

THE NORTH-CAROLINA STAR.

THOMAS J. LENAY, Editor.

NORTH CAROLINA—"Powerful in intellectual, moral and physical resources, the land of our sires and home of our affections."

VOL. XLIII.

RALEIGH, WEDNESDAY MORNING, JANUARY 14, 1852.

NO. 3.

TERMS.—If paid strictly in advance, \$2 per annum; \$1.25 if paid within six months; and \$1 at the end of the year.

SPEECH OF MR. BADGER. OF NORTH CAROLINA, IN THE SENATE, THURSDAY, December 11, 1851.

On the Joint Resolution relative to Louis Kossuth.

Mr. BADGER. When the Congress of the United States is called upon to award a high honor—an honor, according to the honorable Senator from Florida, [Mr. Mallory], who has just taken his seat, higher than triumphs which Rome in her palmy days, ever awarded to her conquering monarchs, certainly not less than a high honor in this country, which should be clear and manifest upon any grounds that can be made. In the past history of our country we have had but one example of such an honor having been awarded by the Congress of the United States.—And surely, without troubling ourselves with any investigation of what is supposed to be the most doctrine of precedent, we have a right to expect that gentlemen who ask this at our hands shall assign the reasons why we should confer the honor on the individual who is named in this resolution. Gentlemen have felt that there was an obligation upon them to produce the reasons of this proceeding. My friend from Illinois, [Mr. Douglas], who deemed it strange and unreasonable that this resolution should provoke the least discussion, that gentleman himself, who seemed to suppose that any discussion of it in this Senate would always discuss its merits—yet even with the solemnity of the occasion, and with the solemnity of his lips, went forward in the pursuit of that which he condemns in others, and occupied the Senate with a speech—

—to which I listened, of course, with pleasure; as I always do to whatever falls from that distinguished gentleman—which occupied no inconsiderable portion of yesterday's sitting. He delivered a speech, of which I will say it brought no new topic before the American Senate, upon this subject. I urged no new argument, it produced no new statement, it was made in reply to no new antagonist who had appeared in the debate. It was a reiteration for the fourth, fifth, or sixth time, of arguments—I will not say which, but which I will express—into the arena of our criticism as I date not from the first criticism, but from the second, and which I have already said, and which I do not say again, is that I do not recollect the honorable Senator, when he speaks in this Chamber, always speaks to his body; that he seeks to enlighten and to guide our opinions, and that he has no ulterior objects and purposes before him, I have felt by these remarks of his the strongest possible conviction fixed upon my mind that the friends of this resolution thought it necessary to assign some reasons for its adoption. And I must say, that when I listened to that honorable Senator, and when I listened to some other Senators—my friend from Michigan, [Mr. Cass], in particular—I have felt another conviction fastened upon my mind—that while they were deeply impressed with the extreme necessity of producing reasons, they found it no easy task to discover any to produce. Mr. President, I wish to say, in the commencement of what I have to offer to the Senate upon this subject, that if discussion has been produced here on this resolution, it is not to be charged to those of us who oppose its adoption. When the honorable Senator from New York, [Mr. Seward], in discharge of the high duty which he thought proper to introduce with a long, elaborate, and soul-stirring appeal, which was calculated to arouse our feelings, to excite our passions, and for the moment to suspend the calm exercise of our judgment. When, after this storm of passion had subsided, we were at length allowed to exercise our own judgment, unimpeded by the mystic visions of grandeur and terror and glory, with which impassioned eloquence had surrounded us—when we were able once more to resume the exercise of a calm understanding, and to take, in the language of my friend from Wisconsin, [Mr. Walker], a dispassionate view of this subject, what it is to be expected that, maintaining different opinions from others, we could, in justice to ourselves and what we believe to be the true interest of the country, fail to assign our reasons to the Senate? Were we not called upon, by considerations of high respect for the honorable and distinguished Senator from whom this resolution proceeded as well as for the honorable and distinguished gentlemen who supported this resolution with their eloquence and their arguments,—were we not bound, independent of all other considerations, by due respect for them, to say why we could not go with them when it always a matter of such deep-felt reluctance to part from them.

Mr. President, I think it is out of place to say that it is a waste of time to subject this resolution to discussion. It is a question which ought to be discussed; its intrinsic merits demand it. The circumstances which surround it in this Chamber and beyond these walls enforce the necessity and propriety of it; and if we may drop from the high and solemn topics which have been gathered around the reception of Louis Kossuth and his associates in captivity, which have been so brilliantly spread before us—arising the heavens, engaging the firmament, and I know not what other magnificent and startling figures—and look at some of the details of our political future soon to be history,—when we consider certain details of certain eminent political officers which in a short time are to be made by the American people, we find an additional reason.—Why, if we can allow ourselves to subside from the torrent of excited feelings into which we have been plunged, we should present before the American people what we think is the calm and dispassionate and deliberate common-sense view of the subject before the Senate.

I agree with what was said by the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. Sumner], who addressed the Senate a few days ago on this subject, that this is a case which requires attention rather than argument; and I would add to his proposition, that it requires argument rather than declamation, and proof of the propriety of adopting this course rather than, I will not say unmeaning [or nothing that is spoken in this floor is ever unmeaning]

defiance of foreign Powers, and the large and expansive declarations of American power and prowess, which we have heard, and of our capacity to contend with a world in arms. Let us look at this question as it is presented to us upon its intrinsic merits. What is it? As I have said, gentlemen have admitted (as is plain, whether admitted or not) that they are to assign some reasons why this resolution should be adopted. The resolution proposes to bid, in the name of the American people, Louis Kossuth welcome to our shores. Several reasons have been assigned why we should adopt this course. I proceed to offer some remarks upon them.

It is said, in the first place, that by the joint resolution adopted at the last session of Congress, we have taken the initiatory step which requires us, in point of consistency and honor, to follow it up with what is now proposed. That I deny. I know no method by which we can ascertain what we did at the last session of Congress, and to what, therefore, we may consider ourselves as properly obliged as a consequence of it, than by looking at the language of the resolution. My honorable friend from Michigan, [Mr. Cass], said that he scouted the idea of applying philology to this investigation. Scout the idea of applying philological criticism, the rule by which we ascertain the meaning of language, to the question of the interpretation of language.—Why, my honorable friend must have a very singular idea of the office and purpose of philology. He seems to have made a singular mistake in reference to that science which was made by a very respectable but a rather testy old gentleman of my acquaintance with regard to the science of arithmetic, or numbers, who became extremely offended, when waggishly told by a young man sitting at the breakfast table with him, pointing to a plate containing three biscuits, "Mr. R., you can not tell how many biscuits there are in that plate without counting them." "What sir?" says he, "do you take me for a fool, that I cannot tell that there are three biscuits in that plate without counting them?" He rejected the idea that computation and arithmetic were necessary to ascertain numbers; the number of particulars in a small case. I know that my honorable friend did not mean this, but why did he use the high term? Why did he go into this Anglicized Greek word, which many of our constituents at home know nothing and who would naturally imagine, without an explanation, that those of us who are opposed to the resolution had brought some new and strange and barbarous machinery of interpretation to bear,—brought, perhaps from some of those European despots, and totally unknown to our country? Why, we cannot ascertain the meaning of anything which depends upon words, without the application of the rules of philology to it.

But did my friend mean to imply that there was any disposition to what is called hypercriticism; that is, to bring in the construction of this resolution a reluctant disposition to understand its meaning and a disposition to cavil with it? Why, if he did, as was justly said by the honorable Senator from Georgia, [Mr. Berrien], there is not the shadow of a foundation for the suggestion. Yet I may be permitted to say, that although I would not feel myself justified in applying to an ordinary resolution or act of Congress any particular strictures of interpretation; though I am not disposed to apply it to this, there would be nothing very unreasonable in such a process, when we recollect from whom the joint resolution proceeded. It came from my honorable friend from Mississippi, [Mr. Foote], known to us all for his extreme exactness in the use of language, and, therefore, it may well stand out as an exception from the general legislation of this body, and we have a right to treat it with more closeness of examination, and more severity of criticism than a resolution proceeding from another person. We all know that the honorable Senator has a place in what he writes for every word; and he will excuse me for saying, that we also know that he has a word for every place. It is impossible for us according to my judgment, if I understand the English language as it is used in North and South, that there can be any mistake about the understanding of Congress at the time the resolution was adopted. It says:

Whereas the people of the United States sincerely sympathize with the Hungarian exiles, and their associates, and fully appreciate the magnanimous conduct of the Turkish Government in receiving and treating these noble exiles with kindness and hospitality; and it is the wish of these exiles to emigrate to the United States, and the wish of the Sultan to permit them to leave his dominions; Therefore,

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, do hereby be requested to authorize the employment of some one of the public vessels which may now be cruising in the Mediterranean to receive and convey to the United States the said Louis Kossuth and his associates in captivity. The preamble of that resolution asserts, in the first place, a fact; and then it alleges a contingency; upon which contingency, and upon which alone, the particular direction of the resolution is founded, and it is to take effect.—The fact affirmed is the sympathy of the American people for these exiles, and the magnanimous conduct of the Turkish Government in giving them a refuge. The contingency is, whether or not these exiles desire to emigrate to the United States. If they desire to emigrate, the President is requested to authorize the use of one of our ships cruising upon the Mediterranean sea to bring them to the United States. And if they did not desire to emigrate, it was not the intention of Congress that the President should furnish them with a national ship. I presume that, without any particular dexterity in this dark, barbarous Greek-derived science of philology, we have a pretty tolerable understanding in this country of what is meant by an emigrant and emigration. If an English or a French gentleman comes over to this country in a visit; if, at the end of his visit, he takes to his heels, and goes to his old country, we do not call him an emigrant. When we speak of emigrants, we think of the resolution of a man who has left Europe; who comes to our shores with a view of making our country his home; who comes to settle amidst us and become one of our people and to enjoy the privileges and protection which our laws give him, and, ultimately, in due time, and at no very distant day, to be allowed to participate equally in all the municipal privileges conferred by the Constitution upon the citizen. Then to whom did this resolution apply? Applied to Kossuth and his companions in captivity, desiring to emigrate

to this country and to make it their home. It was intended to afford them facilities in a public ship in order that they might become domiciled here. That is the plain, unmistakable meaning of the law.

Now, besides the meaning of it as apparent from its terms, do we not all know that that is the way in which we understood it? We took it for granted—the outbreak in Hungary having been crushed by the power of the Emperor added to that of the Emperor—the country being restored to its original condition of subjecthood, and stripped of its privileges—that Kossuth, languishing in a Turkish prison, was desirous to come to this country, and enjoy with us a common freedom, partake of the protection of our laws, and do what he could not do in Europe—live a peaceful and happy life, and die a Christian and quiet death. To this state of things it applied, and this was all. It was not a resolution directed for the benefit of Kossuth, the late Governor of Hungary, by way of doing him an honor in the character which he had then lately sustained. It was not a resolution that bears upon its face the slightest allusion to the fact, that, for the time, he had been possessed of and exercised sovereign power in the direction of this contest. It was addressed to Louis Kossuth as an exile in captivity, seeking to escape from the insupportable condition of European coercion, to place himself, as a resident and a denizen, upon our shores. No man can successfully deny this. There was a reason why Congress should have desired the President to transport Kossuth and his associates in captivity here in a public ship, which has never heretofore occurred in the case of any other person desiring to emigrate. We all know that the Emperor of Austria considered his entertainment in Turkey an offence to him. We all know he demanded that Kossuth should be expelled from Turkey by the authority of the Sultan. We all know that he sought to seize him and bring him within his jurisdiction and authority, to subject him to such punishment as he might deem suitable to the occasion. It was, therefore, for that reason, important that when the Sultan gave permission to Kossuth and his associates to leave his shores, if they desired to emigrate to the United States, we should put them under the protection of our flag, which would effectually prevent him from being seized by the power of Austria.

This being the state of the case, I desire to know what authority gentlemen say that by that resolution we have invited Kossuth to our shores—have made him the guest of the nation? Is there a word in that resolution expressive of invitation? Is there a word in it that declares that the people of the United States desire that he should come to our shores as a guest? The difficulty interposed by the word "will" was to be solved by this public ship to be placed at his disposal, or used for his service, and there is not a word in the resolution which intimates that the United States cared whether or not he decided to come. It announced nothing but this: This man was in captivity; we understood he wanted to come to our country. We knew that in the existing state of things, if he left Turkey without being put aboard an American ship, he might not be permitted to exercise his free will to come to our shores, and he might be afterwards in a private packet. How, then, is he to be distinguished in the particular to which I am referring from the free will which he seeks our shores? He can go to any place he wishes, but he cannot go where he wishes to be distinguished. Other men who come here are more humble, they may not have achieved the name which he has acquired. They may leave a transient impression in the little circle which surrounds them, and then be forgotten, while his name may remain, and be perpetuated by history to succeeding generations; but so far as the claims of an emigrant may extend—so far as a generous desire to give our hospitality to those who come—so far as a wish to offer a refuge to the persecuted, the oppressed, the unhappy, extends, Louis Kossuth stands no particle higher than the meanest and humblest down-trodden individual of Europe who ever reached our shores. Indeed, so far as claims to our sympathy are concerned, surely to a generous mind there are particular reasons why this sympathy should be peculiar and above the rest towards the lowly and the humble. I say, then, that there being nothing in the original resolution but a simple proposition to bring to this country one who was supposed to be desirous of emigrating here, there is no more reason why we should pass a resolution of welcome towards him that towards those thousands of humble individuals who come here not under a particular resolution, but under general invitation held forth by our Constitution and our laws to the oppressed, the poor, and the humble of every state and clime.

The resolution of the last Congress, then, does not pledge us to this; but if it did, I ask, how is it possible to resist the conclusion that the amendment offered by my honorable friend from Georgia, [Mr. Berrien], ought to be attached to the pending resolution? That the honorable Senator from New York, when he drew it, should have inserted in it the name—not the individual names—but the general name, descriptive of all those persons who are embraced in the original act of Congress which gave rise to these proceedings. The resolution of the last Congress makes no distinction among them. The President is requested to furnish to them all, as Hungarian exiles in captivity, a passage to this country. To Kossuth and his associates in captivity. What a strange spectacle, then, do we exhibit, when our friends on the other side of the Chamber, who are perfectly disposed to permit the associates of Kossuth to be incorporated in the resolution of welcome to Kossuth! Is it to be construed as a degradation to Kossuth to be put alongside in this resolution of those his associates? If the association be not offensive—if he was willing

to keep company with them, to be prisoner with them, to receive their affectionate ministrations and their affectionate sympathies, my opinion is, that, if he has the soul of a man in his bosom, he will resent the idea of having compliments paid to him alone, did he offer to do it. When, during the war of 1812, and during the recent war with Mexico, one of our commanders gained a victory, and Congress expressed the sense of the nation upon the subject, were the thanks of Congress expressed towards the commander-in-chief, and the officers and soldiers who served under him omitted and forgotten? No, sir; the thanks of Congress were always bestowed upon the commander-in-chief, and, through him, to the officers and soldiers who served under him, and by whose aid and assistance the victory had been achieved. Has it not been always so? We may vote medals to the generals; we may sometimes give additional pay to the soldiers; but the thanks of Congress, the expression of the sense of the country in behalf of those who have served faithfully, and added another leaf to the laurels which crown the brave, are intended to be voted to all, in whatever situation, who have participated in the gallant deed. And yet here are Mr. Kossuth's associates, not I suppose, servants—men, I suppose, his equals in the sense in which we understand equality. I presume they are men whom he takes by the hand, whom he does not keep at a distance, compelling them to approach him in the attitude of servile dependence. Yet when Congress is asked to bring Kossuth and these very associates here, the first thing after that, and after they are brought, is, that a resolution is offered by the Senator from New York, [Mr. Seward], to welcome Kossuth, and to turn our backs upon his associates. Sir, if any reason in the world can be assigned for the resolution, it follows as a necessary and indispensable corollary from it, that the associates should be also adopted. I do not understand this. It is not consistent with my notions, and what I believe to be American notions, of equality. We have seen a public ship, or we have authorized the using of a public ship, to bring Kossuth and some twenty or thirty other Hungarians, who have all fled to our country, who have shared a common captivity with him. When we propose to include these men in the resolution of welcome, it is opposed as interfering with the preeminent dignity of the chief. Is that the American idea of equality?

I do not understand a very great deal about this contest. Some of my honorable friends here, who are much better acquainted with the case than I am, have regarded it as a sort of attempt to uphold the Magyar—or Magyar, as some of us call it—superiority of race. Even if that is so, I presume those associates of Kossuth are neither Croats nor Servians, but belong to the privileged race, as well as himself. I do not suppose that Kossuth will feel his dignity insulted if we choose to say to him, We are glad to see you, and are glad also to see the men you have brought with you.

Mr. DODGE, of Iowa. I would ask my friend from North Carolina [Mr. Badger] if he will vote for the resolution in case the amendment he has so much at heart should prevail?

Mr. BADGER. The question need not have been asked by the honorable Senator, because I had answered it already. Allow me to assure the Senator that he places me in no difficulty by asking questions of this kind. I have said, and I repeat, I am opposed to the whole resolution, with or without the amendment. Therefore the Senator did not ask the question in order to be informed. For what purpose he did ask it, he is best able to determine.

Mr. FOOTER, of Mississippi. Will my friend allow me a moment of explanation? Mr. BADGER. Certainly.

Mr. FOOTER. If I was understood as stating that the President of the United States recommended this resolution, I was certainly grossly misunderstood. I stated the simple facts, as I shall explain them on this occasion. I wish it to be understood distinctly, that I said this before that I should never have moved, or thought of moving in this business, but that I received an unexpected, kind, and very complimentary written application from the Secretary of State of the United States, requesting an interview upon this subject; which interview was immediately held. In the course of that interview he brought to my attention, in advance of the President's message being received in this body, the fact that the President would make substantially the recommendation which is to be found in the message. He requested me especially, and in a manner marked with particular earnestness, to introduce, at the earliest possible moment after his announcement of the resolution, a joint resolution for the purpose of raising a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress to decide, in accordance with the recommendation of the President contained in his message, upon the most expedient mode of affording a national reception to Governor Kossuth. He went further, as I may now state, I dislike to go into these particulars; but the attention of the honorable gentleman makes it necessary for me to do it.—He requested me—having a very high respect, as we all have, for that knowledge of parliamentary precedents which distinguishes so highly the Secretary of this body—to go to him immediately. I went to his house with-

out delay, at the instance of the Secretary of State, for the purpose of ascertaining how, in some way consistent with Senatorial usage, such a joint resolution could be introduced and passed. If such a thing should turn out to be practicable, without the necessity of previous notice, I learned from the Secretary that the mode of proceeding thus intimated by the Secretary of State, was not practicable.—Therefore I did proceed to give notice, as the Senate recollects.

I will state further, in explanation of my conduct, that I should not have mentioned the name of the Secretary of State at all except upon his express authorization. It appears to me that if a joint committee was raised, the Secretary should himself deliver the address to the Governor of Hungary. I spoke to him to that effect; which he promptly declined, from an unwillingness to do anything which might look like compromising our neutral relations.

If I had known at first that there would have been so much discussion about this delicate subject, as to the responsibility which the Administration have assumed, or intended to assume, I would have been more circumstantial in the first instance. But really I could not anticipate such a course of proceeding.—It is true, and the Secretary of State will bear me witness of the fact, that in the course of my interview with him, he went so far into particulars as to refer to the former reception of the Marquis de Lafayette, as affording a proper precedent. So that idea did not originate with this side of the Chamber.

I suggested it to me as the proper precedent, and said that in his opinion the best mode would be to bring in Kossuth, without any particular ceremony, to each House, and have him introduced to the President of this body and to the Speaker of the other House, when suitable addresses should be made, in some formal mode, by the presiding officer of each House. This was the idea of the Secretary of State; and concerning with him, I adopted the course which I have pursued. I wish all to understand, that owing to the delicate character of this affair, I resolved not to exist in it at all unless I could be authorized by the Secretary of State to say that it was at his instance that I acted, and that he sanctioned the proceeding. I hope that in all I have said, no one will understand me as casting censure on any person. I have been very desirous of receiving Kossuth in a manner creditable to the nation, creditable to our national feeling, and in a manner required by the almost unanimous voice of the people.—Knowing the feelings of some members of the Administration, I was anxious to give the gentleman on the other side of the House a fair opportunity of participating in the eclat of the proceedings, and if they have declined it, I think they have made a great mistake, and that it has been one of the most serious political blunders they have ever committed.

Mr. BADGER. I would ask my friend from Mississippi, whether, after having introduced this resolution, at the instance of the Secretary of State, he withdrew it without any conference with that gentleman?

Mr. FOOTER, of Mississippi. I withdrew the resolution certainly, without any conference with him. I withdrew it, because I did think honorable gentlemen would not be concerned if they might be done with the progress that I did consider that I was rather erroneously treated by some honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House, who seemed to misunderstand my position, and not to afford me that liberal support which they ought to have done, when the proposition was brought forward under such auspices. I withdrew the resolution for the additional reason, that I saw very plainly, that if Governor Kossuth was received on the day when it was originally expected he would be received in New York, it was not at all likely, from the opposition on experienced here, provided a similar opposition was presented in the other House, that we should be able to act in time to receive this distinguished stranger in the mode contemplated. I stated these reasons at the time I proposed to withdraw the resolution. I did it, as I stated then, without the least feeling of unkindness or disrespect towards any human being in the world; but with feelings of the most profound mortification that gentlemen had not acted up to what I had supposed would be their course of conduct.

Mr. BADGER. I am obliged to my friend from Mississippi for this explicit statement which he has made with his usual candor. It seems, then, that so far as the action of the Administration is concerned, the President and the Secretary of State both referred to a supposed emigrant coming among us for the purpose of settling here, and making this country his domicile.

Mr. FOOTER. If the gentleman understood me as saying that the application was made to me to introduce my resolution this session with a view to providing for the reception of Kossuth as an emigrant, he misunderstood me on such a point. If the gentleman will refer to the British papers, he will find that Governor Kossuth stated in many speeches in England, that he was coming to the United States merely as a visitor in behalf of his country, and not as an emigrant. We ascertained months ago that our original expectations upon this subject had not been founded upon actual facts.

Mr. BADGER. I understood all that he said. What I meant to say was this:—That the Secretary of State had spoken to the Senator from Mississippi to offer this resolution to receive an intended emigrant—not an alien.—It was the resolution of Congress, under which the President was directed to bring him here which fixed the character and what he now expected. That resolution contemplated his coming as an emigrant. Whatever he might have said in England, we had no authoritative exposition from him before he landed here, that he was to act in any other character. When, therefore these proceedings took place, I say that it is clear upon the record that they referred to an expected emigrant. As soon as Kossuth lands upon our shores, he assumes to us that we were mistaken, and that he does not come as an emigrant; that he does not propose to become a citizen of the country; but that he is here as a visitor—not for the purpose of curiosity or improvement, but upon a political mission. He comes here to agitate among the people of this country, and to excite among them a spirit which may prompt intervention in the future contest that is expected between Austria and Hungary—intervention in order to prevent the Czar from interfering. Now the whole character of the case is changed.—I invited Kossuth, if he invited him at all, to come here for purposes personal to himself, as an emigrant and live among us. He says, I come in no such character, for no purposes personal to myself; I come upon a political mission, to place myself in that character before the people of this country, and to induce them to give me pledges that they will make any intervention on the part of Russia in the affairs of Hungary, ineffectual. There has been no sanction given by the Executive Department of this Government, in any of its attaches, to a resolution proposing to welcome this gentleman in any such character. It is one thing to welcome him as a distinguished foreigner, coming from exile to settle among us, and it is another and a very different thing to welcome him as a political agitator among our countrymen. Whatever else may be said it is no diminution of the high character this gentleman occupies for intelligence and high standing as such, that it is in exceedingly bad taste, in my judgment, for a foreigner, who has just set his foot on our soil, who comes here to invoke our sympathies, to become a propagandist of his opinions, to endeavor to influence the people to the adoption of measures which he may think beneficial to the cause of Hungary, without regard either to the law or the policy of our Government; and to bind, not obscurely, that whatever may be the action of Congress, he will appeal to the freemen of the United States as our sovereigns.

Again: and now I refer to what my friend from Mississippi has said. It was the desire of the Secretary of State that this resolution should be introduced. As regards his application to the Senator from Mississippi for that purpose, the introduction of the subject and the withdrawal of the resolution, we must keep dates in view in order to give a proper influence to these various transactions. The President's message was prepared and printed, as we all know, before the meeting of Congress. It was in the town in which I lived, before I left there for the seat of Government. Before it was sent to either House of Congress it was in the possession of the

postmaster, ready to be delivered when he should receive a telegraphic dispatch authorizing him to do so. Everything, therefore, in the President's message, was prepared, written and printed before the arrival of this gentleman in this country. The resolution, offered by my friend from Mississippi, was, if I recollect aright, introduced on the very first day of the session. It was withdrawn on the Thursday succeeding, being the fourth day of the session, and Kossuth did not arrive in this country until the day afterwards—until Friday. We must bear in mind that Kossuth had been expected to come to this country as an emigrant. It was in that character that a public ship was employed to bring him here. It was in that character that he was expected to arrive. It was with reference to that character that the President's message referred to him. It was with reference to the same thing the resolution was proposed to be introduced by the Secretary of State, and that the resolution was introduced. That state of things continued until the resolution was withdrawn. Never, until Kossuth landed upon our shores, did we have any authoritative exposition from the Secretary of State that an emigrant was the purpose for which he came here. We may have drawn our conjectures from what he said in his hasty visit to England, but we had no authoritative expression of his purpose in coming, and what he expected to accomplish, until after he landed in this country.

If I had known at first that there would have been so much discussion about this delicate subject, as to the responsibility which the Administration have assumed, or intended to assume, I would have been more circumstantial in the first instance. But really I could not anticipate such a course of proceeding.—It is true, and the Secretary of State will bear me witness of the fact, that in the course of my interview with him, he went so far into particulars as to refer to the former reception of the Marquis de Lafayette, as affording a proper precedent. So that idea did not originate with this side of the Chamber.

in the field, and to add grace and wisdom to our legislative councils, I shall ever be ready, as, if my friend from Illinois [Mr. Sumner] will permit me to say, I have in respect to him already done, to place them near to my heart. However it may not be in union with the temper of the times, I say I thank no foreign emigrant to come here and assume to instruct one people with regard to our affairs or abroad. Whether it is a member of the British Parliament who endeavors to provoke sectional discord, and if possible to shake the fabric of this Union to pieces, or whether it is a Hungarian exile, however eminent who comes here to persuade us either to make an empty boast and utter an unmeaning threat, and thus expose us to the derision of mankind; or else to mix up in the turmoil of European politics and cause us to expend the blood and treasure of our free citizens in disputes with which they have no concern, and from which they can derive no benefit, terminate as they may, makes in this respect no difference to me. I can agree to welcome neither the one nor the other.

It may be said that I have not got the idea of progress which is peculiar to the times. My honorable friend from New Jersey, [Mr. Stockton], in speaking of that policy of non-interference which we received from Washington, said that what was proper might not be proper now, and he asks, is there to that policy, progress? I think, it is. A man may advance, though he does not change the road in which he travels. To make progress it is not necessary that a man should be perplexed and bewildered with repeated changes of direction, and perpetually retracing his steps, and beating out new and devious paths in which to tread. I want progress in old principles towards the full development of our institutions—to the consolidation of our liberty. Progress upon old principles to make us and to keep us Americanized forever. That is the progress which I wish.

Nor can I consider it entirely harmless in a man to come and inflame the people of the United States, hastily to commit themselves to measures like this. It is not only against the settled policy, but it is against the statute law of this country. One has forbidden armed intervention in all its forms, by citizens or others from the shores of the United States, in the affairs of other nations with whom we are at peace.

Mr. FOOTER, of Mississippi. I believe the resolution has been repealed.

Mr. BADGER. It might perhaps be fortunate for some, in certain events, that the resolution has been repealed. I am not affected by any reference to the resolution. There is a resolution that does not depend upon that statute, and although that statute has been repealed, the repeal has not made it innocuous for any man to endeavor to inflame particular portions of the people of this country, in favor of this measure which Kossuth desires to recommend. Why is it not so? I was about to state why, when the indignant genius of the Senator from Mississippi at once sprang far ahead of me, and he saw in his wild's eye that bugbear of the Democracy—the settling law. We have a statute which forbids all armed intervention from this country in the affairs of any nation with which we are at peace. That statute forbids the settling fourth by settling on foot, of any such expedition, and it necessarily condemns all preparations to effect such a result, in the provisions of the statute, as to be punishable by law, they certainly and indubitably are morally criminal in their character.

What does this gentleman want these fellow-citizens of ours to commit themselves to? Why to this that this country shall furnish the material and means to prevent the Emperor of Russia from interfering in the future contest between Hungary and Austria. What means? Paper resolutions, printed petitions, or protests written upon parchment with the seal of the United States attached? How much do we suppose they will sway the mind of the Czar? No, sir, the moment we take that ground—the moment we occupy the position he desires, (I do not say what gentlemen here contemplate), we will have, in my judgment placed ourselves in such a position that we must advance in the event of a future conflict and the interposition of Russia, which I suppose is just as certain as the future conflict itself, or we must ingloriously retire. We must either abandoned the policy of the country and involve ourselves in distant and future quarrels, of which no man can foresee the issue, or after having threatened we will promptly retreat. I am willing to welcome foreigners who come to our shores for just and laudable and useful purposes, but I am not willing to welcome by my vote any man who comes here to endeavor to commit the citizens of this country to any intervention in foreign transactions. In saying this I do not mean to cast reproach on Kossuth, for I can understand the enthusiastic temper and the character of the man. I can understand how he has been led, on his first landing in the United States, to believe that our people were ready to pour by thousands and hundreds of thousands, to join his standards. It is natural. He is a man of great energy. He is devoted to Hungary.—He lives for Hungary, and he is prepared to die for Hungary. We can understand his natural feeling on this account. We can understand his strong desire to shield aid for his country; but when I see an emigrant upon our shores, and I see him with a ready and willing heart to become a propagandist of his opinions, to endeavor to influence the people to the adoption of measures which he may think beneficial to the cause of Hungary, without regard either to the law or the policy of our Government; and to bind, not obscurely, that whatever may be the action of Congress, he will appeal to the freemen of the United States as our sovereigns.