

# THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOLUME IX.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O'MEARA GOODRICH.

NO. 1000

TOWANDA:

Wednesday Morning, August 23, 1838.

## SPEECH OF HON. D. WILMOT, ON THE Restriction of Slavery in the New Territories.

Delivered in the House of Reps., Aug. 3, 1838.

Mr. Chairman: I shall avail myself of the present opportunity to discuss the great issue now before the country—first presented by an amendment, which, some five years since, I had the honor to offer for the consideration of this House. That amendment asserted no new principle. I was but the copyist of Jefferson, in the reaffirmance of a principle consistent with the uniform and settled policy of this Government—in harmony with the whole history of its legislation. Neither was the subject improperly introduced into our national deliberations. There was no design in its introduction, beyond what appeared on its face. It arose necessarily out of the circumstances in which we were placed. We were engaged in a war with Mexico. The policy of the Administration to acquire vast territories as an indemnity for past injuries, and for the expenses of the war, had been frankly made known to the country and the world. Congress was called upon by the Executive to appropriate money, not for the prosecution of the war, but, confessedly, as a means to further this policy of acquisition. In my judgment, then, as now, there was no more fitting occasion upon which to declare the future policy of this Government, in respect to the territory to be acquired, than the one offered by the bill to which the "Proviso" was originally attached. Such I believe, at the time, was the judgment of Congress and of the country. The amendment was carried by a large majority in this House, and would, I doubt not, have received the prompt sanction of the Senate, had time been afforded that body to act upon it, then in the last hour of its session. It is unfortunate for the country and for the great interests at stake, that the Senate had not then been permitted to come to a vote. The question would have been settled quietly, and without agitation. No controversy of a sectional character would have grown up, engendering unfriendly feelings between the People and States of this Confederacy. The South, I am persuaded, would have cheerfully acquiesced, at that day, in a policy so just, and in the establishment of which Southern statesmen had borne a leading and honorable part.

The failure of prompt action on the part of the Senate threw the question into the arena of party politics. It was caught up by politicians, and used as an element to combine the power of the South, and enable that section of the Union to reward, with the honors of a Presidential nomination, him who should prove himself the most pliant instrument of the Slave Power. Through the press, in their Legislative Assemblies, in State and county Conventions, and in the primary meetings of the people, the voice of the united South was heard in resolve, declaring that she would support no man for the Presidency, who did not openly repudiate the doctrine of preserving freedom in free territory. The Presidency, in fact, was held up to the highest Northern bidder, and the humiliating spectacle presented to the world, of an ignominious rivalry between the leading men of the North, in a race of subservience to Southern demands. Those who should have led in the inculcation of a sound and virtuous public sentiment, who should have been the champions of the rights of free labor, the standard-bearers in the struggle of Freedom, were first and foremost yielding to the mandates of the Slave Power. I speak as I believe, truth demands, and as the iron pen of history will make up the record of the times. A great question, affecting the honor and character of the Republic, vital to the interests of the white laboring man has been jeopardized and endangered, in a selfish scramble for office.

A new creed was set up, a new platform and test of party fidelity erected. Denunciation and proscription followed all who would not bow down to the shrine of Slavery Propagandism. Northern men, who dared to vindicate the rights of free labor, to speak and vote in favor of the white man and his children, were proscribed by an Administration that avowed its existence to the sacrifices and noble efforts of the Democracy of the North. Its organ here was pleased to proclaim that the advocates of freedom would find no favor with those who, but for their support, would have slumbered on in the shades of retirement. The patronage of the Government, and the money of the People, were employed to prostrate the cause of Freedom, and to overwhelm and crush its advocates. A press, largely dependent upon patronage for support, was actively engaged in misrepresenting the true nature of the great issue involved, and in denouncing those who in the face of power, and in defiance of the mandates, remained true to principle, and to their solemn convictions of duty.

Such were the influences, and such the means employed, to break the ranks of the Northern Democracy, and to raise upon free soil, advocates for the propagation and extension of human slavery. It is time that the white laboring man should know that the Government which he supports by his labor, and defends by his strong arm, is against him in this struggle for his rights. It is time he should understand the influences that pervade this Capitol, and which exert so powerful a control over the legislation of the country. The efforts of their friends will be unavailing so long as the patronage of the Government is wielded against them.

Mr. Chairman: This is a day of changes, and of new theories, in the political world. Novel and most extraordinary doctrines have recently been put forth by the advocates of slave extension. Our rights to legislate for territory has been gravely

questioned—our sovereignty over it denied. I have examined, with some care, the history of our legislation in respect to Territories; and I affirm, without the fear of contradiction, that from the first year of the organization of this Government, down to the present session of Congress, our sovereignty over them has been continually exercised in the most perfect and plenary manner. That we have extended over them our sole and exclusive jurisdiction and authority, in all respects, and in all things appertaining to their government and laws.

Territories possess no inherent political sovereignty. Sovereignty appertains to organized States. It is that power which prescribes laws, and to which the citizen is required to yield obedience. This power no more resides in a Territory than it does in a county or a township. As well might the inhabitants of the latter claim the right to make laws, and regulate their own affairs, as that the people of a Territory should assume to themselves such high prerogatives and powers. Such a doctrine is unknown to the legislation of this country. During the whole period of our national existence, not an example can be found in which a Territory has been permitted to exercise a single act of independent political sovereignty. This doctrine is of recent origin—a new invention. It originated in the necessities of the occasion, as a cover behind which to take shelter, and avoid the responsibility of meeting directly the great question of the extension of slavery in territories now free. It is not the doctrine of the Constitution. It is unsupported by authority, and wholly at variance with the teachings of those who have gone before us.

Commencing with the celebrated Ordinance of 1787, down to the organization of a Territorial Government for Iowa in 1838, this Government has exercised full and exclusive sovereignty over its Territories. This long record of sixty years furnishes no precedent to justify this doctrine of Territorial sovereignty. We have invariably prescribed the fundamental law, and laid down the great landmarks, within which every Territorial Government should move. We have regulated the descent of lands, and the distribution of the property of intestates; the mode in which estates should be conveyed and devised. We have prescribed qualifications for the exercise of the right of suffrage, and for eligibility to office; fixed the ratio of representation, established courts, defined their powers and jurisdiction, and directed the manner of the selection of jurors. We have provided for the appointment and election of executive, judicial, legislative and military officers, prescribing their qualifications, duties, and terms of office. We have guaranteed the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and the right of trial by jury. Such are some of the usual and ordinary provisions, most, if not all of which, are to be found in every act organizing a Territorial Government.

What other or stronger evidence could be adduced, or required, to establish the general and exclusive sovereignty of this government over its Territories? Why were not all these matters of local concern left to the People? Why not permit them to say who should vote, and who not? Who will be eligible to office, and who not? These powers are among the highest prerogatives of sovereignty, and have been asserted from time to time, by almost every Congress since the adoption of the Constitution. The novel and extraordinary doctrine has been promulgated from high quarters, that we have no power over our Territories, beyond the making of "useful rules and regulations" for the disposition of the public domain. All beyond this, it is claimed, rightfully belongs to the people themselves. Notwithstanding this doctrine was shamefully abandoned by the friends of its distinguished advocate, in the Territorial bill recently laid upon your table, I shall briefly examine its claims to respect and support. It denies the right of Congress to establish a Territorial Government. It makes our territory essentially foreign, and independent of our control. The people, in the exercise of their inherent sovereignty, might refuse to associate with us as a confederated State. They would have the right to establish an independent empire. This Government having no right except those of a proprietary, they would of course terminate with the disposition of the soil. The territory from that day henceforth would be as independent of us as is the Republic of France. We have had many among us, of late, favorable to the acquisition of the whole of Mexico. The annexation of Cuba, is also, I doubt not, a favorite project with some. Further acquisitions would not be profitable, if this new doctrine of the sovereignty of the Territories should become firmly established. Cuba and the remaining part of Mexico are densely populated. The lands are all appropriated, and in the hands of private owners. Should we expend a thousand millions in the conquest or purchase of those countries, we would acquire no public domain, and therefore nothing at all, if this property argument be good. No sooner would the treaty be ratified and exchanged, than we should instantly become divested of all the benefits of our purchase or conquest. The people, in virtue of their inherent sovereignty, could recall their old rulers, and establish their old Government. Why not? What rightful power would we possess to interfere and prevent such a result. If we have no right, in or power over Territories, except such as result from the ownership of the soil, it is very clear, that if we owned none of the soil, we would possess no rights whatever. To this absurdity do we necessarily come, by such a construction of the Constitution. That clause which gives to Congress power "to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property of the United States," has received, and must continue to receive, a broader and more common-sense construction.

All the Constitution were silent upon this subject, still the question would be free from difficulty or doubt. With what show of reason and fair argument can it be maintained, that we may acquire vast possessions, at an expense of millions of treasure, and the best blood of our citizens, and yet have no power to govern it when acquired? No power

to impose our laws upon its people, or to give character to its institutions! Such doctrines cannot be defended. They are the resort of those who fear to meet this question, lest it disturb the harmony of party organization, and endanger the success of party leaders. It is a question above party; it is one of honor, of character, of humanity, of the rights of free labor.

Mr. Chairman: The general jurisdiction and sovereignty of this Government over its Territories being established by the whole history of our legislation, what is there in the Constitution, or in the practice under it, that justifies this claim of special exemption, on behalf of slavery? Will any man tell me why it is, that we may regulate the questions of suffrage and eligibility to office in a Territory, and not the question of slavery? Is slavery of higher regard than these? May this Government regulate and control within its Territories, every other interest and every other right, except that of slavery alone? Does slavery dictate its own laws and define its own limits? Is there no power to stop its progress—to stay its advances—to arrest the course and desolation of its march? Congress has no power to bind the States by enactments such as are contained in every Territorial bill, and if its power over territory be circumscribed by the same constitutional restraints that are applicable to States, then is any bill you may pass a usurpation and a nullity; then has this Government been in error, from the day of its foundation down to the present hour. States and Territories are widely different in their character, and in respect to the power of this Government over them. The former are organized, independent powers, sovereign in all things, save in those restrictions and grants contained within the Constitution. The latter are unorganized, dependent communities, destitute of sovereignty, looking to us for political existence, and in time for an admission into this sisterhood of States.

It has become habitual with many, when speaking upon this subject, to talk about the guarantees of the Constitution in a manner that seems to imply the existence of some solemn covenant, placing slavery upon a different footing from that upon which rests all the other laws and institutions of the States. The Constitution no more guarantees the Slavery of Virginia, than it does the banking system of Pennsylvania, or the common school system of New York. These are subjects without the sphere of the Constitution, and, in respect to the States, beyond Federal interference and control. They belong to the powers reserved to the States. No powers are reserved to the Territories. The Constitution recognizes the existence of certain persons, not freemen, but nowhere guarantees the continuance of slavery—much less does it provide for its indefinite extension.

No one will deny but that the banking system within the States is as far removed from the control of the General Government as is the institution of slavery. The laws of Pennsylvania which authorize banking are as sacred from Federal interference as are the laws of Virginia which authorize the holding of slaves. Congress can no more interfere with the former than it can with the latter. Both rest upon State authority, and both are alike beyond the control of this Government. Yet Congress may annul a bank charter, and prohibit the whole system of banking, in a Territory. The Territorial Legislature of Florida having incorporated several banks, and insurance companies with banking privileges, Congress, by act of July 14, 1836, declared the same repealed and annulled, together with all other acts and parts of acts, passed by the said Territorial Legislature of Florida in the year 1836, creating banks, or extending banking corporations, or corporations with banking powers, or conferring banking powers on any corporation or institutions whatever.

Was this an act of usurpation and tyranny over the good people of Florida? Or did it fall within the exercise of the rightful power of this Government? If the latter, as I am bound to believe, then why with equal right may not Congress prohibit the introduction of slavery into Territories in which it does not exist? Slavery and banking depend upon the same authority for support—the authority of State laws. They are both equally secure from Federal interference within the States and alike subject to our control within the Territories.

We are not left, in the investigation of this subject, to argument drawn from analogy alone. We have precedents for our guide—the authority of the founders of the Republic, for our instruction. Our fathers had this same question in hand; and in its settlement, as in all things, gave us an example worthy of imitation. Immediately upon the close of our Revolutionary struggle, the wise and good men of that day turned their attention to the condition of the country, and began to digest plans to promote its prosperity and growth. Among the objects of paramount interest that first engaged their attention, was the then almost trackless wilderness of the Northwest. The territory lying northwest of the Ohio river embraced the entire national domain. It was the great heritage of our people—the field in which our empire was to grow and expand. It was the common property of the North and the South, secured by the joint efforts and common sacrifices of both, in the same great struggle for National Independence. Looking out upon this fertile field of human enterprise and labor, they discovered the germ of an evil, which, if permitted to grow, would blight its fertility, and paralyze the energies of its people. It was Slavery just starting into life. They strangled the monster.

As early as 1784, Thomas Jefferson, the great apostle of our faith, introduced into the Congress of the Confederation a proposition, having reference to the States to be formed out of this Territory of the Northwest. It was in these words:

Resolved, That, after the year eighteen hundred of the Christian era there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted to have been personally guilty.

This, sir, looks very much like the "Proviso." Here is the original "Archard"—the heresy, for

holding on to which men are now proscribed by the Government of their country. Mr. Jefferson, had he lived at this day, would have been denounced as an Abolitionist, and a disturber of the peace of the Union.

This resolution did not pass at the time; but, in 1787, three years later, the work was consummated, and the great Ordinance of Freedom firmly established. The sixth article contains substantially the resolution of Mr. Jefferson. It provides as follows:

"There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in said Territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

This Ordinance was passed by the unanimous vote of the slaveholding States. It clearly establishes the policy marked out by the men who laid the foundations of our free institutions. They looked upon Slavery in its true light—as an evil of the first magnitude—a curse upon men and nations—it had been inflicted upon us by the cupidity of the mother country, and in the face of the earnest remonstrances of the people of that day. For its existence among us, we were in no respect responsible. It was in view of these circumstances that our fathers adopted the wise policy of leaving to the several States in which it existed entire control over the subject within their respective limits, and, at the same time, of providing securities against its spread over the unoccupied territories of the nation. Who is it, sir, that now demands a departure from this wise and safe policy? Who are responsible for all the consequences that may follow the agitation of this subject? I answer, the responsibility is with those who seek to overturn the settled policy of this Government—who demand, that the territory of the nation, heretofore closed up against the approaches of Slavery, shall now be opened to its desolating march. To this requirement we can never yield. Let the South adhere to the policy which, in 1787, she aided to establish, and which has been preserved uniform and unbroken from that day to the present. We can consent to no change. We will sanction no departure from this wise policy. We will not aid by our votes, or countenance by our silence, the propagation of Slavery over the free soil of this Continent.

The first Congress that assembled after the adoption of the Constitution, on the 7th of August, 1789, passed an act confirming the Ordinance of 1787, and giving to it full force and validity. The purposes of this act clearly appear from the preamble, which is in these words:

Whereas, in order that the Ordinance of the United States, in Congress assembled, for the government of the Territory, northwest of the Ohio, may continue to have full force and effect, it is required that certain provisions should be made to adapt the same to the present Constitution of the United States—Be it enacted, &c.

This act received the constitutional approval of Washington. Many of those who participated in its enactment had been members of the Convention that framed the Constitution, and, therefore, may be supposed to have understood its true intent and meaning.

On the 7th of May, 1800, an act was passed for the organization of a Territorial Government for Indiana, and Slavery expressly prohibited therein. This act was approved by John Adams.

January 11th, 1805, the northern part of Indiana was erected into the Territory of Michigan, and Slavery prohibited. February 2d, 1809, the Territory of Illinois was established, with the like prohibition as to Slavery. These two latter acts received the approval and signature of Thomas Jefferson.

On the 20th of April, 1836, Wisconsin was organized as a Territory, and Slavery prohibited within its limits. This act was approved by General Jackson.

The Territory of Iowa was established by act of Congress of the 12th of June, 1838, under the administration of Mr. Van Buren; and here, also, was Slavery prohibited.

Here are a series of enactments, commencing with the Ordinance of 1787, which was confirmed by Congress, in 1789, under the administration of Washington, down through the administrations of Adams, Jefferson, Jackson and Van Buren, to the year 1838, when the last Territorial Government was organized, covering a period of more than half a century, in which this policy of restricting the spread of Slavery was steadily pursued and enforced. The constitutionality of these enactments was not controverted at the time, nor has it ever since been called in question.

Not content with providing that slavery should never exist in any Territory which was free from it at the time of its organization, Congress has from time to time regulated and restricted it in those Territories where it had an actual existence.

By the 7th section of the act organizing a Territorial Government for Mississippi, passed in 1798, the importation of slaves into said Territory from any place without the United States was prohibited, under severe penalties. This was ten years before Congress had the power, under the Constitution, to prohibit the importation of slaves into the States.

By act of the 26th of March, 1804, that part of Louisiana south of the Territory of Mississippi was organized into a Territorial Government, by the name of Orleans. By this act, the importation into said Territory of slaves from abroad, was prohibited, and also the importation of any slaves from within the United States who should have been brought into the country since the 1st of May, 1798, or who should thereafter be brought into the United States. It further provided that no slave should be brought into said Territory, except by a citizen of the United States, who should remove there for actual settlement, and who should at the time be the bona fide owner of such slave; thus directly interfering the domestic as well as the foreign slave trade in the Territory of Orleans. This act was approved by Jefferson.

On the 6th of March, 1820, an act was passed to authorize the people of Missouri to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal foot-

ing with the original States, and to prohibit slavery in certain Territories.

By the 8th section of that act it was provided, "that in all that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, slavery and involuntary servitude otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and the same is hereby forever prohibited."

This act, as also the Ordinance of 1787, actually abolished slavery—a thing we do not now propose to do. Slavery existed in parts of the Northwest Territory, and in Louisiana the law of slavery at the time of the cession from France covered the entire territory, from the Gulf of Mexico to the parallel of the forty-ninth degree of north latitude, and west to the Rocky Mountains. The Missouri compromise was in harmony with the settled policy of our Government. It restricted and narrowed the limits of slavery. The arrangement that should extend its limits and enlarge its boundaries would possess none of the features or characteristics of the Missouri compromise. This project however has for the present been abandoned. It sought its object by means too direct and too easily understood. The masses of the free States had condemned it in advance. It was well ascertained that it could not pass this House, and hence the Extensionists were driven to new shifts and devices. A sectional consultation or caucus, as I am informed, was held on the evening preceding the day on which the Select Committee of Eight was moved in the Senate. The known opinions of a majority of that committee— their open opposition to the policy of engrafting the great feature of the Ordinance of 1787 upon the recently acquired Territories, made it certain, from the first, that the interests of slavery would govern their counsels.

Sir, regard this new baiting—this "chick, born in dog days"—over whose sudden death Mr. Ritchie seems the principal, if not the only mourner, as a fraud, both upon the people of the North and of the South. It had no stamp of manliness about it, but was a studied effort to evade and dodge the question. Why not meet this subject as men, and settle it upon a basis that all shall understand? This new scheme, so happily defeated, settled nothing. Certain it is, that no party or the other would have been grossly deceived. Has it passed, the fallacious hope would have been held out to the North that slavery was excluded, while at the South it would have been understood that the whole country was open to that institution. The speech of the honorable Chairman of the Committee of Eight (Mr. Clayton) upon the introduction of the bill to the Senate, is as extraordinary as are all the other circumstances connected with its history. After stating the nature of the Government provided for California and New Mexico, he goes on to say:

"Thus placing that question [slavery] beyond the power of the Territorial Legislature, and resting the right to introduce or prohibit slavery in those two Territories on the Constitution, as the same shall be expounded by the Judges, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. It was thought, by this means, that Congress would avoid the decision of this distracting question, leaving it to be settled by the silent operation of the Constitution itself; and that in case Congress should refuse to touch the subject, the country would be free to settle itself, by the law of nature, slave labor was effective, and free labor could not maintain itself. On the other hand, in case Congress should hereafter choose to adopt the compromise of 36 deg. 30 min., or any other rule of settlement, it will be free to act as to its wisdom and patriotism shall seem fit."

Such sir, in part, the statement of the character of this new "compromise," as given by the chairman who reported it to the Senate. Truly it was a most clear and satisfactory settlement of this "distracting question." As a purely legal question, it was to be finally put to rest by the adjudication of our highest law tribunal. Then came in the law of nature—and climate, soil, and the adaptation of the country to slave labor, and, lastly, the whole subject was left open and unsettled for the subsequent action of Congress. Was it not sir, an admirable and ingenious "compromise"? It settled the question, and yet left it open. The Supreme Court was to decide whether slavery could or could not legally exist in these Territories, and yet the slaveholder was allowed to appropriate such parts to himself as he deemed adapted to slave labor. Such a scheme was unworthy of support from any quarter. We can submit to be voted down, although it is hard when the blow comes from Northern men; but we cannot consent to be cheated. We want no paltering upon this subject. When it is settled, we wish to know how and upon what terms the settlement is made. If free soil is to be surrendered, we wish to know the extent of the surrender—the limits where slavery is to cease its aggressions.

I am fully satisfied, in my own mind, that this ingenious device, not of settlement, but to avoid a settlement, give up the entire Territories of California and New Mexico to slavery. There was nothing in the bill to obstruct the slaveholder in his declared purpose to overrun these countries with his slaves. Congress imposed no restraint; and the people themselves, however much opposed to slavery, were expressly prohibited from raising their voice against it. The idea of a judicial decision that should be effectual for the protection of those distant Territories was shamefully deceptive. I am fully satisfied that no case would ever have been brought before the Supreme Court; and if one had been, before a decision was obtained, slavery would have fixed itself so firmly upon the soil, that its removal would have been impossible. Slavery never yet went into a country under the authority of previous law. The law of slavery is the law of violence and aggression. How came slavery in Texas? It found its way there in violation of law,

just as it will find its way to the Pacific, unless the power of the Government is interposed to prevent it. This is a great public and political question. Its settlement belongs to the People, and not to the Courts. The Supreme Court have already decided that we have authority over the subject; let us do our duty, and not seek to shuffle off the responsibility upon others. We know whether slavery ought or ought not to overrun these Territories, and let us declare directly either that it may or that it may not.

Extend slavery to the Pacific Ocean and it holds the ultimate subjugation of the whole southern half of this continent to its dominion. It erects a barrier over which free emigration cannot pass. It effectually cuts off the free States from all continuity with Mexico, and secures to slavery an easy and certain advance to the South. Such a compromise would be the certain triumph of Slavery, and the last struggle of Freedom. It would give to the slave interests an ascendancy in this Republic for all coming time. There is one way, and but one, in which this controversy should be settled. Do right. Leave the soil of Freedom alone. We make no encroachments upon slavery—we will submit to none. Let the boundaries of Slavery and Freedom stand as they are. This is the compromise we offer—it is just and fair, and all that should be required at our hands. Protection to the institutions of the South against foreign invasion or domestic violence, is a duty enjoined alike by the Constitution and the fraternal ties that bind us together as one people. Slavery within the States, as all other State institutions, we held sacred from Federal interference; but the soil of Freedom must not be invaded, neither by violence nor by stealth—by the direct action of this Government, nor by its stiffened and silent acquiescence. Slavery has its abiding place, and Freedom its home. Let the limits of each be sacredly observed. Here is the true compromise: upon it we can stand in security and peace. Beyond, there is no rest, no place of safety.

The experience of the last few years is full of instruction. We have seen the Southern boundary of the Republic extend as if no obstacle impeded our advance; while on the north, it stands like a wall of adamant. Our Northern boundary never moves except to recede. Within three years we have added to our possessions on the South a Territory of the extent of nearly half of Europe, and surrendered on the North a vast country, to which it was said our titles were "clear and unquestionable." Such are the fruits of Southern policy. In 1844, Oregon and Texas were twin measures—they went hand in hand. Texas was secured, and Oregon abandoned; and the moiety that remained to us must be denied the protection of our Government and laws, until we consent to extend slavery over New Mexico and California. When a measure is proposed for the enlargement of the South—for widening, deepening, and strengthening the institution of slavery—then the patriotism of the whole country is invoked—then we are one people, and the Democracy one great party. But let Northern men talk of the integrity of free soil, of the interests and rights of free labor, and a Government press assails and denounces them as Abolitionists and demagogues, who seek to create sectional divisions, and to organize parties on "geographical lines." Then there is no Democracy but that which adopts Southern opinions, and submits to Southern dictation. We are required to surrender our cherished principles, to do violence to our solemn convictions; and it we refuse to make this sacrifice, we are driven from the councils of the party, and permitted to have no voice in its deliberations. A Northern Democratic statesman, however exalted, and whatever may be his claims upon the confidence and partiality of his political friends, must, qualify himself as a candidate for the Presidency by written pledges to the South—must purge himself of the taint and leprosy of Freedom, and receive the stamp that marks him as the genuine candidate of the slave power. Thus qualified, or stiffened, we may be permitted to vote for him. If we do so, we give the most solemn endorsement to principles we detest: if we withhold our votes, the patronage of a Southern Administration, acting upon a mercenary press, is employed to excite against us the honest laborer, and whose rights and interests we have stood true and faithful. Sir, I will not be forced in a direction contrary to my principles. I know the fearful odds that are against me in this struggle—the overwhelming power of an institution that directs the action of this government, controls its patronage, wields the organization of the Republican party, and tears down and builds up at pleasure. I know the chances are a hundred to one, that I must go down in this unequal contest. Be it so! I had rather sink into the deepest obscurity, with my integrity and reputation unscathed, than purchase distinction at the sacrifice of my self-respect, and the good opinion of all honorable men. But sir, I have faith in the moral power of a good cause. There is another day coming; and, in the language of an able and eloquent statesman of France, "I am willing to place my bark upon the highest promontory, and await the rising of the waters." I cannot believe that the Democracy of the North will ever take upon its broad shoulders the institution of slavery, and carry it over upon lands now free. This is not the mission of the Democratic party, and any attempt to pervert its organization to such objects must end, as it should end, in overwhelming defeat.

Those gallant and true men, who have fought the battle of popular rights against privilege and monopoly all its forms—who aided in crushing the monster bank, and wresting from the grasp of Eastern capital the hard earnings of labor, will never fight the battles of slavery propagandism. They will never become the champions of a money power in the South, more potent and more dangerous than all other enemies of liberty combined. Southern capital has a thousand millions of dollars invested in slaves; and this is another great struggle between capital and labor. Northern and Eastern capital, invested in manufactures, claimed the privilege of

[SEE FOURTH PAGE.]