Mr. SAWYER said: A dangerous system of legislation has been creeping into this House of late, a system which is at open war with all fair and legitimate legislation, to which he interposed his remonstrance. In the bill passed on yesterday, (the annual navy appropriation bill,) there were no less than from three to five appropriations made, not legitimately or properly belonging to that particular branch of the public service; and it was on this account alone that he felt himself compelled to vote against the whole bill.

One of the items by which I now allude, appropriated the sum of $30,000 for improving one of the inlets of Boston harbor, and to prevent a certain island (individual property) from being washed away. Another item was for paying Professor Espy (denominated "the Storm King") for taking certain meteorological observations; or, in other words, as a reward for "regulating storms." Add to this the heavy expenditure provided for the long list of drones now hanging, with a perfect death-gripe, upon the public treasury, and who, fearing that they might be driven from their hold without some such scheme for securing it, have been watching, with eager eyes, every stage of its progress here. These star-gazing astronomers, it seems, have dropped upon a scheme for taking the parallax of the sun; one standing at the equator and the other at the north pole, to take the altitude and bearing of that great luminary. An appropriation has been inserted for this purpose, sir.

But to other items. I find, sir, a pretty heavy sum of $30,000 appropriated for removing obstructions from the Savannah river. Also, the snug little sum of $36,000 for paving and grading the streets of Washington. And why such expenditures, sir? My constituents, like the constituents of all my brethren on this floor, have to make, grade, and pave their own streets, and build their own bridges. It is no part of my errand here to vote away their money for the benefit of the rich nabobs of this city, wallowing in their splendor.

Great care has been taken, it seems, in perfecting these items—a care very common to members from certain sections of this Union. It is managed so as to avoid the great and growing West. Not a cent is appropriated for the benefit of that region. Improvements for all that country are incorporated in a general bill for river and harbor purposes. But even in this operation, in fixing upon the proportions, enough of the most glaringly objectionable and ridiculous—such as digging out a hole where the God of Nature never made one, or creating a navigable river out of some miserable goose run—are usually held in, to secure a vote.

And this result is the very one they seek to accomplish, as affording them a little political capital for charging official misconduct upon a Democratic President, and delinquency upon the Democratic party. And here, sir, I take occasion to warn my friends of this House upon the injustice and danger of all such legislation. If such items are to be forced upon us, thus hurried before us, let us once put them down, and be prepared to render a proper account to our constituents.

Here, sir, I dismiss all small items, for a general examination of topics more interesting and striking in their character. I turn first to my constituents, who have been most wantonly attacked and assailed for one of the most commendable and noble acts ever honored a patriotic and high-minded people. It is with no feeling of pleasure, I do assure you, to repeat here, that I touch again upon that topic, I feel a kind of constitutional privilege pass over me as I approach it. It is a matter, sir, in which my own neighbors and friends—those who have been standing battling by my side in the high paths of public duties, the facts of the day—are directly and immediately involved. Faithless should I prove as their immediate representative here, and utterly unworthy of their approving smiles, were I not to stand up for their defence. At the last session, I felt called upon to state the facts in reference to the resistance offered to the settlement of a negro colony in my county. Some of the leading particulars of that matter remain yet to be in the memory of those who now hear. The people of Mercer county felt themselves assailed upon, and resisted the degrading encroachment.

It would be recollected, and Mr. S. thought no apology for the course he was going to pursue, amply sufficient, that in the early part of this term his constituents were assailed by one of his colleagues [Mr. Gunther], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Bayly]. Now, he ventured to say, there was not a member in this House, save himself, that would have suffered these attacks unmade, and especially by his colleague, without once protesting the charges. He had supposed in his colleague would have ample opportunity, some time or other, during the present session of Congress, to redress them, and he was not mistaken, for now the opportunity had come. The gentleman from Virginia, in the first place, had made the charge, he took leave here to say that he executed his part because it was not to be supposed that he was not acquainted with all the facts of the case; but his colleague, he thought, was less excusable. It had been charged by the gentleman from Virginia, and concurred in by his colleague, that his constituents had been engaged in molesting; that they had mobbed some negroes sent to his district, there to be decided.

Mr. BAYLY explained that the point of his remarks was against those who expelled negroes from their own community, and yet sent representatives here who were encouraging the flight of slaves from their masters. Now, the gentleman from Ohio and his constituents did not stand in that category, for they had sent no such representatives here, and therefore his remarks did not apply to that gentleman, neither had they been so intolerable.
Mr. SAWYER replied that he had said in the outset that he did not censure or blame the gentleman from Virginia, because he presumed he did not understand the subject as well as his colleague. The gentleman from Virginia had said:

"The State of Ohio, that had more abolition members on this floor than any other, had driven off slaves who were emancipated in the State, when they started to go to Ohio, bought land and settled down in the free State of Ohio, and the people, after getting their money, mobbed them, and compelled them to abandon their lands."

The gentleman, it would be recollected, was here speaking of the Randolph negroes. Now, he supposed that the mobocrats did so because the charge had been made in all the abolition papers in Ohio. Whatever his people had done he endorsed. This subject was up at the last session of Congress, and he had then taken occasion to explain how it was and why it was. Many gentlemen who were then members of the House might remember what he had then said; but there were others here now who were not then, and he desired to state the case, and to place himself and his constituents right. The abolition papers of the State of Ohio had charged them with being a set of mobocrats; they had denied it, and set forth in their papers the precise ground on which they stood; but those papers had never printed their decided grounds for saying them to be mobocrats—there they had never retracted the slander. Now, as the Representative of that constituency, and as one of the representatives of the Democracy of Ohio, he stood here in his place, and said that Ohio would never submit to the slave States sending their emancipated blacks within her borders or colonies. He again said, if the test must come, and they must resort to force to effect their object, the banks of the Ohio (a mile wide) would be lined with men with muskets on their shoulders to keep off the emancipated slaves which the slave States might attempt to throw in among them. The Democrats of Ohio, at least of his district, and he with them, would stand up in their own defense.

But his colleague’s reply to the gentleman from Virginia showed that he fully agreed with the gentleman that it was a mob. He was reported in the Intelligencer as having wished to say one word on that point; and (Mr. B. yielding the floor) observed that the act of a mob in the district represented by his colleague [Mr. SAWYER] should not be applied to Ohio in its capacity as a State, or to the Republicans there, who, he said, had taken the responsibility of it; he (Mr. G.) was aware of that; and he had only risen for the purpose of throwing it entirely from the State as a State, and from the people as a people. It was a mob and a bad mob. In town from Virginia called it a mob, his own heart responded to the truth which he asserted. It was a mob; one with which the people of that State had no sympathy whatever. One on which the people of that State looked with deep, inexpressible abhorrence; one on which they had placed their soul of condemnation, as he believed; and whose procedure they held in detestation, because they knew the principles of humanity and of the laws of the land. He knew his colleague [Mr. SAWYER] thought differently. He (Mr. G.) had only expressed what the people generally felt in his part of the State, and what he thought the people of the whole State generally felt and had expressed. He responded to the sentiment of the gentleman from Virginia, that it was the act of a mob—inhuman and detestable.

Now, he desired to say that his constituents were a law-abiding people, and that it was the men who had charge of these negroes, and those who advised and counselled them (who were Thos. Corwin and another distinguished lawyer from Dayton, Ohio, Mr. Oder) who had brought negroes into his district, and had violated the law. He now proposed to read a statute of Ohio under which they had acted, and with the letter of which they had complied, and then he would ask gentlemen to decide whether he and his constituents were the mobocrats, or the men who took the part of these negroes against their own citizens. This law was passed in 1807, and still remained on their statute-book; they acted not in violation of law, but in accordance with it. [He caused to be read a section of the law of Ohio, which requires that when any black or mulatto person comes into that State, he shall give bond and security for good behavior, and in case he refuse, that it shall be the duty of the overseer of the township to remove such person without suing county.]

Now, in accordance with law, they took with them the trustees of the township, and marched where these negroes were to land; they took the statute in their hands and asked the negroes to comply with the letter of that law, and then they could interpose no legal objection to their landing. The negroes, and those who had charge of them, utterly refused to enter into security; they then told them to take the back track, and for fear they would not do it—for fear they would go off, and, having quieted suspicion, land at some other place, their men, to the number of some four or five hundred, marched along with them and saw them safe out of the county with three good hearty cheers, and they had never ventured to come into the commonwealth, and to force the law of the State. He himself lived in it they never should. He gave gentlemen timely notice. They were not mobocrats; they valued the law and obeyed it, but those men who attempted to force those negroes upon them, in violation of the laws of his State, were mobocrats.

Suppose they had tamely submitted to it then: what next? What did these gentlemen desire free negroes to come into Ohio for? The gentleman from Virginia had told them the other day—and he proclaimed now, that all the world might hear—that most of the free negroes in the State of Ohio were the most despisiable of all creatures. Their situation there was tenfold worse than that of the slaves in the slave States; yes, the very worst slaves in the United States were not in so degraded a condition as were the free negroes in the State of Ohio, and they fetched them there for what purpose? There was an ulterior object. Did the abolitionists want to make them citizens? They said not; they professed they did not desire to make them citizens, to let them vote and enjoy all the privileges the whites enjoyed; but he should undertake to show that what was they were after. Why did they want them there? To make them their equals in society? That they could never do. And he remarked, that abolition now was not what abolition was when it was first started, when, some ten or fifteen years ago, it took its rise in Boston and New York. It was not then called abolition; it was not then called abolition; for the negro doctrine was promulgated; and, if accounts were true, gentlemen and ladies let themselves down to the common level of the negro, and said all distinctions ought to be done away with; and it was not uncommon to see a negro woman on the arm of a white man, marching to church and sitting in the same pew, in Boston and New York. That was the fact when the thing first started; but that state of things was so revolting to the sense of the community, that they were soon compelled to abandon it. What was the course taken now? Why, the whole sympathies of some gentlemen run out in favor of a certain class. What class? White. Why had come into Ohio, and asked that these degraded negroes should become the equals of the white citizen there, it was too revolting in every respect.
Their citizens would not submit to it, and they had been obliged to clothe their real designs under specious pretences. He had some evidence on this subject. Suppose that they, and every free State, should sit quietly down, and let the slave States send their surplus negroes to them; what would be the effect of it? He had here a resolution of Mr. John P. Hale, the prince of the Abolition party, offered in the Senate the present session:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to inquire what legislation, if any, be necessary to secure to the citizens of the non-slaveholding States the privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to citizens of each of the States.

What did that mean? The committee were to inquire into the expediency of letting negroes in the free States have "the privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to the citizens of each of the States." That was the privilege of coming up to the polls and voting, the enjoyment of free schools, the privilege of calling in courts of justice; in short, to let them exercise every right and privilege the white man did.

But he had something further; and he would call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Du Bois] to the subject, and ask him what he meant by introducing resolutions of this kind into the House a few days ago?

Mr. Du Bois asked leave to submit the following resolution; which was objected to, and not received:

1. That the Committee on Public Lands be instructed to inquire into the expediency of setting apart a portion of the public lands for the exclusive use and possession of free black persons, on the following terms and conditions:—

a. That every black male person above the age of twenty-one years, residing and making his residence in such territory, shall be entitled to occupy and cultivate an acre of public land situated therein; and after so occupying the same for ten years, shall be further entitled to receive a grant of the same, free of all cost or charge whatsoever.

b. That no sale of land within such territory be made by the said government, until it shall be permitted to be made by individuals, to white persons.

c. That portions of said lands be set apart for the purposes of education.

d. That such territory be separately organized and governed under the authority of Congress.

2. That the inhabitants of said territory shall amount to at least five thousand, they being invested with such powers of self-government as are usually granted to the Territories of the United States.

Now, there was a proposition to establish a State of negroes within the confines of these United States, and not only to give them the same privileges and immunities of the white citizen, but to give them, free of charge, the public lands; while the Journals of the last Congress will show, that every Whig of this House, and every Burr-abourner, and fresh negro-loving Representative from the great State of New York, had refused to give to poor white men that very privilege, and had refused to reduce and graduate the public lands to the negroes within the States. But here they were willing to set off a portion of this country to the free negro, and then guaranty to him all the rights guaranteed to the white man; that was, to allow him to go to the polls, and have a place on this floor as a Representative from the negro colony or State. That State ought to be called after the gentleman from New York—Du Bois.

Mr. Duer asked if the gentleman desired him to answer him?

Mr. Sawyer declined to yield the floor.

Mr. Du Bois said the gentleman had stated he wished to know what he (Mr. D.) meant. He had grossly misrepresented him.

Mr. Sawyer said he might have misrepresented him; he had taken these resolutions, however, out of the National Intelligencer, the White organ in this city, and if there was a misrepresentation, he was not responsible. There was, and he had read it word for word as it stood.

Now, what was they going to do? Would not the relief of those benevolent gentlemen get the negroes as citizens into Ohio and other States before they would throw off all disguise, and ask that they should enjoy free fellowship with the white man. He asked his constituents, the free laboring white men at home, whether they would back such doctrines as these?

But, on the other hand, he said, to his slaveholding friends, while he should so strongly object to their sending their surplus black population into the free States, he was firmly in maintaining their rights. And he said, don't throw up the white heads to us—those men who had the word dough-faces in their mouth every day, and whose practice now did not correspond with their professions heretofore—he asked his southern friends to deliver them up to their tender mercy—the tender mercy of Democrats from the West and Northwest, and they would take care of them and their southern friends also. No special pleading, no pretext, however ingenious, could induce them for one moment to run off after those special, beautiful things that their abolition friends had set up as gods to bow down and worship. They would stand by their own education on the landmarks of the Constitution, which they acknowledged as well as to the West every species of property which their laws made property. They should not come upon the soil of Ohio or the free States, and interfere with their rights, and, so far as they of Ohio and of the North had the power, they would preserve the rights of the South to the very letter of the law and the Constitution. Now, they had been charged, some of them, when they voted with the South on certain questions, with being dough-faces. He cared very little about the epithet; and the gentleman who was foremost in using that epithet he had heard the other evening, in which he had exhibited not only the dough-head but the dough-back. What did the gentleman mean by that term? A dough-face, as he understood, meant a head of dough upon which you might exhibit any face you pleased. There was a certain system which he believed had now been reduced to a—a science—the science of animal magnetism; if they applied that principle, there were certain dough-heads which, if you touched on a certain bump in the cranium, you operated on their sympathies; sympathy was then with them the governing principle; and all their benevolence ran out of the negro; they had no sympathy with the rest of the world, but they proclaimed themselves the sole lords and masters of the world as the sole pure philanthropists. They believed they had struck the great and only motto point, and they had quite another idea: at one moment they would go against any slaveholder in the world, but the very next breath—when touched on this part of the cranium—they hurried for old Zack, the very prince of slaveholders in the United States. He was practice and profession; and when brought to the test, the profession was not worth a cent, if the practice gave the lie to the profession.

Now, these abolition gentlemen, who thought so much and cared so much about the peculiar institution—who made abolition doctrine their gospel, their polar star, and made everything else by the side of it—their was the very same thing here and in the Old World. For he had not long since, on account of an abolition meeting in the city of London, where the aboliditionists of this country were lauded to the skies as possessing all the
patricianism and philanthropist of the country, and the
slaveholding States were held up to derision, who
denounced the South, and held themselves up as
the peculiar and exclusive philanthropists. The
inhabitants of the slaveholding States themselves
were the true friends of the slave—the real abolitionists—
abolitionists not in word, but in deed. If the doc-
trine of real abolition deserved credit, their actions
were entitled to credit. Why, little Maryland, since
the formation of this Government, had man-
united more slaves than the free States of this
Union put together, with the abolitionists of the
country. modern day standing at their backs. Yes, the
Hon. Louis McLane, of Maryland, who, when our
minister in London, was referred to by these ab-
olutionists in their meetings as being a slaveholder
and our representative at that court—that same
Mr. McLane (the brother of the gentleman from
Maryland on this floor) had manumitted all his
slaves. There was the true, philanthropic, Chris-
tian spirit; but that these conscientious abolitionists
refused to tell. The States of Virginia, Mary-
land, North Carolina, South Carolina, and
Georgia, had, of their own free will, manumitted
more slaves a thousand-fold than all the free-State
philanthropists of this country had done since the
formation of this Government. Maryland herself
had manumitted slaves to the value of sixty mil-
dollars.

And let him mention another thing—that while
England, with her friends here, was sympathizing
with the abolitionists, and condemning the slave
States in all possible shapes and forms for their
docruines on the subject of slavery, those States
owed this institution to Great Britain herself.
When we were yet colonies, England, with her
licensed robbers, robbed the coast of Africa, and
forced against the colonists' consent, thousands and
tens of thousands of slaves upon them. One State
of the Union, Massachusetts, was entitled to the
credit of having, one hundred and fifty years ago,
when a colony of Great Britain, when Great Britain
had landed her slaves there against their consent,
purchased them up with their own money, of
her tool, and manumitted them among the free set
of Africa, and landed them at their former homes. And
we looked to the original draft of the Declaration
of Independence by Thomas Jefferson, we found
that one of the reasons assigned by Thomas Je-
fferson for declaring war against Great Britain was,
that she had persisted in forcing slaves upon us
contrary to our will; and one-half of the arguments
deduced from Mr. Jefferson and other fathers of
the Republic against slavery, would be found to be
arguments, not against the institution of slavery in
the slave States, but against the slave trade, as car-
ried on by Great Britain to these colonies. In the
slave States was the very first attempt made to
abolish the slave trade. All those States
united on that principle, and that movement took
its start from the United States, and not from those
abolitionists across the water, who were now inter-
meddling with that with which they had no busi-
ness; and their intermeddling was enough to set
every American on his guard. South Carolina
and Georgia were the last to come into this agree-
ment; but they did come in finally, and it was agreed
to abolish the slave trade in a certain year.

Now, he told gentlemen, whose sympathies were
so very warm for the slave, that the slaveholders
of the slave States had manumitted more slaves—
a thousand to one—than all the philanthropists from
the free States who were now crying out so loudly
on this subject. All that these had contributed
were windy speeches against this institution; while
those true philanthropists, the slaveholders of the
South, with that commendable benevolence so hor-
orable to their character, had put their hands into
their pockets, and taken that which was property,
recognized by the laws as such, and given it up,
to the amount of millions on millions; yet now
these blubbering abolitionists came forward with
their loud boasts of philanthropy, while he ventured
to say they could not show the record where they
had given one single dollar for aiding the emanci-
pation of the slave. It was very easy for some of
the States to abolish slavery; it was very easy for
them to pass a law to compel the slaveholders to
give up their property; the slaveholders were few
in number, and it took no money from the pockets
of the large part of their citizens; and so it was
easy now for the abolitionists to cry out, Abolish
slavery, when it would not cost them one cent.
If he had it in his power, there should be no
slavery under the canopy of heaven. He regretted
its existence; but if the question were put to him
whether slavery should continue in the state States,
or the negroes should be removed to Ohio, he would
not take half a moment to answer. He preferred
that they should remain in the slave States. He
would say to the gentlemen of the slave States, that
he would do all he could to prevent them sending
their negroes into Ohio, and at the same time
he would do all he could to stand up for the rights
of those gentlemen at home. And he would say to
those who assumed to be philanthropists, that the
best way to accomplish the object which they pro-
fessed to have in view was to cause the slave
holders to keep their slaves at home; or if they
wished to manumit their slaves, let them send them
to Liberia, though he confessed he had not much
confidence in that system. However, it was the
best plan he had any knowledge of. If they were
really the friends of emancipation, as they professed
to be, he would tell gentlemen that they were
the very worst course to accomplish their object;
on the contrary, they riveted firmer and firmer the
shackles of the slaves. How many slaves had
they ever manumitted by traducing the South?
Comparatively none.

Suppose our southern friends should respectfully
stand up for us in the West the right of owning,
controlling, or having and using our own household
goods; should forbid us erecting a tene-
ment, a mill, or even a distillery; alleging, if you
please, as to the latter, that the practice of making
distilled spirits had an evil tendency, seriously
affecting the morals of the country, and sending
thousands to perdition; and suppose, under the
excitement of imaginary danger, should they here
solemnly call on Congress to prohibit such a free
use of our own property and means: if (said Mr.
S.) I mistake not the spirit and resolution of the
gallant West, they would hurl defiance in the very
teeth of their presumptuous assailants, and tell
them that every State has its laws, and every citi-
zen his rights. And I take upon me to tell all these
professed to be sympathizers and mock philan-
thropists, that their imperial repugnance towards the South has done more to fasten slavery
upon this country, and to extend and propagate it
in the land, than all that the combined power of
the slaveholders could ever effect, were they to
march all their forces in the effort.
For his part, he (Mr. S.) would say, let the
southern gentlemen keep their slaves within their
own borders; and if they could not use them, they
would discover the unprofitableness of slavery,
but they never would submit to improper inter-
cence from other States in such matters.
It had been said in a celebrated case in England,
tried in one of its courts, in relation to a slave who had procured his freedom there, that "the moment a slave touches the soil of England, his shackles fall." That expression had been frequently quoted in public meetings in this country; but those who used those words appeared not to be conscious, that at the very moment when such a declaration was made before one of the English tribunals, Englishmen were making inroads in sending slaves to her colonies in this country.

But I must pass on, (continued Mr. S.,) as my time is short. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BAXLEY] charged, the other day, that in Ohio they had taken money for land sold to emancipated slaves, and then sent them away out of the State. Perhaps in noticing this, I am running into a digression; but I hope I will be excused, as I am not very methodical in the arrangement of my thoughts. Now, since that statement was made, I have procured the signature of every citizen within the borders of the county where this was said to have occurred, and I find that but two small tracts of land have been sold to them by citizens of that county. Those who did sell the land were citizens of Connecticut, of Boston, Massachusetts, and other parts of Ohio, and not those who resided in the county where it actually took place; so that they stood relieved from such an accusation. In fact they were not aware that such purchases had been made for some time.

The other day, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HUDSON] was making a speech, and in the course of it I interrogated him. I do not see that gentleman in his seat, which I regret; for I am unwilling to speak of a gentleman in his absence, and I have a few words to say of that gentleman's discourtesy. I mean what I say; The gentleman from Massachusetts was discussing the qualifications of the several candidates for the Presidency, and I crossed and asked him, in a gentlemanly manner, and as politely as I knew how, what cause he should pursue in relation to the gentlemen nominated as candidates? The gentleman from Massachusetts, instead of answering the question, quoted some statement respecting General Cass's reception at Cleveland, Ohio, which reported that gentleman as saying that the noise was so great he could not answer questions propounded in relation to great principles. Now, that was no answer to the question which I put to the gentleman from Massachusetts. It was not pertinent to the question asked. And, still further, I deny in toto that General Cass ever used such language. I have heard gentlemen repeat that statement, and glory over it; and I have told them it was false. I am sure, and such words had been spoken, and I now say it is false. There were neither the questions propounded nor the answers given by General Cass, as that statement pretended. General Cass had no need to answer those questions, nor any others. He has been a Democrat from his boyhood, and he had followed the Democratic track, notwithstanding he was charged with having been a Federalist. If he were a Federalist, certain I am that he would receive more favor from some gentlemen than he was now likely to receive. The slander, however, was perfectly harmless; it was not even worthy of an answer.

But the Democratic nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency need no censure from me. Their history is written in the breasts of their countrymen. It is before the world, and of the world. Let the carking vexers of these two old veteran volunteers go on in their bitter crusade. Other men, in other times, have felt their malignity. Let them take a journey to Ohio and to the West, and every day's sojourn among the honest, incorruptible sovereigns of the land will tell them of their folly. Our old men and women, our fathers and mothers—the frontier settlers of that wilderness region during the last British war—all know full well how to appreciate the value of such men.

They rested secure in their humble log cabins when a Cass and Betley, who never felt the fall of danger, were their defenders. To look out upon a field of innocent parents, mothers, their little, dependent household around them, and saw them safe from the fall of the upraised tomahawk when the word of such patriots was rioting in the blood of their invaders.

Many of these patriot fathers have lived to a new generation rise up around them. The sleeping in the cradle are, on this day, at head of the political ranks of that blooming count. Voters now, they are ready to attest their gratitude to those who stood by them when not able to protect themselves.

Mr. S. now desired to ask gentlemen opposite where they stood? He had in his possession a number of extracts from Whig papers, written by himself, and from Maryland. I desire to call some written since, which he should publish, to show the harmony, and concert, and unanimity of opinion existing amongst them. They had abandoned every principle in the selection of their candidate for the Presidency. Notwithstanding their outcry against slavery and slave institutions, they had selected as their candidate the greatest slaveholder in the Union. How would they reconcile this inconsistency? The constituents of some of them did not attempt to reconcile it, for they were out against the nomination. They were showing that the epithets of "dough-faces" and "doughheads" could not be applied to them. They were consistent with themselves, and therefore of them he had nothing to say. But he begged the attention of gentlemen before he proceeded to some extracts which he had collected; and the first was from the New Bedford Mercury, of January 26, 1848, a leading Whig journal of Massachusetts. The editor has no minding of the matter, but comes directly and promptly to the point. Here is his language:

"It must be well known to all those gentlemen, that Gen. Taylor has not a shadow of a claim upon the Whig party; that he professes to be ignorant of the great principles which have formed the Whig party, and that if he is a Whig at all, his Whigery is of the most dubious character. We have had enough of great Whigs, and we infinitely prefer as president toward Locofocos of the bluest order to a merely nominal Whig."

Following up this pronouncement, the same editor "hits him again," in this manner, under date of March 26:

"THE PRESIDENCY.—The strength of General Taltories in the Locofoco sections of the Union. Not a single sure vote in St. Louis, New Orleans, or the St. Mary's, while the Whig sections of some inveterate Locofoco States, such as Virginia and Pennsylvania, go for Henry Clay. We have excepted Maryland, but we are inclined to believe that the popular champions of the Republican party are greatly and considerably to General Taylor. We are aware that the political cliques of Maryland are for Taylor. The two Johnsons, Beverley and Cost, are famous Taylorites; and we do not doubt that Mr. Mac- meal and the, general of the same State, not strictly Whigs, will exert themselves for Taylor."

"We have private advices which indicate that D. Whistle is not in favor of the military candidate."

Will not this account for Mr. Webster's very sudden illness at Baltimore, a few, evenings since, where he had been invited to make a ratification speech? So sudden an attack—an attack that sent him ahead to Boston with locomotive speed—must have sprung from a similar disease to that now raging so awfully in Northern Ohio and some other parts. But again to the Mercury. That Mercury is literally stuffed full of political cabal just now.
The evidence produced in this case clearly proves that the President of the United States unnecessarily and unconstitutionally incurred the expenses of the war, for which he is responsible. Consequently, he ought not only to pay for his expenses of the war, but that of Mexico also. At any rate, I say "right.

Here we have the precious avowals. Here is the Federal policy foreshadowed. Once let them be spoken, and all will be asked by the people to pay back to Mr. Smith, the expenses incurred in the war.

The next peculiarly-marked specimen of Whig policy and principle, I take from the speech of the Honorable Caleb B. Smith, a distinguished Whig Representative from the State of Indiana. He thus alludes to the war, to its causes, and to what is to follow. Let it speak for itself:

"If the Administration shall succeed at the next election, which God forbid, the mask will be thrown off, and then we shall be told, that we cannot get along without all Mexico, we shall be told, that the American people have decided in favor of annexation, and that annexation must be consummated.

Mr. Smith, I believe there can be no easier task for this Administration to bring the present war to a close. I believe that peace, an honorable peace, may be had in thirty days: a peace just to Mexico, and honorable to our country.

Let us meet the War Department, that we may shorten our justice and magnanimity, as we have already shown our heroic courage and skill in war. And what is necessary to effect this desirable object? Let the President do one thing: namely, offer a liberal peace commission, to include clerks, and men of character and high standing, men known to the country, and whose character will be a guarantee of fair and upright intentions on the part of those sent. Let them be empowered to propose the terms, and let them propose terms of peace, just and equitable to both parties; let them relinquish their wild schemes of conquest, and propose terms of peace just and fair; and, my word for it, Mexico will accept terms of peace, because we can, it can be obtained in this way, and without honor. But, for myself, I do not want or wish for a foot of Mexican soil.--I detest and denounce all prosecution of war for plunder.

Mr. Sawyer here interposed, and (Mr. Smith yielding to a floor in a moment) inquired, what were the terms he thought preferable.

Mr. Smith, resuming, said that if he were in a position required him to define the terms of a treaty, he might perhaps tell the gentleman what those terms would be; as it was, he should be glad to see the Administration define them. Why did they not? Why did they not propose some terms on which a judgment could be made up? Why conceal the fact they sought under the cabalistic phrase of "security," the meaning of which he did not pretend to fathom. Mr. Smith said, I believe, that the Secretary of State would have no hesitation in saying what these terms ought to be. He had already stated them. In the first place, he utterly repudiated all idea of demanding indemnity for expenses incurred. Why should we ask for anything like the Mexican? I told my own constituents on the stump, that, for my own part, I would as soon think of taking a lunch on the highway as extorting from Mexico the expenses of the war. We have already, as Mr. Smith has said, paid for it, and for nothing. Office holders are unconstitutional, and that it was begun by the President. Believe it! It is the truth. We have no right to ask to be reimbursed. We have no right to ask anything for the past, and deserve this hugging with Mexico for the cost of the powder burnt in "taking her forts and cities from her." Here we have a fair sample of Federal opposition to the war and to the Administration: it is the sentiment of that party. It is here distinctly and emphatically avowed, and we behold it here put forth with a boldness and independence that leaves no room for doubt or cavil:—"All idea of demanding indemnity for expenses of the war" is promptly "repudiated." Robbing on the highway would be preferred to making such a demand of "poor, persecuted Mexico." Mr. Smith said, "We are for brave and worthy laity. Let every Reoman of this continent read and ponder well this startling declaration: "We have no right to be reimbursed for the cost of this war?" "People of the Union, (cry out these Federal patriots,) give back your ill-gotten gains! You plundered it from feeble and innocent hands! Surrender up (any they) all that you have thus wrongfully acquired! Bow down to Mexico, and ask her for-giveness! You invaded her soil—b butchered her people—laid waste her territory! Pay back the tribute you so arbitrarily exacted; withdraw from her cities; acknowledge your wrongs; repent of this base deed, and be forgiven of your God and country!" This is the shout of patriotic Whigery throughout the land. Their country always wrong—the enemy ever in the right.

Let us give a plain illustration of this business. For a moment let us imagine—what I trust in God can never in this country happen—that General Taylor is elected President of these United States. The Hon. Caleb B. Smith may then come in as Secretary of State, and my friend and colleague, Mr. Fisher, may be sent as minister to Mexico. Negotiations are opened for a settlement of the expenses of the Mexican war. Mexico puts forth her claims for full indemnity, in defending her altars and her freecides from a ruthless invader, quoting Mr. Clay's Lexington speech, and from that of Mr. Corwin, in which he favored in the Senate, to sustain the justice and equity of the claim. She alleges the war to have been "an aggressive one" on our part, our object being solely to rob her, and to steal her land; and, alongside of Mr. Clay's and Mr. Corwin's speeches, those of the new Secretary and minister are publicly read, to prove how just and proper an item of some $50,000,000 or $100,000,000 will be to be thus "reimbursed." Mexico will then urge upon the new minister and Secretary that we "commenced" the war in direct violation of our Constitution; that we invaded an unoffending people; that we pursued them, and fought and conquered them in open violation of all the great principles regulating the intercourse of nations; and, to cap the climax, the House of Representatives and Senate are then brought forward to prove that every Whig vote was given in favor of Mexico! Yes, $100,000,000 may then be demanded, and $100,000,000 refunded! If these Whig speakers, and voters, and praters, and grumblers, have been honest in their professions, honest in their denunciations, honest in their benevolent and sympathetic devotion to Mexican interests, they will, they must vote to pay back, under a Taylor administration. Well can I imagine, sir, the eagerness, the enthusiastic welcome with which such a "reimbursement" will be met in the treaty-making branch of the American Congress. There Mexico will find her old advocates and friends. There will be Mr. Corwin, of the great Whig party, to repeat his own enthusiastic harangue, that had he been a Mexican, he would have welcomed the Americans with bloody hands and hospitable graves. There will stand the great and peerless Webster, the "second Daniel come to judgment," willing, rather, perhaps, to see the walls of the Capitol bolstered down, than to surrender up his opinion of the injustice of the war.

But reverse the picture, and how stands the question? In whom can the American people most safely put their trust in times like these? Where the men, where the statesmen, the patriots, the soldiers, who will now most boldly stand up to the cause of their country, and best protect and defend her honor? Is it not true that the majority of the nation have selected the men—Cass and Butler; if elected, they will carry out American doctrines, and see justice done to our country. We have "indemnity" in our own hands. Insolence has been chastised, American rights have been vindicated, American valor has been tested, and a war of justice, which sought only the redress of injuries, long and patiently endured, has been brought to an honorable, peaceful, and a happy termination.