

THE RALEIGH TIMES.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY CH. C. RABOTEAU,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS: \$2 50 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE, OR
\$8 00 IF PAYMENT IS DELAYED SIX MONTHS.

VOL. III.

RALEIGH, FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1850.

NO. 17.

SPEECH OF MR. STANLEY.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, March 6, 1850.

"This hour, Mr. Chairman, compels me to resume time very closely, and consolidate ideas as much as possible. I will try and do so, that I may not write out any thing as to than I shall say. I wish to say a few plain things in a plain way, and to say a little for Bancombe—not only the western but the eastern Bancombe, which I represent, and, if honorable gentlemen are not desirous to hear this, I advise them to take themselves, on a rainy day, to a more comfortable place than this. I intend most of what I say for my constituents. I have not spoken before, because I thought when matters of such vast magnitude were involved, we ought to wait and hear what the people of both have to say of them. Now, I feel prepared not merely to express my own opinions, but those of my honest constituents. I hope to say nothing offensive to any gentleman. Certainly, I am no such deity. I shall most carefully avoid striking the first blow. If I am assailed, I will take care of myself in the best way I may. And now to come right at it.

I have heard a great deal said here, and read such recently, of "encroachment on the South—aggression on the South," and, though I know we are cause in some respects to complain of the conduct of a portion of our northern people, I cannot exclude the whole North in the just censure due to the conduct of the aggressors. I have attentively watched the debate here and in the Senate. I have looked at the party newspapers of the day, and I have been brought to the settled belief, yes, conviction, that much of the hue and cry is caused by malignant wish to embarrass the Administration, and to build up the party whom the people hurled upon power in November, 1848. Many of the speeches here, relative to the admission of California, are marked by unkind allusions to the President, and sometimes improper and furious, though sensible, aspersions as to his motives.

It seemed to me that if gentlemen, from the South especially, believed our peculiar institutions were in danger, they would desire to produce harmony of feeling, to speak calmly as to brethren in the midst of a common danger; that they would try and reduce unkind action. But instead of manifesting such a disposition, the Administration is ruthlessly assailed, and the Whig party fiercely denounced. For examples of these party speeches refer to that of the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Brown, and of the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. McLane, who on this matter made a party speech, and tried, as he did before the House was organized, to blow his own whistle and pipe his hands on his side to duty. There were other speeches of a like character. I want to show this agitation, this attempt to excite alarm, is now, as was last summer in the northern States, for party purposes. I think I can show it.

In 1837, when Mr. Van Buren was President, an abolition petition, presented by a gentleman from Vermont, I think, produced a great tumult here—a southern meeting was held in a committee-room on Main street. Patton's resolution, which rejected abolition petitions, was the fruit of that meeting, presenting this petition was one of Mr. Calhoun's "encroachments." Mr. Van Buren's friends found necessary to sustain him, as a "northern man with southern principles," and then he elected this abolition excitement the platform for his election to the Presidency. In vain did the Whigs at that time warn the southern country he would be a traitor; that his past life had shown he was unsound upon the question of slavery. No matter what would be the consequence to the South, his game was to be played. In 1838, when Mr. Woodbury was in Van Buren's cabinet, and was engaged in an interesting correspondence to his sub-treasurer, Mr. Atherton, of New Hampshire, who was called the prince of hangers, introduced this wretched, dough-faced, chivalry resolutions, a cause was held in which southern Van Buren Democrats sat side by side with the worst anti-slavery men; from which secret caucus all the southern Whigs were excluded; and these resolutions, then pronounced as Janus-faced and double-meaning, were the hybrid offspring of that caucus. These resolutions were to quiet agitation. I denounced them, and refused to vote for them, and I was assailed at home. They were also denounced, if I mistake not, by other southern gentlemen, as being the South.

[A late article in the *Republic*, in this city, excuses the Atherton caucus, by giving a true account of their origin.]

When General Harrison was nominated, he was announced as an Abolitionist. Mr. Clay was an Abolitionist; and Mr. Van Buren's dough-faces were his friends and allies of the South. I hope the sea of dough-faces is extinct. They were a miserable set of beings—mere puppets of Van Buren—anti-slavery men at home, allies of the South here. Now and then, one is slave, mourning for his lost spoils, and editing a paper that tries to alarm the South by the old saw of 1838, "The Whigs are Abolitionists." Once we were told there were no Democratic Abolitionists at the North. Now we changed! Even in the Senate, a member of that body (Mr. Clemens, of Alabama, on the 7th January, 1850) said:

"I said the people of the South had been heretofore laboring under the delusion that the northern Democrats were their friends. I said it was a delusion, and I was glad to have an opportunity of explaining it to them. God deliver me from such friends as the northern Democrats! I would rather see northern Whigs to-day. They commenced the game earlier, and look not to go so far to get a proper position. Look at the resolutions of Democratic legislatures and the messages of Democratic governors, and the resolutions adopted by Democratic conventions, and then tell me about their delusion being the friends of the South."

Mr. Calhoun, too, thinks all the northern people are "more or less hostile to us." Sir, I will not admit that either of the great parties of the North, as such, are hostile to the South. Some members of each are hostile—are fanatical—but the great body of both parties at the North, I cannot believe, are traitors to the Constitution and the Union. And, sir, it affords me pleasure to say, that when I hear bold and manly speeches, such as those made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Bissell) and from Indiana (Mr. Fitch) I honor their integrity. I feel that the Union is safe. The time has passed I hope when I can be unjust to a patriot, because he differs with me in political opinions. My intercourse with members of the Democratic party in my own State Legislature removed many prejudices—my intercourse with gentlemen of that party here has proved that many of them are true to the Union; and upon such questions as those now under discussion here, I shall be proud to be allowed to tender them the right hand of fellowship, and to acknowledge them as worthy laborers in a common cause. But I speak not here of the dough-faces—the men, who, for party purposes, spitate the country, that they may win the spoils of office. I had rather meet Abolitionists here than such men—if they can be called so.

No, I would say, with a slight alteration of one of Canning's verses:

"Give me the awed, erect, and manly foe;
Open, I can meet, perhaps may turn his blow;
But of all the plagues, great Heaven! thy wrath can send,
Save, oh! save me from a dough-face friend!"

But, sir, to pursue my argument. In proof of the charge I make, that there is a desire to produce agitation for party purposes, I beg attention to a short extract from the "Union" newspaper (Democratic) of this city. I call the attention of my honest Democratic colleagues to this. In the "Union" of February 14, 1850, I find the following:

"THE SOUTHERN WHIGS HAVE PROVED THEMSELVES TO BE THE WORST ENEMIES OF THE SOUTH AND OF SOUTHERN INSTITUTIONS. BUT THE PRESENT IS NO TIME FOR CRIMINATION AND RECrimINATION. LET THE PATRIOTS OF ALL PARTIES, &c., &c."

"No time for crimination!" Then why deal in it? "Patriots of all parties!" But as the northern Whigs are ceaselessly denounced as Abolitionists, and the southern Whigs "enemies of the South," who are "the all parties?" Those, I suppose, who vote for the "regular nominees of the Democratic party!"

My Democratic colleagues, I know, cannot justify such conduct. I will not descend to crimination; but what an argument! If the whole North are hostile to the South, and if the southern Whigs are "the worst enemies of the South and southern institutions," what are to become of those southern States in which the Whigs have the majority?

Besides this extract, just quoted, there are others of like character—one of which was read to us yesterday, by the gentleman from Florida, (Mr. Cabell.)

In the *Union* of February 28, 1850, in the leading editorial article, we are told: "The alliance of northern Abolition-Federalists, and southern slaveholding Whigs, has attempted to prostitute the Democratic party of the North, who stood for half a century firmly by the compromises of the Constitution, which protected southern institutions, and it has succeeded in compelling the northern Democracy to modify its position in relation to the institutions of the South."

No "time for crimination!" And the northern Democracy has "modified its position." How? By alliance with the abolitionists? There are other charges of like character in this and other papers, which I have no time to read.

Sir, is this no proof of the design to agitate for party effect? It proves that now, as in 1839, it is what my colleague from the Bancombe district called it, "a game." In his speech, in 1844, my colleague (Mr. Clingman) as reported in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 1st session, referred to the "fact that, although there was near eighty Democratic members from the free States in the House of Representatives, only thirteen, 'with all possible coaxing,' voted for the rule. How is it with the southern wing of the party? Its members make no vehement speeches in favor of the rule; declare that the Union will be dissolved if it is abolished; and charge as high treason all opposition to it. They are especially vehement in their denunciation of me, and desire to make the impression that its loss, if it should be rejected, is mainly to be attributed to my speech against it."

"The game which they have been playing off is seen through by everybody here, and it is getting to be understood in the country."

Just as the game which the Bobadils are playing off now is understood, and I adopt the language of my colleague in what follows: I think it was true of the party to whom it was applied then, in 1844, and especially true now, of those of the South who wish *disorder should reign*, and of the one-sided fanatical Wilnot provision men of the North. Hear these words: "The game which they have been playing off is seen through by everybody here, and it is getting to be understood in the country. There was some time when gentlemen, by giving themselves airs and talking largely of southern rights in connexion with this subject, were able to give themselves consequence at home. But that day has passed. Its mock tragedy has degenerated into downright farce, and nobody will be humbugged much longer in this way. But the matter is important in one respect. Nothing could more fully show the utter profligacy of the party, its total want of all principle, than the course of its northern and southern wings on this question. They hope, however, by thus spreading their nets, to drag in votes in both sections of the Union, and thereby get into power."

Yes, sir, there's the true secret of this agitation—"get into power"—"to the victors belong the spoils"—adhere to Democratic nominations, even for door-keeper, or the *Gracile dough-faces* will let the Union be dissolved.

I concur in what my colleague said of this agitation in 1844, and especially in a note to his speech, in which he says, that "a certain prominent southern politician, seeing that his course had rendered him unpopular generally, seized upon this question to create excitement between the North and the South, and unite the South thereby into a political party, of which he expected to be the head. There are also individuals at the North, who, though professing opposition to the rule, are, in my opinion, really desirous of its continuance, as a means of producing agitation in that quarter. A portion of them entertain the hope that the excitement there may attain sufficient height to enable them successfully to invade the institutions of the South; but the larger number are simply seeking to produce a strong prejudice in the popular mind in the free States against southern institutions and men, on which to base a political party strong enough to control the offices of the country."

Now, sir, I think a certain prominent southern politician is playing the same game, and the one-sided Wilnot provision men are still trying to control the offices of the country. Some want to get to Congress, or to stay there, or to be placed at the head of some important committee, by voting for the "favorite candidate" of the party.

It was a "game" when my colleague referred to it; it is a "game" now, I fear my colleague does not remember this speech.

Mr. Clingman said, yes.

Mr. Stanley. Well, sir, I will print the extract from the speech of 1844, and let it go to Bancombe with the late speech of my colleague.

Yes, sir, "the game" is still to be played, and now the "refusal to surrender fugitive slaves" is another northern aggression complained of. I admit the northern States have acted badly in this instance. Both parties have played the game too far, of trying to get abolition votes. I cannot see how any man who has sworn to support the Constitution can refuse to pass any law that may be deemed necessary. The conduct of the northern States in this respect is admitted by some of their own citizens to be without excuse. No one condemns it more decidedly than I do, and I believe, from all I have heard, this abuse will be remedied.

But still, the noise made about this is part of the "game," part of the "party operations." One would suppose from speeches made here, that no slaves had escaped from the South until Cass's defeat.

But to the recent history of this. In 1838, shortly after the Atherton resolutions were passed, a worthy gentleman from Kentucky, then a member of this House, introduced a resolution I hold in my hand, which I will print—

"Mr. Calhoun, of Kentucky, moved that the rules in relation to the order of business be suspended, to enable him to move a resolution; which was read at the clerk's table, and is in the words following: viz:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person to aid fugitive slaves in escaping from their owners, and providing for the punishment in the courts of the United States of all persons who may be guilty of such offence.

"And that they be further instructed to report a bill making it unlawful for any person in the non-slaveholding States of this Union to use any means to induce slaves from their owners, and providing for the punishment, in the courts of the United States, of all persons who may be found guilty of such offence.

"And on the question—Shall the rules be suspended for the purpose aforesaid?

"It passed in the negative—yeas 90, nays 107."

Among the nays were Mr. Atherton and fifty-four other northern "allies of the South."

Now, sir, is it not singular, that from that period down to the present, as far as my knowledge extends, no effort has been made, until General Taylor's election, to demand additional legislation upon this subject?

If any such effort has been made, I do not know it. Were there no fugitive slaves in 1838? Well, Mr. Van Buren was President three years after that, and no bill passed for fugitive slaves. In the twenty-fifth Congress, from 1837 to 1839, Mr. Polk was Speaker. From 1839 to 1841, twenty-sixth Congress, Mr. Hunter, of Virginia, was Speaker Democratic majority here, and no bill for fugitive slaves!

Tyler was President from April, 41, to March, White, of Kentucky, was Speaker; and from '43 to 1845, Mr. Jones, of Virginia, was Speaker, and a Democratic majority here, with a Virginia President, and no bill for reclaiming fugitive slaves! Then, from March, 1845, to March, 1849, Mr. Polk, a southern President, and during the two years Mr. Davis, of Indiana, Democratic Speaker; and still no bill for the reclamation of fugitive slaves! Nothing said by Virginia members even, from 1839 till now!

Mr. Venable. Will my honorable colleague allow me to remind him that before the presidential canvass, at the first session of the last Congress, on the abduction of a number of slaves from this District, I raised that question and delivered a speech upon the subject?

Mr. Stanley. My colleague may have raised the question at that time, but there was no legislative action in this House on that subject; nor any attempt to procure any, that I know of. And my colleague raised the question, when there was great excitement here on account of one act of outrage. He did not still try to procure action on the part of Congress to enable the southern people to recover their slaves.

Mr. Bayly. Will the gentleman allow me to put him right on a matter of fact?

Mr. Stanley. If not out of my time.

Mr. Bayly. Indeed, sir, the gentleman is right, that

from 1838, the time of Atherton's resolution, to this time, nothing has been said by Virginia members on the subject of the surrender of fugitive slaves.

Mr. Stanley. Nothing for action of Congress.

Mr. Bayly. Well, the subject was before the Legislature of Virginia in 1841 and 1842; and it was never brought before this House, because we came to the conclusion that the law of 1793 was as nearly perfect as it could be, and that it only required that it should be executed in good faith.

Mr. Stanley. Yes, sir, and you changed your opinion of that law as soon as General Taylor was elected President. And I would ask, why legislate further, if that law is sufficient? We cannot create "good faith" by act of Congress. I admit, Mr. Chairman, that Virginia is still a great and glorious Commonwealth. She has much to be proud of in the past history of this country. She needs no eulogy from me; and, though I must censure, and shall ridicule the conduct of some of her public men, I shall speak respectfully of the State. Many of my dearest friends and nearest relatives reside within her borders, and they have, I believe, done no discredit to her, in peace or in war. But, sir, the Old Dominion is too much in the habit of taking care of the affairs of the General Government, and the debates in her Legislature are not as important in the eyes of the country as they are to the Chairman of Ways and Means, (Mr. Bayly.) And I should be glad to know why, if the representatives from Virginia thought the law of 1793 sufficient, did the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Meade,) introduce his resolution soon after General Taylor's election, proposing to instruct the Committee on the Judiciary to report a bill providing for the apprehension of fugitive slaves?

So I repeat, from 1836 to 1843, until December, 1848, when the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Meade) offered his resolution, all the southern Democracy, now crying out at this dreadful aggression, never moved a finger to procure any law relative to fugitive slaves! No, sir; they were "as mute as a mouse in a cheese." Yes, sir, as a first family Virginia mouse in an English cheese. The reason was, as my colleague (Mr. Venable) said in some poor verses quoted by him in his speech:

"The laurels were fairly portioned,
The spoils were fairly sold."
Mr. Venable. The "lands," I said.

Mr. Stanley. I accept the correction; it was printed "laurels," but my colleague is right; the southern Democracy, whatever of "spoils" they got, won no "laurels" during the last ten years with their northern allies.

No, sir, the truth is, Cass was a "used up man," Taylor was elected, the "spoils" were gone; the cohesive power was lost.

Truly, as we are told in the book of Job, "Doth the wild ass bray when he hath grass: or loweth the ox over his fodder?"

I have watched the progress of the debate in the Senate, and from the published speeches in the newspapers, I see a respectable Senator from Virginia (Mr. Mason) said he wanted the bill acted on "as soon practicable," but had "little hope it would afford the remedy it is intended to afford;" "it depends upon the loyalty of the people to whom it is directed."

Another Senator (from South Carolina—Mr. Butler) said "he had no very great confidence that this bill will subvert the ends which seem to be contemplated by it." When then, I ask, so zealously urge the passage of it? One of these Senators (Mr. Mason) also intimated that it might be necessary for the States whose citizens lost negroes, "to make reprisals on the citizens of the State offending!" Now this, it seems to me, would be but a poor way of doing justice to our citizens. If one rogue in Ohio or Pennsylvania steals a negro, we are to take the wagon-horse of some honest old farmer, who lived hundreds of miles from the thief! Will not this produce civil war? Will it enable us to recover fugitive slaves?

Now, sir, I think I have proved that this new-born zeal for legislation to enable us to recover fugitive slaves is all owing to the defeat of General Cass.

Well, sir, among other reasons given why we should think of dissolution, is the fact that the southern States are annoyed by the "agitation of Abolitionists." The southern address says, I think, it commenced about the year 1835. It commenced first, before the year 1787. The Quakers have for more than a hundred years been opposed to slavery. In 1671, George Fox advocated emancipation. But the aggressive agitation consisted in sending abolition petitions. And I remember well, before the repeal of the "twenty-first rule," southern gentlemen said if that rule should be repealed, and these petitions received, the Union would be dissolved. My colleague (Mr. Clingman) had the boldness to vote against the twenty-first rule. I commend him for it. But he was denounced by various southern gentlemen—by Mr. A. V. Brown, afterwards governor of Tennessee; Mr. Cobb, of Georgia, our speaker; Mr. Stiles, of Georgia; and by Mr. R. M. Saunders, of North Carolina. Some extracts of their speeches are before me, and I will print them, to show them how much mistaken they were. Mr. Brown, of Tennessee, was arguing against making the petitions "the subject of reference, report, and debate in this hall;" "Our safety," said he, "depends upon it." He begged the "real friends" of the South, if they could not altogether exclude these petitions, not to refer them for debate, &c. And he added:

"The South will hold no man guilty here, who shall go one inch beyond the right of petition. He must answer for every free that may be kindled, and for every drop of blood that may be shed. Yes, sir, I will say to the gentleman from New York and from North Carolina (Mr. Cass), if it this

House shall go one inch beyond that, they may have to stand answerable for the shattered and broken fragments of the Union itself." [See *Append. Cong. Globe*, 28th Congress, 1st Session.]

Mr. Cobb, of Georgia, after complimenting the northern Democracy for their devotion to the interests of the South, for their "sincere friendship," referred to the fact that some of the northern Democracy were abandoning the rule, or, at least, the opposition of some few southern members to it; and he said:

"Thus it is that the defection of our northern friends is attributable to our own divisions. Let the fact then be published to the country, that the responsibility of this measure may rest upon those who justly deserve it, upon whom an indignant and outraged people may place the seal of their condemnation. I trust, however, that no such division will be found to exist; no southern Democrat, I am sure, will abandon his post; and but few, if any, of the southern Whigs will be found following in the wake of the gentlemen from North Carolina." [Append. Cong. Globe, 28th Cong., 1st Session.]

I have an extract before me from the speech of Mr. Stiles, of Georgia, which I print—

Mr. Stiles, spoke under excitement, and very wildly.

Extract from the speech of Mr. STILES, of Georgia, House of Representatives, January 28 and 30, 1844, on the twenty-fifth rule relating to the abolition petitions. In replying to the remarks of Mr. Clingman—Appendix to Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 1st session, page 265—he spoke of the Constitution as a "citadel, a fortress; and this rule was 'a barrier,' and he said:

"Whilst that remains, the fortress stands; when it is gone, the fortress falls. That barrier can be removed only by some one within. The fortress can be taken, the citadel lost, only by treachery in the camp. I will pursue the simile no farther.—But let me tell the member from North Carolina, that if this rule is lost, from the relation in which he stands to, and the part which he has borne, in this transaction, he may go home to his constituents and to his grave covered with the unenviable immortality of having betrayed the interests of the South, in having surrendered the Constitution of his country."

Mr. Saunders, of North Carolina thought with others whose remarks I have just quoted:

Mr. R. M. SAUNDERS, arguing against the argument that to receive petitions would silence the "clamor about the right of petition," said: "They might as soon expect to extinguish the conflagration by adding fuel to the flames. I repeat, then, there is but one alternative—rejection without action, or reception and action. There is no middle ground can satisfy those who are resolved to press this matter, whatever its consequence." [Appendix to Cong. Globe, 28th Cong., 1st Session—January, 1844, page 285.]

How much mistaken! Since the repeal of the rule, how seldom we see an abolition petition!

Mr. Saunders appeared to have been sincerely distressed. He appealed to the dough-faces in an extract before me:

"SAUNDERS said: I ask the gentlemen from Maine if there be any here, who have hitherto stood by us, why they should now give away? I turn to our friends from Connecticut, and ask them why they should yield? If I appeal in vain, I turn to those by whom I know the appeal will be answered—to patriotic New Hampshire, whose sons, like her granite basis, have hitherto breast the storm; they, I know, will not give way. So I call upon our friends from the Keystone State not to surrender because a single soldier in the South has deserted us on this trying occasion." [See *Appendix Cong. Globe*, 28th Congress, 1st session.]

How much mistaken, I say again, these gentlemen were! Mr. CLAY always argued—receive these petitions, and much of this clamor will cease. The result shows he was right. When I had the honor of being in Congress in 1839, while the twenty-first rule was in force, I do not think I exaggerate when I say, that during the period of three or four months, we had what were called abolition petitions presented here, signed by more than one hundred thousand men and women. Like the camomile flower, "the more it is trodden upon, the faster it grows," this right of petition when denied was most earnestly asserted. How stands the fact now? We have been here more than three months, and not one single abolition petition has been presented! Hence the Union will not be dissolved because of this aggression. This aggression has ceased. No, sir, there is no danger to this Union from any such. In this happy land, our people will occasionally be guilty of some extravagant conduct. We have a numerous population, who are not always employed.

What was said by one of England's great poets of "her people, can with truth be said of ours—

"Whose only grievance is excess of peace,
Freedom their pain, and plenty their disease."

When they cannot war against the twenty-first rule, they will form peace societies. Noble motives prompt them in this. These agitators, comprising a small portion of our northern people, not only distinguish by their noisy opposition to slavery, but they contend among other things for what they term "the rights of women." I do not know what are the rights they claim; whether they think women should vote, should come to Congress, &c.; but if they give to the New England women more rights than those our North Carolina women have, they will not have a republican government.

Some of these agitators do not believe any Judge has a right to administer an oath. They do not acknowledge the authority of any magistrate—such people deserve our pity or contempt. They ought not to be reckoned with. Denunciation, like

the storm upon the traveller, but makes them fold the cloak of prejudice closely around them, and go on with more energy. Forbearance towards their follies—as it did with their right of petition—like the influence of the sun, will drive them to the shades of retirement.

But complaint is made against the North because they will not stop agitation and aggression of these fanatics. How can they stop them? New York cannot quiet the disturbances of her Antislavery. A mob in the city of New York last year, because of some misunderstanding between two actors, nearly destroyed a valuable building, and caused the death of several persons. Massachusetts, some years ago, could not in her peaceful borders prevent the destruction of convent. Dorrien nearly produced civil war in Rhode Island. Philadelphia has had a church destroyed, and an abolition hall burnt down by her staid population.

If these terrible outbreaks cannot be prevented, how can the northern people suppress fanaticism? And yet we are told by gentlemen, the Union will be dissolved unless this agitation ceases.

Who can reason with fanaticism?

"You may as well stand upon the beach,
And bid the main flood bate his usual height;
You may as well use question with the wind,
Why he hath made the waves-heat for the lamb;
You may as well forbid the mountain pines
To wag their high tops and to make no noise,
When they are trodden with the gusts of Heaven's
Axy and suppress fanaticism by reason or by law."

We give more importance to these agitators than they deserve, by supposing that all who are opposed to slavery are disposed to interfere with slavery in the States. It is a great mistake.—Our Quakers, in North Carolina and elsewhere, are all opposed to slavery. In 1824, I think, Mr. R. M. SAUNDERS presented one of their petitions here. The Quakers, in all countries, are among our best population. They are industrious, sober, orderly. They try and do unto others as they wish others to do unto them. But they are no agitators. It is a part of their religion to oppose slavery. Every year they express, in mild terms, their opposition to it. I received from my district, a few days since, a paper before me, from one of the best men I ever knew—a Quaker. It is entitled "Minutes of the North Carolina yearly meeting, held at New garden Guilford county, 11th month, 1849." They send a memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives, in which they say—

"Your memorialists farther show that they believe themselves conscientiously constrained to bear their testimony against the unrighteous system of slavery. Many of them have made pecuniary sacrifices to obtain a quiet conscience; and they respectfully ask Congress to take the subject under deliberation, and legislate for its amelioration or extinction as far as they constitutionally can. For we believe it to be anti-Christian in practice inasmuch as it is at variance with the divine precept of doing to others as we would they should do to us. We believe it to be anti-republican, because it does not accord with the declaration of American independence—with that self-evident truth, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

"And we suggest for your consideration, the propriety of our government acknowledging the independence and nationality of the Republic of Liberia, and extending to her the same countenance as other nations."

"Your memorialists and petitioner desire that you may be guided and influenced in your legislation by that wisdom which is profitable to direct—which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated."

Now these men are among our best citizens; some of them were slaveholders. I have one who emancipated fifty slaves. It would be a moderate estimate to say he sacrificed to his conscience twenty-five thousand dollars. Yet these people would be the last to encourage violence. These men would not fight; but in the hour of trial I believe many of them would do as one did in Rhode Island in the Dorr rebellion. He found a soldier at his post exhausted by fatigue and want of food. "Friend," he said, "I cannot use arms; but I will take care of thy musket until thou hast refreshment." Ask these men what has been the effect of the agitation of Abolitionists, and they will tell you it has checked emancipation. I contend that it is wrong to suppose that the great body of our northern people, who believe slavery to be an evil, as our Quakers do, are therefore disposed to interfere with the southern States, or are "enemies of the South!"

But is another "aggression on the South." In 1843, Massachusetts passed resolutions recommending a change in the Constitution of the United States. The recommendation was, that the third clause of the second section of the first article of the Constitution should be so changed as to abolish the representation of the southern States for their slaves. This proposition was denounced as tending to dissolution. A gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Gilmer,) and one from South Carolina, (Mr. Bart,) said of it, "a proposition precisely similar to that now under consideration was made by the notorious Hartford convention." I think when that amendment is made others will be made, and dissolution will be the inevitable consequence.

But though the Legislature of Massachusetts did wrong in this instance, it does not follow that while our present Constitution stands, she would interfere with slavery in the southern States. If it evinces a disposition to interfere, it admits also the want of power under the Constitution. Our State Legislatures sometimes do silly things. They resolve on wars against the allies of the year before. But I wish to call the attention of my col-

leagues to the fact that some of the northern Democracy were abandoning the rule, or, at least, the opposition of some few southern members to it; and he said:

"Thus it is that the defection of our northern friends is attributable to our own divisions. Let the fact then be published to the country, that the responsibility of this measure may rest upon those who justly deserve it, upon whom an indignant and outraged people may place the seal of their condemnation. I trust, however, that no such division will be found to exist; no southern Democrat, I am sure, will abandon his post; and but few, if any, of the southern Whigs will be found following in the wake of the gentlemen from North Carolina." [Append. Cong. Globe, 28th Cong., 1st Session.]

I have an extract before me from the speech of Mr. Stiles, of Georgia, which I print—

Mr. Stiles, spoke under excitement, and very wildly.

Extract from the speech of Mr. STILES, of Georgia, House of Representatives, January 28 and 30, 1844, on the twenty-fifth rule relating to the abolition petitions. In replying to the remarks of Mr. Clingman—Appendix to Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 1st session, page 265—he spoke of the Constitution as a "citadel, a fortress; and this rule was 'a barrier,' and he said:

"Whilst that remains, the fortress stands; when it is gone, the fortress falls. That barrier can be removed only by some one within. The fortress can be taken, the citadel lost, only by treachery in the camp. I will pursue the simile no farther.—But let me tell the member from North Carolina, that if this rule is lost, from the relation in which he stands to, and the part which he has borne, in this transaction, he may go home to his constituents and to his grave covered with the unenviable immortality of having betrayed the interests of the South, in having surrendered the Constitution of his country."

Mr. Saunders, of North Carolina thought with others whose remarks I have just quoted:

Mr. R. M. SAUNDERS, arguing against the argument that to receive petitions would silence the "clamor about the right of petition," said: "They might as soon expect to extinguish the conflagration by adding fuel to the flames. I repeat, then, there is but one alternative—rejection without action, or reception and action. There is no middle ground can satisfy those who are resolved to press this matter, whatever its consequence." [Appendix to Cong. Globe, 28th Cong., 1st Session—January, 1844, page 285.]

How much mistaken! Since the repeal of the rule, how seldom we see an abolition petition!

Mr. Saunders appeared to have been sincerely distressed. He appealed to the dough-faces in an extract before me:

"SAUNDERS said: I ask the gentlemen from Maine if there be any here, who have hitherto stood by us, why they should now give away? I turn to our friends from Connecticut, and ask them why they should yield? If I appeal in vain, I turn to those by whom I know the appeal will be answered—to patriotic New Hampshire, whose sons, like her granite basis, have hitherto breast the storm; they, I know, will not give way. So I call upon our friends from the Keystone State not to surrender because a single soldier in the South has deserted us on this trying occasion." [See *Appendix Cong. Globe*, 28th Congress, 1st session.]

How much mistaken, I say again, these gentlemen were! Mr. CLAY always argued—receive these petitions, and much of this clamor will cease. The result shows he was right. When I had the honor of being in Congress in 1839, while the twenty-first rule was in force, I do not think I exaggerate when I say, that during the period of three or four months, we had what were called abolition petitions presented here, signed by more than one hundred thousand men and women. Like the camomile flower, "the more it is trodden upon, the faster it grows," this right of petition when denied was most earnestly asserted. How stands the fact now? We have been here more than three months, and not one single abolition petition has been presented! Hence the Union will not be dissolved because of this aggression. This aggression has ceased. No, sir, there is no danger to this Union from any such. In this happy land, our people will occasionally be guilty of some extravagant conduct. We have a numerous population, who are not always employed.

What was said by one of England's great poets of "her people, can with truth be said of ours—

"Whose only grievance is excess of peace,
Freedom their pain, and plenty their disease."

When they cannot war against the twenty-first rule, they will form peace societies. Noble motives prompt them in this. These agitators, comprising a small portion of our northern people, not only distinguish by their noisy opposition to slavery, but they contend among other things for what they term "the rights of women." I do not know what are the rights they claim; whether they think women should vote, should come to Congress, &c.; but if they give to the New England women more rights than those our North Carolina women have, they will not have a republican government.

Some of these agitators do not believe any Judge has a right to administer an oath. They do not acknowledge the authority of any magistrate—such people deserve our pity or contempt. They ought not to be reckoned with. Denunciation, like

the storm upon the traveller, but makes them fold the cloak of prejudice closely around them, and go on with more energy. Forbearance towards their follies—as it did with their right of petition—like the influence of the sun, will drive them to the shades of retirement.

But complaint is made against the North because they will not stop agitation and aggression of these fanatics. How can they stop them? New York cannot quiet the disturbances of her Antislavery. A mob in the city of New York last year, because of some misunderstanding between two actors, nearly destroyed a valuable building, and caused the death of several persons. Massachusetts, some years ago, could not in her peaceful borders prevent the destruction of convent. Dorrien nearly produced civil war in Rhode Island. Philadelphia has had a church destroyed, and an abolition hall burnt down by her staid population.

If these terrible outbreaks cannot be prevented, how can the northern people suppress fanaticism? And yet we are told by gentlemen, the Union will be dissolved unless this agitation ceases.

Who can reason with fanaticism?

"You may as well stand upon the beach,
And bid the main flood bate his usual height;
You may as well use question with the wind,
Why he hath made the waves-heat for the lamb;
You may as well forbid the mountain pines
To wag their high tops and to make no noise,
When they are trodden with the gusts of Heaven's
Axy and suppress fanaticism by reason or by law."

We give more importance to these agitators than they deserve, by supposing that all who are opposed to slavery are disposed to interfere with slavery in the States. It is a great mistake.—Our Quakers, in North Carolina and elsewhere, are all opposed to slavery. In 1824, I think, Mr. R. M. SAUNDERS presented one of their petitions here. The Quakers, in all countries, are among our best population. They are industrious, sober, orderly. They try and do unto others as they wish others to do unto them. But they are no agitators. It is a part of their religion to oppose slavery. Every year they express, in mild terms, their opposition to it. I received from my district, a few days since, a paper before me, from one of the best men I ever knew—a Quaker. It is entitled "Minutes of the North Carolina yearly meeting, held at New garden Guilford county, 11th month, 1849." They send a memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives, in which they say—

"Your memorialists farther show that they believe themselves conscientiously constrained to bear their testimony against the unrighteous system of slavery. Many of them have made pecuniary sacrifices to obtain a quiet conscience; and they respectfully ask Congress to take the subject under deliberation, and legislate for its amelioration or extinction as far as they constitutionally can. For we believe it to be anti-Christian in practice inasmuch as it is at variance with the divine precept of doing to others as we would they should do to us. We believe it to be anti-republican, because it does not accord with the declaration of American independence—with that self-evident truth, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

"And we suggest for your consideration, the propriety of our government acknowledging the independence and nationality of the Republic of Liberia, and extending to her the same countenance as other nations."

"Your memorialists and petitioner desire that you may be guided and influenced in your legislation by that wisdom which is profitable to direct—which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated."

Now these men are among our best citizens; some of them were slaveholders. I have one who emancipated fifty slaves. It would be a moderate estimate to say he sacrificed to his conscience twenty-five thousand dollars. Yet these people would be the last to encourage violence. These men would not fight; but in the hour of trial I believe many of them would do as one did in Rhode Island in the Dorr rebellion. He found a soldier at his post exhausted by fatigue and want of food. "Friend," he said, "I cannot use arms; but I will take care of thy musket until thou hast refreshment." Ask these men what has been the effect of the agitation of Abolitionists, and they will tell you it has checked emancipation. I contend that it is wrong to suppose that the great body of our northern people, who believe slavery to be an evil, as our Quakers do, are therefore disposed to interfere with the southern States, or are "enemies of the South!"

But is another "aggression on the South." In 1843, Massachusetts passed resolutions recommending a change in the Constitution of the United States. The recommendation was, that the third clause of the second section of the first article of the Constitution should be so changed as to abolish the representation of the southern States for their slaves. This proposition was denounced as tending to dissolution. A gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Gilmer,) and one from South Carolina, (Mr. Bart,) said of it, "a proposition precisely similar to that now under consideration was made by the notorious Hartford convention." I think when that amendment is made others will be made, and dissolution will be the inevitable consequence.

But though the Legislature of Massachusetts did wrong in this instance, it does not follow that while our present Constitution stands, she would interfere with slavery in the southern States. If it evinces a disposition to interfere, it admits also the want of power under the Constitution. Our State Legislatures sometimes do silly things. They resolve on wars against the allies of the year before. But I wish to call the attention of my col-

leagues to the fact that some of the northern Democracy were abandoning the rule, or, at least, the opposition of some few southern members to it; and he said:

"Thus it is that the defection of our northern friends is attributable to our own divisions. Let the fact then be published to the country, that the responsibility of this measure may rest upon those who justly deserve it, upon whom an indignant and outraged people may place the seal of their condemnation. I trust, however, that no such division will be found to exist; no southern Democrat, I am sure, will abandon his post; and but few, if any, of the southern Whigs will be found following in the wake of the gentlemen from North Carolina." [Append. Cong. Globe, 28th Cong., 1st Session.]

I have an extract before me from the speech of Mr. Stiles, of Georgia, which I print—

Mr. Stiles, spoke under excitement, and very wildly.

Extract from the speech of Mr. STILES, of Georgia, House of Representatives, January 28 and 30, 1844, on the twenty-fifth rule relating to the abolition petitions. In replying to the remarks of Mr. Clingman—Appendix to Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 1st session, page 265—he spoke of the Constitution as a "citadel, a fortress; and this rule was 'a barrier,' and he said:

"Whilst that remains, the fortress stands; when it is gone, the fortress falls. That barrier can be removed only by some one within. The fortress can be taken, the citadel lost, only by treachery in the camp. I will pursue the simile no farther.—But let me tell the member from North Carolina, that if this rule is lost, from the relation in which he stands to, and the part which he has borne, in this transaction, he may go home to his constituents and to his grave covered with the unenviable immortality of having betrayed the interests of the South, in having surrendered the Constitution of his country."

Mr. Saunders, of North Carolina thought with others whose remarks I have just quoted:

Mr. R. M. SAUNDERS, arguing against the argument that to receive petitions would silence the "clamor about the right of petition," said: "They might as soon expect to extinguish the conflagration by adding fuel to the flames. I repeat, then, there is but one alternative—rejection without action, or reception and action. There is no middle ground can satisfy those who are resolved to press this matter, whatever its consequence." [Appendix to Cong. Globe, 28th Cong., 1st Session—January, 1844, page 285.]

How much mistaken! Since the repeal of the rule, how seldom we see an abolition petition!

Mr. Saunders appeared to have been sincerely distressed. He appealed to the dough-faces in an extract before me:

"SAUNDERS said: I ask the gentlemen from Maine if there be any here, who have hitherto stood by us, why they should now give away? I turn to our friends from Connecticut, and ask them why they should yield? If I appeal in vain, I turn to those by whom I know the appeal will be answered—to patriotic New Hampshire, whose sons, like her granite basis, have hitherto breast the storm; they, I know, will not give way. So I call upon our friends from the Keystone State not to surrender because a single soldier in the South has deserted us on this trying occasion." [See *Appendix Cong. Globe*,