

upon the South to their utter destruction, to compel obedience to the terms of the Constitution. He admits that he would have violated the Constitution; he justifies the violations which have taken place on the part of the North, and which I shall show have brought this terrible civil war upon us.

Now I desire to reply to a remark which the gentleman made, and at which I was greatly surprised, that there was no property in slaves by the law of nations. I was surprised at that, because I supposed that in this country that principal was so well known that there could be no mistake about it. Have we not compelled Great Britain on divers occasions to admit the right of property in slaves? Has not this Federal Government compelled Great Britain to pay in dollars and cents the value of slaves which she had improperly taken away from our citizens—aye, sir, slaves that by her persuasion she induced to go on board of her ships; and which she acknowledged by treaty she had no right, according to the laws of war, to take? She agreed to return them. And for those she carried to Great Britain or elsewhere in her ships, she was subsequently compelled, under negotiations conducted by John Quincy Adams, to pay the value. And not only that, but cargoes of slaves, by stress of weather upon the high seas, on their way from our ports to New Orleans, slaves belonging to the citizens of this country, some belonging to the citizens of Maryland, cargoes of slaves were driven by stress of weather into Barbadoes or Bermuda, and were there turned adrift by the British authorities, so that they were lost to their owners. The Federal Government made claims upon the government of Great Britain, and ultimately compelled her to admit that the action of her authorities was in violation of the law of nations; that there was a right of property in slaves by the law of nations. And she ultimately paid their value, and that was not a great many years ago.

Mr. STIRLING. My impression was that the facts were the other way. Will the gentleman give the reference?

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I cannot give the precise reference. But if the gentleman will examine the diplomatic correspondence of this government, I think he will find it.

Mr. STIRLING. I think a reclamation was made and refused.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. No, sir.

Mr. SANDS. Has it been since 1808?

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. Yes, sir; within the last 25 or 30 years; I think some time in the neighborhood of 1839. There were citizens of my own county interested in the question. I know there were some other cases not paid for. But in those cases, driven there by stress of weather, Great Britain admitted that she was under obliga-

tion to pay for the loss the acts of her authorities had brought upon us.

Mr. MILLER. I suppose the gentleman refers to the case of slaves being taken from one port of the United States to another.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. Yes sir; in their transit from one port to another, upon our ships, which are just as much a part of our territory as the State of Virginia. They were on board our ships, protected by the national flag, by the law of nations, which was violated, and for which violation Great Britain paid compensation when demanded of her. And there has been no instance, that I have come across, in which any government has taken away this species of property without making compensation.

Great Britain herself, when, after twenty years agitation of this question, under Wilberforce and his coadjutors, influences were brought to bear to induce her to pass an act of emancipation of slaves in her West Indian colonies—although she made it gradual, and, as was very well stated here, she provided not only for gradual emancipation, but that they should serve five years of apprenticeship—Great Britain herself, provided that when emancipation did take place there should be compensation to the owners for the loss of their property. They did not put it upon the ground of any French revolutionary doctrine of the right of man, to set these slaves free; or upon this new gospel of an anti-slavery God, and an anti-slavery Bible, that slavery was a sin: a doctrine which, until within the last century was never pretended to be found in the Bible, and cannot be found in any respectable commentator upon it. It took its rise about the time that the philosophy was promulgated, the political doctrines, which culminated in the French revolution with all its horrors, deluging the land with blood; as it has culminated in this country in all the horrors of civil war, desolating our land in blood. I think the ship I spoke of, or rather there were two of them, were driven into Bermuda by stress of weather, perhaps one of them was wrecked upon some other island, or upon some key of the British possessions.

Now, upon what ground did the President of the United States, in his appeal to the border States, put this proposition of emancipation? He did not put it upon the ground of the rights of man, or the rights of conscience, or that slavery was any invasion of natural rights. He put it upon this ground:

"And the plan therein proposed, [resolution of Congress previously referred to] is yet one of the most potent and swift means of ending the war. Let the States which are in rebellion see definitely and certainly that in no event will the States you represent ever join their proposed confederacy, and they cannot much longer maintain the contest. But you cannot divest them of their hope to