

# Carolina Whirlwind.

Devoted to Politics, News, Agriculture, Internal Improvements, Commerce, the Arts and Sciences, Morality, and the Family Circle.

VOL. XIV.

SALISBURY, N. C., APRIL 20, 1858.

NUMBER 47

## SPEECH OF HON. JOHN A. GILMER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 30, 1858.

### On the Senate Bill with the Leecompton Amendment and the Green-Paugh Amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been an attentive listener to the arguments on this Leecompton question for three months. While some of the speeches have been calm and considerate, I feel constrained to say that, by far, the larger number have been violent and extremely intemperate, leading directly to weaken the respect which the North and the South should have for each other, and which is essential to the safety of the Union itself. I have heard and read speeches delivered both in this House and the other end of this Capitol, by gentlemen from the North and from the South, the true spirit and meaning of which is disunion.

### Georgia Cotton Mills.

The following is an extract from the letter of a friend to the editor of the Abbeville (S. C.) "Independent Press." It will give the reader some idea of the manufacturing resources of the Rowell mills: "We visited the Rowell Cotton Mills, in Cobb County, Georgia. These mills give employment to between 300 and 400 boys and girls, thereby affording education to a class of people who otherwise might suffer. In the picking room there are seven machines, preparing the cotton for the cards; it is then conveyed to the carding room and prepared for the spinning machine. There are 3,172 spindles and 80 operatives in this department, each spinning of 54 hanks a day—all are operated, the best in use. In the reeling room, there are 20 machines; 45 operatives near 150 cuts a day. There are 3 frames for sizing, and 3 operatives; 120 looms in the weaving department, each running 33 yards per day—which is 4,200 yards daily; 25,200 yards a week. This machinery is all turned by water power—overhead wheel. The wheel is 20 feet in diameter, and 18 feet on the face—it is all iron except the arms; it cost over \$5,000. The capital invested in this mill, \$300,000. B. King & Co. are the proprietors of both these mills. Mr. Hugh McLean is the superintendent of both. We had the pleasure of his acquaintance, and found him to be quite accommodating. He takes great interest in showing visitors about the factories, but we know so little of them that we are not able to give an intelligible description of the whole and of the parts of a cotton factory. They also have a rope factory, where they use up all the waste lint, which is a great economy. "Mr. McLean says that some of their machinery was made in their own shops. It appears to be a great mechanic, and studies economy to perfection. These factories are a credit to the State of Georgia, and speak well for their proprietors, and what can be done in the South."

### Wonderful Pens.

Dr. Warren, some years ago, happened to be in the shop of an eminent stationer in the Strand, London, when a member of the House of Commons purchased a hundred quills for six shillings. When he was gone, the Doctor exclaimed: "O, the luxury of the age! Six shillings for a hundred quills! Why it never cost me a sixpence for pens in my life." "That is very surprising, Doctor," observed the stationer, "your work is very voluminous." "I declare," replied the Doctor, "I wrote my Ecclesiastical History, two volumes in folio, and my Dissertation on the Book of Common Prayer, a large folio, both the first and second editions, with one single pen. It was an old one when I began, and it is not worn out now that I am finished." This relation was spread abroad, and the merit of this pen was esteemed so highly that a celebrated Orator begged the Doctor to make for a present of it. He did so, and his ladyship had a gold case made with a short history of the pen written upon it, and placed it in her cabinet of curiosities. Byron wrote his celebrated poem of the "Bride of Abydos" in one night, and without needing his pen. This pen is yet preserved in the British Museum. John Elliot translated the entire Bible into the Indian language, and wrote the whole of it with one pen.

### England, from whom we derive our nature and many of the free principles of which we boast, had her troubles. She has had her dissensions—her White and Red roses—her land has been tinged with blood in civil strife—and once the head of her King was brought to the block—but her people were attached to their government and their Constitution. The political atmosphere again became pure and healthful; and the government was maintained and improved. And it is my honest conviction, that there is too much good sense in the people of these United States to be the people of these United States to be

led away with the idea of disunion, on account of any difficulties growing out of this question, surrounded by such peculiar circumstances. I predict they will not—unless misled and deceived. But—figuratively speaking—they will bring to the black the political heads of all who shall insist on any such remedy for such complaint.

Mr. Chairman, it is not to be disguised, that our Southern people are anxious about appearances for the future. They see the free States in number and in representation, already in the majority in both Houses of Congress, and this majority soon to be largely increased; that while the South falls into this minority, they have witnessed, for the last few years, among many people of the free States, an increasing spirit of litter blotting to the South and her institutions. But let us like statesmen be calm, briefly trace the history of this thing, and inquire why it is. Though by the census, the actual figures show that the natural increase of population in the slave States has been equal to the natural natural increase of the free States have excelled as in the settlement of new Territories and raising up new States.

In the first place we of the Southern States have been, and now are, the advocates of free-trade, and many for direct taxes. We have opposed the policy of discrimination in favor of our own domestic industry in the old States, in regulating and raising revenue, and no more than enough to defray the expenses of the Government economically administered. To this policy we have made in substance, successful opposition—thereby in a good degree cutting off much of the income that would have retained the industries and energetic population in the old States, who, in consequence, have moved to the Territories, there settled, made new and free States, and become producers instead of consumers of the earth's productions.

In the second place, a majority of Southern politicians have uniformly favored the policy of inviting, allying, persuading, and in fact hiring emigrants—not only the citizens of the States, but the whole world, to move and settle in our Territories. Homesteads, by way of pro-temptation, in the Territories, are offered to all the world. The language of the whole policy is in substance, "come ye all the Earth, and settle in our Territories—here you can become citizens, and without waiting to be naturalized, according to the laws of the Union, you can vote and hold office." The result of which has been to run from the old States, (slave and free) into the Territories, much of their population, and particularly that portion, though young, industrious, and worthy, who have, or take but little interest in the institutions of the South,—and besides, we find growing out of this, that hundreds of thousands of foreigners are flocking to us every year—that foreign papers are by thousands and thousands being set upon our shores. In fact, I find from the best official statements, that the number of foreign emigrants that come to this country from June the 1st, 1850, to December 31st, 1851, was five hundred and eighty thousand; for the year 1852, three hundred and seventy-five thousand;—for the year 1853, three hundred and eighty-eight thousand;—for the year 1854, nearly the same. This war in the East diminished the number, but I recapture the prediction that between the years 1850 and 1860 there will have come to this country foreigners enough to place in each of twenty new States more population than is now in the Territory of Kansas. These foreigners make land west mainly to the Territories, or crowd into the free States, occasioning increased emigration from them.

These facts being undeniable, I submit, how important it is for our Southern politicians to turn their attention to them. While the people of the North were willing to dispense with and check this immigration among them, for reasons of a social character, to diminish their taxes, presentations and the inmates of their prisons, jails and penitentiaries. I respectfully ask, why should the South, to a man, for reasons well understood as expressed, have joined in this great movement, and if in the first movements and organizations any rules were adopted, strict or stringent to be generally enforced, or too severe on the honest immigrant, to have given their potent aid and influence in modifying the same, so as to have carried most useful results to our beloved South? But it has been their pleasure to pursue a different course, and the results thereof have, in no small degree, contributed to the embarrassing circumstances that now seem to gather around us and swallow up our influence in the National Council. The argument has been "Settle and populate the Territories," forgetting the fact that in the last twenty-five years our population has increased from three to some twenty-seven millions—ninefold—and if the same ratio of increase shall obtain for the next twenty-five years, the result will be nine times twenty-seven millions—showing how important these Territories may be (sold at reasonable prices paid into the treasury) for the homes of our posterity, and of honest, worthy foreigners, who come to us as they did in former days, from a love of our free government, and who are willing to settle among us, and being protected in all their rights of religion and property, and who are willing to wait until they have understood and become familiar with our people and their institutions before claiming the right to participate in their government.

These suggestions I have made to

Southern gentlemen here, and throughout the slave States, that on reflection they may determine whether they have not been remiss in failing to come to the aid of a cause quite material to Southern influence and Southern interests.

I was very much entertained, Mr. Chairman, by the speech of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Sandridge) and if I had time, I should like to incorporate at least half of it in mine, to show, in addition to the millions that have already come, how many more millions of persons are to come under our present system of inviting them to come here.

But, Mr. Chairman, what is it that we have been discussing here for the last sixty days? This discussion has been either intentionally or accidentally conducted so as to bring out the extreme sectional views of gentlemen from the South and from the North. It is only within the last eight or ten days that any conservative man has been permitted to address the House on this agitated question. It is said that this is a question whether any more slave States shall come into this Union, and speech after speech is made and sent to the South to tell the Southern people that are anxiously debating in the House of Representatives the naked question whether any more slave States shall come into the Union.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if that were true, if that were the only question here, it might have been settled within twenty-four hours after this debate commenced. If that were the only question, I take it that all our American friends would vote for it, every man from the South would vote for it, I know that our Douglas Democrats would vote for it, and I am satisfied to think that the Free-Soil wing of the Democracy—these Buffalo-plat-form men—could be got to vote for it, with a Green amendment. That is my opinion. But, Mr. Chairman, is that the question? Oh what has this debate arisen on! On the special message of the President. Does he say that whether there shall be any more slave States is the question? No; that message, as I understand it, means these two things—and it means nothing more and nothing less—to the South "come in Leecompton," and to Northern gentlemen, "it is the strict and radiant way, and the only certain way, in which you can confiscate Southern property and get clear of negroes in Kansas." I have listened to gentlemen here professing great regard for the interests of the South, and while all of them have been eloquent on the first part of the picture, they have all, save and except a gentleman from the chivalrous State of South Carolina, passed over that portion as tenderly as sucking doves. [Laughter.] I will read from the President's message, in order that there may be no mistake about it:

"As a question of expediency, after the right has been maintained, it may be wise to reduce upon the benefits to Kansas and the whole country which would result from its immediate admission into the Union, as well as the disaster which may follow its rejection. Domestic peace will be the happy consequence of its admission; and that the Territory, which has hitherto been torn by dissensions, will rapidly increase in population and wealth, and speedily realize the blessings and the comforts which follow in the train of agricultural and mechanical industry. The people will then be sovereign, and can regulate their own affairs in their own way. If a majority of their desire to abolish domestic slavery within the State, there is no other possible mode by which this can be effected so speedily as by prompt admission. The will of the majority is supreme and irresistible when expressed in an orderly and lawful manner. They can make and unmake constitutions at pleasure. It would be absurd to say that they can impose fetters upon their own power which they cannot afterwards remove; if they ought to do this, they might as well bind for a hundred as well as for ten years. These are fundamental principles of American freedom, are recognized, I believe, in some or other, by every State constitution; and if Congress, in the act of admission, should object to such a course, this has been done emphatically in the constitution of Kansas. It declares in the bill of rights that all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit, and therefore they have as full an inherent and inalienable right to alter, reform, or abolish their form of government in such manner as they may think proper. The great State of New York is at this moment governed under a constitution framed and established in direct opposition to the mode prescribed by the previous institution. If, therefore, the proposition changing the constitution of the year 1845 could be possibly be construed into a prohibition to make a change previous to that period, this prohibition would be wholly inoperative. The Legislature already elected met, at its very first session, without the question of a vote of the people whether they will or will not have a constitution to amend their constitution, and adopt all necessary means for giving effect to the popular will.

It has been solemnly adjudged, by the highest judicial tribunal known to our laws, that slavery exists in Kansas by virtue of the Constitution of the United States. Kansas is therefore, at this moment, as much a slave State as Georgia or South Carolina. Without this, the equality of the sovereign States composing the Union would be violated, and the same and enjoyment of a Territory acquired by the common treasure of all the States, would be handed against the people and the property of nearly half the members of the confederacy.

And then he concludes with this very cheering doctrine for Southern men and Southern interests:

"Slavery can, therefore, never be prohibited in Kansas, except by means of a constitutional provision, and is no other manner can this be obtained so promptly, if a majority of the people desire it, as by admitting it into the Union under its present constitution."

The President points out the way in advance. He instigates the Free-Soilers

in Kansas to dislike the constitution. He requests this prompt means of getting slavery out of Kansas to be recognized in the bill of admission.

Here is the message. I submit it to the Chairman, to the Committee, and to the Southern men—suppose, that instead of having the name of James Buchanan attached to it, it had the name of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, James R. Giddings at the end of it, I ask, if that name had been attached, whether it would not have been a very different case? We would pronounce it a most righteous and just measure. And yet, sir, our Southern friends come up here and talk about associating with Abolitionists, and of hugging Abolition doctrines as a sweet morsel! Why, Mr. Chairman, the whole thing in this message is, "we will Kansas—not with slavery in Kansas"—and identically the same thing is in the Senate bill, that the South is called upon to ally as one man to the support of it. I have asked many of our Leecompton friends of this Kansas amendment, which they have got in the bill, speaks the language of this message! Some say no, others say it does; and there is another class who give the answer the girl gave to her mother, when asked, if a certain gentleman was courting her; she replied, "it is a sorter an, and a sorter not an." [Laughter.] Now, that amendment is a very little thing—only a few lines. There is not much of it; but I tell you I never read it over but it remains in my very much of the boy who was scolded for not making the potato hills on a wet morning large enough. "Well, dad," said he, "it is a fact that they are small, but I tell you they have got a darned sight of dirt in them." [Laughter.]

Sir, if this is a bill griddled over to make it acceptable to some Green men, Southern men ought to be ashamed of it. I know that this peculiar policy is practiced in our little delectable counties in our country, and I suppose every where else, but I never supposed it ought to obtain in the Congress of our nation. Once when I charged a friend of mine with having said some foolish things in a speech which he had made, and told him that I thought he had hurt our cause, he said: "Ah, Gilmer, you do not know the folks as well as I do. A great many people are like a nest of young birds; if you tap the side of the tree, they'll open their mouths and swallow the worm down." [Laughter.] Southern men supposed that we had got something by the Free-Soil decision. I for one, as a Southern man, I thought we had obtained something; but I thought that we had got upon safe ground; that we had perfect equality in the territories; that we could go there with our institutions and our property, and be just as safe there as any man who goes there from any other section with any other species of property. But if this is the meaning, if this is the result of the Free-Soil decision, then those of us who go into the Territories with our slave property, have to run two chances—first, that the people may exclude us, and if they do not run out at first, then, whenever the majority of the people desire it, they may run us and our negroes out. And this is the doctrine upon which the South is to stand—this is the doctrine, mark you, which Alabama and other States are to go out of the Union on, if they cannot get it.

It is not from any objection to the constitution of Kansas that I, as a Southern man, oppose her admission. I would be pleased that we could fairly and properly get slavery permanently in Kansas. But I object to this doctrine, that we can be protected in our property while in partnership during the Territorial state; but the moment we become an incorporation—a State—every man that owns joint stock is instantly liable by constitutional provision to have his property confiscated. And this is the doctrine which we have been told here, month after month, and day after day, that every Southern man must stand up, or otherwise he is an Abolitionist and opposed to the South!

Mr. Chairman, what is the question which has agitated the country for the last four years? It is one that has taken up the entire attention of Congress. We have been fighting about it, until, I believe, not only the country but the Government itself is upon the verge of bankruptcy. This question commenced with two faces—one for the Free-Soil Democrats of the North, and one for the South; and the same identical double face is in this bill, and I will detain the Committee only for a moment, while I refer them to some history of it. We had our troubles some years ago, growing out of the disunion of the compromise measures. In January, 1851, the venerable fathers of the land, Whigs and Democrats, gathered together, with Henry Clay at their head, and drew up a pledge to the country—that from and after that day their influence would be exerted against every man for office, State or Federal, who would refuse to stand upon the platform of the adjustment measures of 1850. The Democratic convention met in Baltimore, in 1852; the Whig convention met at the same place, and they both bowed down at the same altar of peace upon this agitated question. They reaffirmed in substance what Mr. Fillmore said in December, 1851, that this compromise of 1850 should be a finality, and there should be no more agitation of the slavery question in or out of Congress. To that both of the great leading parties were pledged to the country. They put their candidates upon that platform. General Pierce was elected. He was installed. Unfortun-

ately, however, in a short time made some injudicious appointments; he turned out the true Democrats of the North, men who I am proud to find standing in the same ranks they did then. Van Buren, Dix, Cochran & Co., the Buffalo platform men, were then coming in, and the party was about to break up. Something had to be done. The Administration was going down. A prescription had to be made. It was given—and on the principle that you prescribe to one who is sick with a fever, get him to swallow a pill, and it will relieve him. [Laughter.] They went upon this Cincinnati platform. I am now going to detain the Committee to show how our friends viewed it in the South. That is well known. I do not to show how the matter stands with the Administration, to show what the Democratic Free-Soilers said before, afterwards, and all the time. A few months before the Cincinnati convention, a distinguished Free-Soil man went to the North. Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Woodbury, and all these noisy men of the Buffalo convention, began to give evidence that they wanted to return to their friends. Henry Jones; I give it as a fair specimen of their letters and speeches. It is the letter of Hon. C. C. Campbell:

"WASHINGTON, December 8, 1855. "WILLIAM H. LUDLOW, Esq: "My Dear Sir:—Every Southern man in Kansas acknowledges that it will inevitably be a free State. This is the last struggle for slaves; for the half dozen Territories remaining are already free and will remain so. "There would not have been half the trouble about Kansas, but for Abolition's struggle to get back into the Senate. As the question now stands, there ought to be no difficulty whatever in seating the Democratic party—for the principle of the Nebraska and Kansas bill—squarely and squarely—whatever its origin, gives us every Territory belonging to the United States—and all we have now to insist upon is, that it should be honestly engaged—that Kansas shall have full parity. Practically there is no difference worth quarreling about. "It appears to me to be perfectly absurd for us to be quarreling about 'squatter sovereignty' at the present time, when squatter sovereignty will make free every inch of territory now belonging to the United States. "After the acquisition of California, with the prospect of the addition of more Mexican territory, when Gen. Cass proposed the doctrine of non-intervention, it was an important question, as it might have led to the introduction of many slave States; but after the South had been completely abandoned by California's declaration in favor of freedom, we had no reason to object to the doctrine of non-intervention, or squatter sovereignty. We have now looked Kansas and Nebraska, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, Oregon and Washington, making seven Territories, which will give us seven free States. Some think the fate of Kansas doubtful, but the invasion of the Missouri river, independent of natural causes, will make it a free State. Those borderers came over first to vote for pro-slavery men—the second time to vote against them in the location of the Capital—and the third time to make a States under Stanton, plunder the people, and drink whiskey. "Under such circumstances I cannot conceive what we can possibly gain by robbing a principle which has hitherto excluded slavery from our Territories. "The slaveholders will not get Kansas, and they are now deprived of the pretext of going into the Territories south of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes, under that compromise. They generally opposed non-intervention on that ground, and contended for carrying the compromise line to the Pacific ocean. It is certainly not for our interest now to have that compromise line restored. Why the South should have voted for its repeal is a question for themselves to settle. They all, at the time, admitted that Kansas would never be a slave State. I hope our friends will meet the issue boldly, and have the question of State organization, first to the people of the Territory, who have the natural and best right to decide for themselves. "Let this squatter settle—but insist that the principle of the Nebraska act shall be honestly carried out; that the squatter shall have full parity, and shall not be controlled by invaders from Missouri, or any military power whatever. As to 'more slave States,' there are none in prospect; and it is useless to embarrass ourselves by anticipating questions which may or may not arise. "Now, sir, these two wings are standing to-day exactly where they stood before. Tell me, if you please, why these men you are hugging to your bosom on the one side, stand with you? These men who were, and now are, rank Free-Soilers! Tell us why the Green amendment is admitted! Which would you rather have for you bed-fellows? I tell you the difference is very much like the slave's reply when asked whether Jim and Moses were very much alike? He said, "Yes, very much alike, indeed; and particularly Moses." [Laughter.] It is not so much, I fear, that they care about getting negroes into Kansas, or getting them out. It is not any principle of this kind. It is, I apprehend a mere contrivance by which juggling has been carried on in this country to keep certain men in power. In fact this whole management and shuffling reminds me of what occurred in one of our North Carolina towns some years ago. A silly fellow declared himself a candidate for town edelast. He had a circular printed for him. It was printed on both sides like this—with Leecompton on one side, and Green upon the other. On one side, he addressed himself so the debtors: "Fellow citizens, vote for me, and if I am elected constable, I will never force you to payment, even at my own extremity." On the other side was an address to the creditors: "If you will come up and vote for me, and I shall be elected, I promise, upon my honor, I will have your money paid, in every instance, at the drop of a hat. "Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to detain this Committee with a review of the decision of the Supreme Court in the

Dred Scott case. All I have to say is this; that my views upon the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise were known long before that decision was made; and I thought that the compromise was not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. Although my opinion inclined to that of the Supreme Court, and did before the decision was made, yet, from the length of time it had been a compromise, I was disposed to look upon it as a compromise which had better be abided by. As in the case of two neighbors whose boundary line is in dispute—a boundary which can only be settled by the provisions of a deed, and no agreement they might make by parcel would change the line fixed by the deed, any more than any agreement between two sections of the country by Congress, could be changed. But when the neighbors have established a line by parcel agreement, staked and chopped it off, and have lived in peace, harmony, and prosperity under it for more than thirty years, if they should come to me ask my advice, whether they should break up this old landmark—now the true line being ascertained by the deed—and go back to their rights according to law, I should say, as a man, a neighbor, and as a Christian, also, that they had better let the old landmarks stand and abide by them; and by no means revive old disputes and quarrels. So with the case of this Missouri compromise. I do not believe the South is going to gain anything by its repeal, and I firmly believe that the only reward the South will ever get from its repeal will be to her true interests.

But it is said that the only way to pacify the country is to admit no amendments to this bill; that it cannot be bettered; that in no way can it be improved; that it has got to be passed in the shape in which it is presented, even though a proposition should be presented, which, if carried out, would more effectually pacify and quiet the country and settle the whole question. Why, say they, it would be intervention. Now, let me detain the committee a moment to show how ridiculous that idea is. What is this thing of non-intervention? Why, is it intervention to have the people of a Territory perfectly free and untrammelled to settle this, with all other questions, in their own way fairly and properly, subject only to the Constitution of the United States?

Now, sir, do we consider it any intervention, in the case of a trial by jury, after the verdict is announced, to set the same aside, and grant a new trial upon affidavits which clearly prove and satisfy the judge that the verdict was obtained by fraud, by perjury, deception, or by any mal-practices? Is it any intervention, for an honest and conscientious judge, after being satisfied of the facts by reliable affidavits, to say that he doubted whether the verdict had been fairly obtained, and in the exercise of the discretion which is vested in him, decide to grant a new trial, if order that justice might be done? Is that an interference with the right of trial by jury? And suppose a jury is empaneled to settle the question, and they come back to the judge, and one of the jury gets up and says a verdict is so and so, and another says it is not so, and the judge tells them, "gentlemen, you had better retire, get together again and consult, and agree upon your verdict, and when you come in, it will be recorded"—is that any interference? I wanted to show how ridiculous this idea is. Is that intervention?

What are Green's and Paugh's amendments? Let our Northern anti-slavery men, of all parties, understand the President of the United States has given a true construction of the Dred Scott decision, and you will never have any more fuss about this matter from them. The President says it means that when the people of any State see proper to get together in a legal way, to get up a convention sanctioned by law, a mere majority of their assembly vote Free-Soil they may form a constitution and the negroes all slope. That is giving the Abolitionists a new cue, and which will run out the institution of my beloved section from all the Territories, certainly, and endanger it in many of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to look upon this question without reference to any section, or how it will affect any body other than the general good and peace of the whole country. If no other plan can be devised and agreed on, I may feel myself constrained to vote for the measure, being urged by Southern friends and sectional pressure. And if I do, the Green amendment stricken out, it will not be (and I say it here) a measure which my sound judgment can approve as the better plan. If I could, I would put the whole responsibility upon the Democracy, where it belongs, for I do believe if they would relax a little, and honestly set their heads to work with our Southern friends and other conservative men in this House, this whole matter might be put upon a footing entirely satisfactory to the South—to the East—to the West—to the North—satisfactory to the people of Kansas—and without any compromise of any principle—substantially in the manner indicated by me heretofore.

I must say that when I hear it asserted here, and everywhere, and the proof strongly tending to show that the government of Kansas was, in the first instance, ruthlessly snatched from the people, unconstitutionally set on foot, by which the minority, who by fraud obtained the control of the government, and by which the majority were kept from participating in the government—when I am told—and the proof tends that way—that not more than one-half of the counties of the Territory were permitted to be represented in the convention, I doubt the propriety of supporting the constitution framed thus. I dissent from the idea that a majority of the counties of any State can make a constitution that is binding on the majority of counties who did not have a chance to be represented in the convention. Why have you more judges than one? It is not simply for the sake of numbers, but that there may be conference, argument, interchange of views.—We may be to-day all inclined one way, and to-morrow a greater and better mind than any of us, representing but one district, may make a suggestion sufficient to change the opinion of the whole Congress. We know that the election of the 4th of January was recognized by the Secretary of State, who gave instructions that that very election should be fairly and impartially taken; that vote turns

the Dred Scott case. All I have to say is this; that my views upon the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise were known long before that decision was made; and I thought that the compromise was not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. Although my opinion inclined to that of the Supreme Court, and did before the decision was made, yet, from the length of time it had been a compromise, I was disposed to look upon it as a compromise which had better be abided by. As in the case of two neighbors whose boundary line is in dispute—a boundary which can only be settled by the provisions of a deed, and no agreement they might make by parcel would change the line fixed by the deed, any more than any agreement between two sections of the country by Congress, could be changed. But when the neighbors have established a line by parcel agreement, staked and chopped it off, and have lived in peace, harmony, and prosperity under it for more than thirty years, if they should come to me ask my advice, whether they should break up this old landmark—now the true line being ascertained by the deed—and go back to their rights according to law, I should say, as a man, a neighbor, and as a Christian, also, that they had better let the old landmarks stand and abide by them; and by no means revive old disputes and quarrels. So with the case of this Missouri compromise. I do not believe the South is going to gain anything by its repeal, and I firmly believe that the only reward the South will ever get from its repeal will be to her true interests.

But it is said that the only way to pacify the country is to admit no amendments to this bill; that it cannot be bettered; that in no way can it be improved; that it has got to be passed in the shape in which it is presented, even though a proposition should be presented, which, if carried out, would more effectually pacify and quiet the country and settle the whole question. Why, say they, it would be intervention. Now, let me detain the committee a moment to show how ridiculous that idea is. What is this thing of non-intervention? Why, is it intervention to have the people of a Territory perfectly free and untrammelled to settle this, with all other questions, in their own way fairly and properly, subject only to the Constitution of the United States?

Now, sir, do we consider it any intervention, in the case of a trial by jury, after the verdict is announced, to set the same aside, and grant a new trial upon affidavits which clearly prove and satisfy the judge that the verdict was obtained by fraud, by perjury, deception, or by any mal-practices? Is it any intervention, for an honest and conscientious judge, after being satisfied of the facts by reliable affidavits, to say that he doubted whether the verdict had been fairly obtained, and in the exercise of the discretion which is vested in him, decide to grant a new trial, if order that justice might be done? Is that an interference with the right of trial by jury? And suppose a jury is empaneled to settle the question, and they come back to the judge, and one of the jury gets up and says a verdict is so and so, and another says it is not so, and the judge tells them, "gentlemen, you had better retire, get together again and consult, and agree upon your verdict, and when you come in, it will be recorded"—is that any interference? I wanted to show how ridiculous this idea is. Is that intervention?

What are Green's and Paugh's amendments? Let our Northern anti-slavery men, of all parties, understand the President of the United States has given a true construction of the Dred Scott decision, and you will never have any more fuss about this matter from them. The President says it means that when the people of any State see proper to get together in a legal way, to get up a convention sanctioned by law, a mere majority of their assembly vote Free-Soil they may form a constitution and the negroes all slope. That is giving the Abolitionists a new cue, and which will run out the institution of my beloved section from all the Territories, certainly, and endanger it in many of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to look upon this question without reference to any section, or how it will affect any body other than the general good and peace of the whole country. If no other plan can be devised and agreed on, I may feel myself constrained to vote for the measure, being urged by Southern friends and sectional pressure. And if I do, the Green amendment stricken out, it will not be (and I say it here) a measure which my sound judgment can approve as the better plan. If I could, I would put the whole responsibility upon the Democracy, where it belongs, for I do believe if they would relax a little, and honestly set their heads to work with our Southern friends and other conservative men in this House, this whole matter might be put upon a footing entirely satisfactory to the South—to the East—to the West—to the North—satisfactory to the people of Kansas—and without any compromise of any principle—substantially in the manner indicated by me heretofore.

I must say that when I hear it asserted here, and everywhere, and the proof strongly tending to show that the government of Kansas was, in the first instance, ruthlessly snatched from the people, unconstitutionally set on foot, by which the minority, who by fraud obtained the control of the government, and by which the majority were kept from participating in the government—when I am told—and the proof tends that way—that not more than one-half of the counties of the Territory were permitted to be represented in the convention, I doubt the propriety of supporting the constitution framed thus. I dissent from the idea that a majority of the counties of any State can make a constitution that is binding on the majority of counties who did not have a chance to be represented in the convention. Why have you more judges than one? It is not simply for the sake of numbers, but that there may be conference, argument, interchange of views.—We may be to-day all inclined one way, and to-morrow a greater and better mind than any of us, representing but one district, may make a suggestion sufficient to change the opinion of the whole Congress. We know that the election of the 4th of January was recognized by the Secretary of State, who gave instructions that that very election should be fairly and impartially taken; that vote turns

the Dred Scott case. All I have to say is this; that my views upon the constitutionality of the Missouri compromise were known long before that decision was made; and I thought that the compromise was not in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. Although my opinion inclined to that of the Supreme Court, and did before the decision was made, yet, from the length of time it had been a compromise, I was disposed to look upon it as a compromise which had better be abided by. As in the case of two neighbors whose boundary line is in dispute—a boundary which can only be settled by the provisions of a deed, and no agreement they might make by parcel would change the line fixed by the deed, any more than any agreement between two sections of the country by Congress, could be changed. But when the neighbors have established a line by parcel agreement, staked and chopped it off, and have lived in peace, harmony, and prosperity under it for more than thirty years, if they should come to me ask my advice, whether they should break up this old landmark—now the true line being ascertained by the deed—and go back to their rights according to law, I should say, as a man, a neighbor, and as a Christian, also, that they had better let the old landmarks stand and abide by them; and by no means revive old disputes and quarrels. So with the case of this Missouri compromise. I do not believe the South is going to gain anything by its repeal, and I firmly believe that the only reward the South will ever get from its repeal will be to her true interests.

But it is said that the only way to pacify the country is to admit no amendments to this bill; that it cannot be bettered; that in no way can it be improved; that it has got to be passed in the shape in which it is presented, even though a proposition should be presented, which, if carried out, would more effectually pacify and quiet the country and settle the whole question. Why, say they, it would be intervention. Now, let me detain the committee a moment to show how ridiculous that idea is. What is this thing of non-intervention? Why, is it intervention to have the people of a Territory perfectly free and untrammelled to settle this, with all other questions, in their own way fairly and properly, subject only to the Constitution of the United States?

Now, sir, do we consider it any intervention, in the case of a trial by jury, after the verdict is announced, to set the same aside, and grant a new trial upon affidavits which clearly prove and satisfy the judge that the verdict was obtained by fraud, by perjury, deception, or by any mal-practices? Is it any intervention, for an honest and conscientious judge, after being satisfied of the facts by reliable affidavits, to say that he doubted whether the verdict had been fairly obtained, and in the exercise of the discretion which is vested in him, decide to grant a new trial, if order that justice might be done? Is that an interference with the right of trial by jury? And suppose a jury is empaneled to settle the question, and they come back to the judge, and one of the jury gets up and says a verdict is so and so, and another says it is not so, and the judge tells them, "gentlemen, you had better retire, get together again and consult, and agree upon your verdict, and when you come in, it will be recorded"—is that any interference? I wanted to show how ridiculous this idea is. Is that intervention?