

and all error, bitter to the taste; and that its fruition ends in terrible retribution.

Now, let us inquire into the origin of the system in this country.

It was generally admitted by the framers of the Constitution that the institution should be tolerated, and tolerated only, and the hope both expressed and implied was that the day would soon come when the slaves would be liberated throughout the land. It is not my purpose here to go into a detail statement of the views entertained by the sages of that day. The record is open to all. The views of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Henry, Randolph, Jay, Hamilton, &c., were ably alluded to by the gentleman from Caroline (Mr. Todd,) and by my colleague (Mr. Scott.) I had intended to do so, but will not delay the Convention by any extracts from their speeches or writings.

The framers of our Constitution could not as a body utter the word "slave" as connected with the American Government, and the word does not appear in that instrument. How could they do it? they who in 1776 had given voice to the immortal expression: "We hold these truths to be self evident," &c. Every schoolboy knows it by heart, and I need not repeat it. How could they do it? they who sat under the dome which contained it, and heard the tolling of that bell upon whose rim it is written, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof?"

I do not deny the fact that the institution was recognized by the Constitution, but I do say that it was done indirectly and not boldly nor in the manner generally adopted by those celebrated men in making their sonorous announcements to the world.

So then the institution became one of the fixed institutions of the country, and from that day to this it has been one of the principal causes of trouble to the nation. From that day to this there have been abolitionists. From that day to this it has been securing power and grasping for more, until its tireless devotees, (justifying by their demands the adage that "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad,") are represented here to-day with us attending its funeral in Maryland.

It has been claimed, with some bitterness, by the gentleman from Somerset (Mr. Jones) that the abolitionists are the cause of all our troubles. He speaks of an abolitionist as though he were a sinner. The gentleman cannot mention the day since slavery existed that there were no abolitionists. Let me ask the gentleman, has not a man a right to be opposed to slavery? And being opposed, has he not the right to express his opposition? No institution can live that will not withstand and survive discussion, especially in America.

The first authoritative expression of oppo-

sition to it was in 1794, when "it was enacted that no person in the United States should fit out any vessel there for the purpose of carrying on any traffic in slaves to any foreign country, or for procuring from any foreign country the inhabitants thereof to be disposed of as slaves." In 1800 it was enacted that it should be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to have any property in any vessel employed in transporting slaves from one foreign country to another, or to serve on board any vessel so employed. Any of the commissioned vessels of the United States were authorized to seize and take any vessel employed in the slave trade, to be proceeded against in any of the circuit or district courts, and to be condemned for the use of the officers and crew of the vessel making the capture. In 1807 it was enacted that after the 1st of January, 1808, it should not be lawful to bring into the United States, or the territories thereof, from any foreign place, any negro, mulatto, or person of color with intent to hold or sell him as a slave; and heavy penalties are imposed on the violators of these acts, and others of similar import. In 1820 it was enacted that if any citizen of the United States belonging to the company of any foreign vessel engaged in the slave trade, or any person whatever belonging to the company of any vessel owned in whole or in part by, or navigated for any citizen of the United States, should land on any foreign shore to seize any negro or mulatto, not held to service by the laws of either of the States or Territories of the United States, with intent to make him a slave, or should decoy or forcibly carry off such negro or mulatto, or receive him on board any such vessel, with the intent expressed, he should be adjudged a pirate, and, on conviction, should suffer death. The same penalty was extended to those of the ship's company who should aid in confining such negro or mulatto on board of such vessel, or transfer him on the sea or tide waters to any other ship or vessel, or land him with intent to sell, or having previously sold him.

Thus, in 1820, the slave trade was declared to be piracy.

Now, I wish to notice some views frequently expressed here to this effect, that the North sustained the slave trade, and that even in later times the slave trade has been carried on by Northern money in Northern ships. While I do not see what bearing this fact has upon the question I wish to state my ground. I do not deny the fact that there *have always been* plenty of slaveholders in spirit in the North. I might just as well deny the well known fact that there is a large minority of slaveholders in spirit *there to-day*, and that they are unarmed (therefore the baser) rebels to-day at heart. I assure the gentleman that I am not oblivious of copperheads, nor of the venom of their bite, nor of