

THE MONTROSE DEMOCRAT.

DEVOTED TO POLITICS, NEWS, LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, SCIENCE, AND MORALITY.

S. B. & E. B. CHASE, PROPRIETORS.

MONTROSE, PA., THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1851.

VOLUME VIII. NUMBER 14.



POETRY.

From Tackerman's Poems, just published.
By Madison Mico.

"They also serve who only stand and wait."
Milton.

The lance is rusting on the wall,
No laurel crowns are worn,
And every knightly strain is hushed
In castle, camp and grove.

No many breast now fronts the spear,
No armor wears the brand,
To indicate the rightful cause,
Or any Oppression's hand.

The minstrel's pilgrimage has ceased,
Chivalric days are o'er,
And fiery steeds bear noblemen
To Palestine no more.

What battle-field with courage now
Shall sedate minds inspire?
Upon what shrine can youth devote
Its wild yet hallowed fire?

Most the bold hero ignobly pine
Far from his kindling strife,
And wither trophies to adorn
This cold and fleeting life?

Is there in the garden for the brave?
No warfare for the free?
No wrong for valor to redress?
For men no victory.

Small high and earnest purpose die,
And souls of night grow tame?
Gleam no more be warmed to life
By Love's ennobling flame?

Forbid its every pulse that leaps
At Beethoven's kindling music,
Forbid it all the glowing dreams
That youthful hearts beguile!

By the moon's spell that morning weaves,
By the sun's stirring gleam,
By the west sea; the mighty woods,
And midnight's solemn air.

By Nature's deep and constant tones,
Learn this art of song,
And thus the "art of peace" we know
In every human tongue.

By childhood's hopefulness serene,
And woman's cherished name,
Let not heroic spirit yield
Their heritage of fame!

It may no more be worn in arms,
And knight-hood's loyal toil,
No Jovian, like Mars's grain,
Upon a blood-stained soil.

It will not live in warrior's tales,
Or lay of troubadour,
Nor shall the tread of lady-love
Become its emblem more.

But in the quietude of thought—
The soul's divine retreat,
Does Valor now her garlands twine,
And rear her proud crest?

They who most bravely can endure,
Most earnestly pursue,
And most Oppression's tyrant bands
Unshaken to be true!

Epiphanies in Beauty more than gain,
Guard well the dreams of youth,
And with devoted fervor live
Crusaders for the Truth!

The freedom of the mind maintain,
In sacredness reverse,
And cling to Honor's open path,
As planets to their sphere;

Who own no gods but that of Faith,
And with undaunted brow,
Turn from the whisperings of gold—
These are the heroes now!

Let us wishfulness they stand
Upon Time's hoary steep,
For Glimpses of heaven's light,
And glowing eyes keep.

Thus bravely live heroic men,
A consecrated band,
As in a noble battle-field,
Their hearts a Holy Land.

MISCELLANY.

ESTHETIC OR NOT TO ESTHETIC.
A writer in the Medical and Surgical Journal recently gave attention to the opinion that a week was often enough to bathe the body for purposes of luxury and cleanliness, and that flannel worn next the skin at seasons was proper. Mrs. Swisshelm, of Saturday Visitor, philosophically and whimsically comments this idea as follows: "My opinion about flannel next the skin is, that it would not wear it if all the one now living should bring the authority of Nature into aid, and add a persuasive still to the wisdom of the college embryos, and all M. D.'s yet to be born, and condense it in a prescription of a flannel envelope next the skin would wear it."

The argument which these M. D.'s use is that flannel is the skin is covered by it, and this should not be removed, for the flannel is accustomed to wash the skin, they would know that cold water will not wash off grease. The most delicate and flowers are all "cleansed" in what the same way a human body is surrounded with a soft, unctuous matter to prevent water from rotting them, but old Nature bathes every one of them once every twenty-four hours—keeps them in the right or left, hours out of the twenty-four

besides giving them a thorough drenching occasionally. The old lady must be a bad nurse, or she would swathe the lily, rose, and violet, in red flannel wrappers, to preserve the oil which is secreted by the sebaceous glands of the skin. The argument of the Medical Journal holds good against warm bathing, or washing with soap. Either of these will remove oil which ought to remain. A housewife knows this by the withering of the skin on the hands after wash day. The hot water soap, and soda, extracts the oily covering from the skin, and so with any one who washes her face, and hands, frequently with soap. Her complexion is quickly spoiled—the skin gets a hard, withered look. It is a general idea among housekeepers that washing dishes is good to preserve the hands, soft and white, simply because the grease in the dish-water supplies the place of the natural oil, which is extracted from the skin by a continual use of soap and hot water; hence the very proper practice of greasing the hands and putting on gloves before going to bed. Every woman who cares to preserve the usefulness, flexibility, and beauty of her hands, should adopt the practice. There are many very good and pretty toilette preparations for the purpose, but any grease without salt effects the object. Flax seed oil is perhaps the best.

No one who cares to preserve the health, and consequently, the beauty of the skin, should wash with either soap or warm water, unless in case of cutaneous eruptions, pimples, or the like; but cold water will remove nothing from the skin which ought to remain. Rubbing with a towel, after its use, will not rub off the lubricating oil than rubbing furniture with a silk handkerchief will take off the varnish.

THE HOME JOURNAL. Last week, in alluding to the expected arrival of Mr. Tupper, said:—"The beloved author of Proverbial Philosophy," embarks for the country during the present month—or, so says a paragraph. This is a land where the man leaves the care of his affairs entirely to the ladies, and of course, the information wanted in advance, is first as to the coming favorite's personal appearance, and manners. Mr. Tupper is too handsome ever to have thought of dress except as a protection from the weather, or of manners except as they followed his feelings of his own accord. He is frankly and earnestly, and plainly dressed—the type of the best class of manly Englishmen of fortune. If he has a fault which is likely to offend, it is the never waiting for the luk to dry upon his impulses—sending a new idea abroad upon a mere nomination, without waiting for its confirmation by the senate of after-thought. Being as English as he possibly can be, and America being more French than English he will probably see much, with his clear bright eyes, which he will blantly improve. This, of course will run an even chance of making him very much liked, or very much disliked—as honesty is an intensive thorough—but how our country impresses a thorough English sense, we shall know from him with truthfulness of a daguerreotype.

Mr. Tupper has a beautiful English home—a heaven of wife and children and comfort—and there is unusual certainty in his leaving his heart altogether on the other side of the water. His books however have given so good an idea of this probable absence that perhaps the ladies will not call him heartless without it. We have seldom seen a man we liked better; though how he will look—without ray children on his knee, a lovely and thoughtful wife sitting at work at the table, old armor and fine old pictures hanging on the walls and corners crammed with objects of art and English comforts and elegancies—we cannot safely predict. He will be cordially received, however. The public owes him a great deal, (as we owe a great deal to every man who runs threads of golden thought through the dull web of this homespun life of ours), and the debt will be paid to Mr. Tupper, we doubt not, by a large and cordial hospitality.

MARRIAGE.—Nature and Nature's God smiles upon the union that is sweetened by love and sanctioned by law. The sphere of our affection is enlarged and our pleasures take a wide range. We become more important and respected among men, and existence itself is doubly enjoyed with this our softer self. Misfortune loses half its anguish beneath the soothing influence of her smiles, and triumph becomes triumphant, when shared with her. Without her, what is man? A roving and restless being; driven at pleasure by romantic speculation, and cheated into misery by futile hopes, the mad victim of untamed passions, and the disappointed pursuit of fruitless joys. But with her he awakens to a new life. He follows a path—wider and nobler than the road to aggrandizement—that is scattered with more fragrant flowers, and illuminated by a clearer light.

COSS OR WADE.—Some idea of the enormous waste which war occasions is to be obtained by the expenditures of Great Britain during sixty-five years of war, in which she has been engaged in modern times. She borrowed in seven wars, which occupied the 65 years, \$284,000,000. In the same time she raised by taxes \$1,189,000,000 thus forming a total expenditure of \$9,982,120,000 in our currency. This enormous sum, extorted from the taxed and strained sinews of labor, would have constructed a railroad around the globe, allowing \$25,000 per mile. To raise another such sum would require a tax of \$10 on every human being on the globe!

M. WARD'S LETTER.
(Continued from page 1.)
Spartanburg, Bradford Co., Pa.,
January 27th, 1851.

C. L. Ward, Esq., Dear Sir.—We enclose you herewith a No. of the "Ontario Gazette," containing the letter of Col. S. Salisbury, on the "Slavery Question." This letter speaks our sentiments. The argument in vindication of the great Democratic doctrine of non-interference by Congress, on the subject of slavery, is in the language of the "Gazette," unanswerable.

We desire to keep these important doctrines and principles directly and widely before the people of this country especially. Having full confidence in your attachment to the Constitution and devotion to popular rights, we trust you will not fail to respectfully solicit your opinions and sentiments, on these deeply interesting matters, for publication.

Respectfully your friends,
Rufus Holsley, Chas. Gulliver, Theodore Leonard, John Salisbury, Wm. S. Guthrie, Wm. S. Grace, F. Leonard. Committee.

REPLY.
Gentlemen.—A protracted absence from home prevented my receiving your esteemed favor of the 27th ultimo, until a few days since, and I seize the earliest moment of leisure my business engagements have allowed me, to respond to your interesting request. This request is the more grateful, being coupled with kind expressions of confidence—because it precedes the relentless course of calamity, which has been directed against me, for some time past, by a portion of the public press of this country, has fallen short of the object of its aiders and abettors; and that there are some, at least, of the older and more prominent citizens of Bradford, who have not been misled into hasty and unjust conclusions against me, who is comparatively a stranger amongst them.

Being aware of controversy of every kind, and without the remotest political aspirations affecting myself personally, I should most gladly have abstained from an undertaking in this form, the discussion of any other political question than the one to which you have called my attention. But I sincerely entertain, and here most solemnly avow, the belief, that the course pursued by many of the people of the Northern States, in regard to the question of slavery, has placed our republic and its glorious institutions in imminent peril, and it seems a plain and positive duty, which all of us owe to each sanctified memory of the past, and every brighter hope of the future—to rally for the support of the Union, with whatever strength we may command.

In this view, gentlemen, suffer me to add, that I deem your organization and efforts, highly meritorious and patriotic; especially so, when we consider the extent to which folly and fanaticism have spread over this district, and the desperate and unscrupulous warfare which is waged against every individual, who may desire to stay their career, and abide by the wholesome compromises of our national compact, on the subject of Slavery. You have been fortunate too, in calling out and giving to the public at this crisis, a paper of such marked ability and unanswerable reasonings as the late letter of Col. Salisbury, to which you have referred me as speaking your sentiments upon the subject of which it treats. I subscribe, most unreservedly, to the correctness of the leading principles of that letter; and I apprehend that the self-selected political dictators of this region, will content themselves with some pithy and personal assaults upon its author—rather than attack the impregnable position of the paper itself. At least, such a course would best comport with their ability and instincts, as well as with their established practice with the past.

For obvious reasons, in what I have now to say, I forbear any recurrence to the points and principles so clearly and elaborately treated in the letter before me; and I pass by, also, on the present occasion, the general question of African Slavery—of its propriety, or otherwise, as it exists in the Southern portion of our republic. There are some other views and facts connected with the present agitation, which according to my humble apprehension, are less widely understood and appreciated than they deserve, amongst the American people. It may be that I am unnecessarily alarmed—or, it may be, (and that is my view of the subject) that the mass of our people, either do not sufficiently heed the lessons of history, or have not sufficiently within their view, all the facts and circumstances which illustrate so clearly and so forcibly the prime movers in this unhappy strife—for whose benefit, mainly, it was begun—is continued, and is likely to terminate.

For I cannot but persuade myself, if the greater portion of those honest, warm-hearted, well-meaning men, who have been, by almost imperceptible degrees, drawn into the meshes of abolitionism, through a hasty adoption of the doctrines of the "Proviso," or the delusive cry of "Free Soil"—could perceive that present real position, that they were not only playing into the schemes of a set of half-brained fanatics at home, but also into those of a powerful and vindictive enemy to our whole country abroad—they would fly from the ground they occupy, as from a pestilence. It is plain in relation to the "Proviso," that the Southern States resisted and repudiated it, as much because they deemed it one of a series of movements directed against their domestic peace and well-being, as because of its principles and effect, abstractly considered. The ordinance of 1787, in relation to slavery in the North-western territory, a measure similar in many of its features, was not resisted so stren-

uously at the time—I have thought it was not even sufficiently discussed, for that was single in its purpose and effect; was not pushed forward by avowed enemies of Southern States, nor coupled with designs against their national property; equally selfish and distasteful.

I will now address myself to any honest supporter of the "Proviso," who has no mere partisan or selfish purpose at heart, and ask him if every beneficial result which that measure promised at the outset, has not been attained, by the admission of California into the Union with a free Constitution, and in the moral certainty, which now exists, that slavery can never be planted in the territories, owing to their want of adaptability to the system—not to speak of any other reasons. Why persist then, in a further course of agitation against your Southern brethren, when, in so doing, you are only joining slender and becomingly identified, in what I have before remarked, with a set of rising New England families, who, in their turn, are but the working-tools in the hands of a powerful and blood-thirsty English monopoly? Do you doubt the truth of this proposition? Examine carefully and candidly the facts which I here propose to submit to your consideration, and afterwards deny your own convictions, if you can.

It is now upwards of a century and a half, since the first substantial organization and establishment of the English East India Company. In the year 1698, that Company acquired three insignificant villages from one of the grandsons of Aurangzeb, on the eastern shore of the Ganges, occupying about three miles in extent. Those three villages have since grown into the great city of Calcutta, with its half a million of inhabitants; and the same East India Company, into one of the most wealthy and powerful monopolies in the world—swaying, at times, the commercial destinies of all Europe, and more frequently identified, in every important commercial movement, with the British government itself. Through the operations, or rather machinations, of that Company, England has, from time to time, immense possessions in India. A part of these, she wrested in war from Portugal, Holland, and France; but by far the largest portion were obtained (to use the forcible language of one of the greatest of her own statesmen) "by unparallelled crimes, violated treaties, blood, treachery and devastation." There was not (as Burke) a single State, prince, or potentate, with which the East India Company came in contact, that it did not sell, not a single prince or State, that ever put any trust in the Company, who was not utterly ruined.

After long years of secret, and sometimes avowed, co-operation, by the act of Parliament of August, 1833, the "Lord President of the Council, the Lord of the Privy Seal, the First Lord of the Treasury, the principal Secretaries of State, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer," were made ex officio "Commissioners of the Affairs of India"—being virtually a union of the East India Company with the British Government. It is worthy of remark, as illustrative of the sincerity of English professions on the subject of slavery, that this act of Parliament was passed on the same day with that providing for "the abolition of Slavery in the English West India Islands"—which abolition, however, in the 44th section of the law, is declared "not to extend to any of the territory in possession of the East India Company, or to the islands of Ceylon and St. Helena."

When all the facts and circumstances attending the adoption of these two measures are carefully scrutinized, no intelligent mind is left to perceive that the breaking up of a profitable system of associated labor in the West India Islands, under the plausible pretext of humanity, was really the work of the East India Company, for the most selfish purposes. It desired the destruction of the West India competition in regard to sugar. The files and helpful philanthropy of Abolitionism, with all its incendiary agencies, were set at work; and after a long and severe struggle, lasting for years, and after forming a closer union with the English Government, the East India monopolists triumphed. Then went out through all the world, that falsest of all political assumptions—attributing to English humanity the abbreviation of slavery in her Colonial possessions! Aye—steeped in the corral falsehood is such pretension. For, let the history of that struggle be traced, page by page; scrutinize the debate in the British Parliament on the subject, and the protected controversy in regard to duties on sugar between the East and West India proprietors, in connection with the collateral movements of the prominent abolitionists of that period—and he must be dull of apprehension, indeed, who does not perceive, that in all this matter of negro emancipation, England only sacrificed the lesser interest to the greater; the prosperity of her limited possessions in the West Indies to that of her unlimited domains in Asia. Nor does history place this truth in any clearer light, than does it another, equally startling and significant, (in the view I am now seeking to present) that Hayti was sacrificed at an earlier day, by the same agency, and for the same unhallowed purposes of monopoly and selfishness? In 1793, Hayti, then belonging to France, was not only a happy and peaceful colony, but produced and exported more indigo, sugar and cotton than any other country in the world. Mark the immense productions of that single year: 141,089,831 pounds of Sugar; 76,835,219 pounds of Coffee; and 750,000 pounds of Indigo. This was the year for which awards of abolition emissaries were sent from London to Paris, to indoctrinate the French people with the spirit of liberty. An

abolition society, a branch of the London Convention, was set up in the French capital; and special measures were taken for breaking down the prejudices of color, and the natural differences between the Caucasian and African races. This resulted in the coming of monopolists of East India expected—in creating a party in France desirous of giving freedom to the colored people of the French Colonies.

Clapton, an English emissary of the London abolitionists, picked up in Paris, a mulatto, called Oge, and took him to London. When this colored scape followed reached England he was literally without a friend in the world, yet in a short time he sailed for Hayti—with arms, ammunition, and slaves in abundance, and actually commenced the first insurrection amongst the blacks of the Island. Clarkson, who was a member of the Society of Friends, denied to the last, all agency or participation in the measures of Oge, after his arrival in London; and he has doubtless his truth upon an examination of the facts, which followed. Revolution—a civil and servile war—success of unparalleled and diabolical atrocity; the whites that were not massacred, driven from the island, which continued, for thirty-one years, a constant theatre of sanguinary strife between negroes and petty chieftains. This experiment in African republicanism, which finally, by degrees, progressed into a species of mock imperialism, must be very gratifying, in its political results, to the believers in African equality with the whites, and African capability of an enlightened self-government. It is, however, for its results in another point of view, that I have referred to it here.

The profitable product of indigo, from seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds exported during the year of the first insurrectionary or abolition movement, had dwindled down, in less than five years afterwards, to two thousand pounds; and her other staple products in a like proportion. While British East India, in that same period, had swollen her product from some four hundred thousand pounds in 1789, to nearly three millions of pounds per annum; and to this hour retains a monopoly of the indigo trade against all the world. Thomas Clarkson was a man of peace, and as I have said, I believe his denial of all participation in the bloody schemes of Oge; but I believe this denial more, because he was not a member of the English East India Company, nor concerned with the English Government of that period. Thus we find the destruction of Hayti, so mysteriously commenced by a beggarly mulatto, fitted out and furnished with arms, ammunition, and money, in London, gave to the East India Company a monopoly of the rich trade in indigo. The breaking up of the system of associated labor, (I like this expressive Fourier phrase) in the West Indies, is rapidly giving to that same Company a monopoly of the production of sugar. I observe, in an able article in the *Democratic Review*, on the subject of the present condition of Jamaica, that the production of sugar in that fertile island, has fallen off since the emancipation act, near one million cwt. per annum, although its marketable value, as all know has greatly increased. This is indeed a pregnant and important fact, in more respects than one. The trade in indigo and sugar being thus in a great measure secured, there remains but one great interest to be added to these, to make English monopoly rich beyond conception, and to render English power overwhelming and irresistible—I refer to the production of cotton.

The Southern portion of our own beautiful and magnificent country, and the East India possessions of Great Britain, are both capable of producing the same rich staple commodities, and for many years past have been rivaled in many branches of agriculture. In the cultivation of indigo, British India has already superseded our Southern States, as well as Hayti; and in regard to the production of rice, sugar, and tobacco, a desperate struggle for a similar mastery has been in progress for some time. I have never believed in English professions of free trade; hence my views in regard to the tariff have not kept pace with those of many of my Democratic friends, though I subscribe in the abstract to the doctrine of non-interference in trade, as well as in industry, on the part of the national Government.

The rapid growth and prodigious magnitude of the cotton manufacture in England is, beyond all question, the most extraordinary phenomenon in the history of human industry. It amounts to near two hundred millions of dollars yearly, and subsists not less than one and a half millions of people. Well, might one of our statesmen significantly declare, that "the subsistence of such a number of persons, ought not to be endangered upon slight grounds." The exports of cotton manufactures from that country are now, and for some years have been, nearly equal to one-half her exports of every kind. They are really the principal element in sustaining her present wide-spread commerce. Previous to the year 1790, the United States did not supply the English with half a dozen bales of cotton per annum. About that time, an American ship, having eight bales on board, was seized at Liverpool by the officers of customs, because it was not believed that quantity could have been produced here! The Southern States now furnish, for English consumption, some four hundred millions of pounds, annually. The export to that country, during the last year, is stated to have been 3,184,000 bales; or about four hundred and twelve millions of pounds. It is this almost helpless dependence upon the United States for one of the principal elements of her national prosperity, which has always rankled in the pride of British States-

men, and led them to listen to every hope, and give vigor to every effort, to free their country from a species of commercial thralldom. A number of elaborate reports have been prepared and published by Agents and employees of the East India Company, at different times, attempting to prove that it was unnecessary for the English cotton manufacturers to rely upon the United States for their supplies of the raw material. But a few years since, several periods were openly employed by the English government, at a great expense to get out of this country to India, with all the machinery for preparing cotton. Experiments have since been going on, not only in Britain, but also in New Holland, in all the forms that hope could offer, or science indicate. How eagerly was the proposition caught at, a few weeks since, by the dignitaries of the United Kingdom, that they could be made a successful substitute. Well! let the present institution of our Southern States be broken up; or, being about (for that is the utmost that can be achieved in this respect)—a disruption of our glorious confederacy; and who can doubt that Great Britain would soon secure to her colonies in Asia a monopoly of the cotton trade? It is this monopoly of that country, are aiming at. Thirsting for gold and universal dominion—having at command all the wealth of the Indies, and all the power of the British government—what may not be feared at their hands? In the act of Parliament of 1838, (to which I have referred) in the 33rd section, there is a provision for "a secret committee, who shall take care of secrecy." Unquestionably, they have also their "secret service fund," ample in amount, connected with the more than regal authority which has been given to the Lord's Commissioners for the Affairs of India; and, in all human probability, the burning zeal of the London anti-slavery leaders, and their kindred agitators in this country, has been, and will continue to be, well-rewarded.

Not long since, several gentlemen who had formerly resided in the Southern States, were summoned before, and examined by a Committee of the British Parliament, in regard to the system of African slavery in this country; and they were specially enquired of "what would be the probable effect of immediate emancipation" upon the productive power of the Southern States. Again—in a speech before the selectors of Tamworth, made a short time previous to his death, Sir Robert Peel, (who, whether in the Ministry or out of it, was always a controlling spirit in the public affairs of England) after alluding in the most complimentary terms to the East India possessions of that country, avows an unwillingness "to run the risk of forfeiting the character England has acquired of such an enormous sacrifice by the abolition of slavery; and the slave trade, by opening the markets of England to the produce of slave labor." It is true, that sugar was the only interest especially referred to by the distinguished baronet. But cotton is equally the product of slave labor, and if the statesmen of Great Britain avowedly place additional burdens upon a tax-ridden people, to shut out one production of that species of labor, what would they scruple in regard to another—and that other, also, an important rival interest, of their favored and dear East India colonies!

But perhaps, this most open, and certainly the most offensive demonstration that English monopoly has recently made upon this subject, is that of sending the notorious fanatical incendiary, George Thompson, on his shores. He is now on his second mission, and as before has been received with open arms by the abolition and "higher law" fanatics of this country. His first visit was soon after the passage of the East India emancipation act; and that time he represented himself (I use his own words) a missionary, sent out by some pious ladies of Glasgow, to remonstrate on the subject of slavery. But it was subsequently proved by one who obtained access to their books that Thompson was at the very moment thus put on "the library of heaven" in the pay and employment of the London Anti-Slavery Society; the same body of unscrupulous political fanatics, who had labored so effectively in behalf of the East India Company in breaking up, and ruining thousands of the West India proprietors. This pious and "truth-telling" missionary, since his former advent, has very properly been elected to the British Parliament, and although that body is now in session, he remains here provoking mobs and riots, while his conditor and kindred spirit, Giddings, is taking up the time of the American Congress in raising questions of privilege, so to the manner in which this revered father and loyal servant of Queen Victoria, has been received in this country! Perhaps it would have been more judicious and appropriate to have sent up "blatant lights" upon his reaching the shores of Massachusetts, and offered Mr. Thompson the hall of the "Harvard Convention" to speak in, instead of spoiling eggs on his account, as was done at old Springfield.

Mr. Buckingham, another member of Parliament, once declared that the "people of England would DEMAND not only emancipation, but immediate emancipation of slaves wherever they might be found," and O'Connell, in some of his ravings in regard to West India emancipation, also said, in his place when that emancipation was effected, England would turn to America, and REQUIRE abolition there. Probably, Geo. Thompson, Esq., and that member of that same British Parliament, who now here to demand and require the immediate abolition of slavery in the United States. At all events, he openly appears here, swelling

the ranks of "free soil" and vindictive the doctrine of a "higher law" as a rule of political action, more binding than our National Constitution. Here, in an effort to foment discord amongst our people—to array brother against brother, and to plot treasonable opposition to our government and hostility to our glorious Union! Here, to seduce, if possible, our slave population to rise and butcher their own masters; rendering the South a desert, and our whole country a scene of fraternal war, weakness, suffering and crime! Thus far, I rejoice for the honor of our common name and country, that he has found comparatively few supporters or apologists.

I do not mean to accuse English East India Company, of the insane folly of believing that even a dissolution of the Union would free a single slave. They know well enough that the slaves in Jamaica, for years out-numbered their masters ten to one; yet the whites were always able speedily to arrest any disturbance, if it is not the slaves that British Statesmen care for in reality. If their nice selfishness were running waste—they might very pertinently be directed to the oppressed and starving people of Ireland—to the thousands daily perishing, soul and body, in their own overcrowded mines and manufactories; to the countless millions of slaves, who groan and famish beneath English tyranny in India. Or, if their own victims are beneath their notice—there are the white slaves of Russia, Austria and Poland; and the slaves of Turkey. Why was not Thompson sent to preach abolition to some of those countries, instead of Massachusetts? Or why did not another noted British emissary, Mr. Elliott, sport his famous "white hat" in some Oriental region instead of Texas? The answer is found in one short word—COTTON. The New York Tribune and its kindred brood of agitators, roll up their Pharaonic eyes and sneer at what they term the "cotton aristocracy" of some of the Northern cities. The real, original, dyed-in-the-wool cotton aristocracy, is the English East India Company, whose willing aids and dupes are the "higher law," "free soil" fanatics of the United States. The term as applied by the Tribune, is a misnomer.

I have said, the hope of British statesmanship especially extends to the abolition of slavery in America. What is sought and expected, however, there is a great danger they will attain—the creation of such a state of feeling and irritation between the North and the South, as may end in a dissolution of the Union, and distraction and civil war. Then would the cotton lords of the East Indies, indeed, flourish, and English intrigue be crowned with complete success.

I have thus, gentlemen, attempted to make clear the position which I assumed in regard to foreign interference in matters vital to the existence and well-being of this Union. I have, of necessity, been limited to a mere glance at the historical and documentary evidence at command; which, however, when examined with care, illustrates this point so clearly that none can be mistaken who will take the trouble of examination. The question now comes home to the consciences of the right-minded and honest of all parties—shall we aid British ambition and British tyranny in their selfish schemes? Suppose we do dislike slavery, even in the mild and modified forms in which it exists in the Southern States? Let no one deceive himself; that slavery, whatever we may think of it, cannot be abrogated by any change in our national compact, or in any other way but by the voluntary action of the States where it exists. All the States of the Union, when they adopted the present Constitution, were sole, sovereign, and independent; they remain so still, for every purpose, and in regard to every right not delegated or yielded in that plainly written instrument. In regard to slavery, nothing was yielded on the part of any States where it existed at the time, (and that was in nearly all of them, for nearly all have since on this subject, it is it is) but something was added to their pre-existing rights—that of a restoration of their fugitive slaves. Except in this single respect, Pennsylvania has no more to do with the internal institutions of Virginia than with those of France. We are, as a people, no more responsible for slavery in any Southern State, than for the existence of the same institution in Turkey. We have not had, never did, and never can have any control over it except within our own State boundaries.

So that the clamor in regard to the fugitive slave law, is as hollow and heartless as any other cry of the abolitionists. Our fathers entered into this Union with their eyes open. They knew it should be formed upon no other terms; and they were wisely willing to underwrite the friends of freedom, humanity and religion throughout the world have had abundant cause to rejoice in this compact they made—the compromise they entered into. Suppose no Union had been formed; suppose each State remained now in its sovereign and independent position—can any man doubt that treaties would have been made between the States providing for the return of fugitive slaves, or that civil wars would have ensued? But, for reasons connected with their own best interests, the Northern States should not have aided in returning the negroes to their Southern masters; let it be fully understood among the States at the South, that they run no risk of being sent back, and holders of brutalized blacks would rush in amongst us, infinitely more numerous than at present; labor would become degraded by its cheapness, and every poor and laboring white man be brought to