O. G. HEMPSTEAD, Editor and Proprietor.

TERMS—ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS a year, [illegible] in advance or two dollars [illegible] year or time of subscription.
No paper will be discontinued until arrearages are paid except at the option of the Publisher.
All communications must be post paid [illegible]

[illegible advertising rates]

The Montrose Democrat.

[illegible]

VOLUME VI. MONTROSE, PA., THURSDAY, JULY 5, 1849. NUMBER 27.

Col. Benton's Speech.

[CONCLUDED.]

This is my second personal reason for dwelling on Mr Calhoun. It is to repel his attacks upon me. Public duty to the Senate of the United States would have required me to reply to his resolutions. But he had never called them up there. Their passage through the Missouri Legislature makes it still more needful. These resolutions are his [illegible] with such exactitude [illegible] position of clauses and some variation of phrase, can detect no one [illegible] betrays a design to disguise, which [illegible] else is impossible. I have read the original. Here is the copy:

RESOLUTIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY.

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, That the Federal Constitution was the result of a compromise between the conflicting interests of the States which formed it, and in no part of that instrument is to be found any delegation of power to Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery, excepting some special provisions, having in view the prospective abolition of the African slave trade, and for the securing the recovery of fugitive slaves; any attempt, therefore, on the part of Congress, to legislate on the subject so as to affect the institution of slavery in the States, in the District of Columbia, or in the Territories, is, to say the least, a violation of the principles upon which that instrument was founded.

"2. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] be found in hearty co-operation with the slaveholding States [illegible] may be deemed necessary [illegible] protection against the encroachments of Northern fanaticism.

"6. That our Senators in Congress be instructed [illegible] ing resolutions."

The Calhoun resolutions were entitled "The rights of Congress over territories of the United States in relation to slavery," and were introduced [illegible] February, 1847. Those of the Missouri Legislature were entitled "Resolutions in relation to slavery," and were [illegible] 1849—the subject of both the same—to deny the right of Congress to prevent or prohibit slavery in Territories [illegible] a dissolution of the Union in that [illegible]. One was parent to the other, and I presume no man will deny it. And here I make the exception which truth and justice require from me. I have no idea that the mass of the members who voted for the resolution in the last General Assembly had any idea that they were Calhoun's, or aimed at the dissolution of the Union which they announced as a thing in actual contemplation. But they are not the less injurious on that account. They are the act of the General Assembly, and stand for the act of the State, and bind it to the car of Mr Calhoun, and encourage him more than any event that has taken place. But they are not the sense of the State, nor even the sense of all the members who voted for them. The true sense of the State, and I doubt not of a large majority of the members of the last Legislature, was faithfully expressed in the resolves and instructions of the previous Legislature, which I had received and obeyed, not only in the letter, but in the spirit. These are they:

"JOINT RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE ACT OF 1820.

"*Resolved*, That the peace, permanency, and welfare of our National Union depend upon a strict adherence to the letter and spirit of the 8th section of the act of Congress of the United States, entitled 'An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, *and to prohibit slavery in certain Territories*,' approved March 6th, 1820.

"*Resolved*, That our Senators in the Congress of the United States are hereby instructed, and our Representatives requested, to vote in accordance with the provisions and the spirit of the said eighth section of the said act, in all the questions which may come before them in relation to the organization of new Territories or States out of the territory now belonging to the United States, or which hereafter may be acquired, either by purchase, by treaty, or by conquest."

The resolves passed the General Assembly of Missouri on the 15th day of February, 1847—just four days before Calhoun brought into the Senate of the United States his firebrand resolutions which I denounced upon the spot—which have been adopted by the Missouri Legislature at the last session, and from which I now appeal to the State—the whole State—How different, how irreconcilably hostile to each other, the two sets of resolutions!—One makes the peace, permanency, and welfare of our national Union dependent upon strict adherence to the spirit and terms of the Missouri Compromise, in its application to new territory—that is to say upon the constitutional right, and the equitable exercise of that right, to legislate upon slavery in the new territory, and to admit it in part, and prevent it in part: the other makes the dissolution of the Union dependent upon the same platform of fact and principle—denying the right of Congress to abolish or prohibit slavery in a Territory,—asserting its prohibition to be a violation of the Constitution of the United States, an insult to the sovereignty of the States, and tending to the dissolution of the Union [illegible] kill! And [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] the State of Texas [illegible] State free soil, and one part slave soil, as it stands at this day! Before that act of Mr Calhoun, the whole of Texas was free soil—made so by the laws and Constitution of Texas. The question [illegible] how to admit her consistently with her rights as a sovereign State? The House's resolution imposed a restriction, an abolition, in fact, of slavery, in all her territory above 36° 30', and that was a great deal of the State extended [illegible] up to 42. The Senate's amendment imposed nothing, but proposed to treat with Texas, and to admit her upon agreed terms. Mr. Calhoun seized upon the House resolution, adopted it, and thereby adopted the Missouri Compromise, and imposed it, not upon a Territory, but a State. He abolished slavery in a State! and in this way carried Abolitionism further than any Barnburner ever proposed; for they limit their Abolitionism to Territories. This Mr. Calhoun did, and did as late as March the 3d, 1845. There is no dispute about it. General Houston charged him with it in his Circular Address to his constituents, at the late session of Congress. Everybody was struck with the force of the accusation, and looked out anxiously for Mr Calhoun's reply. They looked in vain. He did not reply, and could not. Confession would do no good, and denial would make it worse. The fact was notorious, and was of public record.—He could not throw the blame upon Tyler, for he had often boasted in the Senate that he himself had selected that resolution.

I repeat, I do not cite this conduct of Mr. Calhoun, in abolishing slavery in a part of Texas, as authority to justify abolishing slavery in States, but to show that he went further than any "*Northern fanatic*" has ever proposed to go; and, further, up to that date, March 3d, 1845, he had not invented his new doctrine of no power in Congress to legislate upon slavery in Territories; and, still further, to show that, up to the same period, he had not felt the pricking of that new point of honor—the insult to the slave States, in being excluded, with their property, from the soil which their common blood and treasure won. Texas was all won, as well north as south of 36° 30', by the same blood and treasure—the taxes of the people, and the blood of Goliad, the Alamo, and San Jacinto. And yet here were citizens of the same State excluded, by the act of Mr Calhoun, from removing with their property from one part of it to another!

And now I have arrived at a point which claims particular attention. It will be remembered by all that after the rejection of the Texas treaty in '44, various propositions were submitted in Congress for her admission, and that every proposition contained some plan for dividing her into free and slave territory. Every body will remember this. Now, I do not recollect a single instance in which the constitutionality of such propositions were disputed, or a single instance in which it was deemed an insult to the slaveholding states to see slavery excluded from any part of it. These propositions were particularly numerous in the session of 1844–5, which ended with two propositions, enacted into two alternative resolutions—one to run the compromise line through the state, the other to negotiate with her upon the subject. Mr Calhoun selected the former—a full proof that neither himself, nor the majority of the two Houses of Congress, nor the President of the United States; who approved their resolutions saw any thing in them either unconstitutional or insulting to the slave states, or tending to disunion.

I, myself, made one of these propositions. It was to divide by a parallel of longitude. It proposed to Texas that she should cede to the United States, all her territory west of the 100th parallel of longitude [illegible] slaves [illegible]. I proposed to limit slavery by a line north and south, and [illegible] opening [illegible] with Texas, and if any [illegible]

[illegible]

What is more [illegible] position of Mr. Calhoun's [illegible] west, [illegible] did so divide it, and the state so stands at this day. The difference between us was [illegible] one through the state itself.

It is absurd to deny to Congress the power to legislate [illegible]. It is absurd to [illegible] territories. They have no government but that which Congress gives them, and no legislative power but that which Congress allows them.—Congress governs the territory as it pleases, and in a way incompatible with the constitution, and of this any state that has been [illegible] is a complete example, and can [illegible].

Congress has the power to prohibit, [illegible] in the territories; for their governments are the creatures of Congress, and its deputies, so far as any legislative power is concerned. It is not in the states separately: [illegible] sions which has grown out of the political metaphysics of Mr. Calhoun. He claims a right for the citizens of the slave states to remove to New Mexico and California with their slave property. This is a profound error. The property is in the law which creates it, and the law cannot be carried an inch beyond the limits of the state which enacts it. No citizen of any state can carry any property, derived from a law of that state, an inch beyond the boundary line of the state which creates it. The instant he passes that boundary, to settle with his property, it becomes subject to another law, if there is one, and is without law if there is not. This is the case with all—with the northern man, with his corporation and franchises—with the southern man and his slaves. This is the law of the land, and let any one try it that disputes it. We, in Missouri, are well situated to make the experiment conveniently, and in all its forms. Let any one of Mr. Calhoun's followers try it, and he will soon see what becomes of his property, his slave property. Let him remove to Iowa; he will meet there the 8th section of the act of Congress of March 6th, 1820—the Calhoun proviso; and will in vain invoke state rights and Missouri statutes. Let him remove to Illinois; he will find there the Jefferson proviso, in the form of the ordinance of 1787. Let him remove to Kentucky; the law of Kentucky takes hold of his slaves, and converts the chattel interest of the Missouri slave into real estate, and placed on the footing of land, as they are in Louisiana. Let him move into Arkansas, his chattel slave will remain chattel, but by virtue of Arkansas law, and subject to its regulation. Finally, let him remove west, and settle in the territory of Nebraska, when it shall be created; and the Calhoun proviso will be on him again, and his property will evaporate. Thus a citizen of Missouri cannot get out of his own state, on any one of its four sides, with his slave property, without having its character altered, or holding it by another law; and twice he will lose it—on two sides of his state—on contiguous territory—he will lose it under an act of Congress, which became a law under the advice and opinion of Mr Calhoun, in his high character of cabinet minister, and assisting at a council armed with the veto power. This is the case of the Missouri citizen, and has been ever since Missouri was a state; and no one ever thought the state sovereignty insulted or felt himself bound to dissolve the Union on account of it.

No! the citizens of the states cannot carry the laws of their states with them to Oregon and California; and if they could what a *Babel* of slave law would be there! Fourteen states, each carrying a code different, in many respects, from each other; and all to be exercised by the same judges, in territories where there is no slave law. What absurdity! No such thing can be done. The only effect of carrying slaves there would be to set them free. It would be in vain to invoke the constitution, and say it acknowledges property in slaves. It does so: but that is confined to states.

And now we arrive at substance—at a practical point. Congress has the constitutional power to abolish slavery in territories; but she has no slave territory in which to exercise the power. We have no territory but the remnant of Louisiana north and west of Missouri,—that in California, New Mexico and Oregon,—and that north of Wisconsin, now Minesota. In Louisiana, north and west of us, it was abolished by Congress in 1820. In the territory north of Wisconsin, now Minesota it was abolished by the Jefferson proviso of 1787. In Oregon it was abolished by Congress in 1848, by what some now call the Benton proviso, [illegible]. In New Mexico and California it was abolished by the Mexican government in 1829—and [illegible] in 1837, and [illegible] in 1841. Here are the decrees [illegible] the originals of which I have read in the [illegible] authentic [illegible] volumes of the Mexican laws and which were produced in the Senate of the United States by Mr Dix, of New York:

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.

"The President of the United Mexican States to the inhabitants of the Republic. [illegible] Desiring to signalize in the year 1829 the anniversary [illegible] by an act of national justice and beneficence, which may [illegible] important [illegible] which [illegible] strengthen more and more the public tranquility; which may co-operate in the aggrandizement of the republic; and which may restore to [illegible] the sacred right which nature gave them, and protected by wise and just laws in conformity to the provision of the 30th article of the constitutive act: exercising the extraordinary powers which are conceded to me, I do decree:

1. Slavery is abolished in the republic.
2. Those who until to-day have been considered slaves are consequently free.
3. When the condition of the treasury will permit, the owners of the slaves will be indemnified in the manner which shall be provided for by law.

JOSE MARIA BOCANEGRA.

Mexico, 16th September, 1829, A. D.

Laws of 1837.

[Translation.]—Slavery is forever abolished, without any exception, in the whole republic: April 1837. [Collection of Laws and Decrees of the General Congress of the United Mexican States, volume 8th, page 201.]

[Translation.]—The masters of slaves manumitted by the present law or by the decree of the 16th of September, 1829, shall be indemnified, &c. [Collection of Laws and Decrees, &c., vol. 8, page 201.]

This is the decree, and this is the act of Congress confirming it, abolishing slavery throughout the Mexican Republic. The Constitution of 1844 does not abolish slavery, for that was done before, but prohibits its future establishment. Thus, there is no slavery now in Mexico and California; and consequently, none in any territory belonging to the United States; and consequently nothing practical or real in the whole slavery question, for the people of the United States to quarrel about. There is no slavery by law in any Territory: and cannot get there by law, except by act of Congress, and no such act will be passed, or even asked for. The dogma of no power in Congress to legislate upon slavery in Territories, kills the pretension. No legal establishment of slavery in California and New Mexico is then to be looked for. That is certain. Equally certain it will never be established in either of them in point of fact. The people of both Territories, the old inhabitants, are unanimously against it. Of the new emigrants, all those from Europe, Asia, Mexico, Central and S. America, and all those from the non-slaveholding part of the United States, will be unanimously against it. There remains then, to overbalance all this unanimous mass, only the emigrants from the slaveholding parts of the United States—in itself the smallest branch of emigration, and it divided on the question—many are going for the express purpose of getting rid of slavery—and very few so far in love with it as to go that distance for the pleasure of having a lawsuit with his own negro, and with the certainty of coming out second best in the contest. There is then no slavery, at this time, either in New Mexico or California, in law or in fact. What, then, is all the present uproar about? Abstraction! The abstract right of doing what cannot be done! The insult to the sovereignty of the States, where there is no insult! All abstraction; and no reality, substance, or practice, in it.

The Romans had a class of disputes which they called *de lana caprina*, that is to say, about goat's wool; and as the goat has no wool, the dispute was about nothing. So is it of this dispute among us about excluding slavery from New Mexico or California; there is none there to exclude, and the dispute now raging is about nothing.

The Missouri resolutions were copied from those of Calhoun, and I do not believe there exceeded half a dozen members in the two Houses, all told, who were in the secret either of the origin or design of that proceeding. They were copied from Calhoun; and to see their design, you must know his. His were aimed at the Union—at the harmony and stability of the Union—and at the members of the slaveholding States who would not follow his lead—myself especially. This makes it my duty to speak of him, and to show his design in bringing forward the resolutions from which he so suddenly backed out in the Senate, and which some half dozen members have succeeded in passing through the Missouri Legislature.—This carries me rather far back, but I will make rapid work and short work.

Mr Calhoun came into public life to be President of the United States. The weird sisters, in the shape of the old men that taught him grammar, had whispered in his ear—*thou shalt be President!* Upon this oracular revelation he commenced his political career, and has toiled at its fulfilment for forty years—at first openly, and, it may be, fairly, by putting himself at the head of all the movements which promised advancement in public favor. In 1816, protection of domestic industry was popular; he put himself at the head of the protective policy, and went for the minimum provision—the cotton minimum—which was the father of all the rest, and the only real injury to the cotton growers, by suppressing for thirty years that class of cotton goods which was of the most universal use, and of the largest cotton consumption—the coarse [illegible] 1816—so totally suppressed under the Calhoun minimum of that year, and just beginning to appear again under the tariff of 1846. At the same time (1816) a National Bank—the State banks having failed, and brought odium on the State institutions—was much called for. Mr Calhoun put himself at the head of the call, and carried through the bank charter. About the same time, internal improvement by the Federal Government became popular. He seized upon the subject; and, in 1823, as Secretary of War, made an elaborate report in favor of a general system of roads and canals pervading all parts of the Union.—In 1819–'20, the Missouri controversy [illegible] the North stood [illegible]. He took the free soil current, and expurgated slaves from all Territories of the United States, by joining in the abolition of slavery in Upper Louisiana, giving Texas to the King of Spain and giving the rest of Louisiana to the Indians. At the same time Jackson became the favorite of the people for President. He withheld, and postponed his pretensions to the Presidency, became the advocate of Jackson, went upon his ticket and was elected Vice President with him. But this was the end of his popular movements to gain the Presidency. He expected to succeed Jackson, and that he would only have to wait and serve eight years. That was only one year longer than Jacob had to wait and serve Laban for Rachel. But, oh! the disappointments in love and politics! Like Jacob, when he woke up he found it was Leah! A little magician of the North had got into the bed and was to be Jackson's successor! Unlike Jacob, he could not wait and serve another long eight years, and determined to clutch the prize at once. Then came nullification No. 1. (pretexed by that tariff of which he himself was the main author,) and to that scheme for dissolving the Union which Jackson's proclamation put down. The tariff failed to bear him through. A more inflammable subject was wanted—and was found in the sensitive question of slavery. Then came that long succession of abolition plots for blowing up slavery in the United States, compared to which, all the popish plots in England for blowing up the Protestant religion—the gunpowder, rye-house, meal-tub, and other plots, so formidable in their days, were tame and impotent inventions. First, there was the London abolition plot of Arabel Smith, John Andrews, and Lord Aberdeen, for lighting the train of abolition in Texas, and then running into the United States, where it was to explode and blow all up! and to prevent which, it became a case of "self-defence," admitting of no delay, to jerk Texas instanter, by treaty, out of their hands before the plot was ripe—something like jerking the fuse out of a bomb before it would explode. The treaty did not stand the jerk, and was broke; and the plot evaporated without harm. Duff Green had been paid a thousand dollars by the Tyler Administration, out of the United States Treasury, for bringing that plot from London; but it was money lost. Then came the World's Convention plot, also located in London, for the abolition of slavery throughout the world, the United States inclusively; but it came up feebly, and had no run. Then came the incendiary transportation mail matter plot: and that, for a while, threatened to break up the transportation of the mails, and to leave the halves of the Union in a state of non-intercourse. It ripened into a bill for searching the mails, and then expired.—Then came the incendiary petitions plot, that occupied the time of Congress for several years, and considerably alarmed the country, until every body saw that it was a game performed by two sets of players, playing into each others' hands, for their own benefit at home, and getting up an agitation of which the public peace and the public business was the victim. It then died out.—Thus all the abolition plots—pretexts for a second nullification—failed. They were—what the New York law reform statute, abolishing law Latin, interprets the writ of *ne exeat* to be—no go!

In the mean time there was an episode, which will require a full history some day, but which can only be hinted at now, to complete the picture. It happened that, after Mr. Van Buren's election, Mr. Calhoun became a sort of supporter of his administration; and upon a principle that one good turn deserves another, expected his support for the succession. That involved a scheme for Northern votes. There was a slave subject which presented it—the liberation of American slaves by the British authorities in the Bahama islands, who had revolted against their owners, committed murder and piracy, and carried their masters' vessels into British ports. When these enormities occurred, Mr. Calhoun took up the cause of the South with justice and vehemence, and I stood by him. When he took it into his head to be Mr Van Buren's successor, he abandoned the South and left me and a few others alone by the side of the ill-fated owners of the Comet, Encomium, Creole, Enterprise, and others. In his new born zeal then, to please the North, he shot ahead—he must always be ahead—beating Woodbury, Buchanan, and other Northern Senators, in his votes and speeches on the northern side of the question.—Some view of this may be seen in my speech on the Ashburton treaty; but the subject requires a separate examination, and shall receive it, but not now. It will be a curious episode, and will place Mr Calhoun a second time where he was in 1819–'20—on the Northern side of the slavery question—but only for a brief space. Mr. Van Buren preferred to try to be his own successor; and the Texas treaty having gone over without making its author President, and the Mexican war promising a large crop of popular presidential candidates, a new political test became necessary; and, the [illegible] 1846 [illegible] a conflagration [illegible] miles off.

The design of these resolutions is now the question; and that design is apparent in the character & words of the resolutions themselves—in the previous course of Mr Calhoun, which I have just faintly sketched—and in his subsequent conduct which is yet to be exhibited.

The resolutions then point directly to the subversion of the Union. It is their language. And for what cause? For a cause so absurd and unfounded, so contradicted by his own conduct, and by the whole action of the Government from its foundation to the present day, that, being confronted with his own conduct, he has never dared to ask a vote upon his resolutions.

I have no new opinion to express about the design of those resolutions. I gave my opinion of them at the time they were introduced, and in many ways, and among the rest in a letter to the people of Oregon, and another to the people of Howard county. The people of Oregon had formed a Provisional Government, and inserted in their articles of Government a fundamental act for the prohibition of slavery, copied from the Jefferson proviso of 1787. The House of Representatives had passed a bill, session of 1846–'47, to establish a Territorial Government for Oregon, sanctioning their articles of Government with the proviso against slavery in it. This bill was defeated in the Senate just twelve days after Mr Calhoun brought in his resolutions; and in giving an account of that defeat to the people of Oregon, in a letter which was then published, I said:

"Your fundamental act against that institution, copied from the ordinance of 1787—the work of the south in the great day of the South, prohibiting slavery in a Territory far less northern than yours—will not be abrogated! nor is that the intention of the prime mover of the amendment. Upon the record, the Judiciary Committee of the Senate is the author of that amendment; but not so the fact. That committee is only midwife to it. Its author is the same mind that generated the 'firebrand resolutions' of which I send you a copy; and the amendment is its legitimate derivation. Oregon is not the object! The most rabid propagandist of slavery cannot expect to plant it on the shores of the Pacific, in the latitude of Wisconsin and the Lake of the Woods.—*Home agitation, for election and disunion purposes*, is all that is intended by thrusting that firebrand question into your bill; and at the next session, when it is thrust in again, we will see to it out."

A home agitation, for election and disunion purposes, is what I told them the object of these resolutions was. Cass and Butler were defeated upon the issue [illegible] of these resolutions; but the election part of the object was against all Northern men, and to bring forward Mr Calhoun himself as the Southern candidate. Failing in this object to get himself nominated, the next [illegible] of the resolutions came into play: and thus brings me to the meeting of Southern members of Congress, got up and conducted by Mr. Calhoun. It was a meeting with closed doors—every citizen not an actual member from a slaveholding State was excluded; even Mr. Bibb, of Kentucky, a former Senator, and who was turned out under the special decision of Mr. Calhoun himself. Members came upon invitation. I was not invited, and would not have gone if I had been. General Houston was not invited, but went without invitation, and moved the opening the doors to the public, which was voted down. I have been told that disunion was expressly discussed; and that would seem to flow, as a regular consequence, from the fundamental proposition of the original address, drawn up by Mr. Calhoun, and assimilating its importance to the declaration of wrongs which separated the American Colonies from Great Britain, and giving a higher importance to the present crisis, as going beyond the former, and involving, not merely *rights*, but life and property—everything—the safety of the South, and all. The paragraph which contained this declaration, was this:

"We whose names are hereunto annexed, address you in discharge of what we believe to be a solemn duty, on the most important subject ever presented for your consideration, not excepting the Declaration which separated you and the other United Colonies from the parent country. That involved your independence, but this your all, not excepting even your safety. We allude to the conflict between the two races, the European and African, which inhabit the Southern section, and the acts of aggression and encroachment to which it has led."

From this strong language, exalting the crisis above that of the Revolution, it would naturally be supposed that the remedy was to be the same; and so it was understood by many, and the words struck out. The same conclusion would seem naturally to result from a concluding part of the address, in which unanimity was invoked, consequences disregarded, the Union treated as hypothetically worse than useless, called a sword to assault, and not a shield to defend, and in which it was left to the North to count its value. This is the paragraph which contained these expressions:

"As the assailed, you would stand justified by all laws, human and divine, in repelling a blow so dangerous, without looking to consequences, and to resort to all means necessary for that purpose. Your assailants, and not you would be responsible for consequences. [It would be for them, and not for you, to count the value of the Union. Without your rights, it would be worse than useless—a sword to assault, and not a shield to defend you."]

The most significant of these phrases were struck out doubtless because they more than squinted—in fact looked straight—at disunion. The striking out of these passages shows that the majority of the meeting dissented from Mr. Calhoun's views and caused to be expunged from his address the anti-union passages. The majority were doubtless in favor of preserving the Union. But this is not our present inquiry. The present inquiry is into Mr. Calhoun's designs. His design in his resolutions of February, 1847, and everything that occurred in the meeting, and especially the passages expunged from his address, show that his deliberate design was what his resolutions hypothetically imported—the subversion of the Union. The paragraph assimilating the condition of the South in relation to the North to that of the Colonies at the Declaration of Independence, was awfully significant, and dreadfully false. No wonder it was expunged. Compare the list of grievances which he drew up, and which constitute the staple of his address that was published; compare this with the list of grievances against Great Britain, drawn by Mr. Jefferson, and prefixed to the Declaration of Independence—and then see what truth there was in Mr. Calhoun's reckless comparison. According to his assertion, the Southern grievances were not only equal, but greater than those enumerated by Mr. Jefferson. The Declaration of Independence is in every house.

But there is another place where the list is more perfect—the preamble to the Constitution of Virginia, also drawn by Mr. Jefferson—and where an item suppressed in the national Declaration of Independence, to gratify some extreme Southern friends, was retained in all its vigor by his native State. That item was this: "By prompting our negroes to rise in arms among us—those very negroes, whom, by an inhuman use of his negative, he hath refused us permission *to exclude by law*." What contrast! The King's refusal to authorize the exclusion of slaves from Virginia, then one of the causes of separation, inserted in her declaration of wrongs, prefixed to her Constitution—the nominal exclusion by law of slavery from a territory where it is not, and cannot be, now a cause of separation of the Southern from the Northern States! Surely the Father of his Country had in his mind's eye this address of Mr. Calhoun, when, in his farewell to his children, he warned them against the misrepresentations of designing men, who, for their own ends, would raise up sectional differences for the purpose of alienating one part of the Union from another. His prophetic vision foresaw the present state of things when he wrote this paragraph:

"In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs, as a matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations—Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western—whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party, to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart-burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection."

This malediction of the father of his Country falls upon Calhoun—falls upon the twenty years' prompter of hatred and alienation between the North and South. But why multiply proofs? From the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh! and for 20 years the mouth of Calhoun has poured forth the language of disunion. Surely the Holy Scriptures are right; and deadly enmity to the Union must be in that heart from which its death-knell is daily sounded.

Mr Calhoun is balked in his mode of proceeding. He finds a difficulty in the first step. The experience of the first nullification has convinced him that one State, and that a small one, is too narrow a foundation to build upon. He needs a broader foundation; and ever since the Texas annexation treaty of 1844, he has manœuvred for a Southern Convention, in order to unite all the Southern States under his control. He wants a Convention. He is great upon a small body—where he can work upon individuals, in detail, and by units. He is great then. A Southern Convention was his plan at the rejection of the Texas treaty in 1844. I contributed to break up that plan. At the passing of the Oregon bill in the summer of 1844, he tried for the Convention again, and a subscription paper was cautiously circulated in the House of Representatives for signatures. It was "no go." But few subscribers were got, and the paper was suppressed. This brings us to the last winter's work—the meeting convoked of the members of Congress from the slaveholding States. Its object has been stated, and I do not repeat it. I only name it as a part of the machinery for getting up his Southern Convention. It was, in fact, a