

or three months! Sir, my judgment was made up and expressed from the first. I learned it from Chatham: "My lords, you cannot conquer America." And you have not conquered the South. You never will. It is not in the nature of things possible; much less under your auspices. But money you have expended without limit, and blood poured out like water. Defeat, debt, taxation, sepulchres, these are your trophies. In vain the people gave you treasure, and the soldier yielded up his life. "Fight, tax, emancipate, let those," said the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. Pike] at the last session, "be the Trinity of our salvation." Sir, they have become the Trinity of your deep damnation. The war for the Union is, in your hands, a most bloody, and costly failure. The President confessed it on the 22d of September, solemnly, and under broad seal of the United States. And he has now repeated the confession. The priests and rabbis of abolition taught him that God would not prosper such a cause. War for the Union was abandoned; war for the negro openly begun, and with stronger battalions than before. With what success? Let the dead at Fredericksburg and Vicksburg answer.

And now, sir, can this war continue? Whence she money to carry it on?—Where the men? Can you borrow? From whom? Can you tax more? Will the people bear it? Wait till you have collected what is already levied. How many millions more of "legal tender"—to-day forty-seven per cent, below the par of gold—can you float? Will men enlist now at any price? Ah, sir, it is easier to die at home. I beg pardon; but I trust I am not "discouraging enlistments." If I am, then first arrest Lincoln, Stanton, and Halleck, and some of your other generals; and I will retreat; yes, I will recant. But can you draft again? Ask new England—New York. Ask Massachusetts. Where are the nine hundred thousand? Ask not Ohio—the North west. She thought you were in earnest, and gave you all—more than you demanded.

"The wife whose first smile that day,

The fair, fond bride of yesterday,

And aged sire, and matron gray,

Saw the loved warriors haste away,

And deemed it sin to grieve."

Sir, in blood she has atoned for her credulity; and now there is morning in every house, and distress and sadness in every heart. Shall she give you any more?

But ought this war to continue? I answer, no—not a day, not an hour. What then? Shall we separate? And I answer, no, no, no! What then? And now, sir, I come to the grandest and most solemn problem of statesmanship from the beginning of time; and to the God of Heaven, "Master of hearts and minds, I would humbly appeal for some measure, at least, of light and wisdom, and strength to explore and reveal the dark but possible future of this land.

CAN THE UNION OF THESE STATES BE RESTORED? HOW SHALL IT BE DONE?

And why not? It is historically impossible! Sir, the frequent civil wars and conflicts between the States of Greece did not prevent their cordial union to resist the Persian invasion; nor did even the thirty years' Peloponnesian war springing, in part, from the abduction of slaves, and embittered and disastrous, as it was—let Thucydides speak—wholly destroy the fellowship of those States. The wise Romans ended the three years social war after many bloody battles, and much acuteness, by admitting the States of Italy to all the rights and privileges of Roman citizenship—the very object to secure which these States had taken up arms. The border wars between Scotland and England running through centuries, did not prevent the final union, in peace and by adjustments, of the two kingdoms under one monarch. Compromise did at last what ages of coercion and attempted conquest had failed to effect. England kept the crown, while Scotland gave the king to wear it; and the memories of Wallace and the Bruce of Bannockburn, became part of the glories of British history. I pass by the union of Ireland with England—a union of force, which God and just men abhor; and yet precisely "the Union as it should be, of the abolitionists of America. Sir, the rivalries of the houses of York and Lancaster filled all England with cruelty and slaughter; yet compromise and intermarriage ended the strife at last, and the white rose and the red were blended in one."

Who dreamed a month before the death of Cromwell that in two years the people of England, after twenty years of civil war and usurpation, would, with great unanimity, restore the house of Stewart in the person of its most worthless prince, whose father but eleven years before they had beheaded? And who could have foretold in the beginning of 1812, that within some three years, Napoleon would be in exile upon a desert island, and the Bourbons restored? Armed foreign intervention did it; but it is a strange history. Or who then expected to see his nephew of Napoleon, thirty-five years later, with the consent of the people, supplant the Bourbon and reign Emperor of France? Sir, many states and people, once separate, have become united in the course of ages through natural causes and without conquest; but I remember a single instance only in history, of states or people once united, and speaking the same language, who have been forced permanently asunder by evil strife or war, unless they were separated by distance or vast natural boundaries. The secession of the Ten Tribes is the exception; these parted without actual war; and their subsequent history is not encouraging to secession. But when Moses, the greatest of all statesmen, would secure a distinct nationality and government to the Hebrews, he left Egypt and established his people in a distant country. In modern times, the Netherlands, three centuries ago, won their independence by the sword; but France and the English Channel separated them from Spain. So did our Thirteen Colonies; but the Atlantic ocean discovered us from England. So did Mexico, and other Spanish colonies in America; but the same ocean divided them from Spain, Cuba and the Canada still adhere to the parent Government. And who now, North or South, in Europe or America, looking into history, shall presumptuously say that because of civil war was the reunion of these States impossible? War, indeed, is disunion, and, if it lasts

long enough, will be final, eternal separation, first, and anarchy and despotism afterward. Hence I would hasten peace now, to-day, by every honorable appliance. Are there physical causes, which render reunion impracticable? None. Where other causes do not control, rivers unite; but mountains, deserts, and great bodies of water—oceanic dissociates—separate a people. Vast forests originally, and the lakes now, also divide us—now very widely or wholly—from the Canadians, though we speak the same language, and are similar in manners, laws, and institutions. Our chief navigable rivers run from North to South. Most of our bays and arms of the sea take the same direction. So do our ranges of mountains.—Natural causes all tend to Union, except as between the Pacific coast and the country east of the Rocky mountains to the Atlantic. It is "manifest destiny"—Union is empire. Hence, hitherto, we have continually extended our territory, and the Union with it, South and West. The Louisiana purchase, Florida, and Texas all attest it. We passed desert and forest, and scaled even the Rocky mountains, to extend the Union to the Pacific. Sir, there is no natural boundary between the North and the South, and no line of latitude upon which to separate; and it is ever a line of longitude shall be established, it will be east of the Mississippi valley. The Alleghanies are no longer a barrier. Highways ascend them everywhere, and the railroad now climbs their summits and spans their charms, or penetrates their rockiest sides. The electric telegraph follows, and stretches its connecting wires along the clouds, there mingling its vocal lightnings with the fire of heaven.

But disunionists in the East will force a separation of any of these States, and a boundary purely conventional, is at last to be marked out, it must and it will be either from Lake Erie upon the shortest line to the Ohio river, or from Manhattan to the Canadas.

And now, sir, is there any difference of race here, so radical as to forbid reunion? I do not refer to the negro race, styled now, in unctuous official phrase by the President, "Americans of African descent." Certainly, sir, there are two white races in the United States, both from the same common stock, and yet so distinct—one of them so peculiar—that they develop different forms of civilization, and might belong, almost, to different types of mankind. But the boundary of these two races is not at all marked by the line which divides the slaveholding from the non-slaveholding States. If race is to be the geographical limit of disunion, then Mason and Dixon's can never be the line.

Next, sir, do not the causes which, in the beginning, impelled to Union still exist in their utmost force and extent? What were they?

First, the common descent—and there fore consanguinity—of the great mass of the people from the Anglo-Saxon stock. Had the Canadas been settled originally by the English, they would doubtless have followed the fortunes of the thirteen colonies. Next, a common language, one of the strongest of the ligaments which bind a people. Had we been contiguous to Great Britain, either the causes which led to a separation would have never existed, or else been speedily removed; or, afterwards, we would long since have reunited as equals and with all the rights of Englishmen. And along with these were similar, at least not essentially dissimilar, manners, habits, laws, religion, and institutions of all kinds, except one. The common defense was another powerful incentive, and is named in the Constitution as one among the objects of the "more perfect Union" of 1787. Stronger yet than all these, perhaps, but made up of all of them, was a common interest. Variety of climate and soil, and therefore of production, implying also extent of country, is not an element of separation, but, added to contiguity, becomes a part of the ligament of union, because of the close of the ligament of the marriage relation, and the family with similar influences, they are stronger than hooks of steel. He was a wise statesman, though he may never have held an office, who said, "Let me write the songs of a people, and I care not who makes them."

Other ties, also, less material in their influence, have grown up under the Union. Long association, a common history, national reputation, treaties and diplomatic intercourse abroad, admission of new States, a common jurisprudence, great men whose names and fame are the patrimony of the whole country, patriotic music and songs, common battle field, and glory won under the same flag. These make up the poetry of Union; and yet, in the marriage relation, and the family with similar influences, they are stronger than hooks of steel. He was a wise statesman, though he may never have held an office, who said, "Let me write the songs of a people, and I care not who makes them."

What is the Marquise prohibited in France? Sir, Haiti Coloumn and the Star spangled Banner—Pennsylvania and the Constitution, and Mary and the other States, and the other sections, and all the debates in the Capitol for forty years, and they will do more yet, than all our armies, navies, and treasuries, to bind us together.

Sir, I would add, "Yankee Doodle," but first let me assure that Yankee Doodle loves the South, and has not the slaveholding States.

And now, sir, I purpose finally to consider the causes which led to disunion and the present civil war; and those which are eternal and ineradicable, and which, if possible, it is now too late to overcome all the causes and considerations which dimmed the vision.

For two years ago discussed faith and reason, the moral, political, and private causes whence civil commotions in all Governments, and those which will do more yet, than all our armies, navies, and treasuries, to bind us together.

Sir, I would add, "Yankee Doodle," but first let me assure that Yankee Doodle loves the South, and has not the slaveholding States.

And now, sir, I purpose finally to consider the causes which led to disunion and the present civil war; and those which are eternal and ineradicable, and which, if possible, it is now too late to overcome all the causes and considerations which dimmed the vision.

What is the Marquise prohibited in France? Sir, Haiti Coloumn and the Star spangled Banner—Pennsylvania and the Constitution, and Mary and the other States, and the other sections, and all the debates in the Capitol for forty years, and they will do more yet, than all our armies, navies, and treasuries, to bind us together.

Sir, I would add, "Yankee Doodle," but first let me assure that Yankee Doodle loves the South, and has not the slaveholding States.

And now, sir, I purpose finally to consider the causes which led to disunion and the present civil war; and those which are eternal and ineradicable, and which, if possible, it is now too late to overcome all the causes and considerations which dimmed the vision.

These, sir, along with the establishment of justice, and the securing of the general welfare, and of the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity, made up the causes and motives which impelled our fathers to the Union at first.

But slavery is the cause of the war—

Why? Because the South obstinately and wickedly refused to restrict or abolish it at the demand of the philosophers or fanatics and demagogues of the North and West. Then, sir, it was abolition, the purpose to abolish or interfere with them in slavery, which caused disunion and war. Slavery is only the subject, but abolition the cause, of this civil war. It was the persistent and determined agitation in the free States of the question of abolishing slavery in the South, because of the alleged "irreducible conflict" between the forms of labor in the two sections, or in the false and mischievous cause of the day, between freedom and slavery, that forced a collision of arms at last.—Sir, that conflict was not confined to the Territories. It was expressly proclaimed by its apostles, as between the States also, against the institution of domestic slavery everywhere. But, assuming the platforms of the Republican party as the standard

and stating the case most strongly in favor of that party, it was the refusal of the South to consent that slavery should be excluded from the Territories that led to the continued agitation. North and South of that question, and finally to disunion and civil war. Sir, I will not be answered now by the old claim about "the aggressions of the slave power." That miserable specter, the unreal mockery, has been exercised and expelled by debt and taxation and blood. It that power did govern this country for sixty years preceding this terrible revolution, then the sooner this Administration and Government return to the principles and policy of southern statesmanship, the better for the country; and that, sir, is already, or soon will be, the judgement of the people. But I deny that it was the "slave power" that governed for so many years, and so wisely and well. It was the Democratic party, and its principles and policy, modified and controlled, largely by southern statesmen. Neither will I be stopped by that other cry of mingled fanaticism and hypocrisy, about the sin and barbarism of African slavery. Sir, I see more of barbarism and sin, a thousand times, in the continuance of this war, the dissolution of the Union, the breaking up of this Government, and the enslavement of the white race by debt and taxes and arbitrary power. The day of fanatics and sophists and enthusiasts, thank God, is gone at last; and though the age of chivalry may not, the age of practical statesmanship is about to return. Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And when we have done this, my word for it, the safety, peace, and welfare of the African will have been secured. Sir, there is fifty-fold less of anti-slavery sentiment to day in the West than there was two years ago, and if this war be continued, there will be still less a year hence. The people there begin, at last, to comprehend that domestic slavery in the South is a question, not of moral, or religious, or humanity, but a form of labor, perfectly compatible with the dignity of free white labor in the same community, and with national vigor, power, and prosperity, and especially with military strength. They have learned or begin to learn, that the evils of the system affect the master alone, or the community and State in which it exists; and that we of the free States partake of all the material benefits of the institution, unmixed with any part of its mischiefs. They believe also in the subordination of the negro race to the white where they both exist together, and that the condition of subordination, as established in the South, is far better every way for the negro than the hard servitude of poverty, degradation and crime to which he is subjected in the free States. All this, sir, may be pro-slavery, if there be such a word. Perhaps it is; but the people of the West begin now to think it wisdom and good sense. We will not establish slavery in our midst; neither will we abolish or interfere with it outside of our own limits.

Sir, I accept the language and intent of the Indiana resolution to the full—"that in considering terms of settlement we will look only to the welfare, peace, and safety of the white race, without reference to the effect that settlement may have upon the condition of the African. And