## SPEECH OF JUDGE KELLEY: Delivered at Spring Garden Hall, Philadelphia, September 9th, 1856.

Have you heard the news from Maine, boys? (Great Applause). Such were the words answer in the language of the good old sage with which I commenced an address to the and statesman, the Democratic leader-Anfriends of Polk, Dallas and Shunk, in 1844, -a drew Jackson-"the Union-it must and shall bout this season of the year, in the district of Spring Garden; and the Democratic news that had come that day,—the day succeeding a Gubernatorial and Congressional electionwas esteemed as the sure prestige of victory to the party, as we esteem the news to-day .--(Cheers.)

We live in curious times, politically, my friends. Why is it that the Democratic star of the West, have wheeled into line and put themselves on either side of the Whig Gibraltar, Vermont? Why stand Democratic Maine and Iowa supporting Whig Vermont? There is a significance in the fact. It tells, to those who understand it, the whole secret of the uprising of the people which has made a party so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, but a few weeks old,] the master of the destinies of the Commonwealth, and the party to settle the coming election. [Immense applause].
The Whigs of old and the Democrats of old,

however they differed upon other questions, agreed upon one; indeed their agreement was so entire that no question was made upon the subject. They differed as to a National Bank; they differed as to a Tariff; they differed as to the distribution of the public lands; they differed as to the improvement of rivers and harbors by the General Government; but they agreed as the patriots who framed the Constitution and who gave our government consistency by the earliest action under it-they agreed between themselves, and with the great men who had moved before them that slavery was did legislate, and said that nobody but a citia local domestic institution; that, being such, | zen of the United States should bring a slave the General Government had no concern with there; that he must come for actual settleit within the limits of any one of the States .-They agreed, in esteeming it a great social imported into that State, by the slave-dealer, and political evil. They held that the Terri- whether he came from Cuba or Virginiatories, being the common property of the whether he came from Africa or the northern States and of the people, and having been con- slave States. It allowed the citizen who ownfided by the Constitution of the United States | ed slaves, and who was going into Louisiana to Congress, fit having been made the duty of to settle, to take his slaves with him; but it Congress to make all necessary regulations allowed no slave to enter the Territory by any for the Territories,] it was the business of other means than that; and had a slave been Congress to legislate for Territories, and to taken into that Territory as they have been taexclude from them so great a social and polit- ken into Kansas, the habeas corpus would have ical evil as Slavery. There was no diversity been issued, and the great judge of that day, of opinion on this subject among those who John Marshall, would have given the slave his established the confederacy and governed the country during the existence of the confed- is the law of to-day; and yet are not slaves eration. There was no disagreement among | carried into Kansas, and is there not there as the earlier members of Congress during the Chief Justice a man whose infamies will re-Administration of George Washington, or be- deem the character of Jeffries in history? tween that great man and the great men who And yet, Democrats, you are asked to vote made up his cabinets. I have stated the doc- and sustain him; and, Americans, you are trine held by them all-that the States were asked to give a half vote, or not to vote against sovereign and independent-that over the in- him. There is the position of the parties. stitutions of the States Congress had no con- The Republicans come up and say, "Kansas is trol-that the Territories were the common free; it is the land of freedom-it is free by property of the States, and that it was the du- the law of God and the law of man, and being ty of Congress to legislate for the Territories; free, we mean to exercise all the power with and by all their action they showed that they which, under God and the Constitution of our agreed in the opinion, that, it being the duty country, we are invested, to secure its freedom of Congress to legislate for the Territories, it to the white man forever." We ask you to was their duty to legislate in such a manner as | join us in the work. should promote the welfare of the people, and therefore, to exclude Slavery from the common domain. [Loud cheers.]

I shall not detain you by dwelling upon the circumstances of the great ordinance of 1787, which gave treedom to Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Illinois. That territory was the property of Virginia, a slave State, and, had no confederation taken place, no Union been framed, it would have been slave territory, as the mother State was. It was It was during the administration of John Tyceded, though in the Southern portions of it ler, when the 'Texas bill' was under considerwere contained considerable numbers of slaves, ation. It was proposed to admit Texas into especially in Illinois. It was ceded first to the Union, and it was agreed in the resolution the confederacy, and subsequently to the United States; Thomas Jefferson himself drafted the ordinance, by which "involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime," was prohibited from all that territory forever .- to the Union; but that from so much of it as That was the draft of the great Virginia statesman. Quibblers tell you that that was the ac- language of the ordinance of Jefferson) "intion of the confederacy. I tell you that it was the action of the confederacy, and that the first crime, should be prohibited forever. Mr. Bu-Congress assembled under our Constitution, made that the law of Congress which had been made the ordinance of the confederacy. It was re-enacted, in the very language of Jefferson, as the sixth section of the act of the government of the Northwestern Territory.

The territory ceded by North Carolina and

by Kentucky, was ceded with stipulations, and Congress was not free to legislate beyond those stipulations; but there came a time when Congress was required to legislate for the territories, and it came speedily. We acquired the Louisiana Territory. We bought it, Mr. Jefferson taking an active part in its purchase, he having succeeded Washington and Adams in the Presidential chair. Now, what were the provisions for the government of that territory, thus acquired by purchase? It was slave territory. The French had admitted slavery into Louisianna; it had its existence there; money was invested in slavery; the habits of the people were adapted to slave labor. That territory, slave territory as it was, was acquired by purchase in 1803 and in 1804, Thomas Jefferson being President, the Congress of the United States legislated upon the subject. Did they legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories-for mark you, we are now called "traiters" and disunionists," because we assert the doctrine that it is the duty of Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories. Upon that one proposition all the grave charges are based, and I propose to show you that if we are traitors and disunionists, our great exemplar was George Washington; that the next in rank, and perhaps even greater in efficiency in this work, was Thomas Jefferson; that we have had in the treasonable and disunion ranks every President, beginning with Washington and ending with Millard Fillmore. If we are a set of traitors and disunionists, the first great set were Washington and his cabinet, and the Senate and Congress of his day; and the last who legislated especially upon the subject were James K. Polk with his cab-Inet (of whom James Buchanan was one) and the Congress of their day; so that if we are traitors and disunionists, we have a brilliant example and a bright array of patriotic names to lead us on. [Great applause.]

But, my friends, if I were asked to sum up should utter in the language of the Whig should responder of the Constitution—"Liberty and Union, one and inseperable, now and for-

ever." [Immense enthusiasm.] If I were asked to express the one point upon which the opinions, the convictions, the will of that party are more thoroughly settled and more vehemently active than any other, I would

be preserved." [Vociferous applause.]
Having, in brief terms, disposed of the first legislation on the subject of Territories, I now come to that of the Territory of Louisiana, the first acquired after the establishment of the Constitution of the United States. What was the action of Congress with reference to that Territory? What was done may be found (United States Statutes, at large, vol. 2. page of the East, and the young Demogratic Giant 238) in an Act approved March 26, 1804, entitled "An act erecting Louisiana into two Territories and providing for the temporary government thereof."

By this Act, all south of the parallel lines of thirty-three degrees, being the present State of Louisiana, was organized by itself under the name of the "Territory of Orleans."

In respect to this Territory of Orleans, the

10th section prohibits the bringing in of slaves from a foreign country; also the bringing in of slaves from any part of the United States. who may have been brought into the United States after the 1st of May, 1798; and finally provides as follows ;-

No slave, or slaves, shall directly or indirectly be introduced into said Territory, except by a cit-izen of the United States removing into said Territory for actual settlement, and being at the time of such removal a bona fide owner of such slave or slaves; and every slave imported or brought into said Territory contrary to the provisions of this act, shall thereupon be entitled to, and receive his or her freedom

It is said that slavery is a subject upon which Congress has no right to legislate. Here they ment-in other words, that no slave should be

Now, my friends, from that time, down till near the close of Mr. Polk's administration, any other doctrine than that which I have asserted, had never been uttered in either House of Congress. 1 take it that my democratic friends will receive the opinions of James Buchanan as pretty sound, and I will quote from one of the last, if not the very last speech which he made while representing the State of Pennsylvania in the Senate of the U. States. of the House, that so much of Texas as lay south of the line of 36 degrees 30 minutes, should be admitted as States when the people thereof saw fit to divide it, and ask admission lay north of that line, slavery, or (to use the chanan was speaking upon those resolutions. "Was it desirable," said he, "again to have the Missouri question brought home to the people to good them to fury?"

What was that Missouri question? When Congress had prohibited the extension of slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min., while the whole north has stood up almost as one man resisting-or, at any rate, when every man from the north, with a solitary exception, who had voted to give up one inch of territory to slavery North or South of that line had been left out of the succeeding Congress, the whole South had voted for it-every Southern Senator and all the Southern Representatives except thirteen-and it had been made. It was of that legislation excluding slavery from all the Territories North of 36 deg. 30 min., that Mr. Buchanan was now speaking.

"Was it desirable," said he, "again to have the Missouri question brought home to the people, to good them into fury? That question between the two great interests in our country had been well discussed and well decided, and from that moment he had set down his foot on the solid ground then established, and there he would let the question stand forever. Who could complain of the terms

of that compromise? "It was then settled that north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, slavery should be forever prohibited. The same line was fixed upon in the resolutions recently received from the House of Representatives, now before us. The bill from the House for the establishment of Territorial government in Oregon excluded slavery altogether from that vast

country. Is our position treasonable? Is it one calculated to promote union? If it is, James Buchanan was, I presume, of discreet age when he made that speech in the Senate of the United States, although in regard to some of his speeches it was said he was a boy when he made them, and therefore ought not to be held responsible. [Laughter.]

I have read a brief quotation to show you what the doetrine was when we were upon the threshold of the agitation that now disturbs the country. It was in 1845 that Mr. Buchan- the subject of slavery ? If so, pray why did an made the speech from which I have quoted. On the 19th of February, 1847, John C. Calhoun arose in the Senate of the United States, and, without business before the Senate to which the resolutions referred, proposed these resolutions :-

"Resolved, That the Territories of the United States belong to the several States composing the Union, and are held by them as their joint and

shall directly, or by its effects, make any discrimi-nation between the States of this Union, by which any of them shall be deprived of its full and equal right in any territory of the United States, acquired or to be acquired.

"Resolved, That the enactment of any law"here is the first germ of the present doctrine of the South, and the present agitation of the whole country-"which should directly or by its effects, de-prive the citizens of any of the States of this Union from emigrating, with their property into any of the Territories of the United States, will make such discrimination, and would, therefore, be a violation of the constitution, and the rights of the States from which such citizens emigrated, and in derogation of that perfect equality which belongs to them as members of this Union, and would tend directly to subvert the Union itself."

When these resolutions were read, the Senator from Missouri, "Old Bullion"-a Senator from a slave State-denounced them as a "firebrand." The next day Mr. Calhoun pressed them to a vote. Mr. Benton opposed the proposition. Mr. Calhoun expressed his surprise that Mr. Benton, as the representative from a Southern State, should oppose the resolutions, but added, "I shall know where to find the gentleman." "Yes, sir; yes, sir," said "Old Bullion," "always know where to find me-by the side of my country and the Union-always there." [Loud applause.]

Six years later, the brave old man writing

upon this subject, says :—
"Ostensibly the complaint (expressed in these resolutions) was that the emigrant from the slaveStates was not allowed to carry his slave with him; in reality it was, that he was not allowed to carry the State law along with him to protect his slave. Plac-ed in that light, which is the true one, the complaint is absurd; presented, as applying to a piece of pro-perty, instead of the law of the State, it becomes specious—has deluded whole communities, and has

ed to rage and resentment, and hatred of the Union. Mr. Benton looked upon them as a "firebrand" when they were introduced, and writing quietly in his closet, six years thereafter, he expressed himself as I have just read.

Who is the anthor of the Kansas-Nebraska bill? Stephen A.Douglas-I don't know what "A" stands for. I have heard it is for Arnold, but I dont believe he could have been so fitly named at his christening. Stephen A. Doug-las is the author of that bill. But does Stephen A. Douglas believe, or did he believe, that Congress had no right to legislate on slavery in the Territories? Were these the doctrines in which he was reared in the bosom of the democratic party of Illinois and the Union? No, my friends; he was reared in the sound Constitutional doctrine which I have uttered here to-night, and I will prove it to you.

In 1848, Congress was engaged in establishing a government for the Territory of Oregon. A territorial bill had passed the lower House containing no provision on the subject of slavery. It came up to the Senate, and Mr. Hale at once moved the "Jefferson Proviso;" in other words, he moved to insert the clause that "involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime, should be prohibited within the Territory forever." Did Stephen A. Douglas rise in his seat and argue that that was unconstitutional? Did he rise and say that Congress had no power under the Constitution to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories? No, my friends; but he arose and offered an amendment, to wit: the extension of the Missouri Compromise line through the Territories of New Mexico, Utah and California, then recently acquired, to the Pacific ocean. Now, mark you, I am upon the point, has Congress the right, and is it its duty to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories? Mr. Douglas moved as an amendment to Mr. Hale's proposition:

That the line of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes of north latitude, known as the Missouri compromise line, as defined by the eighth section of an act entitled "An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, and prohibit slavery in certain ter-ritories,' approved March 6, 1820, be, and the same is hereby declared to extend to the Pacific ocean and the said 5th section, together with the compro-mise therein effected, is hereby revived, and de-clared to be in full force and binding, for the future organization of the Territories of the United States

in the same sense, and with the same understanding, with which it was originally adopted."

Mr. Douglas, having proposed the amendment, voted for it. Now, is he not a pretty Senator? [Laughter.] Is there another such "artful dodger" in so criminal a matter, in this whole broad country, as this same Stephen A. Douglas, the anthor of the Kansas-Nebraska [Many voices, 'no, no.'] No, there is bill? There he was in 1848, ready to legislate not. upon the subject.

What was done? Now, mark, Mr. Polk was President: James Buchanan was Secretary of State. Mr.Douglas was willing to legislate on the subject of slavery; there was no denial of the right. It was one year after the introduction of Calhoun's resolutions, but the "Jefferson proviso" was applied to Oregon, and James K. Polk, by and with the advice and consent of his cabinet, signed the bill; and on signing it, he sent in a special message to the Congress of the United States, assigning his reasons for doing so. I will take the liberty of detaining you with a short extract from that message: When Texas was admitted into our Union, the

same spirit of compromise which guided our pre-decessors in the admission of Missouri, a quarter of a century before, prevailed without any serious opposition. The joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, approved March the 1st, 1845, provides that such States as may be formed out of that territory lying south of 36 deg. 30 minntes north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission. may desire; and in such State or States as shall be formed out of the said territory north of the Missouri compromise line, slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited. The Territory of Ore-gon was far north of 36 degrees 30 minutes—the ouri and Texas compromise line. Its southern boundary is the parallel of 42, leaving the inter-mediate distance to be 330 geographical miles.— And it is because the provisions of this bill are not inconsistent with the terms of the Missouri compromise, if extended from the Rio Grande to the Pacific Ocean, that I have not felt at liberty to withhold my sanction.

Now, gentlemen, did Mr. Buchanan believe that it was unconstitutional to legislate upon he not make it known by his resignation from Mr. Polk's cabinet? Why did he let the responsibility rest upon him of sanctioning, as a cabinet minister, an unconstitutional act? He did not doubt either the right or the duty; nor do I believe that in his inmost heart he doubts either now; but ambition has misled him-

"Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself,

ment of the country-that organization which Kansas-Nebraska act by which that great comestablishes platforms of party, by which to over-ride all law and even the Constitution itself. Let me carry you to the Baltimore Convention of 1848, at which Lewis Cass was nominated for the Presidency, and Wm. O. Butler

for the Vice Presidency.

I have shown you that Congress had not abandoned the safe and constitutional doctrine given us in the example of Washington, Jefferson and Jackson; and I have shown you by Mr. Polk's action that he and Mr. Buchanan

had not yet abandoned it. That Convention had been at work four days. It had succeeded in making its nominations, and was adopting its platform, when Mr. Yancy, of Alabama, following in the wake of his great master, John C. Calhoun, introduced this resolution :

"Resolved. That the doctrine of non-interference with the rights of property of any portion of this confederation, be it in the States or in the Territories, by any other than the parties interested in them, is the true republican doctrine recognized by

That is, that Congress has no right to interfere : that the slave-owner had a right to take his slaves, and Congress had no right to interfere. Did the Democratic Convention of 1848 accept that doctrine? Were they willing to go before the people upon that issue? No; they tabled that resolution. They did more; they negatived it by a vote of 249 against it. to 39 for it.

Now we have seen "squatter sovereignty" rejected in the Senate of the United States, when first introduced by Mr. Calhoun, in 1847. In May, 1848, we find it excluded from the doctrines of the Democratic party by the great political Sanhedrim, assembled at Baltimore, in a slave State. Now I go on a little farther in that year, and I come to that time, near its close, when James K. Polk, [Mr. Buchanan's great chieftain, as he then was] presented his last message to the United States. Had he yielded to Mr. Calhoun, or to Mr. Yancy, or did he still stand by the experience of the past? The following extract from that message will show what his sentiments were at that time :-

"Upon a great emergency, however, and under menacing dangers to the Union, the Missouri compromise line in respect to slavery was adopted. The same line was extended further west on the acquisition of Texas. After an acquiescence of nearly thirty years in the principle of compromise recognized and established by these acts, and to avoid the danger to the Union which might follow if it were now disregarded. I have heretofore expressed the opinion that that line of compromise should be extended on the parallel of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes from the western boundary of Texas, where it now terminates, to the Pacific Ocean. This is the middle line of compromise upon which the different sections of the Union may meet, as they have hitherto met "

Here is Mr. Buchanan, as a member of Mr. Polk's cabinet, presenting Mr. Polk's annual message, with a recommendation to Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery-to de clare that all territory north of 36 deg. 30 m. shall be forever free, and that all south of it may take its chance, and be slave territory if the people want it, or be free territory if the people want it ... not to declare that one-half shall be slave territory and one-half free, but that all north of that line shall be forever free, and the other may take its chance of being made free or slave as may be determined.

No, no, gentlemen; the doctrines of to-day as yet had no existence, save in the plotting brains of three or four southern disunionists they were yet to be made so-called "national" doctrines.

Let us now go one step further. When I went out of politics I was a partisan Democrat, and I stand to-day, so far as slavery is concerned, upon the doctrines which I then rested upon, and, as I have shown you, they were the doctrines of the administration of Polk and Dallas-the last administration which ! helped to elect. They continued to be the doctrines of the State of Pennsylvania thro'out the existence of that great man at whose hands I received my first appointment-Francis R. Shunk. He died just after his election to a second term. A convention was called, which nominated Morris Longstreth for the gubernatorial chair. At that time nothing was said upon the subject of slavery, for it was not then a subject of agitation. But during that year there was agitation. The doctrines of Calhoun and Yancy were brought before the people; Southern conventions were being held; Calhoun resolutions were being sent from State Legislature to State Legislature in the South; disunion conventions were being held in the Southern States, and it became the duty of the Democrats, as of the other parties of the North, to speak their opinions upon the subject of slavery. And when, on the 4th of July, 1849, the Democratic party assembled in State Convention at Pittsburg, the question of slavery was agitated. Among the regular set of resolutions submitted to that convention, there was none touching the question of slavery. Gentlemen rose and objected to the resolutions; gentlemen upon the committee insisted that the opinion of the convention should be expressed upon the subject of slavery; and at length Col. Samuel W. Black, a delegate from Allegheny county, proposed the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted as the doctrine of the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, by that State Convention, assembled on the 4th of July, 1849 :-

Resolved, That the Democratic party adheres now, as it ever has done to the Constitution of the country. Its letter and spirit they will neither weaken and destroy, and they re-declare' -they announce no new doctrine; they do not declare for the first time—that slavery is a local, domestic in-stitution of the South, subject to State law alone. and with which the General Government has nothing to do. Wherever the State law extends its ju-risdiction, the local institution can continue to exist. Esteeming it a violation of State rights to carry it beyond State limits, we deny the power of any citizen to extend the area of bondage beyond its present dominion: nor do we consider it a part of the compromise of the Constitution, that slavery should forever travel with the advancing column of our territorial progress."

Gentlemen, do I not stand to-night upon what was the doctrine of the Democratic party on the 4th of July, 1849? [Applause.] Standing upon that doctrine, I stand upon what has been from the formation of the government down to the present time, the doctrine of the Whig party, north and south. I stand upon what was the doctrine, of the country. It knew no party division upon this subject until Mr. Calhoun hatched the treasonable dectrines.— The south-not the southern people-not even the southern slave-owners, but the traders in

promise line was repealed, and by which it is asserted that slavery may walk all over the ter-

ritories of the Union. Were you Whigs, or were you Democratsfor at the time of which I have been speaking, you were all one side or the other; your sympathies lay with one or the other of those great parties. I care not what you were, I have inculcated your doctrines. And will you now abandon them? Why will you now fail to snstain them? Why will you not now stand up for what was your doctrine, as it had been the doctrine of the Adamses, of Harrison, and of Taylor, on the one hand, and of Jefferson, of Jackson, of Madison, of Van Buren, and of

to-either, but belonging to all parties and to all countries? [Unbounded applause.] Why, I say, will you abandon the doctrine in which you were reared, and which has the sanction of all the great patriots and statesmen, whose names you revere, whose memories you love? I ask it, whether you be Buchanan men, or Fillmore men for in the one case you are asked to oppose the doctrine, and in the other you are asked to vote for a man who does not tell

Polk, on the other-as it had been the doctrine

of the great Washington-too great to belong

you on which side of the great issue he stands. Applause.1 Now, my triends, shall slavery be permitted to go beyond the line? [A general response from the audience of "no, no."] No. Let Pennsylvania answer, as with one voice-"no." Deafening applause for several minutes.] The power is in our hands. Maine and Vermont give us the voice of New England; Iowa gives

us the voice of the West; and let the great old "Wheel-horse of the Union," Penusylvania, stand firm, and freedom will be established forever in those Territories, large enough to make thirty-one Pennsylvanias. [Long continued cheering.] We are to settle the question. It is feared by the friends of freefrom that we will settle it upon a side issue; it age, that, in 1850, could not read or write, is hoped by the friends of slavery that we will | was one in every 79; while in Virginia it was settle it upon a side issue.

I have had handed to me since I came upon the stand, by a gentleman who sits beside me, a copy of the Madison Journal, published in Richmond, Louisiana, which has at its head the names of James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, for President, and John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, for Vice President. He has called my attention to a paragraph, which I will read :

"MR.FILLMORE NOT TO BE WITHDRAWN.-The New Orleans Picayune has a dispatch from Washington, dated the 18th, to the effect that Mr. Fillmore is not to be withdrawn. We are glad to hear it. Mr. Fillmore may, by continuing a candidate, yet save the cause of conservatism, by preventing the conrentration of the entire opposition in the North upon Fremont. No one has the least idea that he can carry a single State, but he may, possibly, prevent the success of Fremont in a single one, and thus give a wider margin to the nationality of Mr.

Men of Pennsylvania, are you willing to be the cat in the hands of the monkey to pull so great a chestnut as that out of the fire? [Laughter, and cries of "no, no."] Workingmen of Pennsylvania, merchants of Pennsylvania, farmers of Pennsylvania, are you willing to be used by the trading politicians of the South, and induced to vote for a man who, they say, has not a chance to carry a single State, in order that Kansas first, and then all the territory through to the Pacific, may be shut against the free white laborer-against wages-against the hopes, the enterprise, the prospects of the poor man of the world ? [Many voices, "no, never."] Stand upon the Constitution; stand firm for freedom; plant your feet were Washington and Jefferson stood; plant your feet were Polk stood, with Buchanan beside him, in 1848, and say, "Thus, far, accursed institution, thou shalt come; thus far thou art protected by State institutions, and as we are loyal to the Constitution, we will defend you there ourselves; but beyond that, by the grace

of God, and by the power of a freemen's vote, you never shall go." [Great applause.] What is it, my fellow-citizens, that they ask of us? What have we not done for that fretful, peevish, boasting lazy South? Why, we have bought them Florida, we have bought them the Louisana territory; we have bought them the Missouri territory. We have bought them, not by our money and our labor alone, but by best blood of our sons and brothers, the four times as large as Massachusetts. Massaterritory [capable of making four large States] known as Texas. We have expended between eight and nine hundred millions of dollarsin interest and all, very nearly a thousand millions of dollars-in acquiring territory which has all been made into slave States; freedom has obtained no foot of it. The States thus acquired are Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas. They send to the House of Representatives sixteen members, while they send to the Senate ten! Think of it, my fellow-citizens; it takes over ninety thousand of you to get a representative in Congress, while twenty-seven thousand white people in Florida get one representative and two members of the United States Senate. Those five States, with people enough to give them sixteen representatives have ten members of the Senate, while New York, which has thirty-three members of the lower House, and more than twice the number of people has but two Senators. Pennsylvania, with her large population, almost doubling that of those States, has but two Senators.

Now, my friends, shall Kansas be made a slave State, in order that with a few thousand people there and their slaves, she shall have is many votes in the Senate as New York or Pennsylvania. I say with but a few people and their slaves," because, let slavery get read or write they lavish silver pitchers and footing there, and Kansas will be no more gold-headed canes upon a man who tells them largely peopled in proportion to the square mile, than Texas, or Louisiana, or Florida is hear of it in any other way than he chooses to now. Why? The reason in a very simple let them know. And Arkansas-what an idea one. There is no law on the statute book to to indict a man for sending incendiary docuprevent you, my overworked working men, ments," into that State, when one in every from emigrating to the South. There is no nine is not able to read!—And I suppose from emigrating to the South. There is no law of that country which forbids you, poor men, who feel that you are working for inade- fashion of the boys that we have here in the quate wages, from making your home in the House of Refuge. You say to one of them South, where the climate is genial, the soil can you read and write? "Yes sir I can read," better, the season for fuel shorter, and where is the reply. "You give the fellow some there are a thousand advantages which we do simple book and he begins, "A c-a-t cat," not possess here in the cold North. Why do saw-no, w-a-s, 'was;' [loud laughter,] and so you not go? You cannot, though there is no he gets along with words of one sylable by law to prevent you. I am mistaken; I should spelling the longer ones. Where one in evhave said, there is no law upon the statute ery nine cannot read at all, we may take it book; but when the Great Creator gave law to this universe, he provided that injustice and wrong should not be inflicted without a penal-

right to make any law, or do any act whatever that | and take a peep at the illegitimate govern- | the Presidential nomination; then came the | er of his wages, shall have a curse in some form entailed upon them; and we find it there. It is the existence of slavery in the Southern States that excludes the white labor-

Compare the statistics of a free State with those of a slave State. Take the census of 1850, (Table 1.) and compare New York with Virginia—cold New York, with her upper boundry at 45—sunny Virginia with her lower boundry at 36—winter "lingering" long "in the lap of spring," at the Northern line of New York; winter scarcely existing at the southern line of Virginia. I find that they were admitted into the Union together in 1789. They are of the old States. New York has 47,000 square miles of territory, and Virginia 61.852. Mark the difference in size .-The population of Virginia is as 23 to a square mile, while that of New York is as 66 to a square mile. In 1790 the population of New York was 340,120; that of Virginia was 748,-308-more than twice, largely more than twice that of New York. How do they stand now? The free white population of Virginia is now 894,800; the free white population of New York is 3,044,325. Just think of it .-Little New York-for little she is in comparison with Virginia, has 3,048,325 white inhabitants, while the old mother of commonwealths and statesmen has but 894,800.

But, working men, do you value the privileges of free schools and institutions of learn-While you are at labor in the workshop, do yo not feel that, though you have to toil hard for a beggarly subsistence, your children, by the aid of our public schools and public libraries, shall stand the peers of the proudest in the land, and may rise, like the . Natick cobbler," to be the great man of the United States Senate? (Enthusiastic applause) Yes, such feelings are in all your hearts. Let us take a glimpse at Virginia and New York, as compared in that respect. In New York the native free population, over twenty years as one in every 10. Why should they teach "the poor white trash" to read! They do not want to use them. The slaves do the work, and rich men only are worthy of consideration. Why should they keep public schools, to put fanciful notions into the heads of people that do not own property in slaves, and are of no use in the community, but only an incumbrance?

Now, let me compare briefly Kentucky and Ohio. Kentucky was admitted into the Union in 1792; Ohio was admitted ten years thereafter, in 1802; she is the younger sister of Kentucky. Ten years difference in the age of States is really a difference worthy of consideration. Ohio contains about twenty-five millions of acres and Kentucky twenty-four millions. The difference between them is about a million of acres, or about two thou sand square miles. Ohio is rather the largest At this time the population to the square mile is twenty six in Kentucky and forty-nine and a half in her younger sister, Ohio. In 1800 Ohio had forty-five thousand inhabitants, and Kentucky two hundred and twenty thousand. In 1850 the free white population of Kentucky was 761,413, while her sister Ohio had 1.955,050, exceeding that of Kentucky by about 1,200,000. Let us again examine the question as to who could read and write. In 1850 the native free population over twenty years of age unable to read and write, was in Ohio 1 in 31, in Kentucky 1 in 11-nearly as bad as in Virginia.

Between Michigan and Arkansas the same relations prevail. Michigan was admitted into the Union in 1837, Arkansas in 1836. Michigan has about 56,348 square miles of territory. Arkansas 52,198. In 1820 Arkansas had 14,278 inhabitants, Michigan 8,896. In 1850 the free population of Michigan was 895,-071; that of Arkansas, her elder sister, was 162,189. In Michigan for those over 20 years of age, 1 in 65 cannot read or write; in Arkansas I in 9-worse than Virginia; "poor white trash," again. [Laughter-]

Now let us come to the States of Brooks and Sumner-South Carolina and Massachusetts. They came into the Union at the same time. We see Massachusetts a mere speck, lying be tween New Hampshire and Vermont on the north and Connecticut on the south; we see chusetts has 7,250 square miles; South Carolina has 28,000 square miles. They came into the Union together. Their population in 1790 was 378,717 in Massachusetts, and 249,037 in South Carolina. Of free white population Massachusetts has now 985,450-100,000 more than Virginia. While Massachusetts has now 985,450 South Carolina has 274,563-about one quarter as many. And that is the State that is going to thrash the Union, [laughter] and on the 4th March, at a quarter to twelve, or a quarter after, (I forget which; I hope I may get right in regard to it when the time comes,) they are to take possession of the archives and Treasury of the Union, and the north is to be no where-That's the programme. [Great laughter.] There are 273,000 white inhabitants to take care of 384,000 "niggers" as she calls them; and I think that while they are away taking care of the Treasury an the archives, the "niggers" upon the principle when than all these States contain, black and white, the cat's away the mice will play," will have some fun. [Shouts of laughter.]

Now look at these two States as to reading and writing. In Massachusetts, of those over 20 years of age there are but 1,861 who cannot read and write, or one in every 446, [great applause,] while in South Carolina there is one in seventeen! And do you wonder that in a State where one in every seventeen cannot himself what he has been doing; they don't those who can read, do it very much after the