signify my sentiments on the state of public affairs in this country, and the interests in question which are before us. This proves, gentlemen, that, in the opinion of those who invited me here, there are questions sometimes arising which range above all party, and all the influences, and considerations, and interests of party. It proves more. It proves that in their judgment, at whose request I now stand before you, this is a time in which public affairs do rise in importance above the range of party, and draw to them an interest paramount to all porty considerations. If that be not so, I am here without object, and you are listening to me for no purpose whatever. Then, gentlemen, what is the condition of public affairs which makes it necessary—proper—for men to meet and confer together on the state of the country? What are the questions which are overriding, subduing, and overwhelming party—uniting honest, well-meaning persons to lay party aside—to meet and confer for the general public weal? I shall, of course, fellow-citizens, not enter at any length into many of these questions—nor into any lengthened discussion of the state of public affairs—but shall endeavor to state what that condition is—what these questions are—and to pronounce a conscientious judgment of my own upon the whole. The last Congress, fellow-citizens, passed laws called adjustment measures, or settlement measures—laws intended to put an end to certain internal and domestic controversies which existed in the county. The laws were passed by the constitutional majority of both houses of Congress. They received the constitutional approbation of the President. They are the laws of the land. To some, or all of them, indeed, to all of them—at that time there existed warm and violent opposition. None of them passed without opposition. Government was established in each of the Territories of New Mexico and Utah, but not without opposition. The boundary of Texas was provided to be settled by compromise by that State, but not without determined and violent opposition. These laws are all passed; and as they have now become, from the nature of the case, irrevocable, it is not necessary that I should detain you with discussing their merits or demerits. Nevertheless, gentlemen, I desire on this, and on all public occasions, in the most emphatic and clear manner to declare that I hold some of these laws—and especially that which provided for the adjustment of the controversy with Texas—to have been essential to the preservation of the public peace. I will not now argue that point, nor lay before you the circumstances which existed at that time at any length—the peculiar situation of things in so many of the Southern States, or the fact that many of those States had adopted measures for the separation of the Union—the fact that Texas was preparing to assert her rights to territory which New Mexico thought was her's by right, and that hundreds and thousands of men, tired of the ordinary pursuits of private life, were ready to rise and unite in any enterprise that might open to them, even at the risk of a direct conflict with the authority of this government. I say, therefore, without going into the argument with any details, that in March of 1850, when I found it my duty to address Congress on these important topics, it was my conscientious belief—still unshaken—ever since confirmed—that if the controversy with Texas had not been amicably adjusted; there must have been civil war and bloodshed; and to the contemplation of such a prospect it was not a farthing's consequence to me on which standard victory should perch. In such a contest we take it for granted that no opposition could arise to the authority of the United States that would not be suppressed. But what of that? I did not care for the military consequences of things—looked to the civil and political state of things, and I inquired what would be the condition of the country, if, in this agitated state of things—if, in this vastly extended, but not generally pervading feeling at the South, war should break out and bloodshed should come in that extreme of the Union? That was enough for me. And if the chances had been one in a thousand that such would have been the result, I should still have felt that would have been the result, I should still have felt that that one thousandth chance should be guarded against by any reasonable sacrifice; because, gentlemen, sanguine as I am for the future prosperity of the country—strongly as I believe now, after what has passed, and especially after those measures, that it is likely to hold together—I yet believe firmly that this Union, once broken, is utterly incapable, according to all human experience, of being reunited—of being reconstructed, by any chemistry, or art, or effort, or skill of man. Then, gentlemen, passing from those measures which are now accomplished and settled. California is in the Union, and can't be got out; the Texas boundary is settled, and can't be disturbed; Utah and New Mexico are territories, under provision of law, according to accustomed usage in former cases—and these things may be regarded as settled. But, then, there was another subject, equally agitating and equally irritating, which, in its nature, must always be subject to consideration, and that is the Fugitive Slave law of 1850, passed at the same session of Congress. Allow me to advert very shortly to what I consider the ground of that law. You know, and I know, that it was very much opposed in the Northern States—sometimes with argument, not unfair, often by mere ebullition of party, and often by those who winds of fanaticism that raise a dust and blind the eyes, but produce nothing else. Now, gentlemen, this question of the property of the Fugitive Slave law, or the enactment of some such law, is a question that must be met. Its enemies will not let it sleep, or slumber. They will "give neither sleep to their eyes or slumber to their eyelids," so long as they can agitate it before the people. It is with them a topic—a desirable topic—and all know, who have much experience in political affairs, that for party men and party times there is hardly anything so desirable as a topic. (Laughter.) Now, gentlemen, proper, expedient, just, that a proper law should be passed for the restoration of fugitive slaves, found in free States, back to their owners in the slave States. I am ready to say that, because I only repeat the words of the constitution itself, and I am not afraid of being considered a plagiarist, nor a feeble imitator of other men's language and sentiments, when I repeat and announce to every part of the country—to you, here, and at all times—the language of the constitution of my country. [Loud cheers.] Gentlemen, before the revolution, slavery existed in the Southern States, and had existed there for more than a hundred years. We of the North were not guilty of its introduction. That generation of men, even in the South, were not guilty of it. It had been introduced according to the policy of the mother country, before there was any independence in the United States—indeed, before there were any authorities in the colonies to resist it. Why, gentlemen, men's opinions have so changed on this subject, and properly—the world has come to so much juster sentiment—that we can hardly believe that which is certainly true—that at the peace of Utrecht, in 1713, the English government insisted on compensation from the Spanish government for having violated a contract by which the Spanish government had established the unqualified and exclusive privilege to the British government of importing slaves into her West India colonies! That was not then repugnant to public sentiment, but it is now. I allude to it to show that the introduction of slavery into the Southern States is not to be visited upon the generation that achieved the independence of this country. On the contrary, all the eminent men of that day regretted it. And you, my young friends of Albany, if you will take the pains to go back to the debates of the period from the meeting of the first Congress, in 1771—I mean the Congress of the Confederation—to the adoption of the present constitution, and the enactment of the first law under the existing constitution—anybody who will make that necessary research, will find that Southern men and Southern States, as represented in Congress, lamented the existence of slavery in far more earnest and emphatic terms than the Northern; for, though it did exist in the Northern States, it was a feeble taper, just going out—soon to end—and nothing was feared from it; whilst leading men of the South—of Virginia and the Carolinas—felt and acknowledged that it was a moral and political evil; that it retarded the arm of the free man, kept back the progress and success of free labor, and said with truth—and all history verifies the observation, "that, if the shores of the Chesapeake had been made as free to free labor as the shores of the North River, New York might have been great, but Virginia would have been great also." That was the sentiment. Now, under this state of things, gentlemen, when the constitution was framed, its framers, and the people who adopted it, came to a clear, express, unquestionable stipulation and compact. There had been an ancient practice for many years, for a century, for aught I know, according to which fugitives from service, whether apprentices at the North or slaves at the South, that fugitives should be restored. Massachusetts had restored fugitive slaves to Virginia long before the adoption of the constitution; and it is well known that, in the States here, the centre where slavery existed, they were restored. And it was held that any man could pursue his slave and take him wherever he could find him. Under this state of things, it was expressly stipulated, in the plainest language, and there it stands; sophistry cannot gloss it; it cannot be erased from the page of the constitution: there it stands, that persons held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall not, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, upon claim of the party to whom such service or labor shall be due. Adopted without dissent—nowhere objected to, North or South—considered as a matter of absolute right and justice to the Southern States—concurred in everywhere, by every State that adopted the constitution; and we look in vain for any opposition, from Massachusetts to Georgia. Then, this being the case—this being the provision of the constitution, soon after Congress had organized, in General Washington's time, it was found necessary to pass a law to carry that provision of the constitution into effect. Such a law was prepared and passed. It was prepared by a gentleman from a Northern State. It is said it was drawn by Mr. Cabot of Massachusetts. It was supported by him and by Mr. Goodhue, and Mr. Sedgwick of Massachusetts, and generally by all the free States. There was not a tenth vote against it. It went into operation, and, for a time, it satisfied the just rights and expectations of everybody. That law provided that its provisions should be carried into effect mainly by State magistrates, justices of the peace, judges of State courts, sheriffs of State counties, and other organs of State authority.

So things went on, without loud complaints from any quarter, until some fifteen years ago, when some of the States—the free States—thought it proper for them to pass laws prohibiting their own magistrates and officers from executing this law of Congress, under heavy penalties, and refusing to the U. S. authorities the use of their prisons for the detention of persons arrested as fugitive slaves—that is to say, as far as the State could go. Those of them to which I refer—not all, but several—nullified the law of '93 entirely. They said—"not execute it. No runaway shall be restored." Thus the law became a dead letter—an entire dead letter. But here was the constitutional compact—here was the stipulation, as solemn as words could form it, and which every member of Congress, every officer of the State government, from Governors down to constables, had sworn to support. Well, under this state of things, in 1850, I was of opinion that common justice and good faith called upon us to make a law—fair, reasonable, equitable, just—that should be calculated to carry this constitutional provision into effect, and give the Southern States what they were entitled to, and what it was intended originally they should receive—that is, a fair right to recover their fugitives from service from the States into which they had fled. I was of opinion that it was the bounden duty of Congress to pass such a law. The South insisted that they had a right to it, and I thought they insisted justly. It was no concession—yielding nothing—gives up nothing. When [illegible] and for one I was ready [illegible] Now, these [illegible] jects, both of which were accomplished by it. First, it was to make the law more favorable for the fugitive than the law of 1793. It did so, because it called for a record, under seal, from a Court in the State from which the fugitive might be said to have come, proving and ascertaining that he was a fugitive so that nothing should be left, when pursued into a free State, but to produce the proof of his identity. Next, it secured a higher tribunal. It placed the power in more responsible hands. The Judges of the Supreme and District Courts of the United States, and learned persons appointed by them as commissioners, were to see to the execution of the law. Therefore it was a more favorable law, in all respects, to the fugitive, than the law passed under Gen. Washington's administration, in '93. Now, let me say that this law has been discussed, considered and adjudged in a great many of the tribunals of the country. It has been the subject of discussion before Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States—the subject of discussion before Courts the most respectable in the States. Every where—on all occasions—and by all judges, it has been holden to be, and pronounced to be, a constitutional law. So say Judges Nelson, Woodberry, and all the rest of the judges, as far as I know. So says the unanimous opinion of Massachusetts herself, expressed by as good a court as ever sat in Massachusetts—unanimously and without hesitation—and so says every body, eminent for learning, and constitutional law, and good judgment, without obstruction, without opposition, without intermixture of dissent of judicial opinion any where. And I hope I may be indulged on this occasion, gentlemen, partly on account of a high personal regard, and partly of the excellence and ability of the production, to refer you all to a recent very short opinion of Mr. Prentice, the District Judge of Vermont. (Applause.) True, the case before him did not turn so much on the question of the constitutionality of this law as the unconstitutionality, and illegality, and utter inadmissibility of private men and political bodies setting up their notions above it,—on the idea of the higher law that exists some where between us and the third heavens; I never knew exactly where. (Cries of "good," and laughter.) All judicial opinions are in favor of this law. You can't find a man in the profession in New York, whose income reaches thirty pounds a year, who will stake his professional reputation on an opinion against it. If he does, his reputation is not worth thirty pounds, (renewed laughter.) And yet this law is opposed—violently opposed—not by bringing this question into court. These lovers of human liberty, these friends of the slave, the fugitive slaves don't put their hands in their pockets and draw funds to conduct law suits, and try the question, they are not in that habit much. (Laughter.) That is not the way they show their devotion to liberty of any kind. But they meet and pass resolutions—they resolve that the law is oppressive, unjust, and should not be executed at any rate, under circumstances. It has been said in the State of New York, Massachusetts and Ohio, over and over again, that the law shall not be executed. That was the language of a convention in Worcester, in Mass.; in Syracuse, New York, and elsewhere. And for this they pledged their lives, and their fortunes, and their sacred honor! (Laughter.) Now, gentlemen, these proceedings, I say it upon my professional reputation, are distinctly treasonable. And the act of taking away Shadrach from the public authorities in Boston, and sending him off, was an act of clear treason. I speak this in the hearing of men who are lawyers—I speak it out to the county, I say it everywhere, on my professional reputation. It was treason, and nothing else—that is to say, if men get together, and combine together, and resolve that they will oppose a law of the government, not in any one case, but in all cases—I say, if they resolve to resist the law, whoever may be attempted to be made the subject of it, and carry that purpose into effect by resisting the application of the law in any case, that, sir, is treason. (Turning to Mr. Spencer, and stamping with emphasis.) You know it well. (Continuing to address Mr. Spencer.) The resolution itself, unacted on, is not treason—it only manifests a treasonable purpose proclaimed—and it is proclaimed that it will be carried out in all cases—and is carried into effect, by force of arms or numbers, in any one case, that constitutes a case looking to war against the Union; and, if it were necessary, I might cite in illustration the case of John Shays, who suffered death in Washington's time, for being concerned in the whiskey insurrection of that day. (There is probably an error here. Shay's rebellion was in Massachusetts, and the whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania.) Now, various are the arguments, and various the efforts, to denounce this law, to oppose its execution, to keep it up as a question of agitation, and they are as various as the varied ingenuity of man, and the various aspect of such questions when they come before the public. And a common thing it is to say that the law is odious, that it can't be executed, and will not be executed. That has always been said by those who don't mean it shall be executed, not by any body else. They assume the fact that it can't be executed, to make that true which they wish to turn out to be true. They wish that it shall not be executed, and, therefore, announce to mankind that it can't be executed. Who? public men—your conductors of newspapers—thus deal with the subject, they deal unfairly with it. Those who have types at command, have a perfect right to express their opinions; but I doubt their right to express opinions as facts; I doubt whether they have a right to say, not as matter of opinion but of fact, that this particular law is so odious here and elsewhere that it cannot be executed. That only proves that they are of opinion that it ought not, that they hope it may not be executed. I go to that length. I do not find any of the description of the public press who say we wish it were otherwise. They do not say, "see if my wrong is inflicted on anybody by it; I hope to find it inoperative, no wrong or injury to anybody." Does any of them hold that language? Not one. They wish to further to the thought. They wish that it may not be executed, and therefore they say, "Let it remain as obnoxious as it can be, and so much the sooner it will disgust, and be detested by the whole community." I am ashamed to say that such sentiments have been avowed by those in Massachusetts who ought to be utterly—utterly ashamed to utter such opinions. For, what do they mean? They mean to make the law obnoxious, so obnoxious that it shall not be executed. They suggest no other law, they oppose all amendment, oppose doing anything that shall make it less distasteful. What do they mean? They mean, and they know it, that there shall not exist any law whatever for carrying into effect this provision of the constitution of the country. They wish to strike out—to annul it. They oppose it in every possible form short of personal resistance; and to do this, they say the worse the law is the better. They say we have now a topic, and for mercy's sake don't amend the horrible law of 1850. [Laughter.] Then again they say, "We are for an eternal agitation and discussion of this question—the people can't be bound by it. Every member of Congress has the right to move the repeal of this as well as any other law." Who does not know this? A member must act according to his own discretion.

No doubt he has a right to-morrow, if Congress were in session, to move a repeal of the slave law; but this takes it with another. He has just as much right to move to tear down the capitol, until one stone will not be left on another—just as much right to move to disband the army, and to throw the ordinance and arms into the sea. He has just as much right to move that all the ships of war of the U. S. shall be collected and burned, an illumination like that which lit up ancient Troy. He may do any of these things. The question is, is he prudent, wise, a real friend of the country, or adverse to it? That is all. And a greater question lies behind—will the people support him in it? Is it the result of the good sense of the Northern people that the question shall have neither rest nor quiet, but shall be constantly kept up as a topic of agitation? I shall not decide it for them, but leave them to do so. Now, gentlemen, this is a serious question—whether the Constitution can be maintained in part and not in whole?—whether those interested in the preservation of one part of it, finding their interests in that particular secured, are not likely enough, according to all experience of human feeling, to discard that portion introduced not for their benefit but for the benefit of others? That is the question. For one, I confess, I don't see any reasonable prospect of maintaining the Constitution of the United States, unless we maintain it as a whole—impartially, honorably, patriotically. Gentlemen, I am detaining you too long, but allow me a few words on another subject.

The Constitution of the United States consists in a series of mutual agreements and compromises; one thing being yielded by the South, another by the North. The general mind having been brought together, the whole were agreed to, as I said, as a series of compromises. Well, who does not say that? Had the North no particular interest in that? Had the North no interest? Was nothing yielded by the South to the North? Gentlemen, you are proud citizens of a great commercial State. You know that New York ships float over the whole world, and bring abundance of riches to your own shores. You know that this is the result of the commercial policy of the United States; but how was the commerce established? by what Constitutional provisions? and for whose benefit? The South was never a commercial country. The plantation States were never commercial. Their