

# The Burlington Free Press.

NOT THE GLORY OF CÆSAR; BUT THE WELFARE OF ROME.

BY H. B. STACY.

FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1836.

VOL. X--No. 469.

## SPEECH OF MR. ADAMS.

In the House of Representatives, May 23, on the resolution authorizing the payment of rations to the inhabitants of Alabama and Georgia, who have been driven from their homes by the Indians.

[This speech is of too great a length to admit of our publishing it entire. Mr Adams began by assigning his reasons for voting in favor of this resolution. The reason why he should vote for the resolution he said was the same with that why he voted against the resolution in the morning, that the House had no authority to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in the states. He proceeded to state his reasons which he was then prohibited from doing, for voting against that resolution. He proceeded to show, that in the contingency of either of the wars which now threaten us, Congress would have authority in various ways to interfere with the institution of slavery.]

I return then, to my first position, that there are two classes of powers vested by the Constitution of the United States in their Congress and Executive Government: the powers to be exercised in time of peace, and the powers incidental to war. That the powers of peace are limited by provisions within the body of the constitution itself; but that the powers of war are limited and regulated only by the laws and usages of nations. There are, indeed, powers of peace conferred upon Congress, which also come within the scope and jurisdiction of the laws of nations, such as the negotiation of treaties of amity and commerce, the interchange of public ministers and consuls, and all the personal and social intercourse between the individual inhabitants of the United States and foreign nations, and the Indian tribes, which require the intervention of a law. But the powers of war are all regulated by the laws of nations, and are subject to no other limitation. It is by this power that I am justified in voting the money of my constituents for the immediate relief of their fellow citizens suffering with extreme necessity even for subsistence, by the direct consequence of an Indian war. Upon the same principle your consuls in foreign parts are authorized to provide for the subsistence of seamen in distress, and even for their passage to their own country.

And it was upon that same principle that I voted against the resolution reported by the slavery committee, "that Congress possess no constitutional authority to interfere in any way, with the institution of slavery in any of the States of this Confederacy," to which resolution most of those with whom I usually concur, and even my own colleagues in this House gave their assent. I do not admit that there is, even among the peace powers of Congress, such authority, but in war there are many ways by which Congress not only have the authority, but are bound to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States. It was so considered by the founders of the Constitution of the United States, in which it was stipulated that Congress should not interfere, in that way, with the institution, prior to the year 1803.

During the late war with Great Britain, the military and naval commanders of that nation issued proclamations inviting the slaves to repair to their standards, with promises of freedom and of settlement in some of the British colonial establishments. This, surely was an interference with the institution of slavery in the States. By the treaty of peace, Great Britain stipulated to evacuate all the forts and places in the United States, without carrying away any slaves. If the Government of the United States had no authority to interfere, in any way, with the institution of slavery in the States, they would not have had the authority to require this stipulation. It is well known that this engagement was not fulfilled by the British naval and military commanders; that on the contrary, they did carry away all the slaves whom they had induced to join them, and that the British Government inflexibly refused to restore any of them to their masters; that a claim of indemnity was consequently instituted in behalf of the owners of the slaves and was successfully maintained.—All that series of transactions was an interference by Congress with the institution of slavery in the States in one way—in the way of protection and support. It was by the institution of slavery alone that the restoration of slaves enticed by proclamations into the British service could be claimed as property. But for the institution of slavery the British commanders could neither have allured them to their standard, nor restored them otherwise than as liberated prisoners of war. But for the institution of slavery there could have been no stipulation that they should not be carried away as property, nor any claim of indemnity for the violation of that engagement.

But the war power of Congress over the institution of slavery in the States is yet far more extensive. Suppose the case of a servile war, complicated, as to some extent it is even now with an Indian war; suppose Congress were called to raise armies, to supply money from the whole Union to suppress a servile insurrection: would they have no authority to interfere with the institution of slavery? The issue of a servile war may be disastrous. By war, the slave may emancipate himself; it may become necessary for the master to recognize his emancipation by a treaty of peace; can it for an instant be pretended that Congress in such a contingency, would have no authority to interfere with the institution of slavery, in any way, in the States? Why, it would be equivalent to saying that Congress have no constitutional authority to make peace.

I suppose a more portentous case, certainly within the bounds of possibility—I would to God I could say not within the bounds of probability. You have been, if you are not now, at the very point of a war with Mexico—a war, I am sorry to say so far as public rumor may be credited, stimulated by provocations on our part

from the very commencement of this administration down to the recent authority given to Gen. Gaines to invade the Mexican territory. It is said that one of the earliest acts of this administration was a proposal, made at a time when there was much ill humor in Mexico against the United States, that she should cede to the United States a very large portion of her territory, large enough to constitute nine States equal in extent to Kentucky. It must be confessed that a device better calculated to produce jealousy, suspicion, ill-will, and hatred, could not have been contrived. It is further affirmed that this overture, offensive in itself, was made precisely at the time when a swarm of colonists from these United States were covering the Mexican border with hand-jobs, and with slaves, introduced in defiance of the Mexican laws, by which slavery had been abolished throughout that republic. The war now raging in Texas is a Mexican civil war, and a war for the re-establishment of slavery where it was abolished. It is not a servile war, but a war between slavery and emancipation, and every possible effort has been made to drive us into the war, on the side of slavery.

It is, indeed, a circumstance eminently fortunate for us that this man, Santa Ana, has been defeated and taken, though I cannot participate in that exquisite joy with which we have been told that every one having Anglo-Saxon blood in his veins must have been delighted on hearing that this ruffian has been shot, in cold blood, when a prisoner of war, by the Anglo-Saxon leader of the victorious Texian army.—Sir, I hope there is no member of this House, of other than Anglo-Saxon origin, who will deem it uncourteous that I, being myself in part Anglo-Saxon, must of course, hold that for the best blood that ever circulated in human veins. Oh! yes, sir: far be it from me to depreciate the glories of the Anglo-Saxon race; although there have been times when they bowed their necks and submitted to the law of conquest, beneath the ascendancy of the Norman race. But sir, it has struck me as no inconsiderable evidence of the spirit which is spurring us into this war of aggression, of conquest and of slave making, that all the fires of ancient, hereditary national hatred are to be kindled, to familiarize us with the ferocious spirit of rejecting at the massacre of prisoners in cold blood. Sir, there is not yet hatred enough between the races which compose your Southern population and the population of Mexico, their next neighbor, but you must go back eight hundred or a thousand years, and to another hemisphere, for the fountains of bitterness between you and them? What is the cause of feeling between the component parts of your own Southern population between your Anglo-Saxon, Norman French, and Spanish-Spanish inhabitants of Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Missouri; between them all and the Indian savage, the original possessor of the land from which you are scourging him already back to the foot of the Rocky Mountains?—What between them all and the native American negro, of African origin, whom they are holding in cruel bondage? Are these elements of harmony, concord, and patriotism between the component parts of a nation starting upon a crusade of conquest? And what are the feelings of all this motley compound of your Southern population towards the compound equally heterogeneous of the Mexican population? Do not you, an Anglo-Saxon, slaveholding exterminator of Indians, from the bottom of your soul, hate the Mexican Spaniard, Indian, emancipator of slaves and abolisher of slavery? And do you think that your hatred is not with equal cordiality returned? Go to the city of Mexico, ask any of your fellow-citizens who have been there for the last three or four years, whether they scarcely dare show their faces, as Anglo-Americans, in the streets. Be assured, sir, that, however heartily you detest the Mexican, his bosom burns with an equally deep-seated detestation of you.

And this is the nation with which, at the instigation of your executive Government, you are now rushing into war—into a war of conquest; commenced by aggression on your part, and for the re-establishment of slavery, where it has been abolished, throughout the American Republic.—For your war will be with Mexico—with a Republic of twenty-four States, and a population of eight or nine millions of souls. It seems to be considered that this victory over twelve hundred men with the capture of their commander, the President of the Mexican Republic, has already achieved the conquest of the whole Republic. That it may have achieved the independence of Texas is not impossible. But Texas is to the Mexican Republic not more nor so much as the State of Michigan is to yours. The State of Michigan, the People of which are in vain claiming of you the performance of that sacred promise you made them, of admitting her as a State into the Union; that State of Michigan, which has greater grievances and heavier wrongs to allege against you for a declaration of her independence, if she were disposed to declare it then the People of Texas have for breaking off their union with the Republic of Mexico, Texas is an extreme boundary portion of the Republic of Mexico; a wilderness inhabited only by Indians; a wilderness inhabited only by Indians till after the Revolution which separated Mexico from Spain; not sufficiently populous at the organization of the Mexican Confederacy to form a State by itself, and therefore united with Coahuila, where the greater part of the indigenous part of the population reside. Sir, the history of all the emancipated Spanish American colonies has been ever since their separation from Spain, a history of convulsionsary wars of revolutions, accomplished by single, and often very insignificant battles; of chief towns, whose title to power has been the murder of their immediate predecessors.—They have all partaken of the character of the first conquest of Mexico by Cortez.

and of Peru by Pizarro; and this, sir, makes me shudder at the thought of connecting our destinies indissolubly with theirs. It may be that a new revolution in Mexico will follow upon this captivity or death of their President and commanding general; we have rumors, indeed, that such a revolution had happened even before his defeat; but I cannot yet see my way clear to the conclusion that either the independence of Texas, or the capture and military execution of Santa Ana, will save you from war with Mexico. Santa Ana was but one of a breed of white Spanish America for the last twenty-five years has been a teeming mother—soldiers of fortune who, by the sword or the musket ball have risen to supreme power, and by the sword or the musket ball have fallen from it.—That breed is not extinct; the very last intelligence from Peru tells of one who has fallen there as Yturbe, and Mina, and Guerrero, and Santa Ana have fallen in Mexico. The same soil which produced them is yet fertile to produce others. They reproduce themselves, with nothing but a change of the name and of the man. Your war, sir, is to be a war of races—the Anglo-Saxon American pitted against the Moorish Spanish-Mexican American; a war between the northern and southern halves of North America; from Passamaquoddy to Panama. And you prepared for such a war?

And again I ask, what will be your cause in such a war? Aggression, conquest, and the re-establishment of slavery, where it has been abolished. In that war, sir, the banners of freedom will be the banners of Mexico; and your banners, I blush to speak the word, will be the banners of slavery.

Sir, in considering these United States, and the United Mexican States as mere masses of power coming to collision against each other, I cannot doubt that Mexico will be the greatest sufferer by the shock. The conquest of all Mexico would seem to be an improbable result of the conflict, especially if the war should extend no farther than to the two mighty combatants. But will it be so confined? Mexico is clearly the weakest of the Powers; but she is not the least prepared for action. She has the more recent experience of war. She has the greatest number of veteran warriors; and although her highest chief has just suffered a fatal and ignominious defeat, yet that has happened often before to leaders of armies too confident of success and contemptuous of their enemy. Even now, Mexico is better prepared for a war of invasion upon her. There may be found a successor to Santa Ana, infamed with the desire not only of avenging his disaster but what he and his nation will consider your perfidious hostility. The national spirit may go with him. He may not only turn the tables upon the Texian conquerors, but drive them for refuge within your borders, and pursue them into the heart of your own territories. Are you in a condition to resist him? Is the success of your whole army, all your veteran generals, and all your militia calls and your mutinous volunteers against a miserable band of five or six hundred invisible Seminole Indians in your late campaign an earnest of the energy and vigor with which you are ready to carry on that far otherwise formidable and complicated war—so complicated did I say? And how complicated? Your Seminole war is already spreading to the Creeks; and, in their march of desolation, they sweep along with their negro slaves, and put arms into their hands to make common cause with them against you; and how far will it spread, sir, should a Mexican invader, with the torch of liberty in his hand, and the standard of freedom floating over his head, proclaiming emancipation to the slave and revenge to the native Indian, as he goes, invade your soil? What will be your States of Louisiana, of Mississippi, of Alabama, of Arkansas, of Missouri, and of Georgia? Where will be your negroes? Where will be that combined and concentrated mass of Indian tribes, whom by an inconceivable policy, you have expelled from their widely distant habitations, to embody them within a small compass on the very borders of Mexico, as if on purpose to give that country a nation of natural allies in their hostilities against you? Sir, you have a Mexican, an Indian, and a Negro war upon your hands, and you are plunging into it blindfold; you are talking about acknowledging the independence of the republic of Texas, and you are thirsting to annex Texas, ay, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas, and Santa Fe, from the source to the mouth of the Rio Bravo, to your already over-distended dominions. Five hundred thousand square miles of the territory of Mexico would not even now quench your burning thirst for aggrandizement.

But will your foreign war for this be with Mexico alone? No, sir. As the weaker party, Mexico, when the contest shall have once begun, will look abroad, as well as among your negroes and your Indians, for assistance. Neither Great Britain nor France will suffer you to make such a conquest from Mexico; no, nor even to annex the independent state of Texas to your confederation, without their interposition. You will have Anglo-Saxon intermeddling with a Mexican War to wage.—Great Britain may have no serious objection to the independence of Texas, and may be willing enough to take her under her protection as a barrier both against Mexico and against you. But as aggrandizement to you, she will not readily suffer it; and above all she will not suffer you to acquire it by conquest and the re-establishment of slavery. Urged on by the irresistible, overwhelming torrent of public opinion, Great Britain has recently, at a cost of one hundred millions of dollars, which her people have joyfully paid, abolished slavery throughout all her colonies in the West Indies. After setting such an example, she will not—it is impossible that she should stand by and witness a war for the re-establishment of slavery where it had been

for years abolished, and situated thus, in the immediate neighborhood of her islands. She will tell you that, if you must have Texas a member of your confederacy, it must be without the taint or the trammels of slavery; and if you will wage a war to hand off and fetter your fellow-man, she will wage the war against you to break his chains. Sir, what a figure, in the eyes of mankind would you make, in deadly conflict with Great Britain, she fighting the battles of emancipation, and you the battles of slavery; she the benefactress and you the oppressor of human kind! In such a war, the enthusiasm of emancipation, too, would unite vast numbers of her people in aid of the national rivalry, and all her natural jealousy against your aggrandizement. No war was ever so popular in England as that war would be against slavery, the slave trade, and the Anglo-Saxon descendant from her own loins.

As to the annexation of Texas to your Confederation, for what do you want it? Are you not large and unwieldy enough already? Do not two millions of square miles cover surface enough for the insatiable rapacity of your land jobbers? I hope there are none of them within the sound of my voice. Have you not Indians enough to excel from the land of their fathers' sepulchres, and to exterminate? What, in a prudential and military point of view, would be the addition of Texas to your domain? It would be weakness, and not power. Is your southern and southwestern frontier not sufficiently extensive? Not sufficiently feeble? Not sufficiently defensible? Why are you adding regiment after regiment of dragoons to your standing army? Why are you struggling, by direction and by inclination, to raise *per saltum* that army from less than six to more than twenty thousand men? Your commanding General, now returning from his excursion to Florida, openly recommends the increase of your Army to that number. Sir, the extension of your sea-coast frontier from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo would add to your weakness tenfold; for it is now only weakness with reference to Mexico. It would then be weakness with reference to Great Britain, to France, even perhaps to Russia, to every naval European Power, which might make a quarrel with us for the sake of setting a colony; but, above all, to Great Britain. She, by her naval power, and by her American colonies, holds the keys of the Gulf of Mexico. What would be the condition of your frontier from the mouth of the Mississippi to that of the Rio del Norte, in the event of a war with Great Britain? Sir, the reasons of Mr. Monroe for accepting the Sabine as the boundary were three. First, he had no confidence in the strength of our claim as far as the Rio Bravo; secondly, he thought it would make our union so heavy that it would break into fragments of its own weight; thirdly, he thought it would protrude a long line of sea coast, which, in our first war with Great Britain, she might take into her own possessions, and which we should be able neither to defend nor to recover. At that time there was no question of slavery or of abolition involved in the controversy. The country belonged to Spain; it was a wilderness, and slavery was the established law of the land. There was then no project for carving out nine slave States, to hold eighteen seats in the other wing of the capitol, in the triangle between the mouths and the sources of the Mississippi and Bravo rivers. But what was our claim? Why it was that La Salle, having discovered the mouth of the Mississippi, and France having made a settlement at New Orleans, France had a right to one-half the sea coast from the mouth of the Mississippi to the next Spanish settlement, which was Vera Cruz. The mouth of the Rio Bravo was about half way from the Balize to Vera Cruz; and so as grants, from France to Louisiana, we claimed to the Rio del Norte, though the Spanish settlement of Santa Fe was at the head of that river. France, from whom we had received Louisiana, utterly disclaimed ever having even raised such a pretension. Still we made the best of the claim that we could, and finally yielded it for the Florida, and for the line of the 42d degree of latitude from the source of the Arkansas river to the South sea. Such was our claim; and you may judge how much confidence Mr. Monroe could have in its validity? The great object and desire of the country then was to obtain the Florida. It was General Jackson's desire; and in that conference with me to which I have heretofore alluded, and which it is said he does not recollect, he said to me that so long as the Florida rivers were not in our possession, there could be no safety for our whole Southern country.

But, sir, suppose you should annex Texas to these United States; another year would not pass before you would have engaged in a war for the conquest of the island of Cuba. What is now the condition of that island? Still under the nominal protection of Spain. What is the condition of Spain herself? Consuming her own vitals in a civil war for the succession to the crown. Do you expect, that whatever may be the issue of that war, she can retain even the nominal possession of Cuba? After having lost all her continental colonies in North and South America, Cuba will stand in need of more efficient protection; and above all, that of a naval power. Suppose that naval power should be Great Britain. There is Cuba at your very door; and if you spread yourself along a naked coast, from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo, what will be your relative position towards Great Britain, not only Jamaica, but Cuba, and Porto Rico in her hands, and abolition for the motto to her union cross of St. George and Saint Andrew? Mr. Chairman, do you think I am treating on fantastic grounds? Let me tell you a piece of history, not far remote. Sir, many years have not passed away since an internal revolution in Spain subjected that country and her king for a short time to the momentary government of the Cortes. That

revolution was followed by another, by which, under the auspices of a French army, with the Duke d'Angouleme at their head Ferdinand and the Seventh was restored to a despotic throne; Cuba had followed the fortunes of the Cortes when they were crowned with victory, and when the counter revolution came, the inhabitants of the island, uncertain what was to be their destination, were for some time in great perplexity what to do for themselves. Two considerable parties arose in the island, one of which was for placing it under the protection of Great Britain, and another was for annexing it to the confederation of these United States. By one of these parties I have reason to believe that overtures were made to the Government of Great Britain. By the other I know that overtures were made to the Government of the United States. And I further know that secret, though irresponsible assurances were communicated to the then President of the United States, as coming from the French Government, that they were secretly informed that the British Government had determined to take possession of Cuba. Whether similar overtures were made to France herself, I do not undertake to say; but that Mr. George Canning, then the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was under no inconsiderable alarm, lest under the pupillage of the Duke d'Angouleme, Ferdinand and the Seventh might commit to the command of a French naval squadron the custody of the Moro Castle, is a circumstance also well known to me.

It happened that just about that time a French squadron of considerable force was fitted out and received sailing orders for the West Indies, without formal communication of the fact to the British Government; and that as soon as it was made known to him, he gave orders to the British Ambassador at Paris to demand, in the most peremptory tone, what was the destination of that squadron, and a special and positive disclaimer that it was intended even to visit the Havans; and this was made the occasion of mutual explanations, by which Great Britain, France, and the United States, not by the formal solemnity of a treaty, but by the implied engagement of mutual assurances of intention, gave pledges of honor to each other, that neither of them should in the then condition of the island take it, or the Moro Castle, as its citadel, from the possession of Spain. This engagement was on all sides faithfully performed; but, without it, who doubts that from that day to this either of the three Powers might have taken the island and held it in undisputed possession.

At this time circumstances have changed—popular revolutions both in France and Great Britain have perhaps curbed the spirit of conquest in Great Britain, and France may have enough to do to govern her kingdom of Algiers. But Spain is again convulsed with a civil war for the succession to her crown; she has irretrievably lost all her colonies on both continents of America. It is impossible that she should hold much longer a shadow of dominion over the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico; nor can those islands, in their present condition, form independent nations, capable of protecting themselves. They must for ages remain at the mercy of Great Britain or of these United States, or of both; Great Britain is even now about to interfere in this war for the Spanish succession. If by the utter imbecility of the Mexican Cortes this result of Texas should lead immediately to its separation from that Republic, and its annexation to the United States, I believe it impossible that Great Britain should look on while this operation is performing with indifference. She will see that it must shake her own whole colonial power on this continent, in the Gulf of Mexico, and in the Caribbean Seas, like an earthquake; she will see, too, that it endangers her own abolition of slavery in her own colonies. A war for the restoration of slavery where it has been abolished, successful in Texas, must extend over all Mexico; and the example will create in her own colonies a war of color in her own islands. She will take possession of Cuba and of Porto Rico, by ocean from Spain or by batteries from her wooden walls; and if you ask her by what authority she has done it, she will ask you, in return, what authority you have extended your sea coast from the Sabine to the Rio Bravo. She will ask you a question more perplexing, namely—by what authority you, with freedom, independence, and democracy upon your lips, are waging a war of extermination to forge new manacles and fetters, instead of those which are falling from the hands and feet of man. She will carry emancipation and abolition with her in every fold of her flag; while your stars, as they increase in numbers, will be overcast with the murky vapors of oppression, and the only portion of your banners visible to the eye will be the blood-stained stripes of the task master.

Mr Chairman, are you ready for all these wars? a war with Great Britain, if not with France? a general Indian war? a servile war? and as an inevitable consequence of them all, a civil war? for it must ultimately terminate in a war of colors as well as of races. And do you imagine that while with your eyes open you are wilfully kindling, and then closing your eyes and blindly rushing into them; do you imagine that while in the very nature of things, your own southern and southwestern states must be the flanders of these complicated wars, the battlefield upon which the last great conflict must be fought between slavery and emancipation; do you imagine, that your Congress will have no constitutional authority to interfere with the institution of slavery in any way in the States of this confederacy? Sir, they must and will interfere with it—perhaps to sustain it by war; perhaps to abolish it by treaty of peace; and they will not only possess the constitutional power so to interfere, but they will be bound in duty, to do it by the express provisions of the constitution itself.

From the instant that your slave-holding States become the theatre of war—civil, servile, or foreign—then that instant the war power of Congress extends to interference with the institution of slavery, in every way by which it can be interfered with from a claim of indemnity for slaves taken or destroyed, to the cession of the state burdened with slavery to a foreign power.

Sir, it is by virtue of this same war power as now brought into exercise by the Indian war in Florida, Alabama and Georgia, that I vote for the resolution before the committee. By virtue of this, I have already voted in the course of this session to increase your standing army by a second regiment of dragoons, to authorize your President to accept the services of ten thousand volunteers, and to appropriate millions of the public money to suppress these Indian hostilities—all for the common defence, all for the general welfare. And if, on this occasion, I have been compelled to avail myself of the opportunity to assign my reasons for voting against the first resolution reported by the slavery committee, it is because it was the pleasure of the majority of the House this morning to refuse me the permission to assign my reasons for my vote, when the question was put upon those resolutions themselves.

Sir, it is a melancholy contemplation to me, and raises fearful forebodings in my mind when I consider the manner in which that Report and those Resolutions have been disposed of by the House.—I have twice asked permission of this House to offer two resolutions calling for information from the President upon subjects of infinite importance to this question of slavery, to our relations with Mexico, and to the peace of the country. When I last made the attempt, a majority of the House voted by yeas and nays to suspend the rules to enable me to offer one of the two resolutions—but the majority not amounting to two thirds, my resolution has not yet obtained from the House the favor of being considered. Had it been the pleasure of the House to indulge the call, or to allow me the privilege of assigning my reasons for my vote on the resolution this morning, the remarks that I have made might have been deemed more appropriate to those topics of discussion, than to the question more immediately now before the committee. They are reflections, however, which I deem it not less independent to make than they are painful to be made—extracted from me by a coalition of public affairs unexampled in the history of this country.—I therefore, call upon the Executive Department for information, such as that which I have proposed to make, were considered as among the rights of the members of this House, and which was deemed decent to resist. A previous question, something like discussion upon resolutions reported by a committee, affecting the vital principles of the Constitution, moved by one of the members who reported the resolutions, and sustained by the members of that committee itself, is an occurrence which never before has happened in the annals of this Government. The adoption of those resolutions of the House had never been moved. Upon the mere question whether an extra number of the report of the committee should be printed, a member moves the question of the report of the committee, with instructions to report a new resolution. On this motion the previous question is moved, and the Speaker declares that the motion is not on the motion to recommit, nor on the motion to print an extra number of copies of the report, but upon the adoption of three resolutions, reported, but never even moved to the House. If this is to be the sample of our future legislation, it is time to awake from the delusion that freedom of speech is among the rights of the members of the minority of this House.

To return, Mr Chairman, to the resolution before the committee. I shall vote for this application of money, levied by taxation upon my constituents, to feed the suffering and starving fugitives from Indian desolation and revenge. How deeply searching to the coffers of your Treasury this operation will ultimately be, no man can at this time foretell.—The expenditure authorized by this resolution may be as itself very considerable; but in its progress it has already stretched from Alabama to Georgia—as much further it may extend, will soon be hereafter. I turn my eyes away from the prospect of it now; but am prepared to meet the emergency, if it should come, with all the resources of the Treasury.

But, sir, I shall not vote for this relief to the suffering inhabitants of Alabama and Georgia, upon the ground on which the gentleman from Alabama, (Mr Lewis) and the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr Thompson) have been disposed to place it. Little reason have the inhabitants of Georgia and Alabama to complain that the Government of the United States has been inactive or neglectful in protecting them from Indian hostilities; the fact is directly the reverse. The People of Alabama and Georgia are now suffering the recoil of their own unlawful weapons. Georgia, sir, Georgia, by trampling upon the faith of our national treaties with the Indian tribes, and by subjecting them to the State laws, first set the example of that policy which is now in the process of consummation by the Indian war. In setting this example, she had defied the authority of the Government of the nation; she nullified your laws; she set at naught your Executive and judicial guarantees of the most sacred Constitution of the land. To what extent she carried this policy, the dangers of her prisons and the records of the Supreme Judicial Court of the United States can tell. To those prisons she committed offensive, indigent, pliant ministers of the Gospel of Truth, for carrying the light, the comfort, and the consolation of that Gospel to the hearts and minds of these unhappy Indians. A solemn decision of the Supreme Court of the U. S. pronounced that an violation of your treaties and of your laws. Georgia defied that decision; your Executive Government never carried it into execution; the unopposed missionaries of the Gospel were compelled to purchase their ransom from perpetual captivity by surrendering their rights as freemen to the iniquity of their principles as Christians; and you have sanctioned all these outrages upon justice, law, and humanity, by succumbing to the power and the policy of Georgia, by accommodating your legislation to her arbitrary will; by treating to ratify some old treaties with the Indians, and by countering them, under *peine forte et dure* to the mockery of signing other treaties with you, which at the first moment when it shall suit your purpose, you will again tear in shreds and scatter to the four winds of Heaven, till the Indian race shall be extinct upon this continent, and it shall become a problem beyond the solution of antiquaries and historical societies, what the real man of the forest was.

This, sir, is the remote primitive cause of the present Indian war; your own injustice in sanctioning and sustaining that of Georgia and Alabama. This system of policy was first introduced by the present administration of your national government. It is directly the reverse of that system which had been pursued by all the preceding Administrations of this government under the present constitution. That system consisted in the most anxious and persevering efforts to civilize the Indians; to attach them to the soil upon which they lived; to enlighten their minds; to soften and humanize their hearts; to fix in permanency their habitations; and to turn them from the wandering and precarious pursuits of the hunter, to the tillage of the ground;