

poses which have been avowed in this hall by the advocates of this article.

Sir, it seems that gentlemen connect the war, which unfortunately now so devastates the land, with all their favorite articles. When the fourth article of this Bill of Rights was under consideration, we were told that secession was the cause of the war, and that that article must be put in the Bill of Rights with a view to putting down the doctrine of secession. And now when the twenty-third article of the Bill of Rights is under consideration, we are told that slavery is the cause of the war, and hence this article must be put in to put down slavery.

Sir, there is a more intimate connection between these two than at the first blush might appear. More than thirty years ago it became my duty to discuss both of these subjects upon this floor, and to discuss them in connection, because there was then but one question presented to the consideration of the General Assembly of Maryland. There had then appeared in the North—as if reviving from the grave, to which it had been supposed to have been consigned by the compromise of 1820, under the eloquence and patriotism of a Clay and those who co-operated with him at that day—there appeared the demon abolition, which arose with threats that have been now carried into execution, to set aside the God of the Bible that we worship and the Bible in which we believe, and to inaugurate in their place an anti-slavery God, an anti-slavery Bible, and an anti-slavery Constitution. That was the threat, and though there had been at that time but one meeting held in Boston, at which resolutions had been passed, in January, 1833, breaking the silence which had been over this question, and the peace which had prevailed for so many years, yet I thought I saw then a purpose connected with circumstances of *revenge* against the South for her opposition to the tariff, which created the difficulties in 1833. The papers evidently showed that they intended to repay the South for her opposition to the tariff; an opposition which sprung out of a desire, not to escape from the just liabilities, or taxes, or duties, or burdens which were necessary to carry on the government, but an opposition which was based upon the fact that the public debt was all paid; that there was an overflowing treasury and Congress was at their wits' end to know what to do with the money, and there were propositions to expend it in internal improvements here, there, and everywhere, but which were stopped by the veto of General Jackson—and propositions to distribute it among the States. The South planted itself upon the ground that the taxing power was given by the Constitution to enable the government to execute its powers according to the Constitution, and that when money was raised for that purpose, and that

alone, they had no objection to paying the full amount required. But they did object to having millions upon millions wrung out of the tax-payers of the land to go into the pockets of the collectors, to a great extent, and what was left unsquandered into the treasury of the United States and then be disbursed again to the States, never reaching the payers of the taxes. Against this system the South remonstrated, and against this system the South was united; and against this, when all other remedy seemed to her hopeless, the State of South Carolina arose, and immediately upon that controversy arising between South Carolina and the Federal Government, the demon abolition arose in Massachusetts.

There was a recommendation upon the part of Virginia to the Southern States, that a National Convention should be called to settle the difficulty between the Federal Government and South Carolina. Instantly the papers of the North said—when that National Convention assembles there will be a very good opportunity afforded to strike out of the Constitution the article giving representation for slaves. Thus it was that the compromises of the Constitution were all disregarded—compromises which, it is admitted on all hands by every statesman who has ever spoken upon the subject, were the very basis of the Constitution, and without which we should have had no Union, no Constitution, no Federal Government. It is well known that this question of slavery was one of the difficult questions to be adjusted. It is well known that it was adjusted in the liberal spirit of compromise by our fathers in the terms of the Constitution. It is well known that the slave trade was even continued until 1808, as a compromise of conflicting rights, and of duties, and of investments—the North taking her full share of the responsibility, being engaged in the trade, and having been engaged in it for a great number of years, under the authority of acts of parliament of Great Britain. Not only was this representation for slaves agreed upon as one of the compromises of the Constitution, but the rendition of fugitive slaves was expressly put in as an additional compromise upon that subject.

And now, sir, upon this point I may ask—how has the faith of the North been kept upon these compromises of the Constitution? We have heard the eloquent gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Cushing,) who has just concluded his argument, state that he witnessed the execution in Boston of that clause of the Constitution. And that, although he had been born in a slave State, and had slavery prejudices, yet had he been a citizen of Massachusetts, he would not have aided in that enforcement. Then the gentleman would have violated the compromises of the Constitution, as now he would wage war