

**SUPERIOR COURT FOR WAKE.**  
Nearly the whole of the week was occupied with the trial of capital cases, and the Court did not adjourn until late Saturday night. On Tuesday, James Bushford was tried for the murder of his brother. The Attorney General did not press for a conviction for any thing but manslaughter. He was defended by Wm. H. Haywood, Jr. Esq. He was convicted of manslaughter.

On Wednesday, Jones Kill, a free negro, about 18 years of age, was tried for a rape on a colored woman nearly 80 years of age. Mr. W. H. Haywood, assigned as counsel by the Court, defended him. He was acquitted.

On Thursday, John Murphy alias John Suggs, arrested some time since in Alabama, was put on his trial for the murder of the wife of his putative father. It was suggested that he was laboring under mental alienation. The jury summoned to pronounce upon the fact, found that he was not insane. The trial lasted for something like 16 hours; during which time Judge Settle remained on the bench. The jury, about 11 o'clock Friday, rendered a verdict of guilty. For the prosecution, Mr. Attorney General Daniel; for the prisoner, W. H. Haywood, Jr. and George W. Haywood, Esquires. The defence is spoken of in high terms of commendation by those who heard it.

On Friday, Merrill Miller was put on his trial, and convicted for the murder of John Whiteaker. A motion for a new trial having been made and overruled, an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, on the ground that there was a separation of the jury. We extract from the Register the following paragraphs in relation to the presiding Judge and the Attorney General. We cannot conclude these busy paragraphs without paying a passing tribute to his honor, Judge Settle. Certainly, no Judge ever rode this Circuit, who has presided with greater acceptability to the Profession and the public. Distinguished by urbanity of manner, dignity on the Bench, and promptness in his decisions, he is, at the same time, indefatigably industrious in the labors of his office.

To the attorney General, who appeared for the first time, in this Court, in a Capital indictment, we render but an act of simple justice in saying; that he is an efficient and zealous Prosecuting Officer, and manages cases with skill and ability; and while he does full justice to the State, never seeks to press a conviction, where the evidence does not justify it.

**The original Jackson party—the present Van Buren party.**—The reader will recollect, in our paper of the 24th of March, we enumerated some of those promises which were made and some of the principles which were professed by the original Jackson party. We attempted to show a wide and manifest difference between these and the practices of this administration. We again resume the subject. One of the practices of Mr. Adams, and one not least condemned, was the appointment of members of Congress to Executive offices. Mr. Jackson himself had pointedly condemned the practice, and regarded it as an evil of sufficient magnitude to require an amendment of the Constitution. Placed by that instrument as watches upon Executive misrule and encroachment, it was, as we conceive, well feared, that vigilance might be lulled, their eyes charmed to sleep, by the official power and the substantial emoluments at the disposal of the President. Has the present administration acted out the principle? Have they redeemed this pledge? They have utterly disregarded the one and countenanced the other. More members of Congress have been appointed to office during this administration than during the administration of all preceding Presidents together. This is a stubborn fact, and cannot be denied. But is this all? Have we not good reason to say, that a power of appointment has been exercised with a view to influence the action of Congress? We have. An honorable member from Virginia, in the face of the House of Representatives and before the whole nation, has made the charge, made specifications, named the very individuals who have been thus operated upon, and who was found to gainsay it? Who dares contradict him? He affirmed that the Department question, a great constitutional question, one of the most important which, for years has agitated the country, was controuled and decided by the mission to England. This proves but too clearly how well founded were the President's apprehensions of this practice—its corrupting tendencies; and it also unfortunately establishes that his doctrine is one thing—his practice another, and quite a different thing.

Against the whole country rung with the danger of the line of safe precedents, in the election of a member of the Cabinet. It was said it would soon, to all practical purposes, give to the incumbent of the Presidential chair, the appointment of his successor. Mark the sequel! It is well known, no man can deny it, Mr. Van Buren is advocated expressly by the ground that the President desires his election. To the more ignorant and credulous part of the community, this appeal is constantly made: Gen. Jackson is your friend, he knows what will do best, and he is in favour of Van Buren. The immense patronage of the government, the great and unexampled personal popularity of the Executive, is notoriously exerted to procure Van Buren's election. Is this not establishing the line of safe precedents? If this nomination of his successor shall be ratified by the people, if they shall bend their necks to the yoke, will it not be introducing into this government a royal power, which no limited monarchy of modern Europe tolerates, and which is only known under the iron despotism of the Russian Autocrat? What will the empty form, the idle pageantry of electing our Chief magistrate be worth, if we are mere puppets, to be moved at the will of our master?

Mr. Adams was loudly condemned for his latitudinarian construction of the Constitution, as entertaining high toned Federal doctrines, and we were promised that the government should be administered according to the principles of Mr. Jefferson. How have these fine promises been complied with? Have these pledges been redeemed? Has the system of Internal Improvement been prostrated? A candid and brief review of the past will furnish the best answer. The proclamation of the President of the United States can scarcely have been forgotten. It is not likely soon to be forgotten. A highly republican constitution, by! Wonderfully accordant with Jeffersonian principles!

Again the protest is another truly Jeffersonian State paper? Both these, according to his promises, gentle reader, and those of his friends, whilst he was yet a Jackson, a private individual, and before his head was turned by the giddy height to which he had been raised by a grateful people, you would suppose contended for the strictest construction of the Constitution. This only shows your simplicity, and how little you are versed in the wiles of politicians. So far from his being so, he boldly ventured the assertion, and challenge contradiction—we will and can prove it from the papers themselves—no two documents have ever emanated from any public man more high toned, more ultra-Federal, more at war with the celebrated Virginia and Kentucky resolutions.

the principle that it was bound to receive petitions? That a member of his long experience and caution should venture to make an assertion so unfounded, is one among the many proofs of the carelessness, both as to facts and argument, with which this important subject has been examined and discussed on that side.

But it is not necessary to cross the Atlantic, or to go back to remote periods to find precedents for the rejection of petitions. This body, on a memorable occasion, and after full deliberation, a short time since, rejected a petition; and among those who voted for the rejection will be found the names (of course I exclude my own) of the most able and experienced members of the Senate. I refer to the case of resolutions in the nature of a remonstrance from the citizens of York, Pennsylvania, approving the act of the President in removing the deposits. I ask the Secretary to read the journals on the occasion:

"The Vice President communicated a preamble and a series of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the citizens of York county, Pennsylvania, approving the act of the Executive removing the public money from the Bank of the United States, and opposed to the renewal of the charter of said Bank; which having been read, Mr. Clay objected to the reception. And on the question, Shall they be received, it was determined in the negative by yeas 23, nays 21."

"On a motion of Mr. Preston, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present, those who voted in the affirmative, were—Messrs. Benton, Thompson, Forsyth, Grundy, Henderson, Hill, King, of Alabama, King, of Georgia, Linn, McKean, Mangum, Morris, Robinson, Sneydy, Tallmadge, Tipton, White, Wilkins, Wright."

"Those who voted in the negative, were—Messrs. Hobb, Black, Calhoun, Clay, Clayton, Ewing, Frelinghuysen, Kent, Leigh, Moore, Nauhin, Polk, Porter, Prentiss, Preston, Robbins, Silsbee, Smith, Southard, Sprague, Swift, Tomlinson, Waggaman, Webster."

In citing this case it is not my intention to call in question the consistency of any member on this floor; it would be unworthy of the occasion. I doubt not the vote then given was given from a full conviction of its correctness, as it will doubtless be in the present case, on whatever side it may be found. My object is to show that the principle for which I contend, so far from being opposed, is sustained by precedents, here and elsewhere, ancient and modern.

In following as I have those opposed to me, to Magna Charta, and the Declaration of Rights, for the origin and the limits of the right of petition, I am not disposed with them to set aside the Constitution. I assent to the position they assume, that the right of petition existed before the Constitution, and that it is not derived from it; but while I look beyond that instrument for the right, I hold the Constitution, on a question as to its extent and limits, to be the highest authority. The first amended article of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall pass no law to prevent the People from peaceably assembling and petitioning for a redress of grievances was clearly intended to prescribe the limits within which the right might be exercised. It is not pretended that I refuse to receive petitions touches in the slightest degree on these limits. To suppose that the framers of the Constitution—no, not the framers, but those jealous patriots who were not satisfied with that instrument as it came from the hands of the framers, and who proposed this very provision to guard what they considered a sacred right, performed their task so bunglingly as to omit any essential guard, would be to do great injustice to the memory of those stern and sagacious men; and yet this is what the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Grundy) has ventured to assert. He said that no provision was added to guard against the rejection of petitions, because the obligation to receive was considered so clear that it was deemed unnecessary; when he ought to have known that, according to the standing practice at that time, Parliament was in the constant habit, as has been shown, of refusing to receive petitions—a practice which could not have been unknown to the authors of the amendment; and from which it may be fairly inferred that, in omitting to provide that petitions should be received, it was not intended to comprehend their reception in the right of petition.

I have now, I trust, established, beyond all controversy, that we are not bound to receive these petitions, and that if we should reject them we would not in the slightest degree infringe the right of petition. It is now time to look to the rights of this body, and to see whether, if we should receive them, when it is acknowledged that the only reason for receiving is that we are bound to do so, we would not establish a principle which would trench deeply on the rights of the Senate. I have already shown that where the action of the Senate commences there also its right to determine how and when it shall act also commences. I have also shown that the action of the Senate necessarily begins on the presentation of a petition; that the petition is then before the body; that the Senate cannot proceed to other business without making some disposition of it; and that, by the 24th rule, the first action after presentation is on a question to receive the petition. To extend the right of petition to the question on receiving is to expunge this rule—to abolish this unquestionable right of the Senate, and that for the benefit, in this case, of the abolitionists. Their gain would be at the loss of this body. I have not expressed myself too strongly. Give the right of petition the extent contended

for; decide that we are bound under the constitution to receive these incendiary petitions, and the very motion before the Senate would be out of order. If the Constitution makes it our duty to receive, we would have no discretion left to reject, as the motion presupposes. Our rules of proceeding must accord with the Constitution.— Thus in the case of revenue bills, which by the Constitution must originate in the other House, it would be out of order to introduce them here, and it has accordingly been so decided. For like reason, if we are bound to receive petitions, the present motion would be out of order; and, if such be your opinion, it is your duty, as the presiding officer, to call me to order, and to arrest all further discussion on the question of reception. Let us now turn our eyes for a moment to the nature of the right which I fear we are about to abandon, with the view to ascertain what must be the consequence if we should surrender it.

Of all the rights belonging to a deliberative body, I know of none more universal, or indispensable to a proper performance of its functions, than the right to determine at its discretion what it shall receive, over what it shall extend its jurisdiction, and to what it shall direct its deliberation and action. It is the first and universal law of all such bodies; and extends not only to petitions, but to reports, bills, and resolutions, varied only in the two latter in the form of the question. It may be compared to the function in the animal economy, with which all living creatures are endowed, of selecting through the instinct of taste what to receive or reject, and on which the preservation of their existence depends. Deprive them of this function, and the poisonous as well as the wholesome would be indifferently received into their system. So with deliberative bodies; deprive them of the essential and primary right to determine at their pleasure what to receive or reject, and they would become the passive receptacle, indifferently, of all that is frivolous, absurd, unconstitutional, immoral, and impious, as well as what may properly demand their deliberation and action. Establish this monstrous, this impious principle (as it would prove to be in practice,) and what must be the consequence? To what would we commit ourselves? If a petition should be presented praying the abolition of the Constitution (which we are all bound by our oaths to protect,) according to this abominable doctrine it must be received. So if it prayed the abolition of the Decalogue, or of the Bible itself, I go farther. If the abolition societies should be converted into a body of Atheists, and should ask the passage of a law denying the existence of the Almighty Being above us, the Creator of all, according to this blasphemous doctrine we would be bound to receive the petition, to take jurisdiction of it. I ask the Senators from Tennessee and Pennsylvania (Mr. Grundy and Mr. Buchanan) would they vote to receive such a petition? I wait not an answer. They would instantly reject it with loathing.— What then becomes of the unlimited, unqualified, and universal obligation to receive petitions, which they so strenuously maintained, and to which they are prepared to sacrifice the constitutional rights of this body?

I shall now descend from these hypothetical cases to the particular question before the Senate. What then must be the consequences of receiving this petition, on the principle that we are bound to receive it, and all similar petitions whenever presented? I have considered this question calmly in all its bearings, and do not hesitate to pronounce that to receive would be to yield to the abolitionists all that the most sanguine could for the present hope, and to abandon all the outworks upon which we of the South rely for our defence against their attacks here.

No one can believe that the fanatics, who have flooded this and the other House with their petitions, entertain the slightest hope that Congress would pass a law at this time to abolish slavery in this District. Infatuated as they are, they must see that public opinion at the North is not yet prepared for so decisive a step, and that seriously to attempt it now would be fatal to their cause. What then do they hope? What but that Congress should take jurisdiction of the subject of abolishing slavery—should throw open to the abolitionists the halls of legislation, and enable them to establish a permanent position within their walls, from which hereafter to carry on their operations against the institutions of the slaveholding States. If we receive this petition, all these advantages will be realized to them to the fullest extent. Permanent jurisdiction would be assumed over the subject of slavery not only in this District, but in the States themselves, whenever the abolitionists might choose to ask Congress, by sending their petitions here, for the abolition of slavery in the States. We would be bound to receive such petitions, and, by receiving, would be fairly pledged to deliberate and decide on them. Having succeeded in this point, a most favorable position would be gained. The centre of operations would be transferred from Nassau Hall to the Halls of Congress. To this common centre the incendiary publications of the abolitionists would

flow, in the form of petitions, to be received and preserved among the public records. Here the subject of abolition would be agitated session after session, and from hence the assaults on the property and institutions of the People of the slaveholding States would be disseminated, in the guise of speeches, over the whole Union.

Such would be the advantages yielded to their gain would be our loss.— What would be yielded to them would be taken from us. Our true position, that which is indispensable to our defence here, is, that Congress has no legitimate jurisdiction over the subject of slavery either here or elsewhere. The reception of this petition surrenders this commanding position; yields the question of jurisdiction, so important to the cause of abolition and so injurious to us; compels us to sit in silence to witness the assaults on our character and institutions, or to engage in an endless contest in their defence. Such a contest is beyond mortal endurance. We must in the end be humbled, degraded, broken down, and worn out.

The Senators from the slaveholding States, who most unfortunately have committed themselves to vote for receiving these incendiary petitions, tell us that whenever the attempt shall be made to abolish slavery, they will join with us to repel it. I doubt not the sincerity of their declaration. We all have a common interest, and they cannot betray ours without betraying at the same time their own. But I announce to them that they are now called on to redeem their pledge.— The attempt is now making. The work is going on daily and hourly. The war is waged, not only in the most dangerous manner, but in the only manner it can be waged. Do they expect that the abolitionists will resort to arms, and commence a crusade to liberate our slaves by force? Is this what they mean when they speak of the attempt to abolish slavery? If so, let me tell our friends of the South who differ from us, that the war which the abolitionists wage against us is of a very different character, and far more effective. It is a war of religious and political fanaticism, mingled on the part of the leaders with ambition and the love of notoriety, and waged not against our lives but our character. The object is to humble and debase us in our own estimation, and that of the world in general; to blast our reputation, while they overthrow our domestic institutions. This is the mode in which they are attempting abolition, with such ample means and untiring industry; and now is the time for all who are opposed to them to meet the attack. How can it be successfully met? This is the important question. There is but one way; we must meet the enemy on the frontier, on the question of receiving; we must secure that important pass—it is our Thermopylae. The power of resistance by a universal law of nature, is on the exterior. Break through the shell, penetrate the crust, and there is no resistance within. In the present contest, the question on receiving constitutes our frontier. It is the first, the exterior question, that covers and protects all the others. Let it be penetrated by receiving this petition, and not a point of resistance can be found within, as far as this Government is concerned. If we cannot maintain ourselves there, we cannot on any interior position. Of all the questions that can be raised, there is not one on which we can rally on ground more tenable for ourselves, or more untenable for our opponents, not excepting the ultimate question of abolition in the States. For our right to reject this petition is as clear and unquestionable as that Congress has no right to abolish slavery in the States.

Such is the importance of taking our stand immovably on the question now before us. Such are the advantages that we of the South would sacrifice, and the abolitionists would gain, were we to surrender that important position by receiving this petition. What motives have we for making so great a sacrifice? What advantages can we hope to gain that would justify us? We are told of the great advantages of a strong majority. I acknowledge it in a good cause, and on sound principles. I feel in the present instance how much our cause would be strengthened by a strong and decided majority for the rejection of these incendiary petitions. If any thing we could do here could arrest the progress of the abolitionists, it would be such a rejection. But as advantageous as would be a strong majority on sound principles, it is in the same degree dangerous when on the opposite—when it rests on improper concessions, and the surrender of principles, which would be the case at present. Such a majority must in this instance be purchased by concessions to the abolitionists, and a surrender, on our part, that would demolish all our outworks, give up all our strong positions, and open all the passes to the free admission of our enemies. It is only on this condition that we can hope to obtain such a majority—a majority which must be gathered together from all sides, and entertaining every variety of opinion. To rally such a majority, the Senator from Pennsylvania has fallen on the device to re-

ceive this petition, and immediately reject it, without consideration or reflection. To my mind the movement looks like a trick—a mere piece of artifice to juggle and deceive. I intend no disrespect to the Senator.— I doubt not his intention is good, and believe his feelings are with us; but I must say that the course he has intimated is, in my opinion, the worst possible for the slaveholding States. It surrenders all to abolitionists, and gives nothing, in turn, that would be of the least advantage to us. Let the majority for the course he indicates be ever so strong, can the Senator hope that it will make any impression on the abolitionists? Can he even hope to maintain his position of rejecting their petitions without consideration against them? Does he not see that, in assuming jurisdiction by receiving their petitions he gives an implied pledge to inquire, to deliberate, and decide on them? Experience will teach him that we must either refuse to receive, or go through. I entirely concur with the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prentiss) on that point. There is no middle ground that is tenable, and least of all that proposed to be occupied by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and those who act with him. In the mean time, the course he proposes is calculated to lull the People of the slaveholding States into a false security, under the delusive impression which it is calculated to make; that there is more strength here against the abolitionists than really does exist.

But we are told that the right of petition is popular in the North, and that to make an issue, however true, which might bring it in question, would weaken our friends here, and strengthen the abolitionists. I have no doubt of the kind feelings of our brethren from the North on this floor; but I clearly see that while we have their feelings in our favor, their constituents, right or wrong, will have their votes, however we may be affected. But I assure our friends that we would not do any thing, willingly, which would weaken them at home; and, if we could be assured that, by yielding to their wishes the right of receiving petitions, they would be able to arrest, permanently, the progress of the abolitionists, we then might be induced to yield; but nothing short of the certainty of permanent security can induce us to yield an inch. If to maintain our rights must increase the abolitionists, be it so. I would at no period make the least sacrifice of principle for any temporary advantage, and much less at the present. If there must be an issue, now is our time. We never can be more united or better prepared for the struggle; and I, for one, would much rather meet the danger now, than to turn it over to those who are to come after us.

But putting these views aside, it does seem to me, taking a general view of the subject, that the course intimated by the Senator from Pennsylvania is radically wrong and must end in disappointment. The attempt to unite all must, as it usually does, terminate in division and distraction. It will divide the South on the question of receiving, and the North on that of rejection, with a mutual weakening of both. I already see indications of division among Northern gentlemen on this floor, even in this stage of the question. A division among them would give a great impulse to the cause of abolition. Whatever position the parties may take, in the event of such division, one or the other would be considered more or less favorable to the abolition cause, which could not fail to run into the political struggles of the two great parties of the North. With these views, I hold that the only possible hope of arresting the progress of the abolitionists in that quarter is to keep the two great parties here united against them, which would be impossible if they divide here. The course intimated by the Senator from Pennsylvania will effect a division here, and instead of uniting the North, and thereby arresting the progress of the abolitionists, as he anticipates, will end in division and distraction, and in giving thereby a more powerful impulse to their cause. I must say before I close my remarks in this connection, that the members from the North, it seems to me, are not duly sensible of the deep interest which they have in this question, not only affecting the Union, but as it relates immediately and directly to their particular section. As great as may be our interests, theirs is not less. If the tide continues to roll on its turbid waves of folly and fanaticism, it must in the end prostrate in the North all institutions that uphold their peace and prosperity, and ultimately overwhelm all that is eminent, morally and intellectually.

I have now concluded what I intended to say on the question immediately before the Senate. If I have spoken earnestly, it is because I feel the subject to be one of the deepest interest. We are about to take the first step; that must control all our subsequent movements. If it should be such as I fear it will, if we receive this petition, and thereby establish the principle that we are obliged to receive all such petitions, if we shall determine to take permanent jurisdiction over the subject of abolition, whenever and in whatever manner the abolitionists may ask, either here or in the States, I fear that the consequences will be ultimately disastrous. Such a course would destroy the confidence of the People of the slaveholding States in this Government. We love & cherish the Union; we remember with the kindest feelings our common origin, with pride our common achievements, and fondly anticipate the common greatness and glory that seem to await us; but origin, achievements and anticipation of coming greatness are to us as nothing, compared to this question. It is to us a vital question. It involves not only our liberty, but, what is greater (if to free men anything can be,) existence itself. The relation which now exists between the two races in the slaveholding States has existed for two centuries. It has grown with our growth, and strengthened with our strength. It has entered into and modified all our institutions, civil and political. None other can be substituted. We will not, cannot permit it to be destroyed, if we were base enough to do so, we would be traitors to our section, to ourselves, our families, and to posterity. It is our anxious desire, to protect

and preserve this relation by the joint action of the Government and the confederated States of the Union; but if, instead of closing the door—if, instead of denying all jurisdiction and all interference in this question, the doors of Congress are to be thrown open; and if we are to be exposed here, in the heart of the Union, to an endless attack on our rights, our character, and our institutions; if the other States are to stand and look on without attempting to suppress these attacks, originating within their borders; and, finally, if this is to be our fixed and permanent condition as members of this Confederacy, we will then be compelled to turn our eyes on ourselves. Come what will, should it cost every drop of blood, and every cent of property, we would stand just fixed by all laws, human and divine.

If I feel alarm, it is not for ourselves, but for the Union, and the institutions of the country, to which I have ever been devotedly attached, however exultantly and slandered. Few have made greater sacrifices to maintain them, and none is more anxious to perpetuate them to the latest generations; but they can and ought to be perpetuated only on the condition that they fulfil the great objects for which they were created—the liberty and protection of these States.

As for ourselves, I feel no apprehension. I know to the fullest extent the magnitude of the danger that surrounds us. I am not disposed to underestimate it. My colleague has painted it truly. But, as great as is the danger, we have nothing to fear if true to ourselves. We have many and great resources: a numerous, intelligent, and brave population; great and valuable staples; ample facilities of communication; feeling and interest, and an entire exemption from those dangers originating in a conflict between labour and capital, which afflict constitutional Governments. To these may be added that we would act under an imperative necessity. There would be to us but one alternative—to triumph or perish as a people. We would stand alone, compelled to defend life, character and institutions. A necessity so stern and imperious would develop to the full all the great qualities of our nature, mental and moral, requisite for defence—intelligence, fortitude, courage, and patriotism; and these, with our ample means, and our admirable materials for the construction of durable free States, would insure security, liberty, and renown.

With these impressions, I ask neither sympathy nor compassion for the slaveholding States. We can take care of ourselves. It is not we, but the Union which is in danger. It is that which demands our care—demands that the agitation of this question shall cease here—that you shall refuse to receive these petitions—and decline all jurisdiction over the subject of abolition, in every form and shape. It is only on these terms that the Union can be safe. We cannot remain here in an endless struggle in defence of our character, our property, and institutions.

I shall now, in conclusion, make a few remarks as to the course I shall feel myself compelled to pursue, should the Senate, by receiving this petition, determine to entertain jurisdiction over the question of abolition. Thinking as I do, I can perform no act that would countenance so dangerous an assumption; and as a participation in the subsequent proceedings on this petition, should it unfortunately be received, might be so construed, in that event I shall feel myself constrained to decline such participation, and to leave the responsibility wholly on those who may assume it.

and preserve this relation by the joint action of the Government and the confederated States of the Union; but if, instead of closing the door—if, instead of denying all jurisdiction and all interference in this question, the doors of Congress are to be thrown open; and if we are to be exposed here, in the heart of the Union, to an endless attack on our rights, our character, and our institutions; if the other States are to stand and look on without attempting to suppress these attacks, originating within their borders; and, finally, if this is to be our fixed and permanent condition as members of this Confederacy, we will then be compelled to turn our eyes on ourselves. Come what will, should it cost every drop of blood, and every cent of property, we would stand just fixed by all laws, human and divine.

If I feel alarm, it is not for ourselves, but for the Union, and the institutions of the country, to which I have ever been devotedly attached, however exultantly and slandered. Few have made greater sacrifices to maintain them, and none is more anxious to perpetuate them to the latest generations; but they can and ought to be perpetuated only on the condition that they fulfil the great objects for which they were created—the liberty and protection of these States.

As for ourselves, I feel no apprehension. I know to the fullest extent the magnitude of the danger that surrounds us. I am not disposed to underestimate it. My colleague has painted it truly. But, as great as is the danger, we have nothing to fear if true to ourselves. We have many and great resources: a numerous, intelligent, and brave population; great and valuable staples; ample facilities of communication; feeling and interest, and an entire exemption from those dangers originating in a conflict between labour and capital, which afflict constitutional Governments. To these may be added that we would act under an imperative necessity. There would be to us but one alternative—to triumph or perish as a people. We would stand alone, compelled to defend life, character and institutions. A necessity so stern and imperious would develop to the full all the great qualities of our nature, mental and moral, requisite for defence—intelligence, fortitude, courage, and patriotism; and these, with our ample means, and our admirable materials for the construction of durable free States, would insure security, liberty, and renown.

With these impressions, I ask neither sympathy nor compassion for the slaveholding States. We can take care of ourselves. It is not we, but the Union which is in danger. It is that which demands our care—demands that the agitation of this question shall cease here—that you shall refuse to receive these petitions—and decline all jurisdiction over the subject of abolition, in every form and shape. It is only on these terms that the Union can be safe. We cannot remain here in an endless struggle in defence of our character, our property, and institutions.

I shall now, in conclusion, make a few remarks as to the course I shall feel myself compelled to pursue, should the Senate, by receiving this petition, determine to entertain jurisdiction over the question of abolition. Thinking as I do, I can perform no act that would countenance so dangerous an assumption; and as a participation in the subsequent proceedings on this petition, should it unfortunately be received, might be so construed, in that event I shall feel myself constrained to decline such participation, and to leave the responsibility wholly on those who may assume it.

and preserve this relation by the joint action of the Government and the confederated States of the Union; but if, instead of closing the door—if, instead of denying all jurisdiction and all interference in this question, the doors of Congress are to be thrown open; and if we are to be exposed here, in the heart of the Union, to an endless attack on our rights, our character, and our institutions; if the other States are to stand and look on without attempting to suppress these attacks, originating within their borders; and, finally, if this is to be our fixed and permanent condition as members of this Confederacy, we will then be compelled to turn our eyes on ourselves. Come what will, should it cost every drop of blood, and every cent of property, we would stand just fixed by all laws, human and divine.

If I feel alarm, it is not for ourselves, but for the Union, and the institutions of the country, to which I have ever been devotedly attached, however exultantly and slandered. Few have made greater sacrifices to maintain them, and none is more anxious to perpetuate them to the latest generations; but they can and ought to be perpetuated only on the condition that they fulfil the great objects for which they were created—the liberty and protection of these States.

As for ourselves, I feel no apprehension. I know to the fullest extent the magnitude of the danger that surrounds us. I am not disposed to underestimate it. My colleague has painted it truly. But, as great as is the danger, we have nothing to fear if true to ourselves. We have many and great resources: a numerous, intelligent, and brave population; great and valuable staples; ample facilities of communication; feeling and interest, and an entire exemption from those dangers originating in a conflict between labour and capital, which afflict constitutional Governments. To these may be added that we would act under an imperative necessity. There would be to us but one alternative—to triumph or perish as a people. We would stand alone, compelled to defend life, character and institutions. A necessity so stern and imperious would develop to the full all the great qualities of our nature, mental and moral, requisite for defence—intelligence, fortitude, courage, and patriotism; and these, with our ample means, and our admirable materials for the construction of durable free States, would insure security, liberty, and renown.

With these impressions, I ask neither sympathy nor compassion for the slaveholding States. We can take care of ourselves. It is not we, but the Union which is in danger. It is that which demands our care—demands that the agitation of this question shall cease here—that you shall refuse to receive these petitions—and decline all jurisdiction over the subject of abolition, in every form and shape. It is only on these terms that the Union can be safe. We cannot remain here in an endless struggle in defence of our character, our property, and institutions.

I shall now, in conclusion, make a few remarks as to the course I shall feel myself compelled to pursue, should the Senate, by receiving this petition, determine to entertain jurisdiction over the question of abolition. Thinking as I do, I can perform no act that would countenance so dangerous an assumption; and as a participation in the subsequent proceedings on this petition, should it unfortunately be received, might be so construed, in that event I shall feel myself constrained to decline such participation, and to leave the responsibility wholly on those who may assume it.

**Twenty-Fourth Congress.**

**Wednesday, March 20.**  
The Senate was occupied chiefly in discussing the bill to admit Michigan as a State into the Union.

In the House of Representatives Mr. Dromgole, from the select Committee on whom that part of the President's message in relation to the election of President and Vice President devolving upon Congress and fixing the duration of the Presidential term, &c was referred, made a report, accompanied by a Joint Resolution, in conformity to the President's recommendation, which were read and ordered to be printed.

**Thursday, March 31.**  
On leave, introduced a bill to reduce and graduate the price of the public lands to actual settlers only; upon which a discussion took place, which lasted until 3 o'clock.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. Hawkins, from the Committee on elections, reported a resolution directing the Clerk of the House to pay to David Newland, Esq. the same sum for per diem and mileage, as is allowed to members of Congress, to be computed from the day of presenting his petition to the House, commencing the election of James Graham, Esq. to the 29th inst. inclusive. The resolution was adopted 124 to 34.

**Friday, April 1.**  
In the Senate, the sitting was principally consumed in debate on the question of admitting Michigan into the Union.

In the House, nothing of importance was transacted.

**Saturday, April 2.**  
In the Senate, the bill to establish the northern boundary of Ohio, and to provide for the admission of the State of Michigan into the United States, was read a third time, passed, and sent to the other House.

Nothing important was transacted in the House.

**Monday, April 3.**  
In the Senate, the bill for the admission of the State of Arkansas being read a third time, passed, and sent to the other House.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. Wise, moved to suspend the rules to enable him to offer the following resolution, which was refused 90 to 84.

Resolved, That a select committee be appointed, with power to send for persons and papers, to inquire into the agency or mode of selecting the banks of deposit for the public money, and into the contracts with the Treasury Department, by which they are regulated, and into the manner in which, and the persons by whom, such contracts are made; and to inquire whether any, and, if any, what connection or relation, official or unofficial, exists or has existed between a certain Reuben M. Whitney and the Treasury Department of the United States, or between him and the banks of deposit of the public money, and into the extent of his agency generally, in keeping and controlling the public money, and into the amount of his compensation, whether the same be paid out of the public Treasury or by the deposit banks; and that said committee have leave to report by bill or otherwise.

**Tuesday, April 4.**  
The Senate proceeded to consider the expunging resolution offered by Mr. Benton. Mr. Leigh resumed his observations. After Mr. Leigh concluded his speech on motion of Mr. Benton, the resolution was laid on table, and ordered to be printed.

In the House of Representatives, Mr. Wise asked leave to offer the resolution presented by him yesterday. Objections having been made, he moved to suspend the rules; which was again refused 91 to 89.