

# North Carolina Argus.

WADESBOROUGH, N. C., THURSDAY, AUGUST 30, 1860.

WHOLE NO. 103.

NEW SERIES—VOL. 12—NO. 103

## NORTH CAROLINA ARGUS.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY  
BY  
FENTON & DARLEY.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.  
Single copies, Two Dollars per year, invariably in advance.  
To Clubs of Ten and upwards, it will be furnished at One Dollar and a Half per copy.  
No subscription received for less than six months.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.  
ONE SQUARE, TEN LINES OR LESS PER WEEK.  
One insertion ..... 70c.  
Three insertions ..... \$1.50  
Two months, or six insertions ..... 3.00  
Three months, or thirteen insertions ..... 4.00  
Six months ..... 6.00  
One year ..... 9.00  
Advertisers must state the number of times they wish their advertisements inserted; otherwise they will be continued till forbidden, and charged according to the above.

Agreements will be made with yearly advertisers on liberal and advantageous terms.  
Professional and Business Cards, not exceeding five lines in length, will be inserted at \$5 a year; if exceeding five lines will be charged the same as other advertisements.  
Obituary notices free when not exceeding twenty lines; all above twenty lines at advertisement rates.

[From the Nashville National Union.]

### JOHN BELL'S RECORD.

[Concluded.]

MR. BELL IN 1854—THE KANSAS-NEBRASKA BILL.

We come now to what may justly be considered as the most important act of Mr. Bell's public life—his opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska act. A few brief passages from the two speeches made by him in the Senate on that memorable occasion will suffice to place before the people of the South (where his vote against the bill has been made the subject of bitter condemnation) the motives and reasons by which he was governed. Hear him, fellow-citizens!

Repeal of the Missouri Compromise—A Great Practical Question—Its Probable Results Considered.

"If this measure shall appear to be as important to the interests of the country as its friends assume, I shall feel no embarrassment arising from any of the questions to which I have just alluded, in giving my support to the principle of non-intervention, embraced in the provisions of the bill before the Senate. I think it is a wise and expedient principle, for general application; and upon this point, it will be perceived, that there is no difference between myself and any of my Southern friends. It is not a new principle. It was the principle adopted in the compromise acts of 1850, and had my full concurrence and support. But in the application of this principle to the Territories proposed to be organized by this bill, in order to give it a free and unembarrassed operation, it is proposed to repeal the Missouri Compromise; and thus a great practical question is directly presented; and one which, above all others, claims the dispassionate consideration and reflection of every statesman of the country, North and South: *Is it wise, is it expedient to disturb the Missouri Compromise? Does the repeal of the slavery restriction clause of the act of 1820 promise such important and beneficial results to the country that all objections should be yielded?*"

*Missouri Restriction Unjust to the South.*  
"Sir, it is contended that by applying the principle of non-intervention to the Territories, we shall harmonize the action of the Government by conforming it to the principle of the compromise acts of 1850. Admitted. It is said that the slavery restriction clause of the act of 1820 was a violation of the obligations of the treaty by which France ceded to the United States the Territory of Louisiana. I admit it. It is contended that the restriction upon slavery, imposed by the Missouri Compromise, was unjust to the South. That is also true.  
"The attempt of the North in 1820 to interdict slavery in Missouri, as a condition of her admission into the Union, and the continued resistance offered to the application of that State for admission, until the South agreed to accept the proposition to interdict slavery in all the remaining territory ceded by France lying north of the line of 36° 30', was just such a proceeding that the great names invoked by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Sumner,) to sustain him in his course as an abolitionist—Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and Hamilton, had they been living at the time, anti-slavery in sentiment though they were, would have raised their united voices against it, as conceived in a spirit the very reverse of that which controlled their own course when they gave their sanction to the Constitution; when they contributed the full weight of their great names and characters in conciliating and reconciling the strongest antagonism of sentiment and interests between the North and the South; and in blending all in one great organic instrument of Union, unparalleled in the wisdom of its provisions, and the grandeur of its results. Jefferson did raise his voice against it, but unhappily his glorious compatriots of the Revolution had passed away, and he, in his retirement, was no longer able to control the active passions of the day."

*He Fears the Consequences of Repealing the Missouri Compromise.*  
"Having thus gone over all the grounds of objection suggested against the validity of the Missouri Compromise, I trust it will be seen that I am not disposed to controvert them either as to fact or doctrine, with such exceptions only as upon more deliberate consideration, by those who asserted them, will be allowed to be well taken. But, sir, admitting them, with the exceptions I have stated, to be incontrovertibly true, still the main question remains to be considered and decided: *Do these facts and doctrines demonstrate the expediency of disturbing the Missouri Compromise under existing circumstances? and in coming to an affirmative conclusion upon this point, I hesitate, I pause.*"

*Probable Consequences of the Repeal Further Considered.*  
"I have listened with attention to all the luminous explications and theories of constitutional construction, and of popular sovereignty; to the ingenious application of doctrinal points to questions of compact and compromises by the friends of this measure. The question has been fruitful of themes for dialectic display—for the exhibition of great powers of analysis and logical acumen; but the whole argument has been singularly defective and unsatisfactory upon the main question: *What practical advantage or benefit to the country generally, or to the South in particu-*

lar, would be attained by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise?"

"I wish to state to you that the application of the principle of non-intervention to these Territories, under the Missouri Compromise, will require the assent of the local legislatures, the State Legislatures, and to relieve Congress from the most dangerous and distressing aspect of controversy which ever has, or ever can disturb its deliberations; that the spirit of sectional conflict and dissension upon the subject of slavery, which has more than once endangered the peace of the country, will be removed; that justice will be done to the South; that the Constitution will be preserved; and a new guarantee provided for the stability of the Union. I need not say that *one-half the many beneficial results predicted of this measure can be shown to follow as a probable consequence of its adoption*, I would no longer hesitate to give my support; but unfortunately the argument has proceeded no further than the affirmation, without showing how these results must or will follow."

*Wisdom of the Repeal Doubtful.*  
"Sir, I believe there is a better feeling prevailing at the North towards the South than formerly; but would it not be wise on the part of the South to do nothing to reverse the current of that better feeling, unless urged by some great necessity in vindication of its rights?"

*What has the South to Gain by it?*  
"What has the South to gain by the measure? Will slavery be established in the Kansas Territory proposed to be organized under its provisions? Does any one who has fully considered the subject, believe that this Territory will become a slave State?"

*He Differs with his Southern Friends only as to the Results of the Measure.*  
"I have said already, and I repeat that if I could take the view of the importance of this measure to the country which my Southern friends do—cutting off the source of all future controversy between the North and the South—putting an end to agitation in both sections upon the subject of slavery—I would feel justified in waiving all my objections to this bill, and in uniting heartily with them in its support. We differ only as to the results of the measure."

The foregoing extracts are from the first speech of Mr. Bell on the Kansas-Nebraska bill, delivered in the Senate on the 3d of March, 1854. See Appendix to Congressional Globe, vol. 29, page 407.

From his second speech on the bill, delivered on the 24th and 25th of May, 1854, we make the following extracts, for which see Congressional Globe, vol. 29, pages, 947-958.

*Probable Consequences of the Repeal further Considered.*  
"The people of Tennessee will doubt the propriety and wisdom of adding fuel to the flame kindled by the abolitionists of the North, by repealing the Missouri Compromise. They will see that it must and will have a bad effect on the steady, sober, patriotic, national men of the North. There are many gentlemen at the South who may not care what consequences may flow from such a course. The people of Tennessee have sense enough, judgment and penetration enough, to perceive that, though the feeling of the North, excited by the passage of this bill, may be restrained within such bounds as not to threaten immediate division, yet that perhaps no more fugitive slaves may be captured and returned from the North, and that the swelling tide of fanaticism, and the more intense sentiment of hostility to the institutions of the South, created by this bill, may lead to such excess that irritation and resentment will be, in turn, excited and kindled into flame at the South; and that, then, we shall find all the fears and apprehensions of civil war and disunion renewed, which spread consternation throughout the land in 1850."

*Scatter Sovereignty.*  
"As to the principle of 'squatter sovereignty,' I wish further to say that, in the late contest between General Taylor and the honorable and distinguished Senator from Michigan, (Gen. Cass,) it was distinctly brought forward as an issue before the people of Tennessee. In that contest, in common with the South generally, they [the people of Tennessee] repudiated the idea, that a handful, or any number of inhabitants, in a Territory of the United States, should have the power granted to them by Congress of regulating their domestic institutions and at their discretion, to deny to the citizen of one section of the Union the power to enjoy his right of property in slaves. We were not prepared to reverse and set aside the previously established practice and doctrines of the Government, from 1789 to that time. We could see no peace, no quiet, no end of agitation that was to result from such a course. We thought that if a Territorial Legislature should, in one or two years, establish or abolish slavery, the agitation of the question of slavery would still go on. We, in Tennessee, at that time believed we were advocating principles and doctrines on this subject approved in all the Southern States. The principle then contended for was that the people of a Territory, when they came to form their State constitution, AND THEN ONLY, were qualified to establish their domestic institutions."

*Must Discharge his Duty to the Country at whatever Sacrifice.*  
"When I informed honorable Senators that I did not hold myself committed to this bill, I was told, by some of my friends, that if I opposed the bill, such a course would be utterly destructive to me; that it would lead to a disruption of the Whig party in Tennessee, and furnish a plausible ground for imputations upon my motives. And those friendly warnings were given to me up to the time of the final vote in the Senate."  
"Sir, when a question is presented here involving great principles of any kind, when any great measure is proposed, and a man occupying a responsible position becomes strongly impressed with the conviction that its adoption would have a deep, and permanent, and injurious effect upon the future prospects of the country, threatening the stability of the Constitution and the Union itself, he should be willing to sacrifice himself, and surrender all prospects that may be held out to him which stand in conflict with his duty. Why should a man abandon his convictions upon such a question for the sake of doubtful political chances? I consider the position of a Senator of the United States, which I now enjoy, as the proudest and most independent that any American citizen can occupy—the noblest and most desirable to any man who will boldly do his duty. Sir, I acknowledge my weaknesses. I know that kind feelings and a deference for the opinions of others have often induced me to give my support

to measures of inferior importance, which my judgment did not approve. But when a great question is presented, when I have deliberately reflected upon it, when I have lights before me by which to guide my course, whatever sacrifice of political standing may be required of me, whatever obstacles and embarrassments of any kind may stand in my way, I trust I shall always have the firmness to do what, upon deliberate reflection, I consider my duty to the country."

*A Conservative Sentiment at the North—Danger of Alienating it.*  
"I wish honorable Senators to understand that if I thought there was really any great principle to be established or settled by this bill, of importance or value to the South, and to the country generally, it would be a different question. But I must not be diverted from the issue made with me that there is no great body of conservative and national Whigs at the North, ready to stand by the South on questions affecting their rights and institutions. I deny the assertion. I know that there is a large body of patriotic and noble Whigs at the North, who, though they do not approve this bill, have steadily opposed the Abolition movement at the North, from its inception, and have always deprecated all agitation on the subject of slavery. They, like all Northern men, have been, from training and education, opposed to slavery; but they have been trained to respect and revere the Constitution and its compromises; and they have shown their determination to respect and stand by the compromises of 1850, in their unwavering efforts to silence opposition to the fugitive slave law, and to secure its faithful execution. And, sir, I would enquire of those who assert that there is no sound national Whig party at the North, what has become of that noble Whig phalanx at the North, who stood by and sustained Daniel Webster in his bold advocacy of the compromises of 1850? Where the supporters of Millard Fillmore at the North? Where the Union Whigs of New York? Where the conservative spirit which prompted five hundred of the most respectable citizens of Boston, and to be very hot-bed of fanaticism, to enroll themselves as special constables to secure the execution of the fugitive slave law? Is there no consideration due to the position of such Whigs as those at the North in deciding upon measures so well calculated as the present to weaken their position and influence, or rather, to use the forcible language of the Attorney General, 'to crush them out?'"

"But, sir, there is a conservative sentiment at the North, outside the ranks of those Whigs known as the supporters of Mr. Webster and Mr. Fillmore, even among those denominated Free-soilers, or the opponents of the extension of slave territory, belonging to the Whig and Democratic parties—I allude to those who acquiesced in the compromises of 1850—who are opposed to the plans of the Abolition organization, and entertain no purpose of pressing their anti-slavery feelings and doctrines to the point of disunion. Is there any wisdom or sound policy in adopting a measure not called for by any public necessity or interest, but so well calculated to incite that large class of Northern citizens to form combinations which may lead to a permanent alienation between the North and the South?"

*Rise of the Republican Party Predicted, as a Consequence of the Repeal.*  
"Sir, the tendency of this bill is to stimulate the formation of a sectional party organization. And, as I said in my speech on the passage of the Senate bill, I regard that as the last and most fatal evil which can befall this country, except the dissolution of the Union; and that last and greatest calamity to the country, the success of such a movement would infallibly bring about. I trust, sir, that my fears on this subject will prove to be groundless, and that no such results as I have indicated will ever be realized."

MR. BELL IN 1856—ADMISSION OF KANSAS.  
The following are extracts from a speech made by Mr. Bell in the Senate, on the 2d of July, 1856, on the bill to authorize the people of Kansas to form a constitution and State Government preparatory to their admission into the Union:

*He Advocates its Early Admission.*  
"Whoever has looked closely into this subject and comprehends all its bearings, must be satisfied that, though we may remove some of the more fruitful sources of the existing disturbances in Kansas, disunion and discord will still continue, not only in Kansas, but throughout the country, until Kansas shall become a State. The excitement and agitation at the North may be expected to continue, even with increased intensity, so long as there remains any prospect of the success of the pro-slavery party, in order to unite and consolidate public sentiment in opposition to the admission of Kansas as a slave State. Can the country—can the Union, stand five years of unmitigated agitation upon this distracting subject? It seems inevitable that agitation must continue through the present canvass for the Presidency. There is no remedy for that evil. Had I the power, by my voice, I would paralyze—I would crush this many-headed monster—this Kansas hydra at once; but, as this is impossible, I protest against the extension of this controversy into the next ensuing contest for the purple. I protest against that, as equally unnecessary and perilous."

*Practical Workings of Squatter Sovereignty.*  
"This principle of popular sovereignty, connected as it was in this case with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, was thought by its friends to be of such transcendent importance, that when the Nebraska bill passed the Senate, at a late hour of the 2d of March, 1854, the inhabitants of the national metropolis were awakened from their slumbers by peal after peal of deep-mouthed artillery, announcing the glad tidings that the great principle of popular sovereignty was triumphant; that justice was vindicated by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; that the reign of the Constitution would now be restored; and that slavery agitation would return no more to vex the land. As though some great victory had crowned our arms over a public enemy, as at Buena Vista, or Gero Gordo heights, the reverberations of the cannon had scarcely ceased, when the same joyful tidings were carried with electric speed to every quarter of the Union."

"I trust I may be permitted, without offence, to say that, in a long tract of time, no example can be found of a delusion engendered in the heat of controversy, more completely than that which appears to have taken possession of those who pressed the Nebraska bill to its final passage through Congress. Where, now, do we find the realization of those pleasing dreams which doubtless inspired the author of that measure?"

"Mr. President, I do not wish to say anything that can be considered offensive; but I most say I do not know any way in which I can so well illustrate the true character and tendency of the organic law of Kansas, as by comparing it to the preliminary arrangements which usually attend the sports of the ring. Without any far-fetched analogy, that law may be said to have inaugurated a great national prize fight. The ample lists were regularly marked out—they were the boundaries of Kansas. The two great sections of the Union, the North and the South, were to furnish the champions and to be their backers. The prize of victory was to be a slave State on the one side and a free State on the other. But as the victory was to be decided by the number of the champions, to encourage their enlistment and prompt attendance, the prize of a choice quarter section of land, at the minimum price, was to be awarded to the champions on either side."

"When we consider the champions on both sides of this great national contest were deeply imbued, for the most part, with adverse principles, sentiments, and prejudices on the subject of slavery, excited and inflamed almost to frenzy by recent and violent agitation, and that the inhabitants of the western counties of Missouri were naturally become sensitive and excited in the highest degree by the prospect of a free State on their borders, it is not extravagant to assert that had the most inventive genius of the age been called upon for a scheme of policy combining all the elements of slavery agitation in such a manner as to insure the greatest amount of disorder, personal and neighborhood feuds, border disturbances, and bloodshed, in Kansas, leading, at the same time, to personal and sectional alienation, he could not have succeeded better than by adopting the provisions of the Kansas-Nebraska bill."

*He Insists upon the Importance of a Speedy Adjustment.*  
"Sir, months ago, when authority was first given by the President to Governor Shannon to call in the military force of the United States then at Fort Leavenworth, we were told that there would be no further disturbances; but we have been disappointed. The disorders have rather increased than diminished since that time. It may be that there will be no more unauthorized military arrays on either side; but will that cure the evil? Every settler in Kansas now goes armed, and prepared for sudden conflict; and does any one suppose that any future emigrant to that Territory will fail to equip himself fully with the means of self-defence? Does any one suppose that there will be no more secret associations, no longer any system of intimidation kept up, no longer any use for the bow-knife, revolver, or Sharpe's rifles? Again, I ask, where is all this to end? Can quiet ever be established unless one party or the other is driven out by force, or shall voluntarily abandon the contest, or until Congress shall adopt some measure to end the controversy?"

"And, sir, what forbids that we should now adopt some measure, with provisions so fair and just in all respects, that it cannot fail to mitigate, if it cannot remove altogether, existing evils, and in the shortest period consistent with this spirit of fairness and justice, bring the whole matter into controversy to a close by admitting Kansas into the Union as a State? Do this and we may leave the issue in the hands of a higher power."

"Settle this slavery controversy when we may, now or at any time, or in any way, the best that can be devised, whatever section may have a triumph, there will remain, on the side of the vanquished, a deep and rankling feeling of discontent and alienation, and a whole generation must pass away before they will cease to mar, to some extent, the general harmony. On the question whether Kansas shall be a free or a slave State, as a representative of Southern interests, my preference, of course, is for a slave State. But, sir, in a fair competition it must be so, let it be a free State; let it be retroceded to the Indians, the aboriginal occupants of the soil; let it become another Dead Sea, rather than continue the pestilential source of mortal disease to our system."

MR. BELL IN 1858—THE LECOMPTON CONSTITUTION.  
In the speech made by Mr. Bell in the Senate, on the 18th of March, 1858, on the Lecompton Constitution bill, there occur the following passages:

*Issues between the North and the South—Estimating the Value of the Union.*  
"It is more than indicated; it is boldly assumed by some gentlemen that the rejection of this measure will be regarded as a decision that no more slave States are to be admitted into the Union, and the consequences which may follow such decision are pointed to in no equivocal language. There is no gentleman here with whom I differ as to the value of the union of these States, to whom I do not accord honesty and patriotism of purpose. There is simply between us a difference in judgment as to the true interest of the South as well as the North, connected with the Union. When my attention is invited to the consideration of the advantages and blessings that may follow disunion to the South, I shun the subject as one that is speculative only, and prematurely brought forward. That is a field of inquiry into which I do not propose now to enter. When an issue is made; when a question does arise demanding such an inquiry as that, I shall be ready to enter upon it, and to estimate the value of the Union; but I will not anticipate the occurrence of any such contingency. When the North shall, by any deliberate act, deprive the South of any fair, and just, and equal participation in the benefits of the Union—if, for example, the Territory now proposed to be admitted into the Union as a State had not been subject to an interdict of slavery for thirty years—if it were a Territory such as that lying west of Arkansas, by climate adapted to slave labor, and by population already a slave Territory, and if, on application of such a Territory for admission into the Union as a slave State, the powerful North, without any of the feelings and resentments naturally growing out of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in regard to Kansas, should deliberately announce to the South, 'you shall have no more slave States,' that would afford a pretext with which the South might, with some reason, and with some assurance of the approval of the civilized world and posterity, seek to dissolve the Union. I know that it is supposed by some that the day will come when the North, in the arrogance of its power, will furnish just such a pretext as I have indicated; and the Senator from Georgia and others have argued this question on the ground that it will come; but I must see it come before I will calculate the value of this Union. I trust that day will never come. I do not believe it will come, if the South is wise and true to itself. I would not have them trundle or

surrender any of their rights. I would not have them yield one jot or tittle of their rights; but I would have them make no questionable issues in advance, stir up no strife upon unnecessary abstract questions, having no practical value, but to do always what is just, and right upon all questions. When a people or a Territory apply for admission into the Union under a constitution fairly formed, with the assent of the people, excluding slavery, I would admit it promptly; and when an application comes on the other hand from the people of a Territory, who have fairly formed a constitution recognizing slavery, I would insist upon its admission as a slave State. If the North should not agree to this, it would then be time enough to consider of the proper remedy. But I would make no issue with the North now, and before any occasion for it has arisen; and I regret most sincerely to hear any Senator from the North suggesting that such an issue will ever be tendered from that quarter."

*What Ought to be Done?*  
"With regard to the present question, I by down as the basis of my conclusion as to what ought to be done, that the solution of it which promises the speediest termination of this dangerous slavery agitation is the true one. This dangerous agitation has continued long enough. There has been no mitigation of it in the last four years. They have been intervals of apparent repose, but it was just such repose as foreboded increased disorder and commotion. It is time to terminate it."

"The question is, what is that solution which promises the speediest and most permanent remedy for these difficulties. Divine that to me, whoever, and I will follow his lead. How shall we cut this Gordian knot of Kansas politics? Shall we cut it by the sword? Shall we first subdue the rebellious faction, said to exist in Kansas, by force of arms, or shall we endeavor to unravel this tangled skein by some more peaceful means?"

*Frauds and Irregularities of the Lecompton Constitution.*  
"My friend from Florida (Mr. Mallory) said, in his able speech the other day, that it would be difficult to persuade the people of the South that if this constitution be rejected by Congress, it will not be upon the ground that it recognizes slavery. That is also the opinion of the honorable Senator from Georgia, and others. Unless it be that these honorable Senators want some immediate pretext for a movement in the South, I advise them to investigate this question more fully than they seem to have done, before they conclude to make the rejection of this measure, should it be rejected, a *corpus delictum* (a cause for disunion). We are told that it will be difficult to persuade the people of the South that any other objection exists to this constitution except that it recognizes slavery, and these opinions are avowed in the fact of accumulated frauds and irregularities connected with its history; and though it is clear that four-fifths of the people of Kansas are opposed to it."

"I will not do for these gentlemen to say that there is no record or other satisfactory proof to show the frauds and irregularities alleged against the Lecompton Constitution, or any other statements made by the opponents of this measure in relation to the state of things existing in Kansas. The supporters of this measure in the Senate and in the House of Representatives have obstinately persisted in taking every proposition to investigate and take proof upon the contested questions of fact; and I take it for granted that this course would not have been persisted in unless it was understood that the facts would turn out as they have been charged. If I have not wholly misconceived and mistated the material points in the history of Kansas affairs which preceded the formation of the Lecompton constitution; if I have not misrepresented the facts connected with its formation; if I am not wholly mistaken in the views I have presented of the existing state of public sentiment in Kansas in relation to this constitution, it is becoming the character of the National Legislature to accept this instrument as the organic law of the new State which is proposed to be admitted into the Union?"

"Is it fit, is it becoming the Senate of the United States, to stamp this Constitution, with all its attendant circumstances, with their approval, and send it to Kansas to be abided by or resisted to blood by the people there? Surely, sir, there ought to be some great and overruling political necessity existing in the condition of affairs to justify such a proceeding."

*The Passage of the Lecompton Bill would Strengthen Republicanism.*  
"I now ask the attention of the Senate to the effect of the experiment localizing slavery agitation in the Territories made in 1854 in changing the complexion of parties both in Congress and in the country. In the Congress which passed the Kansas-Nebraska bill, we have seen that there was, at the commencement of the session in December, 1853 a Democratic majority of eighty-four in the House of Representatives, and only four Free Soilers; and in the Senate a like number [of the latter]—so small, yet so distinct in their principles, that neither of the two great parties known to the country knew how to arrange them on committees. \* \* \* Now, let us see what was the effect of the Kansas-Nebraska act on the elections which ensued in the fall of 1854, just on the heels of the adoption of that measure. One hundred and seven Free-Soilers were returned to the House of Representatives; and the Democratic party instead of having a majority of eighty-four in that House, found itself in a minority of seventy-six; and in the Senate the number of Free-Soilers was increased to thirteen. Such was the complexion of the two Houses of Congress in the Thirty-third Congress, which assembled in December, 1855. Now, we find in the Senate twenty Free-Soilers. How many more they may have in the next Congress will depend upon the disposition we make of the question now before the Senate. I call upon the Senator from Georgia to say whether he will have that number limited or not. Does he want a sufficient number to prevent the ratification of any future treaty of acquisition? How long will it be before we have that number, if the Southern Democracy persist in their present course? They would seem to be deeply interested in adding to the power of the Republican party. I consider the most fearful and pernicious of all the results of the Kansas-Nebraska act was to create, to build up a great sectional party. \* \* \* I consider that no more ominous and threatening cloud can darken the political horizon at any time. How formidable this party has already become, may be well illustrated by the fact that its representative candidate Mr. Fremont, was only beaten in the Presidential election by the most desperate efforts; and I feel warranted in saying, that but for the imminent prospect of his success which shone out near the close of the canvass, Mr. Buchanan

would not have attained his present high position. "In the closing debate on the Kansas-Nebraska bill, I told its supporters that they could do nothing more certain to disturb the composure of the two Senators on the opposite side of the chamber, the one from Massachusetts, (Mr. Sumner,) and the other from Ohio, (Mr. Chase,) than to reject that bill. Its passage was the only thing in the range of possible events by which their political fortunes could be reconstituted, so completely had the Free-Soil movement at the North been paralyzed by the compromise measures of 1850. I say now to the advocates of this [the Lecompton] measure: if they want to strengthen the Republican party, and give the reins of Government into their hands, pass this bill. If they desire to weaken the power of that party, and arrest the progress of slavery agitation, reject it. And, if it is their policy to put an end to the agitation connected with Kansas affairs at the earliest day practicable, as they say it is, then let them remit this constitution back to the people of Kansas for their ratification or rejection. In that way the whole difficulty will be settled before the adjournment of the present session of Congress without the violation of any sound principle, or the sacrifice of the rights of either section of the Union."

*Mr. Bell replies to the Complaints of the North against the South, and calls upon the followers of Mr. Seaward to "arrest him in his mad career."*  
"The honorable Senator from New York farther announced to us, in exultant tones, that 'at last there was a North side of this chamber, a North side of the chamber of the House of Representatives, and a North side of the Union, as well as a South side of all these; and he admonished us that the time was at hand when freedom would assert its due influence in the regulation of the domestic and foreign policy of the country.'"

"When was there a time in the history of the Government that there was no North side of this chamber and of the other? When was there a time that there was not a proud array of Northern men in both chambers, distinguished by their genius and ability, devoted to the interests of the North, and successful in maintaining them?"

"Though it may be true that Southern men have filled the Executive chair for much the largest portion of the time that has elapsed since the organization of the Government, yet when, in what instance was it, that a Southerner has been elected to that high station without the support of a majority of the freemen of the North?"

"Do you of the North complain (that the policy of the Government, under the long continued influence of Southern Presidents, has been injurious or fatal to your interests? Has it paralyzed your industry? Has it crippled your resources? Has it impaired your energies? Has it checked your progress in any one department of human effort? Let your powerful mercantile marine, your ships whitening every sea—the fruit of wise commercial regulations and navigation laws; let your flourishing agriculture, your astonishing progress in manufacturing skill, your great canals, your thousands of miles of railroads, your vast trade, internal and external, your proud cities, and your accumulated millions of moneyed capital ready to be invested in profitable enterprises in any part of the world, answer that question. Do you complain of a narrow and jealous policy under Southern rule, in extending and opening new fields of enterprise to your hardy sons in the great West, along the line of the great chain of American lakes, even to the lead waters of the farther of rivers, and over the rich and fertile plains stretching southward from the lake shores? Let the teeming populations—let the hundreds of millions of annual products that have succeeded to the but recent dreary and unproductive haunts of the red man—answer that question. That very preponderance of free States which the Senator from New York contemplates with such satisfaction, and which has led him exultingly to exclaim that there is at least a North side of this chamber, has been hastened by the liberal policy of Southern Presidents and Southern statesmen; and has become the ambition of that Senator to unite and combine all this great, rich and powerful North in the policy of crippling the resources and repressing the power of the South? Is this to be the one idea which is to mould the policy of the Government, when that gentleman and his friends shall control it? If it be, then I appeal to the better feelings and the better judgment of his followers to arrest him in his mad career. Sir, let us have some brief interval of repose at least from this eternal agitation of the slavery question."

*The Union—How only it can be Saved.*  
"Let power go into whatever hands it may, let us save the Union!"

"I have all the confidence other gentlemen can have in the extent to which this Union is entrenched in the hearts of the great mass of the people of the North and South; but when I reflect upon and consider the desperate and dangerous extremes to which ambitious and party leaders are often prepared to go, without meaning to do the country any mischief, in the struggle for the imperial power, the crown of the American Presidency, I sometimes tremble for its fate."

"Two great parties are now dividing the Union on this question. It is evident, to every man of sense, who examines it, that practically, in respect to slavery, the result will be the same both to North and South; Kansas will be a free State, no matter what be the decision on this question. But how that decision may affect the fortunes of those parties, is not certain, and is the chief difficulty. But the great question of all is how will that decision affect the country as a whole?"

"Two adverse yet concurrent and mighty forces are driving the vessel of State towards the rocks upon which she must split, unless she receives timely aid—a paradox, yet expressive of a momentous and perhaps fatal truth. There is no hope of rescue unless the sobriety-minded men, both of the North and South, shall by some sufficient influence, be brought to adopt the wise maxims and sage counsels of the great founders of the Government."

*CONCLUDING REMARKS.*  
It is particularly worthy of notice, that Mr. Bell's traders have never assailed any sentiment, doctrine, or principle enounced by him on the subject of slavery. Their objections lie, and are limited—

1. To his votes in favor of receiving and acting upon abolition petitions, as a matter of sound policy on the part of the Representatives from the South, and in view of the injurious results which he believed would follow the adoption of

the measure.

"In the closing debate on the Kansas-Nebraska bill, I told its supporters that they could do nothing more certain to disturb the composure of the two Senators on the opposite side of the chamber, the one from Massachusetts, (Mr. Sumner,) and the other from Ohio, (Mr. Chase,) than to reject that bill. Its passage was the only thing in the range of possible events by which their political fortunes could be reconstituted, so completely had the Free-Soil movement at the North been paralyzed by the compromise measures of 1850. I say now to the advocates of this [the Lecompton] measure: if they want to strengthen the Republican party, and give the reins of Government into their hands, pass this bill. If they desire to weaken the power of that party, and arrest the progress of slavery agitation, reject it. And, if it is their policy to put an end to the agitation connected with Kansas affairs at the earliest day practicable, as they say it is, then let them remit this constitution back to the people of Kansas for their ratification or rejection. In that way the whole difficulty will be settled before the adjournment of the present session of Congress without the violation of any sound principle, or the sacrifice of the rights of either section of the Union."

*Mr. Bell replies to the Complaints of the North against the South, and calls upon the followers of Mr. Seaward to "arrest him in his mad career."*  
"The honorable Senator from New York farther announced to us, in exultant tones, that 'at last there was a North side of this chamber, a North side of the chamber of the House of Representatives, and a North side of the Union, as well as a South side of all these; and he admonished us that the time was at hand when freedom would assert its due influence in the regulation of the domestic and foreign policy of the country.'"

"When was there a time in the history of the Government that there was no North side of this chamber and of the other? When was there a time that there was not a proud array of Northern men in both chambers, distinguished by their genius and ability, devoted to the interests of the North, and successful in maintaining them?"

"Though it may be true that Southern men have filled the Executive chair for much the largest portion of the time that has elapsed since the organization of the Government, yet when, in what instance was it, that a Southerner has been elected to that high station without the support of a majority of the freemen of the North?"

"Do you of the North complain (that the policy of the Government, under the long continued influence of Southern Presidents, has been injurious or fatal to your interests? Has it paralyzed your industry? Has it crippled your resources? Has it impaired your energies? Has it checked your progress in any one department of human effort? Let your powerful mercantile marine, your ships whitening every sea—the fruit of wise commercial regulations and navigation laws; let your flourishing agriculture, your astonishing progress in manufacturing skill, your great canals, your thousands of miles of railroads, your vast trade, internal and external, your proud cities, and your accumulated millions of moneyed capital ready to be invested in profitable enterprises in any part of the world, answer that question. Do you complain of a narrow and jealous policy under Southern rule, in extending and opening new fields of enterprise to your hardy sons in the great West, along the line of the great chain of American lakes, even to the lead waters of the farther of rivers, and over the rich and fertile plains stretching southward from the lake shores? Let the teeming populations—let the hundreds of millions of annual products that have succeeded to the but recent dreary and unproductive haunts of the red man—answer that question. That very preponderance of free States which the Senator from New York contemplates with such satisfaction, and which has led him exultingly to exclaim that there is at least a North side of this chamber, has been hastened by the liberal policy of Southern Presidents and Southern statesmen; and has become the ambition of that Senator to unite and combine all this great, rich and powerful North in the policy of crippling the resources and repressing the power of the South? Is this to be the one idea which is to mould the policy of the Government, when that gentleman and his friends shall control it? If it be, then I appeal to the better feelings and the better judgment of his followers to arrest him in his mad career. Sir, let us have some brief interval of repose at least from this eternal agitation of the slavery question."

*The Union—How only it can be Saved.*  
"Let power go into whatever hands it may, let us save the Union!"

"I have all the confidence other gentlemen can have in the extent to which this Union is entrenched in the hearts of the great mass of the people of the North and South; but when I reflect upon and consider the desperate and dangerous extremes to which ambitious and party leaders are often prepared to go, without meaning to do the country any mischief, in the struggle for the imperial power, the crown of the American Presidency, I sometimes tremble for its fate."

"Two great parties are now dividing the Union on this question. It is evident, to every man of sense, who examines it, that practically, in respect to slavery, the result will be the same both to North and South; Kansas will be a free State, no matter what be the decision on this question. But how that decision may affect the fortunes of those parties, is not certain, and is the chief difficulty. But the great question of all is how will that decision affect the country as a whole?"

"Two adverse yet concurrent and mighty forces are driving the vessel of State towards the rocks upon which she must split, unless she receives timely aid—a paradox, yet expressive of a momentous and perhaps fatal truth. There is no hope of rescue unless the sobriety-minded men, both of the North and South, shall by some sufficient influence, be brought to adopt the wise maxims and sage counsels of the great founders of the Government."

*CONCLUDING REMARKS.*  
It is particularly worthy of notice, that Mr. Bell's traders have never assailed any sentiment, doctrine, or principle enounced by him on the subject of slavery. Their objections lie, and are limited—

1. To his votes in favor of receiving and acting upon abolition petitions, as a matter of sound policy on the part of the Representatives from the South, and in view of the injurious results which he believed would follow the adoption of