fact ... press, and un... whatever, ... of the ... It may it, ... and I only leave ... the ... is not ne... to attempt to prove a ... I have ... to protra... Senate by an elaborate de... fe... of the Administration of James ... and the policy of the Demo... party. Sir, the Government ... needs no defence, that by treaty stipu... acquired the sealed empire of ... the holy feet of the Christian ... that brought order out of ... in our Western Territories, and ... closed "the purple testament of bleeding war" in the frontier settlements of the Republic—that sent its "white winged messengers," armed with ... to the dictator of Paraguay, and wrested from that arrogant power, "indemnity for the past and security for the future"—and that proudly maintained the indisputable right of the American citizen, native or adopted, to be protected and shielded from harm, wherever the glorious flag of his country floated, and wherever his wanderings or steps strayed. I am willing to leave the acts of this Administration to time and truth. I am willing to put the Democratic policy, as it is illustrated by the Cabinet at Washington, upon the country, and I believe, sir, that God will send it a safe deliverance!

Equally unfounded and fallacious is the claim of the Republican party, so frequently advanced, to be the exclusive friend of the individual and industrial interests of the country. From the inception of the government, to the present hour, the Democratic party has ever been the true and real friend of the people. In all times, and under all circumstances, it has battled for the abolition of prerogatives and for the destruction of monopolies. Let us appeal to impartial history, to learn the true position of our opponents upon this question. I hold, sir, that they are unsound upon this great question of protection to American industry, which is deemed by so many in this country the elixir of our social and political life, and which always assumes an undue prominence in Presidential, and even in minor political struggles. I say that the record is against the Republican party upon this point, and I ask you to turn with me, for a single moment, to the history of the passage of the last two Tariffs which were enacted by our National Legislature. It is well known, that when James K. Polk came into power, on the 4th of March, 1845, he did so with the positive understanding that he would throw the full force of his Administration in favor of a reduction of the Tariff of 1842. True to the pledge he made to the people of the United States, he at once sought to reduce the duties upon foreign importations to such rates as would raise revenue enough for the wants of the government, and would, also, incidentally afford ample protection to American industry. The rates of duties imposed by the Tariff of the 30th of July, 1846, were exclusively ad valorem, and were arranged by schedules, from 5 to 100 per cent., while the free list was large and liberal in its provisions. But no sooner had this act passed and become the law of the land, than the fiercest denunciations were heaped upon the President and the Democratic party.—David Wilmot was bitterally assailed by the Opposition press of Pennsylvania, for his vote upon the bill in the House of Representatives—and George M. Dallas was denounced as a traitor to his native Commonwealth, for giving the casting vote in its favor in the Senate of the United States. Ruin was everywhere predicted, and a widespread national distress was deemed inevitable. And yet, sir, all the while, trade flourished, commerce increased, and our people were prosperous and happy. Now, we all remember that in 1857, the Republicans were in a large plurality in the House of Representatives. Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, was elected Speaker, and Lewis D. Campbell, of Ohio, was appointed by him Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means. Although it was a short session, a revision of the tariff of 1846 was absolutely demanded, and after the usual manœuvrings in legislation, a report came from a committee of conference to both branches of Congress. The report was adopted in the last days of the session, and the rates of duties in it were arranged by schedules, from 4 to 30 per cent., the duties being exclusively ad valorem in their character, while the free list was greatly and largely extended. The vote in the House upon this reduction of the Tariff of 1846, was one hundred and twenty-two yeas, and seventy-two nays. Among the former there were fifty-five members who had been elected as hostile to the Democratic party, and thirty-nine of that number were good, honest, and true Republicans! In the Senate the vote upon acquiescing in the report of the committee of conference presented the same aspect. The leading Republicans, Seward, Fish, Foster, Trumbull and Wilson, voted to sustain the report—while the whole number of votes cast against the bill did not equal the number of righteous men required by the angel of the Lord to save ill-fated Sodom from destruction! And yet we are told that the Republican party is the friend of American industry—of Pennsylvania interests! I say again, sir, that the record is against this organization, and that the claim, impudently put forth in these resolutions, that the Republican party is the exclusive patron of the industrial interests of the country, is unreasonable, and hence unfortunate in truth or justice. Sir, I do not wish to make any unfair assertions in reference to this important question. I do not wish to claim anything for the Democratic party, which is not its due.

I therefore, sir, speak for myself alone, with no reference to any political that may be determined upon by my party, which ... interests ... of protecting ... of her ... I would ... would ... of duties, sufficient revenue to ... necessary ... of the government, and, at the same ... protection to the great and flourishing ... of the country.

... and ... this discussion, which ... and ... and ...

... the mind ... Democratic party, ... "threats of disunion ... floor of Congress," has ... sunrise and reverberation ... of the majority upon the floor. The charges made in the secret ... tempered resolutions, is ... is illogical. Why, sir, do the gentlemen of the majority intend to hold the Democratic party responsible for the excited language that has been uttered by Southern men, in the crisis that is now impending? So be it! But we must "count the poisoned shaft to their own tips!" I remember most distinctly, sir, that a Republican member from New York, high in position and commanding in talents, boldly declared that there was, in this country, "a higher law" than the Constitution. I recollect that a Republican member of the National House of Representatives said that he looked forward to the day when a servile insurrection would desolate the homes of our Southern brethren, and that he would "hail it as the dawn of a political millennium." I have not forgotten that an anti-slavery fanatic in the North, proclaimed the Constitution of the United States to be "a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell." Nor can I ever obliterate from my memory the treasonable sentiments of that champion of Republicanism in Massachusetts, who told the country that "the times now demanded an anti-slavery Constitution, an anti-slavery Bible and an anti-slavery God." Sir, the spirit of Northern fanaticism is reeking with the pestilential breath of treason and disunion! And is it any wonder that the men of the South, who are sharers of our sacred compact and should be partakers of all our Constitutional guarantees, should be appalled and startled from their propriety, when the flaming sword of insurrection is carried to their borders, and the flag of treason is borne upon their soil? Is there not some excuse for men to pause and inquire, "what is all this worth?" when their rights are invaded, and their homes are despoiled by malignant traitors? Sir, scarcely three months have passed away, since a miserable fanatic, led on by the doctrines of the "irrepressible conflict," and influenced by the wicked teachings of the anti-slavery apostles of the North, invaded the soil of Virginia, for the purpose of hastening the dawn of that political millenium which was to be ushered in with fire and the sword. Gathering together a few deluded followers, in the dead of night, he seized upon the property of the United States, at Harper's Ferry, and raise the standard of rebellion against the laws of his country. Arming the negro, he told him to cut the throat of his master. Placing the torch in the hands of the slave, he incited him to apply it to the dwelling of his protector. Arrested in his crimes, the slaves themselves failing to join in his bloody foray, he and four of his guilty comrades were taken captives, tried, condemned, and most righteously executed; and when the just sentence of the law was carried into effect, when the majesty of the outraged Commonwealth of Virginia was vindicated, there were, sir, in Northern cities, assemblages of men and women, who gathered together to applaud the traitors, and to proclaim the gallows upon which John Brown was executed, as glorious as the cross of the Redeemer! When the time has come for the citizens of any portion of our country to arm their households—when the torch of the incendiary flashes in the midnight—when the property of the United States is seized by a band of desperadoes—when the soil of a neighboring State is ruthlessly invaded—I ask you, sir, if the crisis has not arrived in the history of this Union, when men may well think of the preservation of their Constitutional rights which fear and trembling, and demand in all sincerity and earnestness the true intent and meaning of the compact with our fathers made? Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can all live happily and prosperously in this Union as it is, without wasting its substance in unfriendly strifes and internecine conflicts. I do not believe that at any time it is necessary for any man in the North, or in the South, to claim a dissolution of this Union as the panacea for any ills that may afflict the body politic. I am for the Union as it is, and for the Constitution as it came from its immortal framers! What has given rise to all this trouble? It is the ceaseless agitation of the slavery question.—Fifteen States in this Confederacy, under the compromises of the Constitution, assert their indisputable right to hold negroes as property. No one can successfully controvert that right. It is theirs by law, and under the Constitution. Why should any portion of the Northern mind be arrayed against it? Is not, then, the continued and ceaseless agitation of this question, calculated to weaken the bonds of our beloved Union, and destroy the fraternal relations which should exist between all sections of the Republic? Sir, the Constitution under which we are living to-day, was formed for our "more perfect union" in a spirit of compromise and concession. The question of negro slavery, at an early day, invoked the serious attention of the founders of this Government. It was one which they saw, in their prophetic visions, would be the prolific source of anxiety and trouble. Hence they dealt with it, in a spirit that well became the great work they were attempting to accomplish. The golden grains of compromise sparkled in all the cement they used to build up the fabric of our national liberties.—When the Ordinance of 1784 was proposed for the government of the Western Territory, after the cession by Virginia to the United States of the domain lying northwest of the Ohio river, a proviso was proposed and had its instrument, that after the year 1800 slavery should not exist in any of the States formed out of the territory. The recognition of the right to hold slaves for sixteen years, evinced the disposition of the framers of the Constitution to compromise to the very point at issue. In 1785 this proviso was stricken out, and "the Ordinance" was amended, became the law of the land. In 1787 ... [illegible] ... and ... [illegible] ... and ... [illegible] ... and