

able to make enough to eat and to wear, and that of the very poorest sort. That is the condition of the laboring population in those countries. And I say that I may challenge the world to show any laboring population so well cared for as our slaves were.

"No compensation for their labor" it is said; that is the idea. They are now to have the fruits of their labor. Have they not had the fruits of their labor? Have they not had comfortable houses to shelter them, and abundance of food and clothing, and as light labor as was compatible with the duties of the master to provide for his household? Have they not had the family physician to attend them in sickness? Have not the wives and daughters of slaveholders nursed them and cared for them in sickness? Has not the minister of God come to them and stood around their beds as they were lying in suffering and pain? And this is the system that you are to uproot, and in place of which you are to bring abolitionism to destroy all this fair prospect, and to plunge this unfortunate class into idleness, crime and degradation; to break asunder the ties which bind this unfortunate, yet faithful and affectionate class in many respects, to their owners. I have seen some of the victims of this delusion. When the steamboat came with soldiers sounding the praises of getting food and clothing at the expense of the United States, they thought it was a fine life for the negro, and so they rushed on board the boat to go where they could get plenty to eat and clothes to wear and nothing to do. Some of them tried it for two or three months at Washington among their particular friends, the abolitionists, at \$25 a month; and one poor old man, who worked precisely as he pleased, who served as manager and overseer to one of my neighbors, a man about 60 years of age, who carried his master's keys, had a horse to ride, and a carriage, too, if he chose, with as much money as he wanted, he thought he must go, and he went to Washington and engaged to groom horses for \$25 a month. He worked there for two or three months without getting any pay, and finally went to the department, where he was put off with \$7.50. He had got enough of that; he went home to his master, most humbly beseeching to be received again as a slave; as others have done in that neighborhood, coming back to their owners, repudiating this system which brings them to poverty, disease and death, praying to be received again in their homes which they had left under a delusion, and asking to be received under the kind care of their masters, and into the servitude in which they lived before.

My learned friend from Howard (Mr. Sands) asked me this question the other day: If my slaves run away from Maryland, and went into the Northern States, to whom would I look for redress? Well might he ask that

question. I tell him that the Constitution clothed the Federal Government with that authority and made it obligatory upon it to execute the law. The Constitution has done more. The Constitution which has been adopted by New Hampshire, and Vermont, and Massachusetts, and Connecticut, and New York, and all those western States which have been admitted to enjoy the blessings of this Union—that Constitution said to them: You are bound by the high obligation of your plighted faith to return to his owner the fugitive slave that comes within your borders; it was a part of the compact, and whatever you may think about it you are not at liberty to set it aside, for the obligation is there resting upon you. How has that obligation been fulfilled, even within the State of Pennsylvania, upon your border?

Mr. SANDS. My question related to the time antecedent to this war, when the slaveholders looked exclusively to the Federal Government.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. Precisely, and looked in vain. Not because the Federal Government was unable or unwilling.

The PRESIDENT. The gentleman's time is up.

On motion of Mr. SCOTT,

The time of the gentleman was extended fifteen minutes.

Mr. JONES, of Somerset. I had no idea I had spoken an hour. I was just going to give my friend from Howard (Mr. Sands) the benefit of Mr. Clay's opinions about abolition and its tendencies, in a speech which he made in 1850 to the Legislature of Kentucky, after he succeeded in carrying the compromise measure in Congress. It was Mr. Clay's testimony to the patriotism and support of the democratic party in carrying those measures, which he said was equal to if not greater than that he had received from his whig friends. The vote will show that he was dependent upon the democratic support which he received for the success of his measure. But I shall have to forego that.

I had intended to show that Mr. Lincoln in his inaugural address, and Mr. Seward in his despatch No. 3 to Mr. Dayton, said that the condition of slavery in the several States would remain just the same whether the rebellion succeeded or failed. Now see the change that has taken place in their purposes.

I have another pamphlet here from which I should have been very happy to read some extracts. It is a pamphlet filled with the sayings and doings of that abolition conspiracy in the New England States which has brought about these troubles. It is entitled, "The abolition conspiracy to destroy the Union; or, a ten years' record of the 'Republican' party. The opinions of William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Abraham Lincoln, William H. Seward, Salmon P. Chase, Horace Greeley," and a great many others.