THE STAR AND BANNER.

D. A. BUEHLER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR. "FEARLESS AND FREE." TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

VOL. XIX.—25. GETTYSBURG, PA. FRIDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 1, 1848. NEW SERIES—NO 67.

☞ The following lines by Fanny Forrester, accompanied the announcement in the Maulmain Free Press, of the birth of a daughter:

MY BIRD.

BY FANNY FORRESTER.

Ere but yesterday's moon had left the sky,
A birdling sought my Indian nest,
And folded, oh so lovingly!
Her tiny wings upon my breast.

From morn to evening's purple tinge,
In winsome helplessness she lies;
Two rosy leaves with a silken fringe
Shuts softly on her starry eyes.

There's not in Ind a lovlier bird;
Broad earth owns not a happier nest;
Oh, God, thou hast a fountain stirred,
Whose waters never more shall rest!

This beautiful, mysterious thing,
This seeming visitant from heaven,
This bird, with the immortal wing,
To me—to me, thy hand hath given.

The pulse first caught its tiny stroke,
The blood its crimson hue, from mine;
The life which I have dared invoke,
Henceforth is parallel with thine.

A silent awe is in my room—
I tremble with delicious fear;
The future, with delight and gloom,
Time and eternity, are here.

Doubt—hopes, in eager tumult rise;
Hear, oh my God, one earnest prayer;
Room for my bird in Paradise,
And give her angel plumage there!

FREE SOIL VS. SLAVERY.

MR. CORWIN'S GREAT SPEECH Against the Compromise Bill.

DELIVERED IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE MONDAY, JULY 24, 1848.

(*Concluded.*)

What is there in the way, then, of my giving an intelligent vote on this subject? Nothing at all. I would take this bill in a moment, if I had faith in the processes through which that law is to pass until it becomes a law in the Chamber below.—But I have not that faith, and I will tell the gentlemen why. It is a sad commentary on the perfection of human reason, that with but few exceptions, gentlemen coming from a slave State—and I think I have one behind me who ought to be before me—[Mr. Badger,] with a very few exceptions, all eminent lawyers on this floor from that section of the country, have argued that you have no right to prohibit the introduction of Slavery into Oregon, California, and New Mexico; while, on the other hand, there is not a man, with few exceptions, (and some highly respectable) in the free States, learned or unlearned, clerical or lay, who has any pretensions to legal knowledge, but believes in his conscience that you have a right to prohibit Slavery. Is that not a curious commentary upon that wonderful thing called human reason?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is regulated by a line!

Mr. CORWIN. Yes, by 36 deg. 30 min., and what is black on one side of the line is white on the other, turning to jet black again when restored to its original locality. How is that? Can I have confidence in the Supreme Court of the United State, when my confidence fails in Senators around me here? Do I expect that the members of that body will be more careful than the Senators from Georgia and South Carolina to form their opinions without any regard to selfish considerations? Can I suppose that either of these gentlemen, or the gentleman from Georgia on the other side of the chamber, [Mr. Johnson,] or the learned Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. Davis,] who thought it exceedingly wrong that we should attempt to restrain the Almighty in the execution of His purposes, as revealed to us by Noah—can I suppose that these Senators, with all the terrible responsibilities which press upon us when engaged in legislating for a whole empire, came to their conclusions without the most anxious deliberation? And yet, on one side of the line, in the slave States, the Constitution reads yea, while on the other, after the exercise of an equal degree of intelligence, calmness and deliberation, in the free States the Constitution is made to read nay.

I admire the Supreme Court of the U. States as a tribunal. I admire the wisdom which contrived it. I rejoice in the good consequences to this Republic from the exercise of its functions. I also revere the Senate of the U. States. Here is the most august body in the world, they say, composed of men who have wasted the midnight oil from year to year—men who, in cloisters, in courts, in legislative halls, have been reaping the fruits of ripe experience, and suddenly their mighty intellects, able to scan every thing, however minute, and comprehend everything, however grand, utterly fail them, and they kneel down in dumb ingnificance, and implore the Supreme Court to read the Constitution for them. I think the Senator from South Carolina must have had some new light upon the subject within the last few years, and that several of my democratic friends on all sides of the Chamber must have been smitten with new love for the power and wisdom of the Supreme Court. You may rembember the case adverted to by the Senator from N. Jersey to-day. I recollect very well when we did not stop to inquire how the Supreme Court had ordained. It had decided, with John Marshall at its head—a man whose lightest conjectures upon the subject of constitutional law have always had with me as much weight as the well-considered opinion of almost any other man—that Congress had power to establish just such a bank as you had; but with what infinite scorn did Democratic gentlemen—Jackson Democrats as they chose to be called—curl their lips when referred to that decision of the Supreme Court. Then they was, "We are Judges for ourselves; we make no law unless we have no power to enact it." Now, however, the doctrine is, that here is the only tribunal competent to put the matter at rest forever. We are to thank God, that though all should fail, there is an infallible depository of truth, and it lives once a year for three months, in a little chamber below us! We can go there. Now I understand my duty here to be to ascertain what constitutional power we have; and when I have ascertained that, I act without reference to what the Supreme Court may do—for they have yet furnished no guide on the subject—we are to take it for granted that they will concur with us. I agree with gentlemen who have been so lofty in their encomiums upon that Court, that their decision, whether right or wrong, controls our action. But we have not hitherto endeavored to ascertain what the Supreme Court would do. I wish next to ascertain in what manner this wonderful response is to be obtained—not from the Delphic Oracle, but from that infalible divinity, the Supreme Court. How is it to be done? A gentleman starts from Baltimore, in Maryland, with a dozen black men, who have been slaves; he takes them to California, 3,000 miles off. Now, I dont know how it may be in other parts of the world, but I know that in the State of Ohio we do not travel 3,000 miles to get justice. What, then, is the admirable contrivance in this bill by which we can get at the meaning of the Constitution? It seems the meaning of the Constitution is to be forever hidden from us until light shall be given by the Supreme Court. Sir, this bill seems to me a rich and rare legislative curiosity. It does not enact "a law," which I had supposed the usual fuction of legislation.—No, sir; it only menaces "a lawsuit."—So we virtually enact that, when the Supreme Court say we *can* make law, *then* we *have* made it!

But sir, to have a fair trial of this question, so as to make it effectual to keep slaves out of our Territories, all must admit this trial should be had before slaves become numerous there. If Slavery goes there and remains there for one year, according to all experience, it is eternal.—Let it but plant its roots there, and the next thing you will hear will be earnest appeals about the rights of property. It will be said: "The senate did not say *we had no right to come here.* The House of Representatives, a body of gentlemen elected from all parts of the country, on account of their sagacity and legal attainments, did not prohibit us from coming here. I thought I had a right to come here: the Senator from South Carolina said I had a right to come; the Hon. Senator from Georgia said I had a right to come here; his colleague said it was a right secured to me somewhere high up in the clouds, and not belonging to the world; the Senator from Mississippi said it was the ordinance of Heaven, sanctified by decrees and revealed through prophecy—am I not, then, to enjoy the privileges thus so fully secured to me? I have property here; several of my women have borne children, who have *partus sequitur ventrem* borne with them: they are my property." Thus the appeal will be made to their fellow-citizens around them; and it will be asked whether you are prepared to strike down the property which the settler in those territories has acquired? That will be the case, unless the negro from Baltimore, when he gets there and sees Peons there—slaves not by hereditary taint, but by a much better title—a verdict before a justice of the peace—should determine to avail himself of the admirable facilities afforded him by this bill for gaining his freedom. Suppose my friend from New Hampshire, when he goes home, gets up a meeting and collects a fund for the purpose of sending a missionary after these men; and when the missionary arrives there, he proposes to hold a prayer meeting; he gets up a meeting, as they used to do in Yankee times, "for the improvement of gifts." He goes to the negro quarter of this gentleman from Baltimore, and says: "Come, I want this brother; it is true he is a son of Ham, but I want to instruct him that he is free." I am very much inclined to think that the missionary would fare very much as one did in South Caolina, at the hands of him from Baltimore. This bill supposes that the negro is to start all at once into a free Anglo-Saxon in California—the blood of liberty flowing in every vein, and its divine impulses throbbing in his heart. He is to say: "I am free; I am a Californian; I bring the right of *habeas corpus* with me." At last he is brought up on a writ of *habeas corpus*—before whom? Very likely one of those gentlemen who have been proclaiming that Slavery has a right to go there; for such are the men that Mr. Polk is likely to appoint. On the faith of his opinion the slave has been brought there—what can he do? There is his recorded judgment printed in your Congressional Report—what will he say? "You are a slave. Mr. Calhoun was right. Judge Berrien, of Georgia, a profound lawyer, whom I well knew, was right. I know these gentlemen well! their opinion is entitled to the highest authority; and, in the face of it, it does not become me to say that you are free—so, boy, go to your master; you belong to the class *partus sequitur ventrem*; you are not quite enough of a Saxon!" What, then, is to be done by this bill? Oh! a writ of error or appeal can come to the Supreme Court of the U. States. How? The negro, if he is to be treated like a white man, taking out an appeal, must give bonds in double the value of the subject matter in dispute. And what is that? If you consider it the mercantile value of the negro, it may be perhaps $1,000 or $2,000. But he cannot have the appeal, according to this bill, unless the value of the thing in controversy amounts to $2,000. But, then, there comes this ideality of personal liberty. What is it worth? Nothing at all—says the Senator from South Carolina—to this fellow, who is better without it. And under this complexity of legal quibbling and litigation, it is expected that the negro will stand there and contend with his master, and, coming on to Washington, will prosecute his appeal two years before the Supreme Court, enjoying the opportunity of visting his old friends about Baltimore! [Laughter.]

And now, Mr. President, if we have found upon the opinions of wise ones of old, upon the observations of past and present time, that involuntary slavery is not useful, profitable, or beneficial to either master or slave, that such institutions only become tolerable, because, when long established, the evil is less then those consequences which would follow their sudden change, I think it will be admitted that we should prohibit involuntary servitude in the territories over which we have control.

Here, then, the question arises, have we this prohibitory power? I have already said, that where the Supreme Court of the United States has solemnly adjudged any power to belong to any branch of this government, such adjudication should, until overruled, have great if not controlling weight with Cougress. What, then, are the adjudications of that Court upon this point? I quote from the case so often referred to, American Insurance Company vs. Carter, (1st Peter's Reports, page 515.) On page 542 of that case, the Court say: "The Consitution confers absolutely on the Government of the Union the powers of making war, and of making treaties. Consequently, that Governmant possesses the power of acquiring territory, *either by conquest or treaty.*" Again, on the same page, the right to make law for a Territory is thus spoken of: "Perhaps the power of governing a Territory of the United States, which has not by becoming a State acquired the means of self-government, may result necessarily from the fact that it is not within the jurisdiction of any particular State. The right to govern may be the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire territory; but whichever may be the source whence the power is derived, *the possession is unquestioned.*"

Nothing can be clearer or more satisfactory on this point. While this doctrine conforms to the plain dictates of reason, it is satisfactory to know that the principle has been strengthened by the uniform practice under the Constitution. The latter class of cases is too numerous to permit even reference to them all. They have been frequently adverted to in this debate, and therefore I need not again bring them to the attention of the Senate. I therefore find the power of Congress to make law for a territory absolute and unlimited. I have only to consider whether a law prohibiting Slavery, in a Territory where Slavery does not already exist, is sound policy for such Territory.

Now, if we can make any law whatever, not contrary to the express prohibitions of the Constitution, we can enact that a man with $60,000 worth of bank notes of Maryland shall forfeit the whole amount if he attempts to pass one of them in the Territory of California. We may say if a man carry a menagerie of wild beasts there worth $500,000, and undertakes to exhibit them there, he shall forfeit them. The man comes back with his menagerie, and says that the law forbade him to exhibit his animals there; it was thought that, as an economical arrangement, such things should not be tolerated there. That you may do: he of the lions and tigers goes back, having lost his whole concern. But now you take a slave to California, and instantly your power fails; all the power of the sovereignty of this country is impotent to stop him. That is a strange sort of argument to me. It has always been considered that when a State forms its Constitution it can exclude Slavery.—Why so? Because it chances to consider it an evil. If it be a proper subject of legislation in a State, and we have absolute legislative power, transferred to us by virtue of this bloody power of conquest, as some say, or by purchase as others maintain, I ask—why may we not act? Again—considering this as an abstract question—are there not duties devolving upon us, for the performance of which we may not be responsible to any earthly tribunal, but for which God who has created us all will hold us accountable; What is your duty, above all others, to a conquered people? You say it is your duty to give them a Government—may you not, then, do everything for them which you are not forbidden to do by some fundamental axiomatic truth at the foundation of your Constitution? Show me, then, how your action is precluded, and I submit.—Though I believe it ought to be otherwise, yet, if the Constitution of my country forbids me, I yield. The Constitutions of many States declare Slavery to be an evil. Southern gentlemen have said that they would have done away with it if possible, and they have apologized to the world and to themselves for the existence of it in their States. Those honest old men of another day never could have failed to strike off the chains from every negro in the Colonies, if it had been possible for them to do so without upturning the foundations of society.

I do not revive these things to wound the feelings of gentlemen. I know some of them consider this institution as valuable; but many of them, I also know, regard it as an evil. But Slavery is not in Oregon, it is not in California; and when I find that you have trampled down the people in order to extend your dominion over them, I feel it to be my duty, when you appeal to me to make laws for them, and the Supreme Court has said that I have the power to do so, to avert from them this evil of Slavery, and to establish free institutions, under which no man can say that another is his property. I do not doubt this power. I know that it has been considered of old, from 1787 till the present hour, to be vested in Congress.—The judicial tribunals in the West have considered it so, and the Supreme Court of the United States have said in that decision, so often referred to, that is was so. Have they found any restrictions upon us? No. And what would you do if you were in Oregon to-day, and it were a State? What would you do, and you, and you? Would any man here, if he were acting in a legislative capacity, say, "I feel myself bound to admit this evil into the country, for the benefit of some of the States who are overburdened with slaves." If this were true, it would be the duty of the free States, in that fraternal spirit which ought to prevail between the various States of the Union, to admit slaves whenever the Slave States became overburdened with them. Do we so act in legislating for our States? No; we say, "Enjoy your slaves, or free them, as you will, but it is our wish that there shall be no Slavery here." You may implore a State, if you will, to take slaves into its bosom for your convenience, but they do not feel themselves bound by any Government obligation to do. Am I not, then, bound to lay the foundations of that State for whose future press I am to be responsible, in the way which I think the most likely to produce beneficial results to the people there? And when I find myself possessed of power, and clothed with commensurate responsibility, no threats of dissolution of the Union, no heartburnings here or there, and, least of all—that which we have heard much of out of doors—the cry of Presidential election, shall deter me from pursuing this course. I am about making a law, in the language of the Ordinance of 1787; I would have it enacted that Slavery shall never exist in that country. Then, when my black man comes to the Supreme Court of the United States, as provided in this bill, he comes with a positive law in his favor, the court must overrule the decision of the case of Peters, or else such appeal must be dismissed. Then we will have acted upon the subject—we will have forbidden Slavery. I observed that some gentlemen who touched this subject, were very careful to pen, with emphasis, that Slavery may go where it is not prohibited. That is the reason I prefer the Ordinance of 1787 to the so-called Compromise Bill. I have no doubt that every Senator who assented to that bill convinced himself that it was the best we could pass. I have no doubt that our friends from the North thought it would be effective in preventing Slavery in the Territories. But I see that the Senator from South Carolina does not think so. He supports the bill for the very reason that it will admit Slavery; the Senator from Vermont, for the reason that Slavery is prohibited by it. Now, in this confusion of ideas, I desire that Congress, if it have any opinion, express it.

If we have a power to legislate over these Territories, how long would it take to write down the sixth article of the Ordinance of 1787? Those of us who think that ought to be fundamental law in the organization of Territories will vote for it; and those of us who believe otherwise, will vote against it, and, whichever party triumphs, will give law to Oregon and California, bearing the responsibility. But I must say, that I do not like what appears to me—I say it in no offensive sense—a shuffling of the responsibility which is upon us now, and which we cannot avoid. The Supreme Court may overrule our decision; but if we think we have power to ordain that Slavery shall not exist in that Territory, let us say so; if not, let us so decide. Let us not evade the question altogether.

That honorable Senators who reported this bill had its passage very much at heart, I have no doubt; nor do I feel disposed to deny that every man of them believed that it was just such a measure as was calculated to give tranquility to the agitated minds of the People of this country. Well, I do not care for that agitation further than that I shall look to it as a motive to inquire carefully what my powers and my duties are. I have heard much of this—I have been myself a prophet of dissolution of this Union; but I have seen the Union of these States survive so many shocks, that I am not afraid of dissolution. Perhaps, indeed, when this cry of wolf has been long disregarded, he may come at last when not expected; but I do not believe that the people of the South are willing to sever themselves from this Republic because we shall not establish Slavery here or there. If we have no power to pass the Ordinance of 1787, let the people of the South go to the Supreme Court, and have the question decided. It will only be a few months till the Court resumes its session here and the question can then be tried. If the decision be against us, the gentlemen of the South can at once commence their emigration to these Territories. Let us then make the law as we think it ought to made now.

I am the more confirmed in the course which I am determined to pursue, by some historical facts elicited in this very discussion. I remember what was said by the Senator from Virgina the other day. It is a truth, that when the Constitution of the United States was made, South Carolina and Georgia refused to come into the Union unless the slave trade should be continued for twenty years; and the North agreed that they would vote to continue the slave trade for twenty years; yes, voted that this new Republic should engage in piracy and murder at the will of two States! So the history reads; and the condition of the agreement was, that those two States should agree to some arrangement about navigation laws! I do not blame South Carolina and Georgia for this transaction any more than I do those Northern States who shared in it. But suppose the question were now presented here by any one, whether we should adopt the foreign slave trade and continue it for twenty years, would not the whole land turn pale with horror, that, in the middle of the nineteenth century, a citizen of a free community, a Senator of the United States, should dare to propose the adoption of a system that has been denominated piracy and murder, and is by law punished by death all over Christendom? What did they do then? They had the power to prohibit it; but, at the command of these two States, they allowed that to be introduced into the Constitution, to which much of Slavery now existing in our land is clearly to be traced. For who can doubt that, but for that woful bargain, Slavery would by this time have disappeared from all the States then in the Union, with one or two exceptions? The number of slaves in the United States at this period was about six hundred thousand; it is now three millions. And just as you extend the area of Slavery, so you multiply the difficulties which lie in the way of its extermination. It had been infinitely better that day that South Carolina and Georgia had remained out of the Union for a while, rather than that the Constitution should have been made to sanction the slave trade for twenty years. The dissolution of the old Confederation would have been nothing in comparison with that recognition of piracy and murder. I can conceive of nothing in the dark record of man's enormities, from the death of Abel down to this hour, so horrible as that of stealing people from their own home, and making them and their posterity slaves forever. It is a crime which we know has been visited with such signal punishment in the history of nations as to warrant the belief that Heaven itself had interfered to avenge the wrongs of earth.

In thus characterizing this accursed traffic, I speak but the common sentiment of all mankind. I could not, if I taxed my feeble intellect to the utmost, denounce it in language as strong as that uttered by Thomas Jefferson himself. Nay, more—the spirit of that great man descending to his grandson, in your Virginia Convention, denounced the Slave Trade, as now carried on between the States, as being no less infamous than that foreign Slave Trade carried on in ships that went down into the sea. I speak of Thomas Jefferson Randolph. If you would not go to Africa, and thence people California with slaves, may you not perpetuate equal enormities here? You take the child from its mother's bosom—you separate husband and wife—and you transport them three thousand miles off to the shores of the Pacific.

I know that this is a peculiar institution; and I doubt not that in the hands of such gentlemen as talk about it here, it may be made very attractive. It may be a very agreeable sight to behold a large company of dependents, kindly treated by a benevolent master, and to trace the manifestations of gratitude which they exhibit. But in in my eyes a much more grateful spectacle would be that of a patriarch in the same neighborhood, with his dependents all around him, invested with all the attributes of freedom bestowed upon them by the Common Father, in whose sight all are alike precious! It is, indeed, a very "peculiar" institution. According to the account of the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Davis,) this institution exhibits all that is most amiable and beautiful in our nature. That Senator drew a picture of an old, grey-headed negro woman, exhausting the kindness of her heart upon the white child she had nursed. This is true; and it shows the good master and the grateful servant. But, sir, all are not such as these. The Senator concealed the other side of the picture; and it was only revealed to us by the quick apprehension of the Senator from Florida, (Mr. Westcott,) who wanted the power to send a patrol all over the country to prevent the slaves from rising to upturn the order of society. I had almost believed, after hearing the beautiful, romantic, sentimental narration of the Senator from Mississippi, that God had, indeed, as he said, made this people in Africa, to come over here and wait upon us, till the Senator from Florida waked me up to a recollection of the old doctrines of Washington and Jefferson, by assuring us that wherever that patriarchal institution existed, a rigid police should be maintained in order to prevent the uprising of the slave. Sir, it is indeed a peculiar institution. I know many good men, who, as masters, honor human nature, by the kindness, equity, and moderation of their rule and government of their slaves; but put a bad man, as sometimes happens, as often happens, in possession of uncontrolled dominion over another, black or white, and *then* wrongs follow that make angels weep. It is, sir a troublesome institution; it requires too much law, too much force, to keep up social and domestic security; therefore, I do not wish to extend it to these new and as yet feeble Territories.

Is it pretended that slave labor could be profitable in Oregon or California? Do we expect to grow cotton and sugar there? I do not know that it may not be done there; for, as the gentleman from New York has told us, just as you go west upon this continent, the line of latitude changes in temperature, so that you may have a very different isothermal line as you approach the Pacific ocean. But I do not care so much about that. My objection is a radical one to the institution everywhere. I do believe, if there is any place upon the globe which we inhabit where a white man cannot work, he has no business there. If that place is fit only for black men to work, let black men alone work there. I do not know any better law for man's good than that old one, which was announced to man after the first transgression, that by the sweat of his brow he should earn his bread. I don't know what business men have in the world, unless it is to work. If any man has no work of head or hand to do in this world, let him get out of it soon. The idle man is the only gentleman who has nothing to do but eat and sleep. *Him* we dispose of as soon as he is fat. Difficult as the settlement of this question seems to some, it is in my judgment only so because we will not look at it and treat it as an original proposition, to be decided by the influence its determination may have on the Territories themselves. We are ever running away from this, and inquiring how it will affect the "slave States" or the "free States." The only question mainly to be considered is, How will this policy affect the Territories for which *this* law is intended? Is Slavery a good thing, or is it a bad thing, for *them?* With my views of the subject, I must consider it bad policy to plant Slavery in any soil where I do not find it already growing. I look upon it as an exotic, that blights with its shade the soil in which you plant it; therefore, as I am satisfied of our constitutional power to prohibit it, so I am equally certain it is our duty to do so.

In the States where law and long usage have made the slave property, as property I treat it. It is there, and while there it should and will receive that protection which the Constitution and the good neighborhood of the States afford and require at our hands. But I should be false to my best convictions of duty, policy, and right, if by my vote I should extend it one acre beyond its present limits. I may be mistaken in all this; but of one thing I am satisfied—of the honest conviction of my own judgement; and no imaginary interruption of the ties which bind the various sections of the Confederacy, shall induce me me to shrink from these convictions, whenever I am called upon to carry them out into law.

But we are told that, when the Constitution was made, there existed certain relative proportions between the power of the slave and between the power of the free States. I understand the Senator from South Carolina, that we were under obligations to preserve forever these relative proportions in the same way.

Mr. CALHOUN. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. CORWIN. I am very happy to be undeceived. I understood the Senator to conceive that this is a question of power. It is not so. It is a question of municipal law, of civil polity. The men who framed the Constition never dreamed that there was to be a conflict of power between the slave and free States. They never dreamed that the South was to contend that they would always be equal in representation in the Senate to the North. They had no idea of that equilibrium of power of which we have heard so much. The circumstances of that period forbade any such supposition. Looking at all the circumstances, (and I have no doubt these farseeing men regarded them carefully,) you would have had fourteen free States and nine slave States. But every man who had much to do with the formation of the Constitution expected and desired that Slavery should be prohibited in the new States; and they even expected to have it abolished in many of the States where it existed. They had no idea of conflict; and if the ultra fanatics in the South, as well as those in the North, would let the subject alone, we should have much less difficulty in a proper settlement of the question.

While the extreme fanaticism of the North, it is said, would burst the barriers of the Constitution, and rush into the slave States to enforce their abolition views, trampling on your laws and madly overturning existing institutions there, the South vents its fiery indignation in tones of unmeasured reproach. But have Southern gentlemen considered their position before the world on this question? You declare the opinion that Slavery does not exist in Oregon, California, or New Mexico; all the immense regions are now, and for many years, have been free from Negro Slavery. And now what do the ultra fanatics of the South ask? Sir, they avow their determination to rush into these free Territories, overturn the social systems there existing, uproot all establishments founded in and moulded by an absence of Slavery, and having thus swept away the former free systems, plant there forever the system of involuntary servitude. Sir, Southern gentlemen must say no more about the fanatics of the North endeavoring to uproot your institutions, while you imitate the example of those fanatics in your treatment of the Free Soil of this Union. Sir, there is no difference between the two cases. The fanatics of the South are but a counterpart of those of the North. If there be any difference, it is only this: The fanatic of the North has this apology—he purposes, at least in theory, to enlarge and extend the boundaries of human rights. The fanatic of the South, strangely inconsistent with the obvious tendencies of the age, seeks to extend, at one sweep, human *black* slavery over a country, new and sparsely settled, larger in extent than most of the Governments of the Old World. This does appear to my poor judgement, not merely at war with the spirit of the age, with the *better* spirit, I would say, of men in all ages; nay, more—I must be pardoned if I declare it wears the aspect of absurdity, arrogance, and timerity. Sir, I have spoken out my opinions freely, boldly, but in no spirit of unkindness to any man or any section of our common country. I know how widely different are the views of other gentlemen from mine. I know how habit, usage, time, color our thoughts, and indeed form our principles often. But I must here repeat my belief, that if we could set about this business in the spirit of those who founded this Republic, we should have no difficulty in enacting the Ordinance of 1787. Sir, it is best to repeat what they did. In 1787, they made the Constitution. In 1787, they made that celebrated Ordinance for the Northwest. Sir, this doctrine of free territory is not new; it is coeval with the Constitution, born the same year, of the same parents, and baptised in the same good old Republican church. And now, when we are about to establish these new Republics, much larger than the old, why should we not imitate their example, reenact their laws, and thus secure to this new Republic on the Pacific the glory, the prosperity, the rational progress, which have shed such lustre around that founded upon the shore of the Atlantic?

A Senator who sits before me (Mr. Fitzgerald) has with great propriety explained to the Senate the position in which he is placed on this subject, as connected with his friend, General Cass, not now a member of this body. The subject, as bearing on the opinions and prospects of both General Cass and General Taylor, has been often adverted to in this debate. While I am yet on my feet, I desire to say a word or two on this aspect of the debate.

I speak of one absent from this Chamber with every feeling of respect, and with some reluctance. It is said, and I believe truly, that General Cass has, within the last two years, entertained two opinions on this subject, the one in direct conflict with the other. In other words, he has changed his opinion respecting it. Whereas he was at *one time* in favor of extending the Ordinance of 1787 over all new territory; *now*, he denies the power of Congress to do so. Thus it follows that he would arrest all such legislation by interposing his veto. His position *at present* is fixed. But, sir, this facility in forming and changing opinions in a gentleman at his time of life, gives some hope that in the future he may not *obstinately* persevere in his error. Sir, one who on such subjects can change in the two past years his opinion, gives hopeful expectation that he may change back in the two years to come. As Major Dugald Dalgetty would say, "He will be amenable to reason." His opinion, it seems, is, that the whole subject is to be given over to the unlimited discretion of the Territorial Legislatures. As to General Taylor's position in regard to this and all like subjects of domestic policy, I here declare that if I did not consider him pledged by his published letter to Captain Allison not to interpose his veto on such subjects of legislation, he certainly could not get my vote, nor do I believe that of any Northern State.

Mr. HANNEGAN. I would like to be informed by the Senator from Ohio, as he has referred to General Cass's position, and as he is about to give his support to General Taylor, if he can give us General Taylor's views on the subject, and what his opinion would be, as expressed in his message to Congress!

Mr. CORWIN. I cannot.

Mr. HANNEGAN. I understand the Senator from Ohio to say, that if General Taylor would interpose a veto upon the subject, he would not vote for him under any circumstances.

Mr. CORWIN. I would not; nor would any Whig in Ohio, unless indeed we found him opposed to just such another man who had a great many bad qualities beside. (A laugh.) But, sir, I have to say that I do not believe that General Taylor could get the electoral vote of a free State in America, if it were not for the belief that prevails, that upon this subject, as well as upon any other of domestic policy, where the power of Congress had been sanctioned by the various departments of Government, and acquiesced in by the people, he would not, through the veto power, interfere to crush the free will of the people, as expressed through both branches of Congress.

I repeat, sir, that if Congress, having the power as defined by the Supreme Court, acted on by Congress in various cases, as shown by your legislation, sanctioned in so many ways, and till now cheerfully acquiesced in by the people, should enact the Ordinance of 1787 over again, and extend it over the three Territories in question, and the man in the White House should interpose his veto, and again and again thrust his puny arm in the way of the Legislative power, and arrest for a long time the popular will, I will not say he would be impeached, tried, and (if the law were so) have his head brought to the block. Patience might in its exhaustion give way to exasperation, and the forms of law and the majesty of judicial trial fall before the summary vengeance of an abused and insulted people.

I know very well that the Senate is weary of this debate. I wish now only to state another fact, which will show what it is which our brethren of the South now demand. If you take the area of the free States and the slave States as they exist, and compare them, you will find that the latter predominate. When the Constitution was formed, and when all the territory which you then had was brought into the Union, the free States had an excess of 100,000 square miles over the slave States; but when you had acquired Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, and added them to the Union, and when you have added the claim of the South that they will carry their slaves into Oregon, New Mexico, and California, what will then be the condition of the free States? The slave States will have one-third more power in the Senate of the United States than the free States could ever have.

Sir, if this is to be viewed at all as a question of power, what I have stated would be the exact result of yielding to the present claim of the South; and this will be the result, unless you prohibit the introduction of slavery into these territories. Sir, I have seen the working of this system: Plant thirty slave-holders among three hundred inhabitants who are not slaveholders, and they will maintain their position against the three hundred. Let one man out of fifty be a slaveholder, and he will persuade the forty-nine that it is better that the institution should exist. It is a capital and social position, opposed to labor and poverty. How this war may wage in the future, I will not say; but thus far the former have ever been an over-match for the latter.

But, sir, I do not like this view of such a subject. If it were merely a comparison of strength or contest for relative power, I could yield without a struggle. But I am called on to lay the foundations of society over a vast extent of country. If this work be done wisely now, ages unborn will bless us, and we shall have done in our day what experience approved and duty demanded. If this work shall be carelessly or badly done, countless millions that shall inherit that vast region will hereafter remember *our* folly as *their* curse; our names and deeds, instead of praises, shall only call forth execration and reproach. In the conflict of present opinions, I have listened patiently to all. Finding myself opposed to some with whom I have rarely ever differed before, I have doubted myself, re-examined my conclusions, reconsidered all the arguments on either side, and I am still obliged to adhere to my first impressions. I may say, my long cherished opinions. If I part company with some *here*, whom I habitually respect, I still find with me the men of the *past*, whom the nations venerated. I stand upon the ordinance of 1787. There the path is marked by the blood of the Revolution. I stand in company with the "men of '87," their locks wet with the mists of the Jordan over which they passed, their garments purple with the waters of the Red Sea through which they led us of old, to the land of promise. With them to point the way, however dark the *present*, Hope shines upon the future, and, discerning their footprints in my path, I shall tread it with unfaltering trust.

A CHAPTER OF POLITICAL WONDERS.—Some one has quaintly remarked, since peace has been made, that this has been the first example of war *begun without authority and ended without authority.*—But this is only a part of the wonders which attend this most extraordinary chapter of history. Look at these, for example:

1. The President makes war without the authority of law.
2. His Ambassador ends it without his authority, or any authority.
3. The President of this country permits the ablest Generals of the enemy to take the command and fight us as hard as possible.
4. The General of our forces, who conquered the enemy, is arrested in the midst of victories, and, without offence, is tried as a criminal.
5. We propose to pay twenty millions of dollars for territory we have already occupied.
6. We have the best lands in the world, and we are exceedingly anxious to get at the worst.

A series of contradictions, of blunders, and incredible inconsistencies, like these, cannot, we believe, be paralleled by any administration in any country. Perhaps, if we hunt up the records of King John or Henry VI., we may possibly find a parallel; but certainly not in this country or in any recent history of Europe.—*Frankfort (Ky.) Commonwealth.*

ALABAMA.—The Taylor Convention of the seventh district has selected Samuel F. Rice as the TAYLOR and FILLMORE elector of that district. Mr. Rice was a thorough going Democrat, but goes enthusiastically for Taylor and Fillmore, and is hard at work, addressing the people in various parts of the district.

LYNCHING.—A colored man named John Smith, was tarred and feathered in Birmingham, Pa., near Pittsburg, on Wednesday night last, by a number of his own color, because he had betrayed a runaway slave from Virginia into the hands of his master, for $100 reward.

TENNESSEE.—The Memphis *Eagle* says:—Tennessee is shouting from all her hills, mountains and valleys, for Taylor and Fillmore. Ratification meetings are being held in the counties generally, and a tornado of enthusiasm is sweeping down all remnants of opposition to Gen. Taylor. In Columbia, the home of Mr. Polk, an immense gathering ratified the nominations—the largest and most animated meeting ever congregated from the hills and hollows of old Maury. The truth is, our opponents in Tennessee might as well ground their arms at once in this fight, and surrender at discretion—for old Zack will capture most of them before November.