

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 2.—NO. 32.

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 1847.

WHOLE NO. 84.

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.

TERMS.—\$1.50 per annum, or \$1.75 (invariably required) if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing. ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents;—one square \$1.

Printed for the Publishing Committee by G. N. HAPGOOD.

CALHOUN'S SPEECH.

In the Senate, Feb. 19th, John C. Calhoun offered some remarks on the Wilmot Proviso, Resolutions of the non-slaveholding States, &c., and concluded his speech by presenting for the consideration of that body the resolutions which we published last week.

Mr. President, it was solemnly asserted on this floor, some time ago, that all parties in the non-slaveholding States had come to a fixed and solemn determination upon two propositions. One was, that there should be no further admission of any States into this Union, which permitted by their Constitution the existence of slavery; and the other was, that slavery should not hereafter exist in any of the Territories of the United States; the effect of which would be to give to the non-slaveholding States the monopoly of the public domain, to the entire exclusion of the slaveholding States. Since that declaration was made, Mr. President, we have abundant proof that there was a satisfactory foundation for it. We have received, already received, solemn resolutions passed by seven of the non-slaveholding States, one half of the number already in the Union, Iowa not counted—using the strongest possible language to that effect, and no doubt, in a short space of time similar resolutions will be received from all the non-slaveholding States. But we need not go beyond the walls of Congress. The subject has been agitated in the other House, and they have sent you a bill, "prohibiting the extension of slavery (to use their own language) to any territory which may be acquired by the United States hereafter." At the same time, two resolutions which have been moved to extend the compromise line from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific, during the present session, have been rejected by a decided majority.

Sir, there is no mistaking the signs of the times; and it is high time that the Southern States, the slaveholding States, should inquire what is now their relative strength in this Union, and what it will be if this determination should be carried into effect hereafter. Sir, already we are in a minority—I use the word "we" for brevity sake—already we are in a minority in the other House, in the electoral college, and I may say, in every department of this government, except at present in the Senate of the United States—there for the present we have an equality. Of the 28 States, 14 are non-slaveholding, and 14 are slaveholding, counting Delaware, which is doubtful, as one of the non-slaveholding States. But this equality of strength exists only in the Senate. One of the clerks at my request has furnished me with a statement of what is the relative strength of the two descriptions of States, in the other House of Congress and in the electoral college. There are 225 representatives, including Iowa, which is already represented there. Of these, 138 are from the non-slaveholding States, and 120 are from what are called the slave States, giving a majority in the aggregate, to the former, of 48. In the electoral college there are 168 votes belonging to the non-slaveholding States, and 118 to the slaveholding, giving a majority of 50 to the non-slaveholding States.

We, Mr. President, have at present only one policy in the government, by which we may make any resistance to this aggressive policy which has been declared against the south, or any other that the non-slaveholding States may choose to take. And this equality in this body is the most transient character. Already Iowa is a State, but owing to some domestic calamity, is not yet represented in this body. When she appears here, there will be an addition of two senators to the representatives of the non-slaveholding States. Already Wisconsin has passed the initiatory stage, and will be here at the next session. This will add two more, making a clear majority of four in this body, on the side of the non-slaveholding States, who will thus be enabled to sway every branch of this government, at their will and pleasure. But, sir, if this aggressive policy be followed—if the determination of the non-slaveholding States is to be adhered to hereafter, and we are to be entirely excluded from the territories we already possess, or may possess—if this is to be the fixed policy of the government, I ask, what will be our situation hereafter?

Sir, there is ample space for twelve or fifteen of the largest descriptions of States in the territories belonging to the United States. Already a law is in course of passage through the other House, creating one north of Wisconsin. There is ample room for another north of Iowa, and another north of that; and then that large region extending on this side of the Rocky Mountains, from 39° down to the Texan line, which may be set down fairly as an area of twelve and a half degrees of latitude—that extended region of Iowa, is susceptible of having six, seven, or eight large States. To this add Oregon, which extends from 49 to 43° north, which will give four more, and I make a very moderate calculation when I say that in addition to Iowa and Wisconsin, 12 more States upon the territory already ours—without reference to any acquisitions from Mexico—may be, and will be shortly added to these United States. How will we then stand? There will be but 14 on the part of the South—we are to be fixed, limited, and forever—and 28 on the part of the non-slaveholding States! Twenty-eight! Double our number; and with the same disproportion in the other House and in the electoral college! The government, sir, will be entirely in the hands of the non-slaveholding States—overwhelmingly!

Sir, if this state of things is to go on—if this determination so solemnly made, is to be persisted in, where shall we stand, as far as this federal government of ours is concerned? What, then, must we do? We must look to justice—to our own interests—to the Constitution. We will have no longer a shield in equality here. Nor can we rely upon the sense of justice of this body. Ought we to

rely upon this? These are solemn questions which I put on all sides. Sir, look to the past. If we are to look to that—I will not go into the details—we will see from the beginning of this government to the present day, as far as pecuniary resources are concerned—in far as the disbursement of revenue is involved, it will be found that we have been a portion of this community which has substantially supported the government without receiving anything like a tantamount support from it. But why should I go beyond this very measure itself? Why go beyond this determination on the part of the non-slaveholding States, that there can be no addition to the slaveholding States, to prove what our opinion is?

Sir, what is the entire amount of this policy? I will not say that it is so designed. I will not say from what cause it originated. I will not say whether a blind fanaticism on one side, whether a hostile feeling to slavery entertained by many not fanatical on the other, or whether it has been the work of men, who, looking to political power, have considered the agitation of this question as the most effectual mode of obtaining the spoils of this government. I look to the fact itself. It is a policy now openly avowed to be persisted in. It is a policy, Mr. President, which aims to monopolize the power of this government, and obtain sole possession of its patronage.

Now, I ask, is there any remedy? Does the Constitution afford any remedy? And, if not, is there any hope? These, Mr. President, are solemn questions—not only to us, but let me say to gentlemen from the non-slaveholding States, to them. Sir, the day that the balance between the two sections of the country—the slaveholding States and the non-slaveholding States—is destroyed, is the day that will not be far removed from political revolution, anarchy, civil war, and widespread disaster. The balance of this system is in the slaveholding States. They are the conservative portion—always have been the conservative portion; and with a due balance on their part, may, for generations to come, uphold this glorious Union of ours. But, if this policy should be carried out—if we are reduced to a handful—if we are to become a mere half to play the presidential game with—to count something in the Baltimore caucus—if this is to be the result—what I say to this Union!

Now, sir, again I put the solemn question—Does the Constitution afford any remedy? Is there any provision in it by which this aggressive policy, boldly avowed, as if perfectly consistent with our institutions and the safety and prosperity of the United States—may be confronted? Is this consistent with the Constitution? No, Mr. President, no! It is, in all its features, daringly opposed to the Constitution. What is it? Ours is a Federal Constitution. The States are its constituents, and not the people. The 28 States—the 29 States (including Iowa)—stand under this government as 29 individuals, or as 29 individuals would stand to a consolidated power. It was not made for the mere individual prosperity of the States as individuals. No, sir, it was made for higher ends. It was formed that every State constituting a portion of this great Union of ours should enjoy all its advantages, natural and acquired, with greater security, and enjoy them more perfectly. The whole system is based on justice and equality, perfect equality between the members of this Republic. Nor can that be consistent with equality which will make this public domain a monopoly on one side—which, in its consequences, would place the whole power in one section of the Union, to be wielded against the other sections of the Union! Is that equality?

How do we stand in reference to this territorial question—this public domain of ours? Why, sir, what is it? It is the common property of the States of the Union. They are called "the territories of the United States." And what are the "United States" but the States united? Sir, these territories are the property of the States united; held jointly for their common use. And is it consistent with justice—is it consistent with equality, that any portion of the partners out-numbering any other portion, shall oust them in this common property of theirs—shall pass any law which shall prescribe the citizens of other portions of the Union from emigrating, with their property, to the territories of the United States? Would that be consistent—can it be consistent with the idea of a common property, held jointly for the common benefit of all? Would it be so considered in private life? Would it not be considered the greatest outrage in the world, and which any court on the face of the globe would at once overrule?

Mr. President, not only is that proposition grossly inconsistent with the Constitution; but the other, which undertakes to say that no State shall be admitted into this Union, which shall not prohibit, by its Constitution, the existence of slavery, is equally a great outrage against the Constitution of the United States. I hold it to be a fundamental principle of our political system, that the people have a right to establish what government they may think proper for themselves; that this State, about to become a member of this Union, has a right to form its own government as it pleases; and that in order to be admitted, there is but one qualification, and that is, that the government shall be Republican. It is not so expressly prescribed by the instrument itself, but by the great section which guarantees to every State in this Union, a Republican form of government. Now, sir, what is proposed, from a vague, indefinite, erroneous, and most dangerous conception of private individual liberty, to overrule this great common liberty which a people have of framing their own constitution? Sir, the individual right of man is not nearly so easily to be established by any course of reasoning, as his common liberty. And yet, sir, there are men of such delicate feeling on the subject of liberty—there are men who cannot possibly bear what they call slavery in one section of the country (and it is not so much slavery as an institution indispensable for the good of both races); men so squeam-

ish on this point, that they are ready to strike down the higher right of a community to govern themselves, in order to maintain the absolute right of individuals in all circumstances, to govern themselves!

Mr. President, sir, that there should be a fair expression of what is the sense of this body. Upon that expression much depends. It is the only stand which we can have. It is the only position which we can take, which will uphold us with anything like independence—which will give us any chance at all to maintain an equality in this Union, on these great principles to which I have had reference. Overrule these principles, and we are nothing! Preserve them, and we will ever be a respectable portion of the community.

Sir, here let me say a word as to the compromise line. I have always considered it as a great error—highly injurious to the South, because it surrendered, for mere temporary purposes, those high principles of the Constitution upon which I think we ought to stand. I am against any compromise line. Yet, I would have been willing to have continued the compromise line. One of the resolutions in the House, to that effect, was offered at my suggestion. I said to a friend there, (Mr. Bur), "Let not be disturbers of this Union. As abhorrent to my feelings as is that compromise line, let it be adhered to in good faith; and if the other portions of the Union are willing to stand by it, let us not refuse to stand by it. It has kept peace for some time, and in the circumstances, perhaps it would be better to keep peace as it is." But, sir, it was voted down by an overwhelming majority. It was renewed by a gentleman from a non-slaveholding State, and again voted down by an overwhelming majority.

Well, I see my way in the Constitution. I cannot in the compromise. A compromise is not an act of Congress. It may be overruled at any time. It gives us no security. But the Constitution is stable. It is a rock. On it I can stand. It is a principle on which we can meet our friends from the non-slaveholding States. It is firm ground on which they can better stand in opposition to fanaticism, than on the shifting sands of compromise.

Let us be done with compromise. Let us go back and stand upon the Constitution! Well, sir, what if the decision of this body shall deny to us this high Constitutional right, which, in my opinion, is as clear as any in the instrument itself—the more defined and stable indeed, because deduced from the entire body of the instrument, and the nature of the subject to which it relates? What then? That is a question which I will not undertake to decide. It is a question for our constituents—the slaveholding States. A solemn and a great question, Mr. President. And if the decision should be adverse at this time, I trust and do believe that they will take under solemn consideration what they ought to do. I give no advice. It would be hazardous and dangerous for me to do so. But I may speak as an individual member of that section of the Union. There I draw my first breath. There are all my hopes. I am a planter—a cotton planter. I am a southern man, and a slaveholder—a kind and a merciful one, I trust—and none the worse for being a slaveholder. I say, for one, I would rather meet any extremity upon earth, than give up one inch of our equality—one inch of what belongs to us as members of this great Republic! What! acknowledge inferiority! The surrender of life is nothing to sinking down into acknowledged inferiority!

I have examined this subject largely, widely. I think I see the future, if we do not stand up now; and, in my humble opinion, the condition of the South is wretched and happy—the condition of Hindostan is peace and happiness—the condition of Jamaica is prosperous and happy, and what the Southern States will be, if now they yield!

"Noble Exploits"

The Cincinnati Advertiser speaks of the "noble exploits" of one of our Volunteers—Samuel Myers. At the battle of Monterey he was wounded by a ball which passed through the bone of the chin and lodged in the under flesh making a dreadful wound. He had the ball extracted and fired several times before he would suffer himself to be withdrawn—remonstrating that "he was a dead man, and did if he didn't want to kill some of them." These are the "noble exploits" which the Advertiser publishes to the world. That paper has singular material out of which to manufacture "noble exploits" or a "noble" hero.—True Democrat.

While the True Democrat, an Anti-Slavery Whig paper, speaks thus of the marauders who left Ohio to fight the battles of slavery; the Cincinnati Herald, a Liberty party paper, labors through nearly a column to show that these Ohio cut throats exhibited at Monterey, that kind of bull-dog courage, which made them careless of their own lives, in their eagerness to murder the Mexicans, and that they were no cowards as had been charged upon them. In doing this, the Herald quotes from the Advertiser; the paper referred to by the Democrat.

The Herald has pursued a very singular course in relation to these manning cut throats. It opposed the war, but that noble officer and his brave army must not be jeopardized. It opposed the war, but if England or France were to assist the Mexicans, it would have every man, who believes in the rightfulness of self-defence, asured from the

country, if he did not fly to beat them back. It opposed the war, but these Ohio cut-throats who assisted in the Monterey murders must be vindicated from the charge that they were not perfectly wolfish and very doggish, on that occasion.

Does the Herald, like the D. D.'s in reference to slavery, wish to be understood as being opposed to the war in the abstract, but not opposed to those who fight it out?—Anti-Slavery Bugle.

It would be very difficult for any one, although bent on bearing false witness against his neighbor to pen a more disingenuous paragraph than the foregoing. It is barely possible that its author was not aware, of the extent and number of its mis-statements. We can scarcely conceive, how mis-statements, so numerous and so glaring, could have been innocently crowded into a space so small. But we give a wide margin to the author's prejudices, and for the present shall set down the offences to ignorance rather than to malice. That alternative, will be denied us, if the writer, seeing the opportunity, which we shall, in this article, afford him of correction shall pass it by, neglected.

The Bugle contrasts the course of the True Democrat with that of the Herald, and charges upon the latter that it labors through nearly a column to prove the Ohio volunteers no cowards. Now this is not true; we wrote an article, the one referred to, to show that the volunteers and the press of the slave States, in strict accordance with their exalted and jealous spirit, asuring all that the world considers profitable to themselves and denying it to the citizens of the free States, had got up a false accusation against the courage of the Ohio Troops. We said not one word in admiration of the war, or of the conduct of the soldiers. We only vindicated a fact of history, to illustrate the political bearings of a sectional feeling. Whether the Ohio Volunteers were cowards or not, was a fact, to be determined without reference to the moral nature of the cause in which they are engaged, and we so determined it. A man we should think, might vindicate the fame of Napoleon against any accusations of cowardice without being thought too favorable to his wicked and unscrupulous ambition.

Milton certainly ought not to have been excommunicated for representing Satan as possessed of the admirable qualities of perseverance and indomitable courage.

The Bugle also charges us with quoting the Advertiser, the paper referred to by the Democrat. It evidently means to be understood, that we quoted approvingly, what the Democrat referred to, to condemn, otherwise there is no point to the charge, and it is merely silly. Now the Bugle knows that we never quoted from the Advertiser, anything at all with reference to these "noble exploits." Mere quoting, per se—not even we do not consider sinful, per se—but even from the Bugle. It depends upon the thing quoted, and the intention with which it is done. On any other principle, we might become parties to all the bigotry and nonsense which we saw fit to notice.

The Bugle, whenever by doing so, it has thought it could serve any of its own ends, has not hesitated to republish entire articles from the Herald. The very number from which we extract contains an example. We want to see if it will be as ready to do so when it can serve nothing else but the truth. We therefore request it, as a simple act of justice, to republish either the article to which it has referred, and misrepresented in the reference, or this explanation. If it refuses, we shall suspect that it too has deserted the cherished maxim, not to do evil, that good may come, for some more world-wise counsels.—Cin. Herald.

The Ohio Regiment and its Trauders.

Amongst the first of the numerous letters which were written from Monterey, after the late storming of that place, was one which contained a charge against the Ohio Troops of cowardice. It came from one of the Baltimore volunteers. We have watched the progress of the discussion to which it gave rise, and have been struck with one or two facts which it has elicited. It turns out, in the first place, that the man who originated this charge, the Baltimore volunteer, were the men against whom alone such a charge could justly be brought. This seems evident from different accounts of the battle which have been given. Mr. Myers, an Ohio volunteer, who has returned home, gave an account of the affair to the Commercial of this city, which says:—

Mr. Myers assures us that he stood next to the brave Col. Watson, when he fell, and that he had twice called to the Baltimoreans to come to the charge! "They refused!" and he exclaimed—"Cowards! they are cowards!" and ran to the charge WITH THE OHIO VOLUNTEERS!!

"The Baltimoreans actually did—says this brave soldier, who is corroborated by numerous letters, received yesterday—allow their leader to fall! fighting with strangers! but, we see, with men who appreciated him! The Ohio Volunteers actually took the advance of the Baltimoreans, when it was meanly unclaimed, marching before them by the side of their brave leader! It now appears, plain enough, why the Baltimoreans accused the Ohio and Kentucky volunteers with showing the "White Feather"—it was to cover, in advance, the cowardice, compared with the Ohioans, they displayed."

The Advertiser gives the other evidence to the point. It says:—

"Now, that young Myers may not be aspersed with increased witness, we will take it upon ourselves to fortify his declaration by the testimony of men who are disinterested."

Colonel Campbell, of the Tennessee Regiment, whose letters to the Nashville papers we have heretofore quoted, says he was sent to sustain the 3d Infantry and the Baltimore Battalion, who had been ordered to attack a fort, but they faltered, and had taken shelter behind houses, and got into the outskirts of the town, &c. No more for them.—Myers is

sustained by one witness. The Army Correspondent of the New Orleans Times, most signally eludes both these statements, and ends the controversy. He writes:—

"In the midst of the fire, Col. Watson, of the Baltimore battalion, rode up to Col. Garland and expressed his satisfaction at joining him. The latter replied that he was glad to see him. (Col. W.) but says he, this is a mere pinch war are in, and where is your regiment? Col. W. replied, they are coming to which the other said, I do not see them, if you do not bring them up, they will soon be of no service to us. Col. Watson immediately set off in search of his command. As he approached, but when, at some distance, his horse was shot and fell with him; he sprang up and ran towards the men, exclaiming that he was not hurt, and calling on them to advance. He again turned about and pressed towards town, close by the northeastern fort, not far from which he fell. Lieut. Bowie, and a few men, being near him."

"The Sun and its camp slanderer, are not to be envied, and they deserve no pity. We will exercise compassion enough, however, henceforth to let them wear their wicked leeches in such place of mind as the consciousness of convicted cowardice can bring them."

The Ohio Regiment, it will be remembered, constitutes the only body of troops from a free state which were in that engagement. And true to that instinct, which never varies, the chivalry have in this instance, as in all others, glorified themselves, and have endeavored, in every way, to depreciate the conduct and character of the citizens of the Free States. The Baltimore volunteers brought the charge of base and dastardly cowardice. The Mississippians extolled the daring courage of their soldiers. The Texas Rangers were praised to the skies for their gallantry. The Tennessee Regiment was commended in the highest terms for its intrepidity and firmness. All had their letter writers and their adulators. The Buckeyes alone had their traducers. The Mississippians, the Tennesseans, the Texans, all had plenty to say for themselves, or persons who could say it for them. But they had nothing to say for the volunteers from "free sister States," as it is contemptuously called. They went to the work at which they were set, and find their best, but saddest defense in the report of death's doings on that day. The official report has been published and effectually answers the charges which these chivalric Baltimoreans have thought fit to bring against the yeomanry of Ohio. This states, that of the gallant Baltimore Battalion 6 killed and 17 wounded! This itself is a mistake that remains to be accounted for. There were really 15 killed and 38 wounded. The Tennessee Regiment who were in the same charge, lost 24 killed and 75 wounded, being the only Regiment whose loss was heavier than ours. The Mississippi Regiment lost only 9 killed and 47 wounded. The Texas volunteers, of whose valor so much has been boasted, lost 2 killed and 4 wounded! And the gallant Baltimore Battalion lost 6 killed and 17 wounded!! Their leader was shot, in trying to find them. The Texan and the Baltimore troops were with the Regulars.—The loss of the latter was three or four times greater than that of their comrades.

These facts add proof to the charge that we have so often made, of the arrogant meanness of the "chivalry" of the slave States, in monopolizing all the rewards of honor and profit, while they assign to the free North, the posts of toil and danger. They manage to obtain possession of nearly all the offices of the army and navy. The ranks of the soldier and the sailor are filled by the hardy sons of free labor. The former are ever ready for power and wealth and honor. Hard working and hard fighting they leave for others. This last development has shown that they can add to their other meanness, that of slander. And we have nothing to say for the generosity of those, who did not actually participate in the accusation, who had the opportunity and means of putting it down, and yet have left room for it to be believed.

Speech of Theodore Parker, Delivered at the Anti-War Meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston, Feb. 4, 1847.

MR. CHAIRMAN,—We have come here to consult for the honor of our country. The honor and dignity of the United States are in danger. I love my country; I love her honor. It is dear to me almost as my own. I have seen stormy meetings in Faneuil Hall before now, and am not easily disturbed by a popular tumult. But never before did I see a body of ARMED SOLDIERS attempting to overawe the majesty of the people, when met to deliberate on the people's affairs. Yet the meetings of the people of Boston have been disturbed by soldiers before now; by British bayonets—but never since the Boston massacre on the 5th of March, 1770! Our fathers had a standing army. This is a new one—but behold the effect! Here are soldiers with bayonets, to overawe the majesty of the people! They went to our meeting last Monday night—the hired soldiers of President Polk—to overawe and disturb the meetings of honest men. Here they are now, and in arms!

We are in a war—the signs of war are seen here in Boston. Men, needed to be hew wood and honestly serve society, are marching down your streets; they are learning to kill men—men who never harmed us, nor them—learning to kill their brothers! It is a mean and infamous war we are fighting. It is a great boy fighting a little one, and that little one feeble and sick. What makes it worse is—the little boy is in the right, and the big boy is in the wrong, and tells us solemn lies to make his side seem right. He wants, besides, to make the small boy pay the expenses of the quarrel.

The friends of the war say, 'Mexico has invaded our territory!' When it is shown that it is we who have invaded hers, then it is said, 'Ay, but she owes us money.' Better say outright, 'Mexico has land, and we want to get it!'

This war is waged for a mean and infamous purpose—for the extension of slavery! It is not enough that there are fifteen slave States, and three million men here who have no legal rights—not so much as the horse and the ox have in Boston; it is not enough that the slaveholders annexed Texas, and made slavery perpetual there, extending even north of Mason and Dixon's line—covering a territory forty-five times as large as the State of Massachusetts! Oh, no! we must have yet more land to whip negroes in!

The war had a mean and infamous beginning. It began illegally, unconstitutionally. The Whigs say, 'the President made the war.' Mr. Webster says so! It went on meanly and infamously. Your Congress lied about it. Don't lay the blame on the Democrats; the Whigs lied just as badly. Your Congress has seldom been so single-mouthed before. Why, only sixteen voted against the war, or the lies. I say this war is mean and infamous all the more, because waged by a people calling itself Democratic and Christian. I know but one war so bad in modern times, between civilized nations; and that was the war for the partition of Poland. Even for that, there was more excuse!

We have come to Faneuil Hall to talk about the war; to work against the war. It is rather late, 'but better late than never.' We have two opportunities for work pass un-employed. One came while the annexation of Texas was pending. Then was the time to push and be active. Then was the time for Massachusetts and all the North, to protest as one man, against the extension of slavery. Every body knew all about the matter, the Democrats and the Whigs. But how few worked against that gross mischief! One noble man lifted up his warning voice,—a man noble in his father,—and there he stands in marble; noble in himself—and there he stands yet higher up—and I hope there will show him yet nobler in his son, and there he stands, not in marble, but in man! He talked against it, worked against it, fought against it. But Massachusetts did little.—Her tonguey men said little; her handly men did little. Too little could not be done or said. True, we came here to Faneuil Hall, and passed resolutions; good resolutions they were, too. They did the same in the State House; but nothing came of them. They say 'hell is paved with resolutions'; these were of that sort of resolutions which resolves nothing, because they are of words, no works! He talked against it, worked against it, fought against it. But Massachusetts did little.—Her tonguey men said little; her handly men did little. Too little could not be done or said. True, we came here to Faneuil Hall, and passed resolutions; good resolutions they were, too. They did the same in the State House; but nothing came of them. They say 'hell is paved with resolutions'; these were of that sort of resolutions which resolves nothing, because they are of words, no works!

Well, we passed the resolutions; you know who opposed them; who hung back and did nothing—nothing good I mean—quite enough not good. Then we thought all the danger was over; that the resolutions settled the matter. But then was the time to confound at once the enemies of your country; to show an even front hostile to slavery.

But the chosen time passed over, and nothing was done. Don't lay the blame on the Democrats; a Whig Senate annexed Texas, and so annexed a war. We ought to have told our delegation in Congress, if Texas were annexed, to come home, and we would breathe upon it and sleep upon it, and then see what to do next. Had our resolutions taken so warmly here in Faneuil Hall in 1845, been but as warmly worked out, we had now been as terrible to the Slave Power, as the Slave Power, since extended, now is to us!

Why was it that we did nothing? That is a public secret. Perhaps I ought not to tell it to the people. (Cries of "tell it.") The annexation of Texas—a slave territory big as the kingdom of France—would not furl a sail on the ocean; would not stop a mill-wheel at Lowell! Men thought so. That time passed by, and there came another. The government had made war; the Congress voted the dollars, voted the men, voted a lie. Your representative, men of Boston, voted for all three; the lie, the dollars, and the men; all three, in obedience to the slave power! Let him excuse that to the conscience of his party,—'tis an easy matter. I do not believe he can excuse it to his own conscience. To the conscience of the world it admits of no excuse. Your President called for volunteers, 50,000 of them. Then came an opportunity such as offers not once in one hundred years—an opportunity to speak for Freedom and the Rights of Man-kind! This was the time for Massachusetts to stand up in the spirit of '76, and say, 'We won't send a man, from Cape Ann to Williamstown—not one Yankee man for this wicked war.' Then was the time for your Governor to say, 'Not a volunteer for this wicked war.' Then was the time for your merchants to say, 'Not a ship, not a dollar for this wicked war!' for your manufacturers to say, 'We will not make you a cannon, nor a sword, nor a kernel of powder, nor a soldier's shirt, for this wicked war.'—Then was the time for all good men to say, 'This is a war for slavery, a mean and infamous war; an aristocratic war—a war against the best interests of mankind. If God please we will die a thousand times—but never draw blade in this wicked war.' (Cries of "throw him over." &c.) Throw him over—what good would that do? What would you do next, after you had thrown him over?—(Cries of "out of the hall.") What good would that do? It would not wipe off the infamy of this war—would not make it less wicked!

That is what a Democratic nation, a Christian people, ought to have said. But we did not say so; the Bay State did not say so; nor your Governor, nor your merchants, nor your manufacturers, nor your good men!—Your Governor issued his Proclamation for soldiers; accepted the President's decree; recommended men to enlist, by appealing to their patriotism and humanity!

God! Briggs is a good man, and so far I honor him. He is a temperance man—strong and consistent—I honor him for that. He is a friend of education; a friend of the people! I wish there were more such. Like many other New England men, he started from humble beginnings; but unlike many successful men of New England, he is not ashamed of the humblest root he ever trod on. I honor him for that. But there was a time when, tried men's souls, and his soul could