Elect. D. Dimock

The Montrose Democrat.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL—DEVOTED TO POLITICS, NEWS, LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, SCIENCE, AND MORALITY.

George A. Chase, Publisher, | Montrose, Susquehanna County, Penn'a, Thursday Morning, July 24, 1856. | Volume 13, Number 31

Choice Poetry.

The White-House Race.

There's an old white horse whose name is Buck.
Du da, du da,
His dam was Freedom and his sire Good Luck.
Du da, du da day.

Chorus—We're bound to work all night,
We're bound to clear the track,
I'll bet my money on the Keystone nag,
Will anybody bet on the "*black?*"

The Keystone horse is sound and good,
Du da, du da.
He's full of democratic blood.
Du da, du da day

Chorus—We're bound to &c.

The Mustang horse is a grey little hack,
Du da, du da,
That's been well fed at the public rack,
Du da, du da day.

Chorus.—We're bound to &c.

The Keystone is a full-blood horse,
Du da, du da,
That will not balk nor bolt the course,
Du da, du da day.

Chorus—We're bound to, &c,

The Mustang horse, when he tries to trot,
Du da, du da,
Goes round and round in the same little spot,
Du da, du da day.

Chorus—We're bound to &c.

The Keystone goes at a killing pace,
Du da, du da,
He's bound to win in the four-mile race,
Du da, du da day.

Chorus—We're bound to &c.

Then do your best with the Mustang nag,
Du da, du da.
The Keystone horse will clear the track,
Du da, du da day.

Chorus—We're bound to work all night,
Were bound to clear the track,
I'll bet my money on the Keystone nag.
Will anybody bet on the "*black?*"

Miscellaneous.

For the Democrat.

FAME.

BY NELLIE CLIFTON.

It has been said that "*fame* is the hobby horse of youth!" But, we ask, are most of its votaries among the young? nay, from the "genius gifted boy" to the hoary headed man, fame has its blind worshipers.

Yonder student, with a lofty purpose written on his clear, open brow, and an eye flashing with the light of intellect, is pressing after the glittering prize.

His soul thirsts for renown, even as the weary way-worn traveler on the parched desert, thirsts for the cooling waters, and grateful shades of the green oasis; and indeed his ambition is a laudable one, for he aims to carve out his fortune unaided and alone, that he may write his name on the tablet of the fortunate, and men shall speak of him with admiration and reverence. He pictures the future as verdant with all the rain-bow hues of hope, and bends eagerly to his task, that he may one day twine the unfading coronal of glory around his brow, and drink in the adulatory prasies of multitudes swayed by the invincible might of his own genius, what though the cheek pale beside the midnight lamp, or the eye dim in pouring over volumes of ancient lore and modern science that are to satisfy his yearnings for knowledge?

The eager spirit must bathe its earth clogged wings in the fount of wisdom, and shake the dust of ignorance from its pinions, ere it can hope to sore to the loftiest pinicle in the temple of fame.

But is the ambition of the Statesman, who has numbered scores of years, less strong than that of the student, his desire for fame less ardent? When he stands in yonder Senate chamber, and thrills that august body by the magic power of his eloquence, till proud men bend their purposes to his will, like reeds before the blast, when in strains of impassioned language he gives utterance to the lofty sentiments that by the electric chord of human sympathy finds a response in every soul, till the dome and basement of that proud Capital echo with the reiterated shouts of applause which do you think is the stronger motive, patriotism or the love of fame?

And the warrior too,—do you think the brutal desire to imbrue his hands in his brothers blood is his only motive? Nay, the hope of military renown animates his breast, and in the conflict of sabred armies he is ever foremost, for the bloody laurels of victory invite him to the carnage of battle, and incite him to do deeds he would never otherwise perform while perhaps he but wears the semblance of valor and courage, without the possession of these noble qualities, to gain the applause of men.

Was a Napoleon less ambitious as the sovereign of one of the proudest empires on the globe, when the thrones of the Old world tottered at the tread of his legions, and the crowned heads of Europe did homage to the mighty conqueror for, than when a student at the military school of Brienne, or when, as an officer under the evanescent republic, his motto was "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, words mocked in all his after-life of devastating tyranny? Ambition was the master passion that made him the hero of a hundred brilliant battles, and splendid achievements; that converted Europe into a vast battle field, where he marshalled his hosts to the conflict—it was the demon that crushed all the finer feelings of his nature, and led him to sacrifice his best affections to that bauble, glory—it was the *malus factus* that lured him to the disasterous campaign to Moscow, when his soldiers melted from him, in the horrors of a Russian winter, like snow beneath a tropical sun. Fame was the fatal star that led him on, sometimes in a triumphal chariot over the bodies of slaughtered thousands, then again to the Waterloo of all his hopes, till it set forever on the barren rocks of St Helena and there left him to drag out a miserable existence and die, amid the dashing of the ocean waves, and the howl of the raging tempest, so emblematical of the strife of his own restless spirit.

Letter from Hon. Wm. B. Reed.

It affords us very great satisfaction to publish the following sound and able letter from our distinguished fellow-citizen, the Hon. Wm. B. Reed, in reply to an invitation from the Democracy of Pittsburg, to unite with them in celebrating the late anniversary of American Independence. We ask for it the most careful consideration. It presents the true questions now before the public mind, with remarkable clearness and vigor. It is hardly necessary for us to add that Mr. Reed has been a leading and influential member of the late Whig party:

PHILADELPHIA, June 20, 1856.

GENTLEMEN:—I have had the honor to receive your letter of invitation. It would, I assure you, give me great pleasure to have the opportunity of saying to my fellow-citizens of Alleghany County, why I support the nomination of Mr. Buchanan earnestly and actively. But my engagements here entirely preclude it. I should have peculiar satisfaction in being among you now, because my last visit to Pittsburgh was on a very different errand. I was there two years ago, as a member of what was supposed to be the Whig State Committee, with an earnest anxiety to save from insult and defeat your fellow-citizen, George Darsie, a man of high character and unquestioned integrity, and who, I thought, (and the result showed how truly,) was about to be sacrificed because his birthplace and every early childhood happened to be abroad.

With what followed, I need not trouble you, but within the next year I found myself obliged by mere self respect publicly to renounce all active connexion with this committee. My reason are before my fellow-citizens—and I feel no little pride in the recollection that I did not wait till its moment of decay and discomfiture to express my antagonism to that unconstitutional and anti-Republican party, known as the Know-Nothing Organization. When I said what I thought about it, it was in its full power of mischief. It is not necessary to speak of it now. Its honest adherents (and those were not a few) are leaving it. Its managers, and designers, and contrivers, ought never to be forgiven for having disfigured the political history of the country by the tradition, as it has now become, of a party which proscribed a man's religion and drew distinctions between those whom the Constitution and laws make equal.

It destroyed the old Whig party utterly and completely; and when I am now asked to vote for Mr. Fillmore as still a Whig, or for Mr. Donelson as a Democrat, I have a plain answer, that, as I understand it, each of these gentlemen became an adhering Know Nothing, or a technical "American," passed the several degrees of the order, and took its foolish and wicked oath. If this be so—and it has been openly asserted and never denied—if Mr. Fillmore, an ex-President of the United States, ever took an oath or obligation to exclude, or aid in excluding a man from public trust simply on account of his religion or birth; if in taking that obligation he had to purge himself from all sympathy or connexion with Catholics or foreigners, however innocent and respectable, then I cannot as a gentleman or an American citizen, vote for Mr. Fillmore. There has died in this city, within the last two months, one of our most venerable citizens, a resident here for more than half a century, though born abroad and a Roman Catholic. I followed him to his grave. His whole heart was loyal to his adopted country, and true to the faith of his ancestors. Two of his sons, my personal and political friends, professing the same religious opinions with their father, for years, represented this city in the Legislature of the State with honor, to themselves and their constituency, and yet if they and he were alive now, they would find themselves, by this new ritual, proscribed and disqualified. I refer to this as a most striking and to my immediate fellow citizens, familiar illustration of the practical and inevitable fruits of this organization. Well may we be grateful that a party, professing such principles, has passed away! I beg your pardon for troubling you even with this reference to it.

Those who were once Whigs are now asked to vote for Mr. Fremont and Mr. Dayton, not as Whigs, but as what are called "Republicans," for it seems to be assumed (and perhaps history justifies it) that nothing is easier for a Whig than to change his name. If he does it in a certain direction, and calls himself a Know-Nothing or a Republican, it is all very well, but if he chooses, in the exercise of a manly discretion, stimulated by local pride, to act with the Democratic party, as I certainly mean to do, there is no end to the denunciation he receives. Mr. Fremont, I do not know personally, and what I have read of him induces me to think he is a gentleman of entire personal respectability, of rambling and adventurous habits of life, and of large speculative wealth. My gallant townsman, Dr. Kane, has done quite as much in the way of adventure, endured as much hardship, gained as large a scientific fame in the cause of human charity; and yet I am not aware that he has any immediate aspirations for the Presidency. He is not a rich man and lives in Philadelphia. Mr. Dayton I do know, and have known long and well; and among all the asperities of politics, it is very pleasant to have the chance of bearing testimony (valueless though it may be,) to his high, social and intellectual position. He is worthy of every honor the nation can bestow on him, although this time his fair ambition cannot be gratified. Mr. Dayton stands on the Republican platform, having within ten years as a Senator voted against extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific ocean, and in favor of the Wilmot proviso; on the last question, if I mistake not, recording his vote against those of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay. Under these circumstances, I see no especial claim this ticket has on Whig fidelity.

But let me, in candor, ask now can any conservative or national man, especially any Pennsylvanian, vote for the Republican nominees? This is a question I should be glad to put and to have answered in your hearing. The nomination was made in Philadelphia, and I had some opportunity of observing the influences under which it was made, and the manner in which it has been received. Had the Convention been left to more disinterested impulses, it would have nominated John McLean, of Ohio, of whom it may at least be said, he is a tried public man. Still though supported earnestly and heartily by Pennsylvania—and Perhaps for that very reason, he had no chance—he was first withdrawn and then defeated. The managers and fanatics had determined on another nominee, and of course Pennsylvania was defeated, her delegates sullently firing guns of dismal acquiescence over their buried candidate. Mr. Fremont was nominated, will be sustained, I fear, by the fiercest and most sectional fanaticism. I do not care to refer to individuals, but no one will question that the leading and most active men in that convention were gentlemen who are proud to call themselves "Abolitionists." You know the opinions of the Representatives from Western Pennsylvania. I can answer for those from the East. They are generally avowed and extreme enthusiasts. But the spirit that actuated the convention was not disguised. It is very boldly avowed. There now lies before me a copy of a Philadelphia newspaper, published at the time and favorable to the Republican cause, which records that just before the nomination, a delegate (Mr. Lovejoy, of Illinois,) said, "he proclaimed himself an Abolitionist—he thought the party had the disease, and before the campaign was through it would break out all over"—and then, at this cutaneous prophecy there was a tremendous cheering in the Convention. Now, gentlemen, it is useless to disguise what sentiment predominated in this body which now claims my allegiance and that of other conservative men. I most resolutely decline all such companionship. I am bound by no such duty. I never will vote for any man who is put forward as a mere sectional candidate.

It may not be uninteresting to you to know, how this sectional nomination has been received here in Philadelphia, the metropolis of the State. Certainly not with enthusiasm, for it seems to me that the men of business here, let the severance of ancient party ties be as it may, will be slow to sustain sectional candidates—to endorse by their votes extreme abolition, or any thing which looks like abolition—to put in jeopardy the great commercial interests they have been so long striving to create, and to run the risk of four years of turmoil and disturbance on this baneful question of slavery with all its adjuncts. The second thought is fast reaching them that Mr. Buchanan uttered safe and true doctrine, when in his letter accepting the Cincinnati nomination, he said so truly and yet so simply, "most happy would it be for our country if this agitation were at an end. During its whole progress it has produced no practical good to any human being, while it has been the source of great and dangerous evils." This is exactly what I believe to be the prevalent sentiment in Philadelphia at this moment, and I shall be much disappointed if every day's reflection does not strengthen it.

But conservative men have seen other influences at work, which are nowhere so repugnant to public feeling as here in Philadelphia. They think they see in the management of the Republican canvas already the use of means that are wholly illegitimate. I do not refer to the innocent attempt to revive the musical tactics of ancient days, though I can hardly repress a smile at the idea of some of my Republican friends hereabouts becoming melodious. All this is innocent enough. But worse agencies are at work. There is now before me a letter from Hon. Charles Sumner, endorsing the Fremont nomination, in which, I find the following remarkable language:—

"Our declaration of principles," says Mr. Sumner, "appeals to the *foreign born*, who, rejoicing in the privileges of American citizens, will not hesitate to join in this holy endeavor to vindicate them against the aggressors of an oligarchy *worse than any tyranny from which they have fled*. In this contest there is every motive to Union, and also every motive to exertion." "Now or never, now and forever." Such was the ancient war-cry which, embroidered on the Irish flag, streamed from the Castle of Dublin, and resounded through the whole land, arousing a generous people to a new struggle for their ancient rights, and this war cry may be fitly inscribed upon our banner now. Arise now, or our inexorable slave-driving tyranny will be fastened upon you—arise now, and Liberty will be secured for ever."

Now, this may be considered proper Senatorial rhetoric, but I know no language strong enough to condemn such an appeal to one class of our population, or so disloyal a comparison of our Southern brethren with the butchers and tyrants of Europe. As an appeal to the foreign born, it is *perse* wrong.—As such an appeal it must be ineffectual, for the naturalized citizen knows to well how hollow such florid expressions usually are.—He knows, too, that at the very moment these words of awkward flattery were written, Mr. Sumner's candidate, Mr. Fremont, has been pronounced to be in full communion with the American Order, has accepted an American (the *North* American,) nomination and is on the ticket at this very time with your townsman, Governor Johnston, for Vice President, whose fidelity to the strictest Americanism, no one can question. But to sober-minded and conservative men, the sorrow must be, and is, most sincere, on seeing any cause thus promoted. No where will there be greater revolt than here in Philadelphia, where the class of citizens referred to have been often petted and persecuted to the top of their bent.

I have thus, gentlemen—written to you very much as I should have talked to you, plainly and unceremoniously—given my reason for refusing my support, or my vote, to two of the candidates before the people. My individual opinions, are, I am quite aware, of no value—they can only seem to be entitled to consideration so far as they represent others who have heretofore acted with me. I believe there are thousands who think as I do.

Having thus defined my opinions, it is hardly necessary for me to say why I vote for Mr. Buchanan, and why I am willing to do any thing in my power to promote his election. I look to him and Mr. Breckenridge, as the candidates who, if elected, will give the country what it most needs, repose and repress thoroughly and completely all sectional agitation on this distressing topic of domestic slavery I find in Mr. Buchanan's past, and especially his recent public career as our representatives abroad, an assurance that he will secure, with foreign nations, honorable peace. I regard him as eminently a safe and conservative statesman. But, I am proud to say, that this is being a son of Pennsylvania, (aside from other considerations,) would entitled him to my vote for I think this great Commonwealth has waited long enough, and been postponed often enough; and that now, when the choice is made of one of her most distinguished citizens for the nation's highest honor, that Pennsylvania, at least should rally to his support. I have no doubt they will, and, if there be any humble service that I can render to promote this result, my fellow citizens have a right to it. If the course I now feel it my duty to pursue, be inconsistent with former political conduct and opinions, it is an inconsistency I am rather proud of—but if it be consonant, as I think it is, with the feelings of State pride and local loyalty, which have been the controlling influences of my public life, I see no reason to regret that they continue to operate on me now, when for the first time for seventy years, we have a chance of doing something for Pennsylvania.

I have the honor to be with great regard, respectfully and truly yours.

WILLIAM B. REED.

Messrs John Birmingham, Alexander Black, M. Harbeson, R. R. Sawyer, John T. Symmes, Jas. H. Ingham, James A. Gibson, M. McCullough, A. M. Pollock, D. Campbell, C. Magee, John J. Mitchell, William Black, Committee.

SPEECH

of Mr. Toombs of Georgia, on the Senate Bill for the admission of Kansas as a State.

Mr. President and Senators, it was not at first my purpose to add anything to the observations which I made when I gave notice of the bill which is substantially the one now before the Senate. I have never been under the necessity of making one speech to explain another. Though that was brief, it told plainly what I wanted, what I meant to do, and how I intended to do it. At the same time, I declared my willingness to accept suggestions from those who agreed with me, so as to do these things in the most effectual manner. With that view, I accepted with pleasure the few amendments to the bill proposed by the Committee on Territories, and was obliged to them for correcting my own errors in matters of detail with which they were much better acquainted than myself. No, sir, I would the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Wilson] have altered my determination but for its being second by the Senator from New York, [Mr. Seward,] accompanied with the assignment of reasons so untenable and extraordinary for his position.

The Senator from New York, in a speech delivered some two months since, after recounting the various grievances of the people of Kansas, (which had no other foundation than his own imagination, and the unreliable sources from which he usually derives his information, sustained not by proof but by intrepid assertions,) called upon the Senate, and upon the country, to give peace to Kansas by introducing her as a State, with the Topeka constitution. The foundation upon which he offered that constitution to the acceptance of the Senate and the country was that it was the voice of Kansas, the will of her *bona fide* inhabitants. He assumed, enlarged upon it, and proclaimed it to the civilized world as a fact, that the voice of Kansas was smothered by invasion; that her true people were overrun and conquered by aliens, that their ballot boxes were seized, and their liberties were trampled under foot by foreigners, and he demanded that you should give justice to Kansas by allowing her people to make their own institutions. When he made that demand, though I admitted none of his assertions to be true—though I denied the truth of every single fact upon which he based his demand, I thought I saw in his demand a basis for a specify and satisfactory adjustment of this question if he were sincere in his demand. I had again and again avowed my purpose to allow the people of Kansas the right to make their own domestic institutions, under the organic law and the Constitution. I stood pledged to that policy as a public man—a pledge which I have again and again at this session, and at previous sessions, reiterated my readiness to redeem.

Then there was a common point of agreement between us. It was not upon past grievances; for there we differed. It was not upon his allegation of frauds or injuries inflicted on the inhabitants; for those I denied to the extent stated by him and his friends. But we agreed that the people of Kansas should legislate for themselves, without the intervention of force, fear, or fraud. We had but one point to settle—what was the will of Kansas? That Senator asserted that the Topeka constitution was the true exponent of that popular will, and as such he demanded its acceptance. He put it to the Senate, the country, and the civilized world that such was the fact. I did not think he believed it; I do not think so now; but I determined to meet him fairly on that issue, to test the sincerity of these declarations. I was willing to give down-trodden Kansas, if she be down-trodden, a right to make her own institutions under the Constitution, according to her own will. This is the principle upon which I supported the Kansas-Nebraska bill. I stood up on it in no fraudulent or double sense, but as an honest man ready to maintain it in the Senate and before the country at any time and all times. I determined to give peace to the country, if this would do it. It was in affirmance and not in derogation of the principles advocated by the friends of the original Kansas Bill. I only required one fact to be established; Is the Topeka constitution the choice of Kansas? This is the only question I asked; this is the sole demand I made; this is the sole difference between my proposition and that proposed by the Senator from New York. I did not believe he wanted my settlement of this question, and he has since satisfied me abundantly of the truth of that belief. I believe he wanted grievances; I believe he wanted discord; I believe he wanted anything but peace; I believe he wanted nothing but revolution, or a state sufficiently near it as to give power to his party. I will offer the evidence of this belief to the Senate and country. He and his associates told us this same story, with all its variations—the Free Soilers, the Abolitionists, the two Senators from New York, the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. Collamer,] and others repeated it. I believe the Senator from Vermont went so far as to suppose that nineteen twentieths, or some other large number of Kansas population were all on one side. He told us, in his report, that Kansas was down-trodden; that the laws made by the Legislature were not the laws of Kansas but were made by representatives of Missouri; that the majority of the people of Kansas abhorred them by them; that they were imposed on force and by fraud.

Mr. COLLAMER—Is the gentleman alluding to me?

Mr. TOOMBS—Yes, sir. In the Senator's speech he said the laws were against the will of the real settlers.

Mr. COLLAMER—I said—and I produced my proof by reference to the returns—that the Legislature was elected by Missouri votes.

Mr. TOOMBS—And did not represent the will of the people of the Territory?

Mr. COLLAMER—Yes.

Mr. TOOMBS—That is what I stated.

Mr. COLLAMER—I meant simply that a large majority of the votes which created the Legislature were cast by people from Missouri.

Mr. TOOMBS—That is what I stated to be the gentleman's position. Then I am not mistaken in asserting that that Senator set forth before the country, in an elaborate report, the position that the present government of Kansas was against the will of the people of Kansas; that a large majority of those people were opposed to the laws enacted by the Legislature; that a majority wanted the Topeka constitution; that the majority had been invaded, overridden, trampled under foot, ravished, plundered, imprisoned, murdered, as we have heard to-day. I did not believe a word of all this. I did not think those who said them believed them.—I intended to apply a test to them which would show us whether those Senators would act as all reasonable men would, who believed their statements; or whether I was sustained in my opinion of their objects, views, and purposes. I submit that point to the American people and the world. The Senator from Massachusetts, now absent from his seat, [Mr. Sumner,] told very much the same story. He spoke of down-trodden Kansas, overridden Kansas, plundered Kansas. He told us that her people had, by a foreign invasion, been deprived of the right which had been promised them, of being allowed to select their own institutions for themselves.—However variously ramified, enlarged, painted, or bedaubed, this was the basis, the corner stone, upon which was built all of their pretended grievances—all of their frantic agonies.

If these things were true, they demanded redress; but the facts being controverted, the first step towards any just measure of redress would be to ascertain the facts—to learn the truth, and then to act upon it—to act promptly, efficiently. The measure which I proposed was founded on that principle. I sought to ascertain the facts in the best possible mode that my own mind could suggest, to the end, that if these alleged wrongs were true, to remove them; and if they were not true, to demonstrate it to the thousands of honest men in the Republic who have been deceived and deluded by falsehoods concocted in the Territory, and daily transmitted to the public through congressional speeches and reports, in order to conceal the base metal under the cover of official sanction.

I came forward to offer it, not in a spirit of compromise, as I said to the Senator from New York, but in vindication of a principle. I offered it on principles which have been affirmed by the great body of American people. I did not expect to satisfy bad men on any side. When four years ago, the present Chief Magistrate was elected—and I believe most of these gentlemen voted for him, or his prominent opponent, General Scott—the people of the United States, with singular unanimity, declared it to be a sound fundamental principle that, when the people of a Territory came to be admitted into the Union, they should be admitted with or without slavery, as the *bona fide* inhabitants should determine. This was affirmed at Baltimore by the Democratic and Whig parties; it was affirmed by nineteen twentieths of the American people. Then, without going into controverted questions, as these gentlemen demanded what the Democrats and Whigs declared to be correct—as they demanded what I held to be the true principle—I felt ready, at any moment, to grant it. But what did I require? Simply, that the fact upon which it all turned should be truly ascertained. I said: "Gentlemen—you the Senators from New York, you the Senators from Massachusetts, you the Senators from Vermont—(whom I had long known and thought I could safely rely upon for a fair judgment)—if you say the voice of Kansas is for a free State, take what I offer; I present you a proposition to let her have her own free choice forever. If you have spoken truly for her, why do you not take the coveted prize?"

When I make the annunciation that I am willing to surrender Kansas precisely in conformity with the will of the nation—in conformity with your own declarations, how am I met? I offer you a pure and undefiled ballot-box. I protect it by all the means which law, backed by force, can give it. I offer the entire military force of this great country to secure you that inestimable privilege—a free, untrammeled, and uncontrolled ballot-box. How am I met? Instead of a pure ballot-box, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from New York, tender me the cartridge-box. Mr. President, if I believed those gentlemen represented the North, I would accept it and withdraw my bill now. If I believed the people of the free States were ready for that issue, before God and my country I would not shrink from it. I am content to accept it whenever the North offers it. I present no compromises; I present principles; but I do not know what claim either of those gentlemen has to speak for the North. I see around me able, patriotic and venerable statesmen—some of whom have for fifty years, in peace and in war, been honored and trusted by the North, by the South, by mankind. They give me a different account of the North. The representatives of millions of northern freemen, from every State, county and town in the non-slaveholding States, met in council with their countrymen of the south four short weeks ago. I consider them better witnesses of the feelings and wishes of the North than the Black Republican and Abolition Senators on this floor. In regard to the Senator from New York, to my knowledge, for the last ten years, all parties have dreaded nothing he would do or say so much as the odium of his alliance. I deny their right to speak for the North. When did the trust them to speak her sentiments? My convictions are confirmed by the honorable contrast to these gentlemen presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. Hale,] who, though he may differ from me—and I doubt not we shall differ in the end on this matter—presents his objections in a manly and patriotic manner. Though we disagree, I respond to the spirit with which he offers his amendments, and makes his objections.

But when these gentlemen tell me that they alone represent the opinions of the North that the national men of that section are condemned and outlawed by their constituents, I tell them that I have heard their shrieks before. I know there is an unconquered and unconquerable body of patriots at the North who repel with scorn and contempt the impudent assumptions. I know the Senator from New York [Mr. SEWARD] represents a party there, if the two or three factions who elected him may be called a party. I know the Senators from Massachusetts were lawfully elected by the proper authority to represent that State. The other Black Republicans and Free Soilers, too, have lawful commissions to speak for the States which they represent. But those commissions give them no right to speak for other constituencies whom they do not represent; and while I admit their senatorial equality in this body, I look with contempt upon their insolent attempt to palm themselves off upon the country, as the North—as the rightful and true exponents of more than half of the Republic. But when I see the men of the North who fought for public liberty seventy-five years ago—the men who have uniformerly opposed the factions that have attempted, from time to time to tear down the very pillars of the Constitution—the men who have withstood their denunciations, and resisted their efforts to gain a sectional majority by appeals to every passion that could arouse their pride—for place, plunder and power—when I see these men still standing true, I know and feel that this great country is safe; that these appeals will not be listened to; that they and their authors will be despised. The folly and baseness of these appeals are every day apparent. If two men fight in Kansas over a squatter's claim, and one is killed, it is forthwith heralded over the country as a southern aggression. If a foul-mouthed Senator gets a caning for an insulting vulgar speech, this is the last exreme of southern aggression. And the crowning aggression of the "slave power" is to seek and obtain an equal enjoyment of the common domain for all the States of the Union. It is very easy to perceive that, if these enemies of the Republic had any real grievance, they would not seek to manufacture pretended ones out of such events as these. We have asked for nothing but equality and justice to the South it has been granted by an American Congress; it is for the constituency to reject or approve the act, and thereby hangs the destiny of the Republic.

We have made no aggression on the North! I said to the honorable gentleman from New Hampshire, more than four months ago, that if there be one aggression from any of the fifteen slaveholding States of this Confederacy, present it to me, and I will myself demand the privilege of striking it from the statute-book with my own hand, and not another's.—There has been none. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. WADE] to-day, in all the violence of his vituperation—in all the ebullition of his passion, finally plants himself on Jefferson, and says he wants nothing but Jefferson's principles. I believe the Free-soil Black Republicans said, in their platform, that they rely on the fathers, and especially on Jefferson, as the head of the fathers. "They claim this Abraham for their political father."—Well, sir, they who seek for truth need not go far to find it on this subject. Jefferson has left his opinions upon it behind, in the most authoritative form.

In 1830, Mr. Jefferson, against the clamor of the progenitors of these Abolitionists, acquired Kansas. Very shortly afterwards a territorial law was passed for it, signed by Jefferson, leaving the inhabitants free to form such institutions as they pleased. That was the first law for this Territory. It allowed all people to carry their property, of all kinds slaves included, in any part of the Territory open to settlement, as far west as the Rocky Mountains, in all the region acquired from France. That law bears the sign-manual of Thomas Jefferson. The people lived, and flourished, and were happy under it. In 1820 that law was overturned. By whom? Jefferson? No; but by Rufus King and his allies, as Mr. Jefferson said, against the Constitution, and against right. I have before me Jefferson's words. He said this was done by those whom he esteemed the enemies of liberty and of their country. In 1820 the Jefferson law was taken from this Territory, and the Rufus Kings provision was applied to it, and that was the prohibition. Mr. King and friends sought to put the prohibition on the State of Missouri as a condition to her admission. He claimed the right to put this prohibition not only on Territories, but on States, and there he stood to the end voting against the line of 36 deg. 30 min, only because it did not go far enough, the line of 36 deg. 30 min. being a substitute for the more sweeping prohibition, but he was the champion and defender of universal prohibition, and in this he was backed by a great majority of the North. Mr. Jefferson foretold the end: it is not yet, but it is only delayed until the consummation of this measure of iniquity urged and defended by Rufus King and his federal allies.

I have given you the action of the fathers and the law of Jefferson. It was the first law for Kansas, and it stood till 1820. You tell us that we obtained the admission of Missouri and Arkansas under the act of 1820.——There is not a Senator here who does not know that there is not one word of truth in this allegation. Missouri was not admitted under that so called compromise. My friend from Missouri showed conclusively that the act providing for the admission of Missouri, with the prohibition in existence, and notwithstanding the prohibition, was resisted by the majority of northern members because of the very provision in her constitution which the Free-soilers are now maintaining in Kansas—the exclusion of free negroes. Missouri was not admited under the compromise establishing the line of 36 deg. 30 min; but she was rejected until she would alter this provision of her constitution. She came in not under this compromise, but under another. Besides, how many northern men voted for it? You have already seen the names, and almost every one of them was defeated on account of it. How many repealed that line? A majority of Senators representing the sovereignty of the North in this House. They found from thirty year's experience that it was wrong. A majority of the Democratic party of the North in the House of Representatives voted to repeal it; so that if we had made a bargain with the North, the true North came forward to relieve us from it, in the honesty and integrity of her heart—not the Abolition North, but the true North that was at Bunker Hill; the North that was at Saratoga; the North that was at Germantown; the North that fought during the war of 1812—not those who attempted to thwart it; the North that has ever stood for nationality and right. They repealed it by a vote of 44 to 43 in the House of Representatives, and by a large majority in this body.

You (turning to Mr. SEWARD) may traduce your own countrymen, and will abuse them as long as they stand out against your treasonable and wicked schemes for overturning the liberties of the country. As long as they are patriots, they will get your abuse. As soon as they qualify themselves for treason—as soon as they unite with you in your sectional schemes, they will get your plaudits, whatever they may have been before; but as long as they will stand up for the country, they will have the honor of your condemnation—an honor to be coveted.

In 1850 this question arose—not in reference to this Territory, but that acquired from Mexico. What was then done? Some declared that a restriction was unconstitutional; others that, though it was constitutional, it was unjust, unbrotherly, unkind. They united in declaring that the common territory of this great country, acquired by the common blood of all her sons which mingled together in the battle fields of the West, or purchased by the common funds and the money of both North and South, should be open to common enjoyment; and it was then solemnly declared, that the new States to be formed out of this Territory should be admitted into the Union, with or without slavery, as the freemen inhabiting them should prefer.—This was in direct opposition to the Missouri; and when we proposed to repeal it, we averred, in the act, that we repealed it because it was inconsistent with the acts of 1840. We said it was against justice; we said it was against the rights of the people. Congress said so in 1850. All parties, except the radical Abolitionists, said so in 1852. The Senator from New York voted, or was supposed to vote, for a man who declared that that prohibition was wrong. The whole people of both the great parties so declared. Therefore, when we came to repeal it, we said we did so because of its inconsistency with this later action, which had been approved by the man for whom the Senator from New York voted.

Mr. SEWARD. With a protest.

Mr. TOOMBS. I suppose so, and the Senator would vote for anybody to-morrow with a protest rather than get out of line with the enemies of the Republic. I believe a number of his friends on that occasion voted with a protest. Some of them talked about spitting on the platform. The leading organ of the Senator's party in New York, the waste-butt, in which is gathered together, for the willing palates of its readers, all the slander, filth, manufactured falsehoods, treasonable schemes, that associated villainy can invent or gather up throughout the land, "spit upon it."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks the Senator is out of order in using such language.

Mr. TOOMBS. To whom?

Mr. WELLER. The Senator is certainly not applying that language to any one in the Senate.

Mr. TOOMBS. I shall hear and consider, any correction which the Chair thinks proper to submit. I say this receptacle of everything dishonorable—which the Senator from New York indorses as the fountain of truth—"spit upon it," repudiated it. He and his friends took the man, and protested against his principles, because they wished to have a chance for the offices—a policy in which I hope, for the honor of the country, the Senator will have but few competitors or imitators.

But I say the principle was confirmed by the nation in 1852. It was confirmed by both parties. We assigned it as the reason for the repeal of the Missouri restriction. But without any of these reasons—if this legislation had been followed from the information of the Constitution down to now, if it had been cemented by the blood of a thousand fathers, the martyrs to liberty of this age and of all ages—if it had gone back to the day when the voice of Jehovah thundered on Mount Sinai—if it had been sustained by all the righteous and patriotic blood shed in the cause of liberty, from that day to this,—I would have stricken it off from the statute-book, because it was against the Constitution. The Constitution is my rule of action. I have no higher law, and I despise the man that has. I look upon him as a wretch who is seeking power, and will not pay its penalty—one without magnanimity or principle—one who will steep his conscience in perjury in order to get the advantages of place.—Not intending to do that, I say that if all the blood of all the fathers had sealed the bond, I would have torn it from the statute book if I stood alone, because it was against the Constitution and against justice. That is the point on which I put it. I fought it openly, independantly, before the North and the South. I take my full share of the responsibility now, henceforth and forever, whatever may be the consequences to me or the Republic.

I have no complaint to make against any man who holds himself bound by the Constitution, and puts a different construction on it from me. I honor him for following his own construction, instead of concurring in mine. New York asks, to what condition have we brought the country? Sir, we have brought it back to Jefferson's law of 1804; we have brought it back to the faith of the fathers.—We have to-day in every Territory over which